

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 March 1993

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Statutes Amendment (Chief Inspector),
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Declaration of Validity).

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

STATE BANK

A petition signed by 291 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow the electors to pass judgment on the losses of the State Bank by calling a general election was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reintroduce capital punishment for crimes of homicide was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

ALBERTON SCHOOL

A petition signed by 258 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide funds for the employment of additional teaching staff at the Alberton school was presented by Mr De Laine.

Petition received.

FISHING, NET

A petition signed by 605 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow commercial net fishing at Maslin and Port Willunga beaches to continue was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

DRUGS

A petition signed by 346 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for drug offenders was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

MODBURY INTERCHANGE

A petition signed by 251 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide adequate shelter for commuters at the Modbury interchange was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

FAIR VIEW PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain the out-of-school-hours care program at Fairview Park Primary School was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

CHILD ABUSE

A petition signed by 1 306 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for offenders convicted of child sexual abuse was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

CITIZEN INITIATED REFERENDA

A petition signed by 246 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to hold a referendum to implement all aspects of citizen initiated referenda was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PRISONER SENTENCES

A petition signed by 2 104 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide for mandatory prison sentences for serious driving, larceny and firearm offences was presented by Mr Lewis.

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 151, 224, 279, 304, 306, 322, 339, 341, 342, 352, 354, 367 and 377.

Stock Medicines Act 1939—Hormone Growth Promotants

Forestry Act Proclamation—Mt Burr Forest District

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Treasurer (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
 Superannuation (Benefit Scheme) Act 1992—
 Regulations—Member Exclusions—Fees
 Friendly Societies Act—Amendment to General Laws
 —Lifeplan Community Services
- By the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and
 Local Government Relations (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Expiation of Offences Act 1987—Late Payment Form
 Summary Procedure Act 1921—Interstate Summary
 Protection Order
 District Council of Tumby Bay—By-law No. 40—Council
 Reserves
- By the Minister of Environment and Land
 Management (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Beverage Container Act 1975—Beer, Water and Soft
 Drink
 Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Dry Areas—Adelaide
 Marine Environment Protection Act 1990—
 Interpretation—Business
- By the Minister of Education, Employment and
 Training (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
 Education Act 1972—Regulations—Expiation Fees
- By the Minister of Public Infrastructure (Hon. J.H.C.
 Klunder)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Rates and Land Tax Remission Act 1986—Schedule
 Variation
 Sewerage Act 1929—Connection Fees
 Water Resources Act 1990—Fees
 Waterworks Act 1932—Connection Fees
- By the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational
 Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Expiation Fees
 Explosives Act 1936—Expiation Fees
- By the Minister of Business and Regional Development
 (Hon. M.D. Rann)—
 Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—Practical Driving
 Examination
- By the Minister of Health, Family and Community
 Services (Hon. M.J. Evans)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Ambulance Services Act 1992—Prescribed Services
 Public and Environmental Health Act 1987—Cytology
 and Biopsy Results
 South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Whyalla
 Hospital Rehabilitation Service
- By the Minister of Primary Industries (Hon. T.R.
 Groom)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Fisheries Act 1982—Rock Lobster
 Stock Act 1990—Hormone Growth Promotants

STATE BANK

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On 18 February 1993 the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked a question regarding the legality, price and protection of insurance offered by the State Bank. The bank has had an extensive survey of its insurance products conducted by its insurance brokers, Sedgwick Limited—one of Australia's largest international broking firms—since the question was raised and is satisfied with the cover offered to its customers. On the question of legality of the home and contents insurance offered by State Bank, the State Bank is complying with all relevant requirements of the Insurance Contracts Act. This has been confirmed by legal and broking firms acting for State Bank and QBE Insurance, who supplies the bank's insurance. Based on the survey by Sedgwick Limited, insurance offered through the State Bank was found to be among the best available.

The Deputy Leader asserted up to 300 homeowners in the Hills were not aware that their home insurance through the State Bank did not include flood cover. In fact, the State Bank has received 12 claims. When customers contact the bank for insurance, they are informed about what the cover includes and they are sent a cover note within 48 hours of that first contact with the details and a brochure that clearly explains what the policy does and does not cover. The cover note provides 30 days of insurance cover and, following the signing of the agreement, allows for a further 14 days in which to pull out.

Flood cover is provided by only one of the 12 insurers surveyed. However, if the property is in the high risk area, cover is also excluded by this particular insurer. Insurance cover for State Bank customers in high risk areas can only be provided upon site inspection and subject to additional premium. This is standard insurance industry practice. I am also advised the 20 per cent commission paid to the State Bank by QBE is within industry standards. I sum up as follows:

1. The State Bank, after a reputable broking firm has surveyed its products, is satisfied with the policy, pricing and procedures it provides to insurance customers.

2. State Bank, through its insurance company QBE Insurance, provides the broadest cover or equivalent cover to the rest of the market.

3. Twelve claims have been made following floods in the Adelaide Hills—not 300.

4. The commission paid to the State Bank by QBE Insurance is within the industry standard.

The SPEAKER: Before calling for questions, I point out, as members will have noticed, that we have been having difficulties with the bells lately. We have had them looked at, but it seems that we may have to take another step into technology to fix the problem. I ask

members for their tolerance as we attempt to solve the problem.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier give an assurance that the report by the State Bank Royal Commissioner on his second and third terms of reference will be tabled in this House next Tuesday, the first sitting day after it is received by Her Excellency the Governor and, if not, why not?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The assurance I give is that the report, when it is received by the Governor and then by the Government, will be tabled on the first sitting day after that. The advice is that the Governor will receive it this Friday; next Tuesday would be the first sitting day. But if there is anything wrong with the advice about this Friday, clearly that would affect the final tabling. It is my intention to table it on the first sitting day after receipt.

FIGHTBACK

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Premier advise the House what impact the Federal Coalition Government would have on the finances of the South Australian Government and what options would be open to the State Government to fill any budget shortfall? I understand that the South Australian Government has completed a costing of the Federal Opposition's Fightback package which analyses in detail the potential impact on the South Australian budget and the people of South Australia.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I do, in fact, have some information on this. Of course, it is somewhat of a moving feast, because the figures tend to change a bit from day to day as a result of the Federal Opposition's policies being refined day to day—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—as they go out trying to seek votes. Indeed, there have been some changes. It is pleasing to note that the State Bank figure that the Opposition is talking about has now been upped as a result of Peter Reith saying that they will have \$400 million net present value as opposed to the effective amount that the Leader apparently—or not so certainly—had been able to get from the Federal Opposition in what is still to be a properly explained situation.

Nevertheless, as I say, the figures do change a bit from day to day. A couple of weeks ago I indicated that the impact on the State would be of the order of \$138 million a year. In fact, if the Federal Opposition were to be in government, the situation would be much worse than that. We find that the actual figure in 1993-94

would be a loss—a take from the South Australian budget—of nearly \$200 million.

Mr Meier: Rubbish!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is not rubbish at all. I would suggest that the actual figures should be looked at.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I was asked today whether I was conducting something of a scare campaign on this matter, but the reality is that I have not created a bogey and then created some legends about this bogey. I have actually gone to the words of the man himself—the words of John Hewson—and his team to hear what they are actually saying they will do to State Governments. Those figures are there. All members opposite are busy promoting these figures; they are promoting the documents of the Federal Opposition right around this State at the moment. We have gone to the selfsame documents, and Treasury has looked at them, as have other departments. Today I issued a summary of the analysis that has been done on these matters, so it is not rubbish at all. They are your own words coming back to haunt you and proving that the election of a Federal Liberal Government would cost taxpayers of this State dearly indeed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is it appropriate for the Premier to use the pronouns 'you' and 'your' when answering such a question? Should not the remarks be addressed to the Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold the point of order. All responses and contributions to this Parliament should be directed through the Chair, and the terms 'you' and 'your' are certainly out of order in the context of the debate in the Parliament. The honourable Premier.

Mr Venning: And you ought to know better!

The SPEAKER: And so should the member for Custance. He is out of order with his interjection. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If a Hewson Government were in office, there would be cuts of \$81.6 million to general purpose grants—\$59.2 million because of inadequate compensation measures in the payroll tax area. That is as a result of the signing away of South Australia by the Leader of the Opposition. He was eager to put his name to a document without looking at the fine print. The fine print of how one calculates the payroll tax compensation, about what guarantees there are that the Grants Commission does in fact take into account relativities between the States, is not there. That adds another \$59.2 million loss or take from South Australians. I also refer to the Building Better Cities Program, \$27.1 million, the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement with another loss of \$36 million, and the urban public transport program, \$800 000. Taking into account the pluses and minuses on the petroleum excise abolition—and it is acknowledged that there are pluses and minuses—the net effect would be a loss to the State of \$19 million. In the legal aid area, it is \$900 000, and that gives a subtotal of \$224.6 million taken from

South Australians—an amount that South Australians can ill afford. In fairness, there are some pluses and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, Treasury officers and other Government departments—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Can I say that the real name involved here as to the author of this information is none other than John Hewson himself, because they are his figures; they are his statements; it is his Fightback program. One can go down to some shop, I guess, and buy it, read it, and do the analysis oneself. In fairness—because one must always be fair and put both sides of the story—were John Hewson to be elected, there are some things that would be a plus for the finances of the State. We must remember that, so far, the negative tally is minus \$224.6 million. As for the pluses, there would be an increase in tobacco excise of \$12.5 million, an increased Government school fund of \$2.5 million, and a superannuation guarantee levy saving of \$15 million. That brings the net impact to a \$194 million loss to the State—an amount that South Australians can ill afford.

Then we take into account the \$200 million difference between the Keating package and the Hewson package in the event of the sale of the State Bank at an appropriate fair market price, and then the fiscal equalisation situation—and in Hewson's own words he does not believe in one State subsidising another. He said that; he is on the public record. That is worth \$380 million to this State.

If he takes away fiscal equalisation from South Australia, in each year it would be taking away \$380 million. What that means is that either this State Government would have to go for increased taxes (and I do not believe that is what the community of South Australia wants) or there would have to be wholesale cuts in Government expenditure and massive reductions in the levels of employment in the public sector, which would therefore not be able to deliver the types and quality of services that South Australians want from their public sector in this State. A Hewson Government would offer to South Australians a package that this State cannot afford. We cannot afford to see the loss of \$200 million in one year and, over a three year Federal term (if we take into account fiscal equalisation and the State Bank), what amounts to well over \$1 billion that would be ripped away from South Australians.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport investigated written information given to him last month that his predecessor, the Hon. Kym Mayes, encouraged patronage and nepotism in the TAB? The Government Management Board report on former TAB General Manager, Mr Barry Smith—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON:—found that allegations of patronage and nepotism in the TAB were of substance and that Mr Smith had acted improperly. This was on the basis that at

least 38 people, including two members of Mr Smith's family, had been employed by the TAB following direct referral by Mr Smith to one of his subordinates. However, when the Minister tabled this report on the last day of sitting, he did not reveal that in a letter to him of 5 February this year he was given information that his predecessor (Hon. Kym Mayes) and board members had referred names to the TAB for employment.

I have been advised that, while the Minister of Recreation and Sport, the Hon. Kym Mayes, telephoned Mr Smith and also wrote to him and his personal assistant requesting that employment be given to at least six people, and I understand that their employment was granted. The Minister was also advised that the son and daughter of one board member, Mr Corcoran, and a daughter of another, Mr Linke, were provided with TAB employment after an approach to Mr Smith. Of the 38 persons identified in the Government Management Board inquiry, Mr Smith recalled referring only 12 for casual employment. A significant number of the balance of that list were granted employment as a result of approaches by the Hon. Kym Mayes and by board members. I am informed that the current Minister of Recreation and Sport knows this but, by his silence, has allowed Mr Smith solely to be blamed for these practices.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: I thank the honourable member for this opportunity to put on the record some pertinent facts about this matter. I understand it is one of a long series of personal attacks the honourable member has made on my colleague, using the forums of this place to do so. The practice of those who abuse the forums of this House for base political purposes is to be deplored. The reality is that an officer of the TAB did seek an indemnity so that information could be given to the Government Management Board inquiry. That indemnity was granted.

The information that was forthcoming was very thoroughly investigated by the Crown Solicitor, officers of the Crown Solicitor and solicitors from the Crown Solicitor's office, who interviewed the relevant persons and carried out this investigation. The investigation showed that indeed many people had referred persons or information about persons to the TAB as persons suitable or recommended for employment. This is a procedure in which I think all members and members of the public engage from time to time, particularly in this area, where people are appointed not to public service positions but to casual positions in the telephone betting service conducted by the TAB. Quite a large staff is employed there and the turnover is quite high. The inquiry revealed that many of the people the Minister had referred in fact did not get employment; in fact, only a small number did.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: From memory, I think it was something less than 10 per cent who obtained employment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: Of those who were employed—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member does not seem to be interested in hearing the answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg has had his opportunity to ask his question. If he wants to ask a further question, he should notify the Chair.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Obviously, he is not interested in the answer. He has made up his mind and he will pursue his political agenda rather than hear the facts of this matter. The reality is that every one of these instances was investigated thoroughly and there was no basis to the allegation that there was any influence upon an officer or officers of the TAB as to these appointments. Indeed, the allegation made by the officer was that the former General Manager of the TAB had in some way, directly or implied, caused there to be some coercion in the appointment of certain people.

The advice from the Crown Solicitor was that there was no evidence to sustain that allegation against the General Manager of the TAB. I can assure the honourable member and all members that this matter was investigated thoroughly as a result of the inquiry and that the conclusion reached was that these allegations were without basis.

STATE BANK

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Has the Treasurer made any comparison of the tax compensation packages that have been offered by the Prime Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The member for Victoria is out of order. The member for Mitchell.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I will start again, Mr Speaker. Has the Treasurer made any comparison of the tax compensation packages which have been offered by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition for the sale of the State Bank?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have been attempting to make these comparisons because I know that every member of the House and every person in South Australia will be interested in the results. However, it has been somewhat difficult. The Federal Labor Government has made perfectly clear what its position is and, in net present value terms, the compensation to be made available to the South Australian Government after 13 March is about \$600 million. All the commentators have said that that is a very generous package indeed.

When trying to compare that with something, I have had to go back to some of the statements made by the Leader to attempt to make a fair comparison although, as I say, it has been extremely difficult. The Leader has said a number of things. On the Keith Conlon program he said that he would expect \$1 000 million—he would demand \$1 000 million—from the Federal Government as compensation. I have the transcript of that here. The Leader actually said that. I thought, 'Okay, I heard him say it and now I've read it, so we ought to be able to rely on that.' But the Leader has since repudiated that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand that under Standing Orders Ministers are required to answer the substance of the question. As I heard the question, it was: Has the Treasurer made a comparison between two sets of figures? I do not think the Minister is answering the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair understands the point of order. The Treasurer has had a little leeway in which to make his case and I now ask him to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In attempting to make the comparison I have tried and made a genuine effort, but on the Keith Conlon program the Leader repudiated what he said and what was written about this issue. It was difficult to make that comparison. The Leader came running back from Canberra after signing away our rights in the payroll tax area and said that it was \$400 million. Up in my home town, Whyalla, John Hewson said, 'I have never heard of it. The South Australian Leader made that up. I am not bound by anything like that. It purely came out of the head of the South Australian Leader.' So much for mates!

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: He looked foolish then.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He did not just look foolish: he looked a complete prat. I want to refer very briefly to an article in the *City Messenger*, and I must say that it was a very balanced article.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule on the same point of order. The Minister does not seem to understand your previous ruling, and I do not understand what the *City Messenger* has to do with this question.

The SPEAKER: If the member for Hayward does not understand it, he cannot hold the Chair responsible for that. However, I ask the Treasurer to be as specific as possible in answer to the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am being sidetracked by the member for Hayward. The article entitled 'Politics' by Kennedy in today's *City Messenger* was a balanced article because it was complimentary of the Treasurer and derogatory of the Leader. It stated:

After more than 48 hours of Dean Brown being made to look a complete prat and someone making very loose with the truth, Peter Reith was wheeled out in damage control mode to say that the discussion had been with him and not with Hewson.

After 13 March, the relative merits of the offers that have been made will be of critical interest to the people of South Australia and, as much as we can, we must be able to make a valid comparison with a package that appears to have no support from Dr Hewson.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It seems to have no basis in fact but, as much as we can make a comparison, it is quite clear that all the independent commentators have said that South Australia would be far better off, without any question, with the Federal Government's package of assistance with respect to its debt reduction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is clear, and becoming clearer every day, that the chances of a change of Government are getting slimmer and slimmer.

Members opposite will wake up on 14 March and say, 'How on earth did we do it again, for the fifth time?'

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier consider it proper for a Minister to ask statutory authorities for which he has responsibility, such as the TAB, to give employment to people nominated by the Minister? If not, what action does he intend to take against the former Minister of Recreation and Sport?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That question has just been answered by my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who put the whole situation into context. This is an attempt to create innuendo and to misrepresent the facts, and it has been suggested, 'Well, if you accept this misrepresentation of the situation, what about doing something else?' The point is that my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport has put into perspective what actually transpired in this situation, and there is nothing more to add.

TEACHERS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training provide the House with information on the work to be undertaken by the review group appointed to examine the current teacher placement policy?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. Certainly—and I have already announced this in the House—I can now confirm that I have established a review group to provide advice on policies and, indeed, procedures relating to the placement of teachers throughout the education system in South Australia. The review will cover aspects of placement policy, process and procedures and will recommend practical strategies for improvement. These terms of reference include, for example, the provision of information to me as the Minister on incentives to attract teachers to transfer to and to remain in difficult to staff locations; to provide strategies to improve the accuracy of predicting senior secondary enrolments, which is not an easy task in any system throughout the country; to provide strategies that will ensure minimum disruption to students and schools annually; and departmental management of the placement process, including the timing and the procedures. The consultancy firm, Ernst and Young, has been engaged to conduct the review, and it will be aided by an advisory group comprising—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, isn't that amazing! What an amazing interjection from the member for Hayward. It just goes to show the complete and total disarray and disunity of the Opposition. His colleague in another place—the shadow Minister for all of this; and I suspect the honourable member would very much like to be the shadow Minister, and he may be making a run for this (and the Opposition Leader is no doubt making notes)—in fact has supported and called for an independent consultant to oversee the process of this

review. So, we have yet another division in the great Liberal Party of South Australia. I find it amazing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, as someone asked, 'Which faction?' I do not think it was mentioned; I do not think he is in any faction. As a result of the interjection, which was quite out of order, again we see exposed the total inconsistency and, in fact, lack of support for various members by other members of the Opposition. As I was saying, the independent consultant from Ernst and Young will be supported by a very small advisory group comprising a representative of the South Australian Institute of Teachers and four school-based practitioners, including a country teacher and a primary schoolteacher.

In terms of the qualifications and the competency of Ernst and Young, it has been extensively involved in work related to education in South Australia in the past four years and, indeed, is very familiar with the operation of the Education Department. It was my predecessor who appointed Ernst and Young to look at the assessment of teachers under the New Directions Scheme in relation to the way in which we were able to ensure that some of those teachers who wished to leave the service were able to do so.

The procedures, in case Opposition members are interested, were undertaken in accordance with the correct procedures under the Government management regulations, whereby a register of interest was called for and quite a number of consultancy firms tendered for this position. It was decided that Ernst and Young certainly was the most suitable for the position, and the firm has been appointed. I welcome any further questions on this matter.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Why has the Minister of Recreation and Sport ignored the recommendations contained within the police report into the TAB regarding the removal of the members of the board, and will the Minister give an assurance that with the exception of the SAJC representative, Dr Richard Morton, who is a recent appointee, the remainder of the TAB board will be immediately replaced and that he will not reappoint any of those members to the new board?

The police report on the board identified at least seven areas of incompetence or negligence by board members, quite separate to the handling of the Barry Smith affair. One of these identified the board's failure to acquaint itself with the TAB tendering process or at least to seek assurances that the process was not creating a significant conflict of interest. Another referred to the failure by the board to recognise that it had a management problem, despite losing 14 managers, including a deputy general manager, five divisional managers and eight departmental managers over four years, creating a management turnover rate of 67 per cent.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member was calling for the sacking of the board well before these reports were tabled and, to be consistent, he is still doing so after they have been tabled. It appears that, regardless

of what the report says, the honourable member is still calling for the sacking of the board. The interesting thing is that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members for Albert Park and Morphett are out of order.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:—the honourable member who asked the question previously is calling for the sacking of those people who could be identified as former members of this place. Of course, now he is calling for further members to be sacked, and to that extent he has modified the ambit of his claim. It was suggested—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

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

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Morphett.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:—in the police report that the meeting to which the police referred as occurring was characterised by the board at that time as not being a meeting but an opportunity to resolve a dispute which was characterised as a personality dispute between two senior officers of the department. Minutes were not taken on the occasion when that dispute was believed to have been resolved by those members of the board who were present. The board did not believe it was its responsibility to do that. I have taken advice on that matter and, when the facts are assessed, I believe that any reasonable person would take the view that it was a very harsh decision to dismiss a board on the basis of what was held by the Government Management Board report as being in the best interests of the TAB. Those members of the board acted in good faith; they believed that they were doing the right thing by the board.

In hindsight it can be seen that the board erred. Its judgment was wrong; it should have formalised that meeting; it should have recorded the decisions that were taken; and it should have been characterised as a meeting of the board of the TAB. But that was not the characterisation given to it at that time by those board members. To claim in hindsight that that very punitive action should be taken against that board simply cannot be justified. By calling for that action, the honourable member is simply trying to take political advantage of the previous service of some members of the TAB board—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I think that is simply deplorable. That board is responsible for an organisation that has a turnover of \$500 million *per annum*. It has been said in the public arena that the growth of activity in that board and the work done by its administration and its former general manager occurred in a period of extreme growth in the activities of that organisation. Many of the decisions that it has taken have borne fruit not only for the Government but for the racing industry in this State. I believe that, instead of the honourable member's carrying on with his carping criticism of individuals associated with that board, he ought to acknowledge that great progress has been made, that the

organisation has been put into a very sound financial position and provides a very important source of revenue for the people of this State and for a very important industry in this State, the racing industry.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training indicate whether the Children's Services Office is working to increase the participation rate in early childhood services and the quality of that participation for Aboriginal children and their families? The report of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody made a very strong point that, to a considerable extent, the success of the whole national Aboriginal education policy hinges on the success of preschool activities.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The member who asked this question certainly has a record in this House of continuous support not only for the Aboriginal communities in South Australia but also in the area of education of Aboriginal children, and now we are looking specifically at the area of children's services. That takes in the 0 to 8 years age group and the issue of early childhood. It is probably the most important learning period in any child's development, and certainly this can be applied to Aboriginal children.

A major objective of the Children's Services Office continues to be to increase the participation rate in early childhood services for Aboriginal children, and just as importantly to involve Aboriginal families in the planning, development and provision of services. It is important that Aboriginal families actually have some say in the type and quality of services provided to their children. We have found over the years that the employment of Aboriginal staff in various capacities ensures the involvement of Aboriginal families in services, and this is complemented by the meetings of an Aboriginal Early Childhood Consultative Committee which is convened by the Children's Services Office.

The Children's Services Office is a leading employer of Aboriginal people, with 54 people being employed in such positions as teacher, assistant, centre director and project officer. Aboriginal participation in services has steadily increased from 193 participants in 1987 to 771 in 1992. The Children's Services Office is developing a three year plan for Aboriginal preschool education from 1993 to 1995, and various activities to celebrate the International Year of Indigenous People in 1993 are being developed through local activities. I understand that a short video will be produced to promote services to Aboriginal families showing Aboriginal children and families participating in children's services and reinforcing the value of those services in providing longer term educational outcomes for children.

I thank the honourable member for this question. It is important that, as South Australians, we recognise that we are moving to meet one of the fundamental recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, that is, to provide an early intervention and support service for Aboriginal families through the provision of children's services right throughout this State.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Will the Minister of Public Infrastructure explain to the House his understanding of section 17 of the ETSA Act which gives the board the power to appoint the General Manager and the extent to which this power overrides section 5 of the Act relating to ministerial control and direction?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. Baker: Have you read the Act?

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

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The member for Victoria, by interjection before I had even started to answer, asked me whether I had read the Act. He is going to regret that statement, I can tell him that, because the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:—has reduced the Opposition's position on this matter to one of ridicule and to the sidelines of the main debate. I can say that, and I do not say things lightly in this House. Let me quote the honourable member on the Conlon show a few days ago. His statement was, 'If you don't like what's going on in a board, you change the board members', and, later on, 'If Minister Klunder didn't like what the board did, he changes the board. That's the Government's powers.'

Mr D.S. Baker: That is exactly right.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: If the honourable member had actually read the ETSA Act, he would have read section 10 of that Act which provides that the only way in which the Government can get rid of board members is by an address of both Houses of Parliament to the Governor. That is the man who has the courage—the foolish courage, perhaps—to ask whether I have read the Act. What an utterly ridiculous situation that a man who asks me whether I have read the Act clearly has not read it himself.

Section 17 of the Act provides that the board has the power to appoint staff. That is the section to which the honourable member is referring. He then refers to section 5, but he actually means section 5(1)(a), which indicates that the Minister has the power to direct and control the trust. I might just indicate that section 17 was in that Act long before section 5(1)(a) was introduced which, from memory, was in 1985. In 1985 that was debated in this House and in another place, and eventually it became an Act.

My understanding is that, whenever we talk to Parliamentary Counsel or lawyers, they will tell us that the latest section is seen as having precedence over a previous section of an Act. Again, the honourable member would not know that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Of course I am defending my actions: I took that action on behalf of this State, and I have absolutely no intention of resiling from it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

SOIL CONSERVATION BOARDS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence will resume his seat. Until the Chair can hear the question and the answer, I will cease the proceedings of the House. The member for Spence.

Mr ATKINSON: Can the Minister of Primary Industries say what incentives the Government gives farmers to conserve the soil quality of their land while maintaining production?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am indebted to the member for Spence for this question. In February I released district plans for both the Murray-Mallee and the West Broughton soil conservation boards. Both documents provide a basis for sustainable land management in South Australia and will lead the way for the rest of Australia, because they are the first of their kind in Australia. The other 26 soil conservation boards in South Australia have begun the planning process, and the Far West Coast Soil Conservation Board currently has its plan out for public comment. The Act provides that all the soil conservation boards must have had such plans in place by 1995.

The importance of land care is self evident in the fact that it is estimated that land-holders need to spend an extra \$140 million over and above current expenditure just to maintain production in South Australia at current levels. About \$60 million spent on improving soil fertility could be expected to return about \$170 million in increased production. It is clear that in South Australia to maintain our resource base we need to increase support for sustainable land resource management if South Australian farmers are to continue to prosper.

In February I was pleased to be able to announce the improved land management loans scheme, which provides incentives for land-holders to use sustainable land management practices on their farms. This scheme was developed jointly by my department, the Soil Conservation Council and the Animal and Plant Control Commission. The loans will go up to a maximum of \$150 000 at an interest rate for the first three years of 6 per cent. There is actually no ceiling on the quantum of the loans, but that will be looked at in the light of what applications are received. So clearly, through these endeavours, the Government strongly supports the concept of district planning, because this approach ensures the integration of development and conservation principles of ecologically sustainable development.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. Why is the Government more interested in using ETSA as a cash cow than in establishing with the trust a vital set of defined objectives relating to tariffs, debt reduction, returns on assets, contributions to

Government and future funding arrangements? The statements in today's *Advertiser* of the former Chairman of ETSA, Mr Mierisch, indicate that, despite four years effort on the part of the ETSA board, the Government has failed to commit itself to such a set of objectives, with the result that ETSA has been forced to pay \$160 million over and above the Government's 5 per cent sales tax in order to prop up the State budget, in the process inflicting the nation's second highest electricity tariffs on South Australians.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Again, the honourable member asks a question either in total ignorance of her own Party's position or with not the slightest interest in her own Party's position. Let me just point out what her own Party's position is in this matter. The trust has assets of about \$2.6 billion, depending on how one calculates it and how one goes about it.

The Opposition's view is that there should be a 7 per cent real rate of return. The last time I saw that it was the Deputy Leader's press statement when he was previously the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but he has not resiled from that situation. Given that to be a real rate of return, we are now talking about a rate of return very close to 9 per cent, and that would be in the order of \$220 million. So, the Opposition is saying that it would take more but it is arguing that this Government should not take as much as it has. That is hypocritical.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): Can the Premier advise on the outcome of the International Advisory Board of the MFP meeting and report any progress on the selection of the chief executive?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The International Advisory Board was established soon after both the South Australian and the Federal Governments committed to the project. It is an extremely prestigious body, with members drawn from the highest level of business and technology from Japan, the United Kingdom, Germany, USA, Thailand, Singapore, Korea, France and Sweden. The board has been conducting its second major meeting in Adelaide over the past two days.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Ross Smith for his question about this important matter. I know of his own extensive interest in this area, he having played an important part in bringing the MFP project to South Australia and in subsequent events, including the establishment of the International Advisory Board, as has of course John Button. Whatever else happens on 13 March, one thing is a certainty: John Button leaves Federal politics and it would be appropriate to acknowledge the great work he has done in developing not only this particular project but all his work in developing Australian industry that is so well respected by industry right around the country.

As the member for Ross Smith has correctly identified, there has just been a meeting of the International Advisory Board in Adelaide. I am advised by both Will

Bailey and Eishiro Saito of that board that they had some productive discussions indeed about the current status of the project and where it is going in 1993 and beyond. Indeed, the members of the board who commit themselves to a significant time schedule in travelling to Australia from the various parts of the world from which they come, plus the commitment they have to give to go through the papers, receive the briefings and then discuss the issues, are happy to do so because they share in the enthusiasm for this great national project.

Nearly concurrent with the International Advisory Board meeting has been a meeting of the MFP Development Corporation Board and there has been useful interaction between those two boards—as there should be—because the purpose of the International Advisory Board is to bring in considerable international flavour to the works of the corporation. One other thing that Mr Saito confirmed was the successful operation of the working group about which I reported to Parliament earlier after my return from overseas and which is meeting on a regular basis in Japan, bringing together in excess of 60 Japanese companies that are eagerly following the progress of the MFP and its activities.

As to the matter of the chief executive of the corporation, I can say that the MFP board through headhunters has been working on a list of names and has now presented a short list of names to me for my opinion. Indeed, it is entirely appropriate that the board should come to the State member of Cabinet responsible for the MFP and say, 'What are your opinions about the various names that we have shortlisted?' They have not approached any of the people, whose names have been listed, on the matter of whether or not they should be appointed, because they know that the appropriate course of action is to have input from the State Government, and I presume that they are doing exactly the same as regards the Federal Government.

We will give our reaction to that and, after those reactions are received by them, they will go through an interview process with the people they have shortlisted and come down with a final recommendation. The process of coming up with a chief executive has taken longer than we would have liked. I explained why that was the case in previous answers in this place, but we are close to the matter being concluded and I look forward to an announcement being made towards the end of the month.

RESTRAINT ORDERS

Mr SUCH (Fisher): What action will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training take to enable schools to obtain restraining orders more easily to exclude non-students who intimidate and harass staff and students? Will she confer with her colleague the Attorney-General on the appropriate steps to take?

A southern suburbs high school has sought restraining orders from the Juvenile Court on four separate occasions to prevent known undesirables entering the school grounds. The magistrate rejected the applications because the incidents, often on a weekly basis and involving threats of violence to staff and students, were not considered frequent enough to warrant a restraining

order. The need for urgent action has been highlighted by several assaults on children and a parent which occurred yesterday and on Friday in close proximity to the school, which adjoins a shopping centre and which has joint use of community facilities, including an oval and a library.

Parents have told me that their children are too frightened to go to the school, which has an excellent academic record and a fine reputation as a caring school. Police have also confirmed that one child was so frightened that he took a replica pistol to school yesterday to scare off would-be assailants.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am aware of the situation and, in fact, I have had a very thorough briefing and have asked for a detailed report. I believe that the question was whether I would instigate discussions with the Attorney-General in terms of the application of restraining orders. I have already put that process in place. I have requested the Director-General of Education to thoroughly investigate the matter and to start discussions with the Attorney-General's Department, but I am also happy to take it up personally with the Attorney-General.

I am well aware of the restrictions that are required legally in obtaining a restraining order because I went through this process myself a couple of years ago and I appeared in court and had to show cause. The law is very definite about the conditions that need to prevail before a restraining order is issued. However, having answered the honourable member's question in part, I think it is important to state clearly that these incidents did not take place on school premises. As the honourable member said, because the school is part of a local regional shopping centre, it makes things a little more difficult. There will always be some people within the community who do not behave in a proper and civilised way, who want to intimidate and threaten others, and that is what has happened.

I have very deep sympathy for the student and the parents in this case and I assure the honourable member that the department is doing everything possible to provide support to the family and to ensure that, through the due and proper processes of law, this does not happen again. I understand that the matter will go before the courts, that a person has been charged with assault and that the matter will be processed through the proper channels. However, I give the honourable member an assurance that, with respect to restraining orders, that process is already under way.

ABORIGINES, CEDUNA

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Emergency Services inform the House of the current situation in Ceduna? Are the police concerned, as has been reported, that the unfortunate and serious brawl that occurred on Saturday night, 6 February, may be the catalyst for severe racial tension in the town? There have been reports that a brawl broke out at about 1 a.m. on 6 February involving about 50 people. It was also reported that the conflict was essentially between two groups of white and Aboriginal youths and that considerable

damage to police property occurred as a result of the brawl.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Stuart for her interest in this matter, because it is of significance for Ceduna and the District Council of Murat Bay and for the whole community in South Australia. These issues need to be addressed sensitively. The police are very concerned about the matter, as are members of the community, the Mayor of the District Council of Murat Bay, the Far West Aboriginal Progress Association, FACS, Correctional Services, the Education Department and DETAFE.

As a consequence of that incident a meeting was called on 10 February and was chaired by Inspector Cameron of the South Australian Police Department. Representatives of each of those community groups were present at that meeting, which I think I can say was a very productive and useful one. What came from that was a series of recommendations and the ongoing establishment of the two committees, comprising members of the local community with input from the State Government and the district council. Those recommendations are being worked through right now. In fact, today I had a meeting with the Chairman and Health Officer from the District Council of Murat Bay so that we could explore where we go and what support we need to offer as a State Government and as a local government authority.

A number of important statements were made, and one of the issues we have to address involves the people who move through from Yalata, as I am sure the honourable member is aware, and the problem of alcoholism. That is a very significant problem and I give a very firm commitment that we as a Government will tackle that problem with all the resources at our fingertips. Although it will be a very complex problem to address in full, I believe that we can and will make some progress in that area. I hope that the members for Stuart and Eyre can join me on 17 March to meet with the community in Ceduna to discuss the progress of this matter.

We are looking at a number of steps. Of course, one is to bring in the Aboriginal Sobriety Group, to offer support in health and education and to involve all support services such as FACHS and the police. The police are currently conducting a program of seminars in local schools to outline their programs and position. At this time—although it is not yet in full flight—we have a program involving Aboriginal aides. On 19 March three Aboriginal aides will be appointed to the Ceduna region, and I believe that will be a significant step in the right direction.

In addition, we are looking at the possibility of acquiring land on which we can set up a base for the people who move through from Yalata and offer them services. This may be somewhat game, but we hope that by doing so we can provide some stability and support services, such as a canteen, food, support for children and also health services.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, the honourable member is interrupting. I think this is a very important issue.

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Indeed not, Mr Speaker, because it is an ongoing issue and I am sure that the member for Eyre supports me in responding in this way, because we need to be very sensitive about how this matter is addressed, working together as a community. The Chairman of the district council and I have agreed today that we will work in that way and that we will bring in ATSIC and all the resources we can to address this issue. I hope we can all work together to resolve the problem facing the Ceduna community.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Has the Premier been made aware of a report by Australian National held in secret for two months by the Federal Minister of Transport and Communications, Senator Collins, which recommends favourable consideration of the Alice Springs to Darwin line; and will he ask Senator Collins why he has not released the report before now? I am told that the AN review states that the previous report on the rail line by former New South Wales chief, Mr David Hill—who is now ABC Chairman—was 'fatally flawed' in its failure to consider the economic benefits to the nation through the flow-on effects to States like South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, I am not actually aware of the particular report to which the honourable member refers, and I will have some inquiries made about that. However, of course, it is known that Australian National has actively supported the construction of the railway line. As I have indicated, we would support that same construction and have given significant technical support to the development of a case to meet the criteria set by the Federal Government: that it must be a commercially viable project. We have also gone further than that over a significant period and indicated that the Federal Government should pick up this project as one of national interest and, in the context of defining it as involving national interest, enable those who will participate in it commercially to get special taxation breaks or other special incentives to enable the commercial case finally to stack up. While I am not aware of this particular report, I do know that AN has long supported the project. As I say, we have used information that it has provided in the past in our case, as well as other information we have obtained to support this project.

PHYLLOXERA

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My question is directed to the Minister of Primary Industries. What does his department intend to do to combat the phylloxera aphid that sucks the sap from the roots of grapevines?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Again, I am indebted to the member for Spence for asking questions on primary industries. It is true, as the member for Spence has identified, that this is a most serious aphid which infects grapevine roots and causes severe damage to the vine. The pests have been detected in pockets of both Victoria

and New South Wales. It is widely spread throughout Europe, which has caused severe damage to the wine industries in southern Italy and in Spain. It is an enormous problem in California where it has affected 30 per cent of the vineyards, and replanting needs to be undertaken. Of course, that has a positive side for us, because it means that we are able to increase our share of the market. We have a competitive edge because we are phylloxera free.

In October, I launched the phylloxera campaign for this year following outbreaks of the pest in Victoria and New South Wales. On becoming Minister and having a look at the Act following that launch (and it is a 1936 Act) my view was that, although it will do the job presently, in the next timeframe that may not necessarily be the case. The situation needs upgrading and modernising. As a consequence, in December last year I released a green paper to look at how South Australia can continue to remain free of one of the wine and grape industries most devastating pests. Our wine grape crush alone is worth about \$103 million, with table grapes returning upwards of \$3 million in 1991, and currants, raisins and sultanas contributing \$7.4 million at farm-gate prices in the same year. So, as every member would know, it is an extremely valuable industry to South Australia.

As I said, the Phylloxera Act dates back to 1936. The industry has changed markedly since the Act was introduced and modernised at that time. The green paper that I have released sets out a range of options, and I am sure the outcome from that green paper process will ensure that what legislation we have in place will be the best legislative controls to keep phylloxera out of South Australia.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): Is the Premier aware that, following his appointment to the Economic Development Board, Mr Chris Hurford has formed a national consultancy on Government and investor relations, Hurford Pty Ltd, to offer specialist advice on politics, economics, industrial relations and related issues? Does the Premier consider that Mr Hurford's new business venture may place him in a continuing and therefore impossible conflict of interest position in relation to his responsibilities to the Economic Development Board; if not, what guarantees can he give the House or seek from Mr Hurford that he will not use the information gained from his membership of the Economic Development Board to assist his business? Was the Premier aware of Mr Hurford's intention to establish this new company at the time of his appointment to the Economic Development Board?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I was aware before his appointment that he was intending to establish a consultancy company. Like anyone who has business activities and who is appointed to a board such as the Economic Development Board, there are set rules about conflict of interest.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: All members!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: And that applies to all members on that board. It applies to Mr Hurford and

every other single member of the board who may have come from the business or public sector. So, the rules that apply to all the others apply equally to Chris Hurford.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Yesterday, we witnessed the spectacle of the Federal Leader of the Opposition's wife standing up and saying how honest she believed her husband, Dr Hewson, was. That is a hypocrite of the worst kind. The Leader tells industrial untruths; and he is not prepared to instruct his shadow spokesperson on industrial matters to release the Coalition's industrial policies. Why does he not want to release those policies? Why does he not have the guts to go out to the working class, to the people of this country, and spell out why he will not release his policies?

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I do not want that rubbish and propaganda from members opposite. If he has an ounce of intestinal fortitude, the Federal Leader of the Opposition should line up before the Canberra Press Club and disclose the policies of the Liberal Party. He is not prepared to do that, and we on this side of the House know the reason why. We have seen the Kennett policies and how they operate in Victoria. We have seen the industrial contract system that operates in New Zealand and which has been feted by Opposition members. They agree 100 per cent with what is happening in New Zealand. They agree with what is happening in Victoria, but they do not have the guts to spell out to the working class the reasons why the Liberal Party will not release its policy. It is not prepared to do it, and we on this side of the House are well aware of the reasons why. Let us look at what the Liberal Party wants to do.

It wants to abolish awards and outlaw penalty rates for shift work and overtime. I worked in the transport industry for many years, and my social and family life was virtually nil because I was required to work long hours. A conservative Government would not be prepared to give any consideration to the working class in this country—none whatsoever. It would abolish all those conditions. It would remove holiday loading and slash workers compensation payments. However, we did have at least one bit of honesty from the Liberal Opposition's little Johnny Howard. On television he said he would decimate the trade union movement. He wants to put more and more money back into the pockets of small business in this country at the expense of the workers.

Members should consider the accord that we have had for so many years in this country. The agreement between the ACTU and the Federal Government means that both industry and the workers benefit. Look at the large number of Public Service jobs that will be axed.

Last week I had the opportunity to visit Western Australia where I saw the spectacle of the new gutless wimp whom they call Premier Court vowing to take on the trade union movement, not wanting to jump out—

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Well, the member for Hanson can have a go in a minute, if he has any manners. They want to guarantee that, irrespective of the situation in the industrial arena, if Kevin Hamilton or his son were killed on the job in the railway industry, workers would not be allowed to walk off the job or go on strike: they would not only fine them but gaol them. That is what they are prepared to do. Let any member opposite deny that that is a fact. That is the situation under Liberal industrial policy. They are industrial liars and industrial cheats. They are hypocrites of the worst kind. They are gutless and they are not prepared to tell the workers of this country what they are about. They are liars in the extreme in terms of industrial matters and award provisions.

The SPEAKER: Order? Does the Deputy Leader have a point of order?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, Sir. I refer to your ruling previously without anyone taking a point of order on the use of the word 'liars'.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps I will clarify that again. The ruling I have given is that, if the word 'liar' is used in particular to a member with respect to a contribution, it is definitely out of order. The difficulty with a broad term like 'liars' is determining at whom it is directed. In this House—

Mr Becker: He said the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! Which Opposition? If the honourable member wishes to take a point of order, I am quite prepared to take it on board. If not, I call the honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Today's contribution from the Premier I guess was another desperate effort to fire a shot in anger which may make some contribution to help out his smelly mates in Canberra. The latest piece of fiction that we have before us is the press conference statement from the Premier of this State which states that South Australia will lose a large sum of money if the Coalition should be successful. Everybody in South Australia, or at least 50 per cent plus of the population in South Australia, is very hopeful that the Federal Coalition will be the next Government of this country, because we simply cannot afford to have another three years of Labor rule in this country. We simply cannot afford it.

I can understand why the Premier wants to support his friends in Canberra, because blood is thicker than water. Let us be quite clear. If he is going to make a public statement, he should at least get closer to the truth than he has attempted in this document. He has outlined a number of Federal Liberal Government initiatives that he suggests would impact dramatically on this State. He has come up with this fictional figure of \$200 million. Members would be aware of all the fairy stories that are around at the moment, so perhaps they will agree with me that the Premier should go by the name of Alice, as in Wonderland, because his relationship with the truth defies belief.

On 11 February, the Premier stated that he had gone through the Fightback document. That document has been out for over a year, and every member of this House has had an opportunity to read it. Treasury officers have had a chance to read it for well over a year. I have been through it word by word, page by page, yet the Premier of this State said on 11 February, 'We have just costed Fightback and we are going to lose \$12.5 million a year from payroll tax.' He said that in the House on 11 February. Now, in this latest document, to get these figures to look at least large, he says it is \$59.2 million. How can we believe the man? How can we believe the Premier of this State when he has had the document for well over a year and he has these flights of fantasy? He is completely and utterly wrong in his calculations. I would suggest they have been done by Trades Hall, because I cannot believe that Treasury officers in this State would put their names to some of these figures. He claims that the abolition of the Better Cities Program will cost \$27.1 million, another new figure this year.

Most of South Australia's Better Cities money has been allocated to the MFP project. The Coalition has given a commitment that it will maintain this funding but there is no commitment in Mr Keating's One Nation statement that the Better Cities program will be continued. I would make the point that the Federal Opposition has put out a statement on rebuilding Australia, involving \$3 000 million, and we can expect close to 10 per cent to come to South Australia in some shape or form. I know that some pretty wonderful projects are being lined up. However, the Better Cities program will be wiped off by the Prime Minister in the future. The Liberal Opposition talks about \$3 000 million. If we look at South Australia, we see that there would be at least \$200 million in it for us. We are an absolute mile in front, and we do not tell the lies that are being spread.

The Premier has pointed to the savings resulting from a freeze on the superannuation guarantee, indicating in his statement the costs and the savings. He has suggested that \$15 million will be saved on the superannuation guarantee. As members would recognise, that is one of the policies put forward by the Federal Opposition. However, his own Treasury documents estimate the saving to be well over \$30 million, yet he has used these figures. There is a long list of inconsistencies. What we have here is a document which is not worth the paper it is printed on, which has no basis in fact and which does the Premier of this State no credit whatsoever.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): The Deputy Leader speaks about facts: I will give him some facts on Fightback as it relates to land transport and Australian road funds. I have had research done on this matter, and some of the information I came up with will be very helpful. The Federal Treasury has identified a \$3.9 billion gap in the Hewson Fightback-GST package. The Opposition has not done its sums correctly. That sum is almost twice the record level of road funding of the Federal Government this year. The worrying aspect is that there is a gap of at least \$2.6 billion between the cost of the nation's current road effort and the revenue to be raised from road users.

I will provide more facts for the Opposition, for example in relation to road funding. The current levels of national road funding that could be recoverable from road users (and these are Federal Treasury estimates) are as follows: on national highways, \$540.6 million; on arterial roads and State and national roads, \$2 574.9 million; and on local roads, \$1 287.7 million, giving a total of \$4 403.2 billion. The figures do not include the Federal Government's expenditure of \$100 million on PCRH, \$130 million on the black spots program (of which we are all aware), or \$450 million from the One Nation package for 1992-93; nor does it include 50 per cent of the expenditure on local roads which is attributed to local access and amenity and which is identified by the NRTC as non-recoverable items.

The introduction of the Coalition's proposed GST package, which the Coalition thinks is wonderful but which we know will ruin Australia, would result in the following revenue being earmarked for the nation's roads (and, again these are Federal Treasury estimates), in 1991 dollar terms: GST on petrol and diesel, \$750 million; State fuel franchise fees, \$348.4 million; and State registration fees, \$675.3 million, giving a total of \$1 773.7 million. The figures for the State fuel franchise fees and State registration fees represent the amounts actually applied to road funding by the States respectively out of total fuel franchise fee collections of \$1061 million and registration revenues of \$1350 million. Therefore, as anybody who is reasonably good at arithmetic could work out, the shortfall in the national road funding package would be \$2.6 billion.

That is a substantial deficit to work from, and it would truly represent a disaster for the national road construction and maintenance effort which, I believe, in the past few years has been progressing very well around Australia. This would be a total disaster for that program, and it would all be attributable to the GST package as it affects the Australian road funds themselves. It is also further confirmation (if any is needed) of the Hewson Coalition's repudiation, for very shallow political reasons, of its former support for the economically sound road cost recovery principle for road funding. This is something that the Coalition said it supported, but it has now done a complete about-face with regard to that. Not only that but there is also the Coalition's dishonesty with regard to the outlandish claim about the fuel excise tax and how much that will reduce the price of petrol.

About 25 per cent of all Federal fuel excise (that is, almost 6c per litre of fuel) is earmarked for roads and is paid into a trust fund. That is pretty well documented. That hypothecated fuel excise is used to provide about half the total Federal road funding effort. It is interesting to note that the other half is funded from general revenue, including fuel excise, thus making a mockery of the Opposition's repeated claim that only 6c out of every 26c per litre is returned to roads. It is general knowledge that half the comments made by members opposite and by the Federal Coalition cannot be substantiated. They cannot substantiate the claims that they make, and members opposite can waffle on as much as they like, but they are not substantiated. The Coalition also claims that it will fund the balance of the road effort out of consolidated revenue. Again, this is an absurd claim in

the light of the Federal Treasury's estimate of a \$3.9 billion gap in the Fightback-GST package; we come back to that gap of \$3.9 billion. How are they going to get all these programs moving that they are talking about? The GST will cripple Australian road funding.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Today I would like to raise a problem that a constituent of mine has encountered; he has written to me for help. My constituent is a qualified motor mechanic of 12 years experience, having completed his trade at Croydon Park College of Automotive Engineering in 1983. Last year, he and his family returned to South Australia after spending seven years in Queensland, two of which were spent running his own automotive business on the Gold Coast. In the latter part of 1991 he attended a TAFE liquefied petroleum gas motor fuel installers course at considerable expense as well as loss of time and work. The course covered both theory and practice of LPG installation to vehicles and he passed both courses with honours and credits respectively. My constituent has sent me a copy of the relevant documents. On returning to South Australia for family reasons, he has been denied the right to an LPG installers licence and has been requested to repeat the course at a cost of over \$600, let alone the loss of a week's work and a week away from home to attend the course in Adelaide. My constituent lives at Coobowie, on southern Yorke Peninsula.

As my constituent says, LPG is just as dangerous in Queensland as it is here. I would say, 'Hear, hear!' to that. In these difficult economic times it is hard enough for people to earn a living without confronting the problems that my constituent is facing. He finds the following statements from the South Australian Department of Labor's guide quite interesting:

The granting of a permit by the Chief Inspector can be granted to a person fully qualified as a motor mechanic—
and he meets that requirement—

or a person who has had at least three months experience in the installation or maintenance of equipment supplying liquefied petroleum gas as a fuel to automotive engines—
and he meets that criteria—

or a person who has successfully completed a training course that provides experience equivalent to the experience referred to [in the previous paragraphs].

It is also stated that one must be a fit and proper person to hold a permit and that auto gas permits must be numbered in a consecutive order, and so on. As my constituent says, he has 12 years experience and he is fully qualified, as his certificates indicate. He has successfully completed a Government LPG installers course and has had over a year's experience in maintaining LPG powered cars. However, when he comes back to South Australia, he is told, 'Start again from scratch.' He asked me to take up this matter on his behalf as all he has achieved in contacting the Department of Labor and the South Australian Department of Technical and Further Education is the usual departmental run-around.

This is a great tragedy confronting a person returning to South Australia, especially as he is one of the few people coming back to this State—and we know that

more people are leaving South Australia. Indeed, we heard that 60 000 people have left Australia in the past year or two, a level that is double the previous record, and it is because of the way this country is going and the mess it is in. My constituent is at least one person who has come back to South Australia. He has done courses interstate and has all the qualifications, yet he is told, 'No, we will not let you practise here in South Australia.' I am asking the Minister to take up this case and I would be happy to provide him with the name of the person. I hope that the decision to deny him the right to install LPG conversions will be reversed as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): As part of the election material that has been put into letterboxes in marginal seats, a number of people in the Districts of Hindmarsh and Adelaide have received personalised letters from the Housing Industry Association. Subsequently, in the past few days that organisation sent out a pamphlet entitled 'We're here to build the barbie'. The pamphlet has a picture on the front of three rather large individuals who are wearing shorts and who look like the members for Fisher and Custance.

Mr Such: Good looking!

Mr QUIRKE: Indeed, the statement is made that they are good looking. Apparently, those individuals have arrived to build a barbecue. When one opens the pamphlet, one sees rather outrageous claims. It is alleged that, as a result of some federal legislation of 1992, from now on it will take 40 tradesmen to install a patio and it will take 20 bricklayers to build a barbecue. I was really impressed by that, so I went and counted the number of bricks in my barbecue. It turns out that they will lay 1.5 bricks each.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Not as thick as the member for Fisher. It also states that there are 'five union officials to fight with you about the schedule'. To fight about what? Is it the patio with the 40 tradesmen or the 20 bricklayers who have to lay 30 bricks for the barbecue. Then comes the gem, 'And a pie warmer on site!' The pamphlet then goes on:

That is the way it could be under the terms of Labor's new law.

The document then goes on to say that the cost of construction of the average new house will increase by \$15 000. Certainly, 15 is an interesting figure because, if the Coalition gets in on 13 March, if the poll gaps that we now see continue to close—and that is why the Opposition is not as happy today—the GST will apply 15 per cent to the cost of new houses and everything that goes into that construction.

What do we find in letterboxes about the GST and its impact on the home building industry that is so important to South Australia? We get nothing from the Housing Industry Association, because that is not its game. The game of Don Kennett and the others is to get their mates in the Coalition elected. They are masquerading under the statements about building the barbecue, the new industrial laws and all the rest of it. The reality is that, if they were interested in the construction industry, particularly in South Australia, they would be concerned

about the GST and the impact it will have on that industry, which is so important to South Australia.

I understand that that pamphlet was sent not only to people in marginal seats but to those in other States as well. A series of claims have been made that are Party-political nonsense. These claims are made simply to help their Coalition mates. The reality is that the greatest danger to the construction industry is not the three individuals depicted on the pamphlet as builders of barbecues but the GST.

The Housing Industry Association has an interesting way of raising funds. Some of the allegations made to me concerning the way it has stood over contractors to generate funds for this exercise are nothing short of disgraceful. Indeed, I will have more to tell the House on this matter in future grievances when I have the time to read those complaints into the public record.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): My comments are to be about Craighburn but, first, I should like to answer the honourable member who has just spoken. He made the claim that he knows more about what the effect would be of the Federal Coalition's policies than does the industry itself. If he were prepared to do proper research, he would find that those policies would not have a serious effect on that industry but that they would be of benefit because people would have more money to spend and to start buying homes. If he wants to challenge me on that, I am prepared to take up with him the sorts of threats that are made about people having to join unions to support the ALP when they do not believe in that philosophy and, sometimes, do not believe in any philosophy at all.

I now refer to Craighburn. A supplementary development plan was put up for public comment and went before the planning committee. After evidence was taken, a new supplementary development plan was released on about 18 February this year. That plan not only ignored the pleas of the community but rubbed salt into the wounds by doing away with the buffer zone nipped out along Coromandel Parade and, to a degree, down Cummins Street and it included a shopping centre within a kilometre and a half of a centre where shops are vacant and where most of the traders are in trouble. The local convenience store, which is open seven days a week, is within walking distance of the proposed development.

The other issue of concern is the size of the allotments. Some were down to 250 square metres, which is half the size of a netball court. With houses that are close together in the Hills, a bushfire-prone area, there would be little hope of saving anyone or their assets in the event of a fire. That is an insult to all the plans that have been suggested for the Hills and how they should be preserved with respect to open space. I wrote to the Premier on my own behalf and that of the member for Fisher on 22 October 1992. My letter stated:

Further to my brief discussion with you, I write on behalf of the Save Craighburn Committee. It would be appreciated by the member for Fisher (Mr Bob Such) and myself if a mutually agreed time could be arranged for us to introduce to you a delegation from the committee. I look forward to your early response.

I mentioned to the Premier the reason that we wanted the deputation and I confirmed it in writing. My secretary telephoned the Premier's office on 10 November asking when a response might be expected from the Premier's Department. I will not name the individuals to whom she spoke, but I will use their initials. A girl with the first initial M of a hyphenated name requested a copy of the letter as the original apparently could not be located. A copy was faxed to her on 10 November at the number 231 0724. A person with the initials EL, the Premier's appointment secretary, advised on 17 November that the Premier was aware of the request and that an appointment would be arranged as soon as possible after Parliament rose. A person with the initials GG of the Premier's Department requested a copy of the letter dated 22 October on 9 February 1993 and this was faxed to her on 9 February at 231 1731 as per the request via my secretary on that day. Then EL telephoned my secretary on 16 February and advised that she was still not able to advise the appointment for the deputation but would advise further as soon as possible. In the meantime, I spoke to the Premier's office and was given a guarantee that there would be no announcement until the deputation was met. That did not occur and we still do not have an appointment for the deputation. The announcement has been made and the matter is to go before a committee of this Parliament.

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills:

Supply (No. 1) (1993),

Police Superannuation (Superannuation Guarantee)

Amendment and

Statutes Amendment (Fisheries)

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

ROAD TRAFFIC (PEDAL CYCLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to permit the shared use of designated paths and bikeways by pedal cyclists and pedestrians

and to provide specific rules for them when using these areas. A bikeway is defined as a path, lane or other place physically separated from a carriageway for the use of persons riding pedal cycles or for shared use by both pedestrians and cyclists. On the other hand, a bicycle lane is one forming part of a carriageway for exclusive use by cyclists. Appropriate signs or line marking will be used to identify bikeways and bicycle lanes.

The Bill will also permit cyclists when making a right turn at an intersection or junction to proceed across the intersection or junction on the left hand side before making the turn. This is commonly known as a "box turn".

The introduction of these measures involves a number of consequential amendments to the Act. For instance, the methods for passing or overtaking pedestrians on a shared use bikeway are dealt with. The Bill provides for cyclists to pass to the right of pedestrians or cyclists when overtaking and to keep to the left when passing pedestrians and cyclists from the opposite direction. The Bill also recognises people in wheelchairs and clarifies their rights and duties along with pedestrians and cyclists. It also recognises Australia Post employees when using these facilities.

Provision is made for the duty of cyclists and other road users when giving way at intersections and junctions as well as for cyclists when leaving a bikeway and entering a carriageway. An amendment to section 63(1)(ba) has been made to correct an anomaly by making it clear that the driver not only must give way to a vehicle approaching the junction but also to a vehicle already in the junction.

The regulations will exempt cyclists from giving hand signals when intending to turn or diverge to the left and also when stopping. No hand signals will be required for cyclists making a "box turn". However, signals to turn or diverge to the right in all other situations will be retained. The reason for this change is to enable cyclists better control over their vehicle without compromising safety. All these changes are in line with national requirements.

Consultation has taken place with the State Bicycle Committee (which has representation of cycling groups), the police and local government.

A further amendment in the Bill will permit cyclists to move to the head of a queue of vehicles that are stationary at an intersection or junction by passing between those vehicles and the left-hand edge of the carriageway. Such a manoeuvre is currently illegal, as the *Road Traffic Act* requires vehicles to overtake on the right.

The Bill also adjusts the definition of "trailer" in the Act to clarify the position under the Act of vehicles towed behind pedal cycles and to assist the making of regulations in relation to such vehicles.

It is considered that all these measures will not only clarify rights and duties of cyclists and pedestrians and other vehicle users, but will also assist in the promotion and encouragement of cycling in general.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 5—Interpretation

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act, the interpretation section. It inserts definitions of "bicycle lane", "bikeway", "box right turn" and "wheelchair". A bicycle lane is defined as a lane on the carriageway of a road that is indicated by a traffic control device to be reserved for the use of

pedal cyclists (or to be so reserved for certain periods). A "bikeway" is defined as a path or lane that does not form part of the carriageway of a road and is indicated by a traffic control device to be reserved for the use of pedal cyclists, or pedal cyclists and pedestrians. A "box right turn" is defined as a right turn at an intersection or junction that may be made by a pedal cyclist in accordance with new section 70a of the principal Act. "Wheelchair" is defined to include a wheelchair propelled or capable of being propelled otherwise than solely by muscular force. Wheelchair is currently so defined in section 61 of the principal Act. This amendment makes it clear that wheelchair has that same meaning throughout the principal Act. Clause 3 also substitutes a new definition of "carriageway". The new definition makes it clear that a reference in the principal Act to the carriageway of a road does not include a bikeway that is separated by a physical barrier from the part of the road used by other vehicles. Clause 3 also amends the definition of "road" in section 5 to make it clear that "road" includes a bikeway, and amends the definition of "trailer" to include vehicles that are not self-propelled and are constructed or adapted for being drawn by pedal cycles.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 7—Drivers of trailers

This clause amends section 7 of the principal Act. Section 7 provides that a person who drives a motor vehicle to which a trailer is attached is to be taken to be the driver of the trailer (and the trailer is to be taken to be driven by that person) for the purposes of the Act. This amendment applies the same rule to persons who ride pedal cycles to which trailers are attached.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 54—Duty to keep to the left

This clause amends section 54 of the principal Act by inserting new subsection (3). Section 54 requires the driver of a vehicle on the carriageway of a road to keep as near as is reasonably practicable to the left boundary of the carriageway. New subsection (3) applies the same "keep to the left" rule to pedestrians and pedal cyclists on a bikeway.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 55—Passing oncoming vehicle

This clause amends section 55 of the principal Act by inserting new subsection (2). Section 55 requires the driver of a vehicle to pass to the left of an oncoming vehicle. New subsection (2) makes it clear that this rule does not apply where one vehicle is on the carriageway of the road and the other is on an adjacent footpath or bikeway.

Clause 7: Insertion of s. 55a

This clause inserts new section 55a into the principal Act. Section 55 of the principal Act requires the driver of a vehicle to pass to the left of an oncoming vehicle. New section 55a specifies that this same rule applies to both pedestrians and pedal cyclists on a bikeway in relation to an oncoming pedestrian or vehicle on that part of the bikeway.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 58—Passing vehicles

This clause amends section 58 of the principal Act. Section 58(2) provides that the driver of a vehicle must overtake on the right. Subsection (3) provides an exception to that requirement where there are two or more lanes for vehicles proceeding in the same direction and it is safe to overtake on the left. This amendment adds a further exception where a pedal cycle overtakes a vehicle that is stationary at an intersection or junction and it is safe to overtake on the left. The amendment also makes it clear that both exceptions relate to overtaking on the left on a carriageway.

Clause 9: Insertion of s. 58a

This clause inserts new section 58a. Section 58 sets out the rule that drivers of vehicles must overtake other vehicles on the

right. New section 58a applies the same rule to the overtaking of pedestrians on bikeways.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 59—Passing trams

This clause amends section 59 of the principal Act. Section 59 requires drivers of vehicles to overtake trams on the left except in certain circumstances. This amendment makes it clear that this rule does not apply to a person riding a cycle or other vehicle on a footpath or bikeway.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 60—Duty of driver or pedestrian being overtaken

This clause amends section 60 of the principal Act. Section 60 requires the driver of a vehicle, on hearing the warning instrument of a vehicle approaching from behind, to not increase speed and to move to the left (if it is safe to do so) to the extent necessary to allow a reasonable space to pass. This amendment inserts an exception to that rule where the driver of the vehicle is stationary at an intersection or junction and the vehicle approaching from behind is a pedal cycle overtaking on the left. The amendment also applies the primary rule from section 60 (move to the left on hearing a warning instrument sounded from behind) to a pedestrian on a bikeway on hearing a warning given by an approaching cyclist.

Clause 12: Substitution of s. 61

This clause repeals section 61 of the principal Act and substitutes new section 61.

The existing section 61 forbids the driving of vehicles on footpaths, other than to enter or leave adjacent land. It makes an exception in the case of persons in wheelchairs and Australia Post employees riding pedal cycles or motor cycles, provided that they do not exceed 10 kilometres per hour and comply with the regulations.

New section 61 forbids the driving of vehicles on footpaths or bikeways, other than to enter or leave adjacent land. It then makes an exception in the case of—

- (a) persons operating wheelchairs on footpaths or bikeways;
 - (b) Australia Post employees riding pedal cycles or motor cycles on footpaths or bikeways while making their deliveries,
- and
- (c) pedal cyclists riding on bikeways (other than on parts of bikeways set apart for pedestrians only).

Each of the exceptions to the general rule is subject to certain restrictions. A person who operates a wheelchair on a footpath must not do so at a speed greater than 10 kilometres per hour. Where a person operates a wheelchair on a part of a bikeway that is reserved for the use of pedal cyclists only, that person must comply with the rules (on keeping to the left and passing other vehicles or pedestrians) that are applicable to pedal cyclists. An Australia Post employee must not ride on a footpath or bikeway at a speed greater than 10 kilometres per hour when delivering mail and, when riding a motor cycle on a bikeway, must comply with the rules (on keeping to the left and passing other vehicles or pedestrians) that are applicable to pedal cyclists.

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 63—Giving way at intersections and junctions

This clause amends section 63 of the principal Act. Section 63 sets out the "give way" rules applicable at an intersection or junction. Section 63(1)(ba) provides that the driver of a vehicle approaching a junction on a road that does not cross the junction must (subject to certain exceptions) give way to any vehicle approaching the junction on another road. This clause corrects an anomaly in section 63(1)(ba) by making it clear that the

driver must also give way to a vehicle that has already entered the junction (not just to a vehicle approaching the junction).

This clause also amends section 63 by inserting new subsection (1c). Under new section 65a the driver of a vehicle entering a carriageway from a footpath or bikeway is required to give way to any vehicle on the carriageway (in the absence of stop signs or traffic lights). New subsection (1c) recognises that new rule by providing that a driver on a carriageway approaching an intersection or junction with a bikeway is not required to comply with the normal give way rules under section 63 where the vehicle on the bikeway is obliged to give way under new section 65a.

This clause further amends section 63 by inserting new subsection (1d). Under new section 70a(2)(c)(ii), the rider of a pedal cycle making a box right turn is required, in certain circumstances, to give way to any vehicle approaching or in the intersection or junction. New subsection (1d) recognises that rule by providing that a driver approaching an intersection or junction is not required to give way under section 63 to a pedal cyclist making a box right turn in the circumstances to which section 70a(2)(c)(ii) refers.

Clause 14: Insertion of s. 65a

This clause inserts new section 65a into the principal Act. New section 65a provides that the driver of a vehicle about to enter or entering the carriageway of a road from a footpath or bikeway must give way to any vehicle on the carriageway, except where stop signs or traffic lights control traffic at the point of entry.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 70—Course to be followed by vehicles turning right

This clause amends section 70 of the principal Act to remove an anomaly. The existing reference in subsection (9) to the "footpath or road" is unnecessary, as "road" is defined in section 5(1) to include a footpath. This amendment removes the reference to "footpath".

Clause 16: Insertion of s. 70a

This clause inserts new section 70a into the principal Act. New section 70a sets out the circumstances in which a pedal cyclist may make a box right turn and the rules to be followed in doing so.

A box right turn may be made by the rider of a pedal cycle approaching an intersection or junction if a road joins that intersection or junction on the rider's left at a point opposite or nearly opposite the road into which the right turn is to be made and access from the road on the left is permitted under the Act to the road into which the turn is to be made. In the case of a junction, a box right turn may also be made if the rider is approaching the junction on the road that continues beyond the junction (unless the road into which the turn is to be made is not one into which a turn may otherwise be made under the Act). A box right turn may not be made at a roundabout.

The rider must approach the intersection or junction as near as is practicable to the left boundary of the carriageway of the road from which the turn is to be made. On entering the intersection or junction the rider must proceed directly to a point—

- (a) that is opposite or nearly opposite the left boundary of the carriageway of the road into which the turn is to be made;
- and
- (b) where there is a road on the left hand side of the intersection or junction at the point referred to in (a) from which access is permitted under the Act to the road into which the turn is to be made—that is as near as

practicable to the left boundary of the carriageway of that road at the point at which it joins the intersection or junction.

The rider must then stop, turn to the right and proceed through the intersection or junction. For that purpose, where the rider is proceeding through the intersection or junction from the boundary of the road that was on the rider's left as he or she approached the intersection or junction, the provisions of the Act (including the "give way" rules) apply as if the rider had entered the intersection or junction from that road on the left. In any other case, in proceeding through the intersection or junction, the rider must give way to any other vehicle that is approaching or is in the intersection or junction.

In making a box right turn, a pedal cyclist is not bound to comply with instructions indicated by a traffic signal that is operating at the intersection or junction for the purpose of regulating right turns other than box right turns.

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 74—Duty to give signals

This clause amends section 74 of the principal Act. Section 74 requires the driver of a vehicle to give a signal in accordance with the regulations before diverging right or left, turning, stopping or carrying out various other manoeuvres. This amendment makes it clear that the regulations may specify that no signal is required.

Clause 18: Amendment of s. 86—Removal of vehicles causing obstruction or danger

This clause amends section 86 of the principal Act. Section 86 empowers members of the police force and council officers to remove vehicles that have been left unattended on a road, where they are likely to obstruct traffic, cause injury or hinder access to adjacent land. This amendment makes it clear that this power also applies in these circumstances to vehicles left on footpaths or bikeways.

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 88—Walking on footpath, bikeway or right of road

This clause amends section 88 of the principal Act. Section 88 provides that a person must not walk along the carriageway of a road if there is a footpath on that road. Where a person does walk on the carriageway of a road, he or she must—

(a) if walking on a two-way carriageway, keep to the right hand side of the carriageway;

and

(b) if walking on a one-way carriageway, walk on the right hand side of the carriageway in the opposite direction to the traffic.

These provisions do not apply to a pedestrian drawing or pushing a vehicle or leading an animal, or to lawful processions. This amendment provides that a person must not walk on the carriageway of a road if there is a bikeway on that road. It also provides that a person must not walk along a bikeway reserved for the use of pedal cyclists if there is a footpath or other place nearby (other than the carriageway of a road) that it is lawful for pedestrians to use. Where a person does walk on a bikeway reserved for pedal cyclists he or she must keep to the left hand side of that bikeway. These provisions do not apply to a pedestrian drawing or pushing a pedal cycle, or to lawful processions.

Clause 20: Amendment of s. 93—Prohibition of opening vehicle doors

This clause amends section 93 of the principal Act, which makes it an offence to open the door of a vehicle on a road, or alight from a vehicle onto the carriageway of a road, so as to cause danger to other road users or so as to impede traffic. This amendment expands the scope of section 93 by making it an

offence to alight from a vehicle onto a footpath or bikeway so as to cause danger to other persons or so as to impede traffic.

Clause 21: Amendment of s. 97—Driving abreast

This clause amends section 97 of the principal Act. Section 97 makes it an offence to drive a vehicle abreast of another vehicle that is going in the same direction (other than when overtaking or where there is more than one lane for vehicles proceeding in the same direction). However a pedal cyclist may ride abreast of one other pedal cyclist or, on a part of the road set apart exclusively for pedal cycles, of more than one other pedal cyclist. This amendment permits a pedal cyclist to ride abreast of more than one other pedal cyclist when on a bicycle lane on the carriageway or when on a bikeway. It also makes it clear that the prohibition on driving abreast does not apply where one vehicle is on the carriageway and the other is on an adjacent footpath or bikeway.

Clause 22: Insertion of s. 99a

This clause inserts new section 99a into the principal Act. New section 99a requires a person riding a pedal cycle on a footpath or bikeway to give warning to other persons using the footpath or bikeway where it is necessary to do so in order to avert danger.

Clause 23: Amendment of s. 176—Regulations

This clause amends section 176 of the principal Act, the regulation-making power. It inserts a power to make regulations regulating or prohibiting the use of footpaths, bicycle lanes and bikeways by pedestrians and drivers of vehicles.

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

LAND AGENTS, BROKERS AND VALUERS (MORTGAGE FINANCIERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Land Management): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends the Land Agents Brokers and Valuers Act 1973 by removing from the Act the provisions relating to mortgage financing and consequently withdrawing access to the Agents Indemnity Fund for future clients of land agents or land brokers when their dealings are for the purpose of mortgage financing.

The protection of the Agents Indemnity Fund is retained for the benefit of people who currently have money placed with agents or brokers for mortgage financing investments. That protection will remain for the duration of current loans. However, the eventual effect of these amendments will be that mortgage financing schemes operated by licensed land agents or land brokers will be regulated entirely by the national Corporations Law. This will put land agents or land brokers who conduct mortgage-financing business on the same footing as anyone else who conducts this business.

It is well known that, in recent years, the Agents Indemnity Fund has had claims made on it totalling approximately

\$21 million by people seeking compensation for defaults by land agents and land brokers. Between mid-1987 and the early days of this month, a total of almost \$18.4 million was paid out to these claimants. It is expected that most of the remaining contingent liabilities of the fund in respect of these claims will be dealt with in the near future.

These claims were overwhelmingly related to fiduciary defaults by a small minority of land agents and land brokers, arising from mortgage-financing activities. The fund paid almost \$5.4 million to claimants caught in the Hodby collapse (although in that case almost \$1.6 million was recovered from the estate on behalf of the fund). Defaults by the land broker Trevor Schiller led to payments exceeding \$2.2 million. Already more than \$4.5 million has been paid on account of defaults by the broker Brian Winzor. And since the decision earlier this year of the Commercial Tribunal in a test case related to the losses arising from the Swan Shepherd collapse, a special task force in the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs has dealt with claims that have required payment of almost \$4.5 million, with almost \$1.8 million in claims still to be dealt with. Many claims dealt with in that matter have been late claims.

The Government responded to these developments by proposing explicit controls on mortgage financing by land agents and land brokers. These amendments to the Act came into force in 1989. As well, considerable resources were committed to monitoring and education, and that resource commitment has continued. At the same time, the number of agents and brokers recorded as being actively involved in mortgage financing has fallen from 64 in September 1989 to 40 by the middle of this year. The total number of licensees under the Act at June this year was approximately 1 800.

At the time the mortgage financing amendments were before the Parliament in 1988, it was appropriate to extend controls under the Land Agents Brokers and Valuers Act, because of the large numbers of very significant claims still outstanding, and in an attempt to protect the Agents Indemnity Fund from further claims of this kind. The alternative of leaving regulation to the then Companies Code and its provisions regulating offers and dealings related to 'prescribed securities' was not available at that time. This was because the Companies Code as it then stood did not clearly cover the full range of mortgage financing activities as they were being conducted in South Australia by land agents and land brokers.

However, in the course of development of the Corporations Law which came into force as a national Act on 1 January 1991, changes to the provisions had the effect of clearly applying to mortgage financing activities of the sort regulated to date in South Australia under the Land Agents Brokers and Valuers Act. Earlier in 1992, the Australian Securities Commission settled the terms on which it has been prepared to grant exemptions from some of the requirements of the Corporations Law to businesses offering mortgage-investment schemes in other States.

It is clear that the controls on this form of investment scheme that are available under the Corporations Law, whether by the legislation itself or in the form of conditions that will be put on exemptions, are more stringent than those available under the Land Agents Brokers and Valuers Act.

For this reason, and also to avoid duplication of regulatory requirements, the Government is of the view that it is appropriate to leave regulation of the small proportion of agents and brokers who engage in mortgage financing to the Corporations Law. The requirements of the Corporations Law are designed for safeguarding the management of medium and

longer term investment schemes, of which mortgage financing is an example.

By contrast, the scheme of the Land Agents Brokers and Valuers Act is directed towards safeguarding the short-term holding of trust moneys by agents and brokers in the course of completely real-estate transactions. It is appropriate that the two quite distinct types of activity should be subject to different frameworks of control. In view of the existence of an appropriate scheme in the Corporations Law, it is no longer appropriate to graft on to the Land Agents Brokers and Valuers Act a parallel scheme of controls to be applied specially to a small minority of agents and brokers.

As mentioned, the Bill provides that existing investors will retain their protection for the duration of their present loans to third-party borrowers. It is also relevant to a consideration of this Bill to note that the Government intends to prescribe a form of simple notice which agents and brokers will have to hand over to their clients if they are doing any mortgage-financing business with them. This notice will emphasise to the client that that type of business will not be under the umbrella of the Agents Indemnity Fund. At an appropriate time, a public education campaign will also be undertaken by the Government.

Clause I.: Short title. This clause is formal.

Clause II.: Commencement. This clause provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause III.: Amendment of s. 6 — Interpretation. This clause removes the definition of 'mortgage financier' and inserts a new subsection (2a) intended to ensure that the definition of 'agent' does not, despite the removal of provisions relating to mortgage financiers, continue to extend the application of various provisions of the Act to persons carrying on mortgage financing business. The clause also removes subsection (6) as a consequential amendment resulting from the removal of the provisions relating to mortgage financiers.

Clause IV.: Amendment of s. 62 — Interpretation. Section 62 contains definitions of terms used in Part VIII relating to trust accounts and the Agents' Indemnity Fund. For the purposes of this Part, 'agent' is currently defined by the section as including a land broker, a mortgage financier and a person carrying on a business of a prescribed class. The clause removes the reference to mortgage financiers from this definition thereby excluding mortgage financiers from the application of the provisions of Part VIII, including the provisions relating to claims against the Agents' Indemnity Fund in respect of losses resulting from fiduciary defaults. The definition of 'trust money' is also amended by the clause to put it beyond doubt that references to trust money extend only to money received by an agent in the agent's capacity as such.

Clause V.: Repeal of s. 98b. Section 98b imposes certain obligations on a mortgage financier where the financier receives money on the understanding that it will be lent to a person on the security of a mortgage over land. The clause provides for the repeal of this section.

Clause VI.: Amendment of s. 107 — Regulations. This is a further consequential amendment removing the regulation-making power relating to mortgage financiers' operations.

Clause VII.: Amendment of the schedule — Transitional Provisions. This clause adds to the schedule transitional provisions designed to ensure that the current provisions relating to trust accounts and the Agents' Indemnity Fund continue to apply in relation to—

- trust money received by a mortgage financier before the commencement of this measure; and

- trust money received by a mortgage financier (whether before or after the commencement of this measure) by way of payment of principal or interest, or both, under a loan made on the security of a mortgage before that commencement.

The clause also adds a regulation-making power for regulations to be made (on a transitional basis) requiring mortgage financiers to provide information to prospective investors or regulating or making other provision with respect to any other matter relating to mortgage financiers.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1993)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 1941.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In addressing this Bill, I believe it is obvious that the problems besetting this State and nation must come into focus. This Bill is about money and it is about the continuance of a Government in South Australia that has lost the confidence of the people. Quite frankly, it does not deserve the right to govern this State. There is no doubt that, if a referendum were held today, there would be an overwhelming judgment that this Government should relinquish its hold on office and we should go to the polls immediately. What we have before us is a long list of problems that have been created through mismanagement, both at Federal and at State level, which can be corrected only over a period by a change of Government.

I will depart from the usual economic analysis that I pursue in these debates and concentrate on some of the human tragedy that has been visited upon this State and nation by Labor Administrations. We all recognise that 92 000 people in this State are unemployed, and the figure is heading for 100 000.

Mr Such: It is a disgrace.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is right, it is a disgrace. That figure of 92 000 people does not include the thousands upon thousands who have part-time jobs, working only a few hours a week because they cannot get any more work. That does not include the thousands upon thousands of our youngsters who cannot get a job and who are continuing in education to hold themselves in the system until the employment market improves. That does not count the almost same number of people who wish to work but who do not have an opportunity to work—and they are the people in the 20 to 60 years age bracket who are not entering the work force because there is no opportunity and there is no hope.

They are the bland statistics, but we as members of Parliament see beyond those statistics. We see the tragedies that befall those people when they lose their confidence and their families; when their kids are out on the streets creating mayhem; and there is no check and balance in the system because there is no opportunity for them to be able to achieve the level of self-determination and self-sufficiency that they all desire.

It is not just the fact that we have record unemployment in this State but it is the impact of that unemployment across the board, particularly on the youngsters and those in the 45-plus age group. It is a human tragedy, an absolute human tragedy. It manifests itself in so many ways. The problems we see in schools today are not only part and parcel of the lack of discipline, as we are all aware, but they are also a product of the way in which the Government has operated in this State over the past 10 years. There is no requirement on our citizens to perform to their utmost. There has never been any initiative by this Government to give them the incentive to achieve their utmost in their chosen field of endeavour.

When we look at our schools system we see the way in which it is breaking down. We can see that this State has gone horribly wrong in a number of areas of education—and today we had a very good example given to us and we have had other examples in previous weeks. We are finding that ever-increasing numbers of children are indulging in activities that we in this Parliament would all condemn. Yet there seems to be a complete lack of capacity by this Government to take one constructive initiative to halt the decline.

We are now talking about having security guards in schools: we are talking about having two-way radios to ensure that the officers in the school yards are safe. We are regrettably talking about replica pistols, knives and instruments which should never be part and parcel of our community. We are seeing them manifested in the school yards, and that is deplorable. We are seeing kids who have no incentive to achieve and who are disrupting classes. Some 200 teachers who have been placed wrongly and who are teaching subjects in which they have no affinity or qualification have been forced into that situation through the stupidity of the Minister, the Government and the South Australian Institute of Teachers, all seeming to bargain for themselves and not for the good of the system.

If we look at the health system in this State we will see that there are 9 000 people waiting for operations. How many other people have given up and are not really talking about the minor things they would like done but cannot get done because they cannot afford to go into the private system and know that they have no opportunity to get into the public system? How many knees and other joints have sustained accidents or have deteriorated? How many of those people are suffering and are in pain but simply cannot get into the system? Whether we talk about limbs, eyes or other parts of the body which need urgent treatment, they cannot be treated because the public hospital system is in overload. Those people are simply missing out.

Any member on the other side who thinks that this is a particularly good level of achievement need not continue in this Parliament. I hope that, if any member on the other side has such a view—that we are really not doing too badly—they will not present themselves for the next election, because they would not deserve to be in this place. We can look at the performances in other portfolios—and we could go through a long list of them. We have a Minister of Primary Industries who is trying to tear down the system of support for people in the country right at this moment. It is an absolute disgrace.

When rural people are going through the worst conditions they have ever experienced—possibly even worse than the Depression—we have a Minister of the Crown removing their advisory and support services that they so desperately need.

If we look at the portfolio of emergency services we see that the serious crime rate is escalating. We are not talking about a small percentage point but about an escalation in serious crimes of rape and assault—the crimes that really make people fearful. They have escalated not by a few percentage points but by hundreds of per cent over the past 10 years—and that is not to mention the impact of breaking, entering and vandalism on the quality of life in South Australia.

In my area public facilities and homes are attacked regularly. There is increasing fear in the general community as to where we are going in the future. People want a halt to this activity. They want some initiative taken by this Government—yet we see nothing at all. If we examine the various areas of Government we can find great fault and very little merit.

In our public transport system literally millions of passenger days have been lost over the past 10 years; the deficit has escalated and the quality and timeliness of services have deteriorated dramatically. The Government is content with its record, but the people are not content with that record. We have had an upsurge in the number of cars stolen and the number of deaths caused by some very unfortunate incidents. Again we do not see any initiative on behalf of the Government to try to apprehend these people and put them into a system that will prevent them from stealing cars.

If we look at those who have been involved in fatal accidents or accidents resulting in serious injury we see that many are repeat offenders. Every time they go to the juvenile aid panel or the Juvenile Court they are given a bag of lollies and told, 'Go away and don't do it again.' Next time it could be fatal; and next time it often has been fatal. Yet the Government sits on its hand and says, 'There's not a lot we can do. The kids are going to pinch cars and that's bad luck for the community at large.' Well, that is not bad luck—it is bad management on behalf of the Government.

Revolving around this tremendous deterioration in the quality of life in this State that we love so much is the fact that the Government is at the centre of the problems that have been created. The dynamism of South Australia has been taken away completely by the policies that have been pursued by this Government. We need only note that our population growth over the past 10 years was less than 10 per cent when, at the same time, the nation's population grew at a rate of 16 per cent; our employment growth was only 16 per cent compared with 21 per cent for the nation over the last 10 years. Yet, our unemployment rate has streaked to the highest of the mainland States and is on an upward, not a downward, trend.

We have seen the national household disposable income increase by 163 per cent over the past 10 years, yet in South Australia it has been well below that—at 146 per cent. Our per capita disposable income rose by \$9 100 compared with \$10 100 nationally over the past 10 years. Our gross State product is now starting to show signs of wear and tear. In fact, our gross State

product did increase over the past 10 years and was relatively attuned to the national average, and the reason for that was that the economy was artificially pumped through the policies that were pursued by the Government and the deficits that were accumulated over a long period. Yet now we see gross State product in the negative when the nation is in a slightly positive mode.

Our retail sales paint the same picture. Over the past 10 years the increase in South Australia has been 135 per cent compared with 145 per cent for the nation. If we look at the sales loss over that period, we see we are talking about a loss of \$340 million, which no longer goes through our shops as a result of the policies pursued. Our motor vehicle registrations have decreased by 20 per cent from 1981-82 to 1991-92. That figure is 20 per cent down, yet across the nation the drop is far less than that, at 16 per cent. We cannot even keep our prices under control and according to the consumer price index the increase in inflation in this State has been higher than that in all other States and, of course, much higher than the national average.

Our State taxation per capita has absolutely rocketed under this regime. Over the period from 1981-82 to 1991-92 the increase in State taxation per capita was 197 per cent overall, compared with the national figure of 171 per cent. That has resulted in an extra \$104 per head of population being taken from South Australians over and above that taken from those living in other States.

So, when we look at the economic performance of the Government and we translate it into all other fields of endeavour, we can only decry the fact that this Government has been in office for 10 years and provided us with one of the worst economic situations that this State has ever seen. The once proud history of this State in terms of its achievements has been decimated by the policies pursued.

We can look at any area. For example, if we look at the environment, we have the Government saying to people, 'We are environmentally conscious.' I say that we should judge a Government by its record: have a look at our national parks; have a look at the areas that have been purchased by the Government and designated as national parks. One will find total neglect. The areas that the Government has said it is interested in preserving have deteriorated dramatically. We now find them full of weeds and vermin and, in fact, the very species of animals and plants that the Government originally wished to protect by including them in the national parks and reserve systems have not been protected in that process.

We could talk about water quality and what the Government has done in relation to the River Murray. We could talk about recycling and the number of words spoken in this House for very little overall impact. We could talk about the brave words spoken on occasions about youth and the way the Government is looking after the young people of this State. We need only look at the record of unemployment and the way the young people of this State feel about themselves and the Government, and we suggest that the Government has failed this State in no uncertain terms. They are some of the human statistics—the human face of what has happened over the past 10 years.

I would like to take up where I left off previously in relation to the \$200 million that the Premier invented in

order to suggest that South Australia would be worse off under a Federal Coalition Government. Of course, in his statement, the Premier forgot a number of things. I have already mentioned that he could not get the figures right on payroll tax and that he is a mile off beam even though he has had a year to consider the document. I mentioned the Better Cities Program which, of course, the Federal Government has not guaranteed to continue, but under the Coalition there will be a national rebuild Australia program involving some \$3 billion, which will benefit this State immensely.

I have mentioned the superannuation guarantee levy and savings that will accrue from the Coalition's policy on freezing the relative contributions of all employers at the current level. However, the Premier got not only those items wrong: he got a whole lot of other things wrong. He failed deliberately to mention the guaranteed real growth in TAFE funding, which is not guaranteed by the Federal or State Governments. He did not mention the reduced pressure on our hospital systems, which can only benefit those who currently cannot get surgery and which will also mean some real dollar values back in the State budget because the pressure will be taken off the public system. The Premier did not mention the savings to agencies like the STA and ETSA as a result of the abolition of the fuel excise, which the Opposition believes will mean a saving of at least \$13 million in STA's fuel bill alone. He did not mention—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Well, the Treasurer said, 'Pigs might fly.' Is he suggesting that the fuel excise will not be abolished and that there will not be a saving of \$13 million? I hope he is not. What about the savings to agencies as a result of the abolition of payroll tax? We note that STA paid \$6.7 million in payroll tax last financial year. The Premier has not mentioned the impact of the abolition of payroll tax which will, in fact, create numerous jobs. The Premier has said on a number of occasions, as did his predecessor, that one of the worst taxes imposed by State Government is payroll tax, because it is a tax on jobs. Yet, when he was doing the costings of the Federal policy not once did he mention what impact there would be if more people were employed, with more people having some income and the capacity to spend. He did not mention that at all.

That flows through to all the other taxes that are paid, whether it be the petrol tax that South Australians pay because of the levy imposed by the State Government or the tobacco tax—if they had enough money to buy it, but that is not a very good example. Whatever one likes to look at, whatever level of taxation, whether it be gambling revenue or stamp duty, one sees that when there is an increase in income in the State there is increased taxation in the State. The Premier did not mention that fact. Nor did he mention what a wonderful opportunity it would be for South Australians to have 20 000 more jobs available to them than they currently have through the abolition of payroll tax: 20 000 jobs would be created. What would that mean for those 92 000—odd people who are currently looking for work—not to mention the 80 000 who have given up or who are not entering the workforce because they cannot, or the 20 000 who are in the education system or elsewhere working a small number of hours because they

cannot get the full-time job they are looking for? It means a lot of hope and a lot of prospects that they do not currently have.

The Premier suggested that under the Coalition's policy South Australia would be \$80 million worse off in terms of recurrent grants from the Commonwealth. However, one should compare this with the fact that over the past 10 years, on the Premier's own admission, the State has become \$300 million worse off if he uses his own figures. That indicates the level of success we have seen from the Premier of this State. In his statement, the Premier also mentioned the cost of discontinuation of the urban public transport program involving \$800 000. There is no guarantee, of course, that the Federal Government will continue this program; no guarantee whatsoever. In fact, the Federal budget papers suggest that it will not be in place in the future.

So, many gross errors have been made in the estimates. They are there to provide some political clout to a floundering campaign, particularly in South Australia where we find that the level of support for the Labor Party has sunk to an all time low and is not likely to improve in the next two weeks and, in fact, in the next two years.

I would now like to address the issue of the budget itself. We know that the budget is in absolute tatters. From the information that has already been supplied to us, we know that the budget of this State will not be sustained, that the levels of expenditure will be exceeded and that the estimated revenue from receipts will not reach the target levels. I note that, when the Treasurer produced his statement on 26 February, he drew this astounding conclusion:

The results of 31 December 1992—
which is the first six months—

show an excess of payments over receipts of \$296.5 million. A deficit of \$63.1 million was recorded in December.

He then goes on to say, with some further explanation in between:

While the recession and a cut in Commonwealth assistance had made meeting this budget more difficult, it is not possible to determine the end year result.

Any Treasurer worth his or her salt would have a pretty good idea of exactly how that budget is travelling—and we all know it is not travelling particularly well. If we look at the receipts from the various areas, we can draw some pretty sound conclusions on what we will be short on in revenue and in excess of in expenditure. For example, we can draw the conclusion that payroll tax will be well below the budget figure. It is already dragging its feet. For the first six months of the 1992-93 financial year, payroll tax collections are \$239 million, compared with the budget estimate of \$497 million. We would expect payroll tax to generally even itself out over 12 months. This is not subject to seasonal influences, but it is subject to the economic conditions prevailing in the State. So, if we did a quick calculation on that basis, it appears as though the payroll tax revenue could be up to \$20 million below that budgeted for this financial year.

We know that financial institutions duty comes in at \$51 million for the first six months, compared with an estimate of \$105 million for a full year. We know that more and more people are taking their financial business up to the sunshine State, Queensland, basically because

the cost of doing business in this town is far too high compared to that of Queensland. We know that they found the cost of this State's FID, which is the highest in Australia, and the BAD, which is equal to a number of States, is having a dramatic impact on the desire of businesses in this State to continue to conduct their financial affairs in this State. We have not seen any initiative from the Premier or the Treasurer to stop it, and we know that we would suffer grave difficulty, given the freedom of trade across State borders. It is important to note that, despite claims made by both the Premier and the Treasurer that FID is holding up, it is declining because some of the businesses around town are coming to the conclusion that they cannot afford any longer to conduct their financial affairs in this State.

Mr Holloway: I thought you liked services taxes.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Mitchell said that he thought I liked taxes; I certainly do not like taxes. I do not like any tax that places us at a severe disadvantage with our neighbours. No tax can be classed as a good tax. There is an inevitability about taxation, and the level of taxation must be set at the point at which it causes the least disruption to economic activity. Unfortunately, because of the way the rates are set, it causes a maximum amount of disruption to people involved in financing their enterprises. So, we are seeing interstate transfers because people believe it is worthwhile. Some of them simply cannot afford to maintain their existing practices, because it is survival out there at any cost, and they see that they can save money by going elsewhere. That is unfortunate; and it is so unfortunate for the future of this State, and I am not sure that we will ever recover that sort of business.

Some of the other revenues are reasonably well on target. There will be some up lift in stamp duties, although my estimation is that they will still finish below the budget estimate. My calculations suggest that the debits tax will come in fairly close to budget, but there will not be any surplus in there of that order. At this stage, it is probably too hard to tell about taxation, because most of the receipts come in the second half of the year.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You are learning.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Treasurer said that I am learning; I learnt a long time ago and the Treasurer himself, I hope, is learning.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: In relation to the other areas of finance, the regulatory fees and fines have fallen behind. The contributions from State undertakings, which can be manipulated at any point, are also falling behind, but they can be picked up pretty easily. The fees and charges are falling behind the budget estimate. So, on this basis, we are facing a revenue shortfall of at least \$50 million at this stage, and it may improve or get worse as we go further into the 1992-93 financial year.

The gravest cause of concern is the Government's management of its budget. In the health area, 55 per cent of the budget has been spent in the first six months. We saw hospital wards close down over the Christmas period as a result of some very sharp reactions to a health budget that was getting out of control. Spare a thought

for the consumer, for those people who really do need urgent operations, and ask the question whether the health system is being properly managed. Certainly the budget and the queues are not. In the area of education, in the first six months 54 per cent of the budget has been spent, and again some hard and difficult decisions must be made in respect of that level of expenditure.

In the area of community service and development, over 60 per cent of the budget has already been spent. I do not have enough details, because this is now a very much consolidated and aggregated form of presentation to be able to define whether that is due to the impact of capital expenditure or whether there has been an absolute overrun in that area. In the broad area of resources and physical development, expenditure amounted to 56 per cent in the first 6 months, and that must be questioned. In the area of protection of people and property, the budget is reasonably well on target, as it is with Government management and support services.

Overall, to date expenditure for the first six months amounts to 53 per cent of the allocations for this financial year. However, I would make the point very strongly that there is a gross under expenditure, and obviously some savings are possible in the economic development area. I can only assume that some savings will be made during the year through some capital projects, including the MFP, and that there will be some under expenditure in that area. Again, I presume there will be a trade off between capital and recurrent expenditure, and more capital will be fitted into the budget to somehow bring those other areas of over expenditure under control and there will be a transfer between the various lines.

It is not a particularly pretty budget picture. It is a picture of a Government still failing to take proper action to control its expenditure. It is a Government that simply does not understand the dynamics of the economy and the extent to which the recession is biting and, as a result, it has over estimated its revenue items. So, the Treasurer has failed to deliver a balanced budget. The net financial requirement for this year's budget is of the order of \$317 million. I expect that we could add another \$60 million to \$80 million to that to represent the actual picture. However, what has not been taken into account are the indemnities that have yet to be paid for with respect to the bank. We know that \$450 million did not appear in the State debt figure for the period ending 30 June 1992. It has gone to the liabilities side.

There is another \$400 million in outstanding interest which has not been paid and still has to be found, and I will be asking the Treasurer questions on that at a later date. That information should form part of this budget. We do not know how it will be handled. There is another \$230 million estimated shortfall or loss from the GAMD operations, and again we do not know how they will be accounted for in this budget, if at all. The Government may well do what it did last year and shift all these additional costs or liabilities onto bankcard and not pay for them during the current financial year. We really do not know where the budget will finish. All we know is that it is in total disarray.

The net financing requirement will be significantly greater than estimated originally by the Government. There will be many unpaid bills which will add to the

future debt of this State and its people, and somehow the next Liberal Government will have to bear the brunt and pick up on some of those areas that the Government has failed to address in a way that we would wish. When addressing this Bill, it is important to understand that the Government of this State has over-expanded for a long time. The great tragedy is that the State Bank situation, with its \$3 150 million worth of losses, has come at a time when the State can least afford it. It is the age old story that Governments, like people, will spend when they have extra revenue coming in on the basis that they believe that it can be sustained.

I visited the United States 18 months ago, and its Constitution requires a balanced budget. To a large degree, that is met, although, when talking about capital expenditure and special raisings, we know that they operate outside of the budget. However, if we look at the States and their levels of budgeting and the way they put their budgets together, they are far more responsible than we have been over the past 10 years. I spoke with a number of State and city financial administrators in America and they said that some of them did the same thing as has occurred here. When the economy was bubbling along and the incoming revenue was strong, they spent that money rather than save it and put it in reserves to cater for the time when there would be a downturn in the economy. It is vital that we budget in the long-term context and do not spend all that we get on a daily basis, because there is a reduced capacity to be able to do that.

In relation to the budget, the debt which was estimated at \$7.3 billion as at 30 June 1992, and in actual terms is closer to \$8 billion, represents 26 per cent of the gross State product for the 1991-92 year. That is up from 15.5 per cent in the 1989-90 year. In just two years the level of debt in this State compared with the gross State product, or the total production of this State, if you like, has increased from about 15 per cent to 26 per cent. The interest costs now amount to \$695 million per annum or \$480 per head per year, and this absorbs 45 per cent of State taxes. If we had the same interest rates prevailing as those of two years ago, the debt servicing costs would be well in excess of \$900 million, as we would all appreciate. We would then have a Government that truly would be bankrupt in every area.

Because of the large debt level that has been contributed to in no small measure by the State Bank disaster, a 1 per cent movement in the interest rate on that size debt means a cost of \$80 million to the budget, and that simply cannot be afforded. I also point out very clearly that this Government has set to taxation with a will exceeded nowhere in Australia. For example, we have seen land tax increase from \$23.7 million to \$78 million, or a real increase of 144 per cent over the past

10 years. Payroll tax has increased from \$222.8 million to \$496.6 million, or a real increase of 38 per cent. New FID and debits taxes have been introduced, and they bring in \$105.4 million and \$41 million respectively. That is an infinitesimal increase because we did not have them in 1982-83. Stamp duties have increased from \$118.3 million to \$356.7 million, or a real increase of 117 per cent. Fuel franchise has increased from \$25.8 million to \$129.9 million over that 10 year period, or a real increase of 318 per cent.

So, taxation fees and fines have increased from \$487 million in 1982-83 to \$1 743 million estimated for 1992-93. No economy can stand that sort of savaging. Not one of those taxation items has kept pace with inflation—all have exceeded inflation to a very large degree. Leading the list would be items such as stamp duty, fuel tax, land tax, FID and debits, although we did not have FID and debits previously. It is my contention that the only way this State will ever lift its head above the waves and not drown in the process is by a dramatic change in the way this Government operates. The Government has to be changed to a Liberal Government so we can take the measures essential to ultimately reduce the taxation burden on our businesses and our people, and to provide the level of service and level of guidance that this community deserves.

This State does have a future, but it has no future under the current Government. Everything it has done over the past 10 years has been detrimental to the future of the people of South Australia. In addressing the Supply Bill, I express my extreme concern about the future of this State, unless we have a Federal Liberal Government to change the nation and a State Liberal Government to take the measures necessary to turn this State around. We must inject some hope for the future and take action to assist some of our young people who are currently breaking loose and causing mayhem, and provide a sense of purpose amongst our younger people. We must provide the educational directions that this State so desperately needs and the jobs that the people of this State so desperately need. We must provide the protection that this State so desperately needs and give the people the capacity to look after themselves in the future.

So, whilst I support the Supply Bill, which provides the money for the public sector to continue its operations past 1 July of this year, I do express my extreme reservations about the future of this State as long as the Labor Government stays in power here. As I said before, this Government has no credibility and no support, and it is high time it gave up and let us have a go.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I have great concern about the way this Government is cutting its expenditure, where it is pruning its budget and who it is affecting. I want to express my deep concern about the proposals put forward by the Minister of Primary Industries (who I notice is in the House) following the report of the Organisational Development Review (ODR). I bring up this issue now because I understand that the Minister is about to make a decision on the report. The ODR into the Department of Agriculture (now the Department of Primary Industries) recommended the closure of as many as nine country offices.

I understand that the Minister's decision is imminent, and I hope it will be favourable. I am doubly or even triply concerned about such a backward step, although I must add that this is the direction this Government seems intent on taking South Australia in other matters as well as this. I am concerned for the sake of the efficient and effective operation of what is now the Department of Primary Industries (the Department of Agriculture as it was) and the severed research arm of the South

Australian Research and Development Institute, commonly known as SARDI.

I am concerned for the sake of the officers who have dedicated themselves to serving their farmer clients and who, with their families, have become important members of their respective communities. Mostly, I am concerned for the farming enterprises that are likely to suffer as a result of being left without sound, locally based advisory services for, make no mistake, there are many times when no amount of academic skill from a centralised institution can match the value of good, local, on the ground information. I call it a backward step; in fact, it is a perverse step but, again, perversity is nothing new to this Government. If there is any reorganising of the regional and central services to agriculture to be done, the move should be just the reverse of what is contemplated in the McKinsey report—the ODR. In agriculture especially, we should be looking at decentralising. We have heard this so often as we have discussed this Supply Bill; it is high time we took the bull by the horns and said, 'We have to turn things around.'

This is the most centralised State in the nation, and probably the most centralised nation in the world. Most of our population huddles into the metropolitan area, while a few, as often as not, neglected by the Government that sees no value in their votes, produce a large proportion of the wealth that supports the whole of this State. Decentralisation or regionalisation is vital if the haemorrhage of people from the country is to be stemmed. Instead of cramming yet more people into the black stump (which is the affectionate name for the Department of Agriculture headquarters) and its environs, and instead of turning useful, practical agricultural advisers into yet more paper pushing bureaucrats, let us take a bold leap of the imagination (which I know is difficult for those opposite) and suggest moving the entire Government agricultural advisory operation out of Adelaide. That would raise a few hackles.

For example, I suggest that, rather than closing down regional offices, the Minister consider moving all the grain related operations of the department to Clare, rather than closing it—not to Adelaide, not to Turretfield but to Clare. All the infrastructure in relation to grain operations ought to be sited in Clare. At the moment we have some in Adelaide, some at Turretfield and some spread everywhere, but it ought to be centralised at Clare. Every argument that can be put in support is commonsense and reasonable. Clare is central to the State, but the department's office there is already threatened with a total shutdown. Twenty people are already sited in Clare; if the whole grain infrastructure were moved there, it would add 25 more, giving a base of 45 people, and that would help the community a lot.

It would be a start. It is right in the middle of the electorate of Culance, and I appreciate the support of local government, particularly Mayor Bob Phillips, who is single-minded in making sure that town survives in these very turbulent times. That is not a bad idea. Is it a very bold idea? No. For example, New South Wales moved its entire headquarters out of Sydney to Orange, with clear benefits to the department and to the regional community. Even as I say this, I can hear the old

excuses being dusted off opposite, but the truth is that this Government has no commitment to the country people of this State, never mind that such a large part of the State economy still comes from the land.

I understand that the Minister went to Spalding the other night, and the people there told him what they thought of his ideas in no uncertain terms. It was the first time the Minister got some home truths. I know the Minister did not like it, but there it was: even the Chairman of the council up there, who is known for his fairness and quiet approach, certainly told the Minister what he thought of his ideas, and I compliment Councillor Longmire for that. Never mind that the people out there build their own communities and community spirit and ask only for an equal go, to face often very unequal odds.

This Government does not care about that; this Government just does not care about the tragic drift of some 17 000 people from the Mid North of the State. You would not believe that, would you, Sir? But, that is the figure for the drift out of mid-northern South Australia. Members opposite laugh about it. It is a disgrace, because that statistic is absolutely damning, and we wonder why Adelaide is overloaded, why we must build new sewerage systems and why the roads are blocked. Members should go down South Road at 6 p.m. and see what they have done to Adelaide. We are asking to keep some of the infrastructure in the country areas and the Government just takes it; it just rapes it and leaves nothing. It is not too late.

While we are discussing the Supply Bill, I am asking the Government to look at its priorities. The Government does not care about those 17 000 people who have gone from the Mid North of South Australia to Adelaide, to other States and even overseas. It does not care that this is the worst population loss of any region in Australia. I make that point as strongly as I can. The Government seems to be so heartless in this matter. It has thoughtless policies that are driving people out of communities where family values are maintained and where people are proud of taking care of their own; its policies are driving people into the city, where their social support needs will be even greater. It does not even make economic sense but, with no vision to see beyond the Labor voting industrial belt, this Government does not care. It does not care that this process of drift away from the country will not stop of its own accord, and that is why I bring it up now. By nature it will increase until it becomes a flood. I think that flood is on right now. This has the potential to destroy the very countryside that provides half or more of this State's wealth.

Instead, the Government brings down policies that will even accelerate the rate at which the country bleeds to death, never caring that it helps to burden even further Adelaide's often already overloaded services. The results are that \$80 million has to be raised to build extra sewerage works and roads, which are currently inadequate. As I said, members should try South Road at

6 p.m. today to see what we have done to Adelaide. There is already unused potential in country areas, especially in health services but, of course, my friends opposite already have plans to take care of them. Education services in regional South Australia are already a disgrace, and I have mentioned that before so

many times, but the Government just does not care. Where now is the so-called social justice that we hear so often from members opposite?

Social engineering can have results that are far removed from social justice: take that most sacred of sacred cows, one vote, one value. Put into practice, that ideal has killed our country electorates. They grow even bigger as people leave the country. Those who are left get poorer representation because the districts are so huge, and so the downward spiral goes on. Members should look at the Federal seat of Grey and the State seat of Eyre. Soon, Grey will start at the Barossa and take in the rest of the State. In fact, one vote, one value and the defeat of the Playford Government is the point in history when our State's graph began its downward plunge. Whatever we may say or believe, the results speak for themselves. Time proves many things. The State has degenerated to the level of a third world—I beg your pardon, Mr Speaker, a 'developing'—country. I only wish this were a developing country. It may no longer be fashionable to say, 'Labor cannot manage money'—we have heard that old phrase, and I happen to agree with it—with its implied alternative, 'Born to rule.' I have heard that said before, from an antagonistic point of view. But like many clichés, it has a germ of truth.

As I say, time proves many things. Both Federal and State Labor Governments have now shown beyond any doubt that they are totally unable to govern. They lack the personal ability and political wherewithal to carry out responsible government. The Labor Government is made up of many groups and factions all demanding what they see as their 'due', so that responsible decision-making for the greater good is impossible.

We need only listen to the speeches from members opposite. We heard another boss and industry-bashing speech today from the member for Albert Park, and we have heard similar from other members opposite. Many of them are just parroting views that they do not privately endorse, but the demand for allegiance from the group that sends them here overrules everything else. Members opposite answer to people outside this Parliament, people who have other agendas and some who would even delight in seeing our democratic system crumble.

Some people eventually see the light, but some never will. Norman Foster saw the light when he broke the Labor stronghold and voted to give us Roxby Downs. So, there is hope for some of them. Indeed, on the weekend I learnt that there is even hope for George Apap, whom I met at a function in Clare—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Culance is not following the excellent example of the lead speaker in this debate on the Supply Bill, whose remarks were relevant. The member for Culance is now drifting from that perfect example, and I ask him to relate his comments to the Supply Bill.

Mr VENNING: Thank you for that guidance, Sir. I will link up my remarks. I am talking about quality of life. As the Government spends its money, it relates to Supply. Further, I understand that the Premier is to make a financial statement in March and I hope that he will heed my comments. Also, the Minister of Primary Industries, who is in the Chamber at present, is to make a decision on ODR, and it is relevant that I bring up

these points now, because they have to do with money and the direction of the State.

I am talking about quality of life. Certainly, George Apap knows quality of life, because he has chosen to live in the Clare Valley. He lives in my electorate and he appreciates the quality of country life. I have welcomed him to my electorate and offered my assistance to him in any way I can. George has moved out of the city and away from the rat race.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr VENNING: No, he has bought a magnificent and lovely property—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

Mr VENNING: We will work on that. It was certainly a good move for George, who now lives with the real people, where life is more enjoyable, where there are fewer hassles and stress and where people are friendlier. They still talk to each other and they will certainly talk to George Apap. This is the way of life that the Government has to preserve. As to the Supply Bill, every time the Government spends a dollar it has an impact on these issues. I do not exaggerate in the slightest when I say that the ill-considered closure of the Clare offices of the Department of Primary Industries, as an example, will put that community and its way of life under threat.

The rural industries on which that community rely have been battered by influences not of their making. The seasons have been hard enough, but every farmer is ready to battle the elements. It is when the disasters of climate are followed by economic and policy disasters of the Government's making that people begin to give up, to move out and to join the rush to the city.

The announcements that the Government has to make in its March statement involve further money to be spent in Adelaide. I am saying that, if the Government reverses that trend, it will remove the pressure that has now built up. In that same context I wish to comment on the reviews now being done on the regional operations of many other departments, and this is relevant to the Supply Bill, Mr Speaker. My greatest concern relates to the Department of Road Transport and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, particularly in the northern region. Both those departments have offices in Crystal Brook. It is my understanding that a review of both these departments in Crystal Brook has been completed.

I heard on the news yesterday that the results in relation to the Department of Road Transport indicate that the Crystal Brook offices will be remaining but that two other offices in this State will be closed. As to the E&WS Department, I visited it for the second time this month last Friday. I was alarmed to find that there were many vacant places, with at least eight people having taken early retirement and so on in the past few weeks. The work force at that establishment has dropped from about 250 about four years ago to about 123.

The department claims that it will not close the offices in this region but individually, by natural attrition and other means, the Government allows numbers to fall. Eventually numbers will be at such a low ebb that the Government will say that it is not worth continuing a presence and activity will be phased out. I am all in favour of smaller government, but it is the wasteful and

pointless areas of Government spending that should be targeted and not those areas that keep healthy the infrastructure and services that support our rural and industrial sectors.

Let us always be clear about why such cuts are necessary: they are for no other reason than for the burden of the Government's self-inflicted State Bank wounds. The Government surgery seems to be very selective: it amputates only the regional services. Closure of the regional offices takes care of the jobs. Employees are transferred back to Adelaide, swelling the population drift, or they disappear as incumbents leave or swallow the attractive early-retirement bait.

So much of this is happening that it must be costing the Government much money with all these early retirements. For example, I refer to the meter-servicing shop at Crystal Brook, which employs five people. I understand that that shop is up for closure and that the task will be moved to Ottoway in Adelaide. I am told quite reliably that each meter is serviced more cheaply in Crystal Brook than in Adelaide. Why would the Government want to close that operation? It is a hatchet job!

A similar development is under way at the road transport depot at Bute, and I have made strong representations previously about this matter. I considered that we had won the first battle, the department promising to keep the depot open and keep eight jobs in Bute. However, let me now tell the House what has happened as a result of the Government's new surgical approach. One staff member retired and was not replaced. An overseer was moved to Moonta, another employee was sent to a relieving position in Jamestown and another left. Two more workers are now likely to be offered early retirement.

How is your mathematics, Mr Speaker? By my reckoning, that leaves just two positions at Bute. But what will happen with the next review? The Government will say that it will not close the depot, but those two employees will be moved to another area. What does that do for the Bute community? That will be it; the deed will be done, yet the Government will put its hand on its heart and say that the Bute depot is still open. What a travesty! It makes me sick. Where is the social justice in that? Many members will know the community of Bute and they will know the impact of any change on that community.

Let me turn to yet another area of Government mismanagement-asset replacement. Not content with bankrupting the State, the Labor Government is now rapping our assets. As to road replacement, we have approximately 10 000 kilometres of bitumen road in South Australia. I understand the roads were designed for 25 years of use, but the fact is that we are getting 35 years of use out of those roads. One does not have to be much of a mathematician to work out that we ought to be replacing 400 kilometres of bitumen each year. The reality is that about 50 kilometres of bitumen is replaced each year.

Where are we going? We are on the road to nowhere. We will quickly reach a situation where our roads will be such that we cannot afford to maintain them. People will be driving four-wheel drive vehicles and the Government will be ploughing up our bitumen roads. This is an

obvious fact. In discussing the Supply Bill, the Government should be resolving some of these problems. Today we heard what impact the GST will have on fuel. I refer to the hide of this Government to comment on this issue when at the same time it mercilessly rips off the motorist while paying less than one-third of the moneys collected from fuel levies on road maintenance. How the Government can claim that we will be worse off under a GST is absolutely ridiculous. I wonder at the hypocrisy of this Government. In conclusion, I support the Supply Bill and I honestly hope that this is the last one that we have to pass for this Government.

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I want to support the theme of the remarks of the member for Custance. That theme was to ensure that we have appropriate regional development and sustainable jobs in regional areas of South Australia. That was the theme of his promotion and, during his remarks, he graphically identified how productivity and efficiency with good industrial relations, as is usually the case in country regions and townships, ought to be the basis upon which we can establish a good, prosperous regional development pattern in South Australia. That applies to some Government agencies which provide services for country people because, after all is said and done, they are entitled to the same access to those services as their counterparts in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Where that service is provided more cheaply and more cost effectively than in the metropolitan area, it ought to be supported and it extends to private sector projects such as the Onkaparinga woollen mills at Lobethal.

Of the Jameson Equity woollen mills operation in Australia, it is the most efficient and profitable, yet it is facing closure at the end of this year. It is being closed because of the state and condition of the factory and plant in Lobethal. The Federal Government's TCF policy gives the company \$13 million to close Lobethal, to shift to Warrnambool and, subsequently, to shift to Albury. I am disappointed that, despite representations to the head of the Premier's Department and officers of DITT, we did not put to Jameson Equity prior to this decision being made a scheme whereby the land south of the existing facility at Lobethal could have been used, under the Housing Trust factory program, to build a modern, efficient plant on a lease-back arrangement much the same as is the case with Gerard Industries at Murray Bridge. We might well have been able to save that industry and 130 jobs in that town had the proposal been put before the decision was made.

Unfortunately, tardiness, concern about which I expressed to the Minister, did not enable such a scheme to be put to Jameson Equity prior to the decision being made. It might not have changed the end result, given the TCF program and the benefits of that to Jameson Equity, but we should have been in there trying, and I am critical of the fact that we were not.

I shall use the time available to me today to talk about small business, its impact and its effect within the economy and the way in which small business is literally being destroyed by Labor Government policies at Federal and State level. Of course, that has a direct impact on our budget. Our budget receipts are down and our stamp duty revenues are down because of the lack of consumer

demand and the lack of retail sales and because the marketplace has fear, anxiety and concern about continuing job prospects and about small business surviving in the current economic climate.

We are really discussing the plight of the forgotten people, because there are 56,000 small business operators in this State. Because of the economic circumstances, many of them have collapsed completely or have had to retrench some or most of their staff over the past couple of years. But there have been no headlines of outrage at this downturn. For them, there have been very few stories of sympathy. Their traumas have been greeted with deafening silence by Governments and the media. It is estimated that a couple of hundred small businesses have been retrenching in twos, threes and fours each week, and that number adds up to far more than any big company's retrenchments, for example, the Nissan closure of its operations in this country.

It seems that the small business crisis that has been ignored by Government has also largely been ignored by the media. There is an ingrained perception that the small business community cries poor but lives rich. There appears to be a media view that being poor for small business means trading down from a Mercedes to a Volvo parked at the back of the small business premises. It is wrong, it is damaging and it is an unfair perception. It seems to be so entrenched in some media circles that the Government has been able to get away quite successfully with the attempted murder of an exceptionally vital component of the South Australian economy, and it is about time the extent of the damage caused by Keating's policies and Labor policies in South Australia, which have adversely affected the small business community, was given the coverage it deserves in the media and the concern it deserves from the Government. In that way, it is to be hoped that South Australians will see the full extent of Labor's attack on a group that earns its description as the engine room of the economy.

I remember a policy speech of former Premier Bannon lauding small business, the engine room of the South Australian economy. However, every policy initiative and direction of this Government has been a further impediment, cost and restriction on the capacity of small business to survive and employ. That is why we have such high levels of unemployment in the community. That has been caused by Labor's economic policies. A walk along any suburban shopping centre strip in any regional city or town will show empty shops and closing down sales.

The Hon. T.R. Groom: Go to New South Wales.

Mr OLSEN: The level of unemployment and small business bankruptcies in this State is the worst since the Great Depression. Because the Minister wants to interject, I will quote some reports for him. One up-to-date report reveals that South Australia is the poorest performing State in terms of retail trade, while Western Australia, with virtually the same trading hours as ours, is the best. I will quote also for the Minister from a survey of business and economic performance and prospects for Australia for 1992-93, which was compiled by the business, economics and forecasting group of the School of Economics, University of New South Wales.

The survey gives the States an index of performance for 1991-92. In terms of policy and performance, Queensland and New South Wales returned positive results, with Victoria and South Australia languishing at the bottom of the graph with negative results. The survey also ascribes the States a risk return trade-off index for 1992-93 and, again, South Australia and Victoria appear at the bottom of the graph, whilst New South Wales, Western Australia and Queensland appear at the top. The gap is huge, so I guess the Minister will not interject and refer to New South Wales again, because he has just been shot down in flames.

The Hon. T.R. Groom: Where is Tasmania?

Mr OLSEN: I am talking about the South Australian economy with a Bill before this Parliament relating to South Australia and, rightly, Mr Speaker, if I did not stick to that, if I was baited by the Minister's interjections and I went off onto Tasmania, you would call me to order. Let me return to the plight of the South Australian small business community. I will give some examples of effect of Keating's policies which has had a detrimental impact on small business and which is occurring now. The new, streamlined sales tax system, operative from 1 January, has created major problems for small business and a major PR problem for the Government. This is the hidden Keating wholesale sales tax system, the tax that the Hewson Fightback package would eliminate lock, stock and barrel.

During a late night meeting in a motel room in Canberra during the tax summit in 1983 or 1984, Paul Keating got scuttled by Bob Hawke and the ACTU with option C; a broadbased GST was involved. He had \$3 billion net revenue from wholesale sales tax but he lost on the GST, so he broadened the net so that wholesale sales tax system, which is collected by small business and which is the Keating Government's hidden tax, went from \$3 billion to \$11 billion. He was not defeated. All he did was to widen the net. He picked up an additional \$11 billion in revenue from the wholesale sales tax system.

What have they done? They have continued to amend it and to expand the net. Let me give an example of the problems currently being experienced by small business. The Tax Office put new arrangements in place on 1 January this year, yet already it has had to introduce transitional arrangements operative until 31 March 1993. It could not get it right. The temporary measures placed unnecessary burdens on the purchasers of conditionally exempt goods and tested the goodwill of tax officers who are trying to handle client inquiries. The commencement date of 1 January did not allow the Tax Office the necessary time to contact clients, receive applications for registration, process the information and issue identification numbers. In other words, the Government was so intent on collecting money that it implemented the measure and had an operative date before the necessary procedures could be put in place so that it could be effectively administered.

Over 150 000 applications were received by early January and 75 000 have been processed. The Australian Tax Office estimates that, by the middle of February, all registrations will have been sent to applicants. An additional 300 000 businesses now have to pay or claim exemption from the wholesale sales tax system. This is

Keating's hidden wholesale sales tax—the net reaching out collecting this hidden tax revenue.

Mr Venning: The GST—the Government's secret tax.

Mr OLSEN: Well, we do not hear much about the hidden wholesale sales tax. We do not hear much about how it has gone from \$3 billion to \$11 billion. We do not hear much about this scheme being in place as at 1 January this year whereby 300 000 more small businesses have been registered as tax collectors for the Government. But the problem goes on. The Government was warned—

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Well, at least we would introduce a fairer system and abolish seven business taxes to give some breathing space to small business operators. We would not do what the Keating Government did—put in place a fiscal policy that for five years had interest rates ranging between 18 and 24 per cent. What that did to small business was to starve its capital, equity and working funds. It brought small business to its knees to the extent that it—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The member for Napier might shake his head. The simple fact is that businesses out there are struggling week by week to pay payroll tax and WorkCover and to cover their ETSA bills, which are the highest in the country. These are the costs for small business. They are not the people with the Mercedes and Volvos; they are the people in the South Australian and Australian community who risk their houses and their life savings to create jobs for others. They are the people who are prepared to take risks—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And work 60 hours a week or more.

Mr OLSEN: And work 60 hours a week or more, as the member for Coles rightly says. They are the people who risk all. They are the people who work extraordinarily hard. They are the people who are at the engine room of this economy. Labor policies, both Federal and State, have brought them to their knees. They have no reserves left. The Minister would well know, with his qualifications, if he ever did any accountancy out in the field and did the books for some of these small business operators, how close to the bone they are. They cannot afford new taxing measures such as this one being used by the Keating Government to expand the wholesale sales tax system.

Since the legislation provides the minimum amount of credit that is paid by the Tax Office (\$200), taxpayers will have to add smaller amounts together in order to reach the \$200 minimum. So, if a small business operator makes a mistake in calculation and remits it to the Tax Office, the Tax Office will not send back any money until the amount is over \$200. How unreasonable! How unfair! It is another impact, another impost, another way to drag money out of the small business community.

Mr S. G. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: Exactly the point. There is a double standard and two sets of rules. I have had a number of inquiries from people in South Australia—for example, one who runs a small music systems company in this State—who are outraged that, if they happen to make a mistake on the form, it is not until they get credits of

\$200 that they will get a cheque back from the Government. You multiply that \$200 by the hundreds of thousands of small businesses across this country and the mind boggles as to the amount of revenue that will be held by the Government and not returned to these small business operators. That is clearly unfair, unjust and unreasonable, but very typical of the way in which the Keating Federal and the State Labor Governments have operated.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier will cease interjecting.

Mr OLSEN: The Government's tired, old line is that this crisis, which it terms I think 'a point in the economic cycle', will flush out the badly managed businesses leaving the well managed to survive. I agree, Mr Speaker: the right to succeed also brings with it the right to fail, but there must at least be a level playing field and the capacity to survive on that playing field. In South Australia WorkCover costs are the second highest in the country, electricity charges are the highest in the country and interest rates are very high. You have to try to meet the Federal Government's provisional and income tax laws; you have to try to establish what these might be. For example, you have to guess, within 85 per cent, the income tax payable for the year in question and you have to remit that to the Government and, if you are out, you pay a substantial penalty to the Government for being out. But the Government, if it makes any mistakes, does not apply any penalty to its system to remit, return and offset the costs of the small business operators.

It is a one-way cycle. That is where we have to change the system and attitudes. We have to change the system and attitudes towards small business and recognise its place in the community. It behoves every member of this Parliament to recognise the importance of small business and ensure that policies are in place that give it a fair go for the future. It behoves the media to recognise once and for all that the small business sector is the most important sector in this economy, not the big business operators. They do not employ the majority of Australians: it is the small business operators.

As I said, it is a pity that when small businesses put off people in their ones, twos and threes, it is not newsworthy. However, when Nissan closes its plant and 1 000 or 2 000 people go off, that causes massive national headlines. I suggest that in the week that Nissan closed, if you added up all the small businesses that had retrenched somebody around Australia, it would make Nissan look like a kindergarten picnic in terms of increasing unemployment in this country. That is where we have got it wrong. That is where, as Parliaments and lawmakers, we do not understand the importance of small business. That is where we need to get a fundamental change in attitude.

Australians need to get over the hangup they have towards profit. I have said it before and will repeat it in this House: profit is the lifeblood of this country; the creation and generation of wealth is the lifeblood of this country because it is only by the creation and generation of wealth that we can provide the necessary support for the disadvantaged groups in the community. It is only by making the cake bigger that we will be able to look after the disadvantaged groups in the community. It behoves

Australians and small business people to change their attitude to profit. It is not a dirty word: it is not a four letter word. It is a good word. It is a word that demonstrates—

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister is out of order.

Mr OLSEN: It is a word that demonstrates prospect. In America, if you make a profit, you get a pat on the back and you are asked, 'How did you do that? Perhaps if I can follow that example I, too, can be profitable.' In Australia, if you have made a profit, the first question that anybody asks is, 'Who did you rip off to make the profit?' and then the lawmakers introduce laws to ensure you never have the chance to do it again. That is where there needs to be a fundamental change in attitude towards small business.

On the other hand, if small business makes a profit it ought not hide that fact. If it makes a profit it should stand up and say, 'I have made a profit because I have the formula right. I have worked hard. I deserve the reward for that effort.' What we need to do in this Parliament and in the national capital is recognise the role of small business, retreat from regulation and restriction, which inhibit small business being able to make a fair go of it, and ensure we reduce the cost of money and venture capital available to small business, so that the people who want to go out there and take a risk will take that risk. Only by those people doing this will we crank up this economy and will the revenue side of this budget come back into the positive mode.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): About this time of each calendar year we are asked to consider the Supply Bill. In doing so we are reminded by the Treasurer of the amount of Supply we are asked to approve, and at the present time it is \$900 million. That covers the period from July to September 1993. I would like to think that perhaps the \$900 million will cover the first quarter of the next financial year. There is something wrong with our State and Federal Government budgeting. I personally believe, and have supported the notion for some years, that we should consider the budget for next financial year—that is, 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994—in the first sitting period after the Christmas recess and that by, say, 29 June this year we should have approved the State budget so that the Public Service and the Government, when considering their budget allocations, know they have a full 12 months for allocating and spending those moneys.

It annoys me to think that we still have this inefficient system, this ridiculous economic strategy, whereby we consider the budget some time in August, it then has to pass through the House of Assembly, we go through the Budget Estimate Committees for two weeks, and the measure is then dealt with in the Legislative Council before it receives royal assent. It means that it is some time in October—and it can be as late as early November—before the budget has been dealt with through the parliamentary process.

That means that most Government departments, whilst they may be aware of their budget allocation, are never too sure exactly what will happen. They then start

spending their money in the second half of the financial year. It is the most inefficient system I know of in any Government in the western world. I think it is about time State Governments got together with the Federal Government and considered the refraining of budgets and followed the American line, where the budget must be passed before the commencement of the financial year. If that can be done in America at a Federal Government level I cannot see why a country with as small a population and budget as Australia's—in comparison with the rest of the world—cannot do the same.

I make an appeal to the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister at the bench at the present time—the Minister of Primary Industries—that it is high time we considered a whole new strategy in dealing with our budget. We must look seriously at curbing inefficiencies in Government; we must consider looking at a whole new system.

The Hon. T.R. Groom: Abolish the Estimates Committees.

Mr BECKER: You might be advocating abolishing the State Parliaments if you do that. There is nothing wrong with the Estimates Committees, because somewhere along the line the Government must be held accountable. Somewhere along the line the Minister knows that he and his Government must be accountable to Parliament in advising the Parliament the reason for seeking the money. Here we are, asking—

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister wishes to contribute to this debate he has only to let the Chair know and he will have an appropriate chance to respond. The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Here we are, looking at a budget of \$900 million. We can only assume that it is to pay the wages and salaries of the public servants and to cover some of the administrative costs. However, there is no detail. We have no idea which budget line will get what; we have no idea whether the Premier's Department will continue to expand willy nilly through the Economic and Development Division—what a great track record that has had in the past under the Premier's control—or whether the Department of Primary Industries will be cut back, or exactly what will happen.

So, here we are approving *carte blanche* something over which we have really very little control. I do not like it; I do not think that constitutionally it should be permitted. I cannot see how the taxpayers can approve of this type of willy nilly spending on their behalf. It is for that reason that I get very annoyed and angry when we are asked to look at a budget allocation such as this without knowing the full facts.

The Treasurer told us that the allocation of \$900 million means that there is a \$40 million increase on the corresponding amount set aside last year. Last year we considered about \$860 million. If we look at the \$40 million increase we see that that represents about 4.75 per cent. Is the Treasurer therefore indicating to us that there is to be an increase in inflation in the next financial year? If so, that means that inflation is set to double. Currently inflation is about 2 to 2.1 per cent. It is a little higher in South Australia and that is a tragedy. Goodness knows, we are in enough financial difficulty at present

with unemployment and with the lack of business confidence.

As the member for Kavel made very clear in his contribution, small business—the backbone of success in this State—is really suffering under some of the most draconian taxes that have ever been introduced. This Government has increased taxes such as bank charges, FID and BAD. They are the highest rates of bank charges in Australia. We have the highest rate of State petrol tax; we have the highest workers compensation premiums and the highest water costs and, as the member for Kavel reminded us, the second highest electricity tariffs. All those taxes, plus payroll tax, really hurt small business.

They stop the incentive to employ additional people, because each small business strives to better itself, improve and to get to the level where payroll tax is paid. Certainly, I would like to have a small business that reached a situation, after a couple of years of hard work, whereby payroll tax had to be paid under the present conditions. However, of course, that is being avoided. Most employers today are getting to a certain level and working under the limit to avoid paying payroll tax, but they are still being hit by all these other draconian taxes, which are killing incentive.

We hear the bleatings of Government members, loud and clear, through the current election campaign, because part of the Coalition's policy is to remove compulsory unionism. They know as well as I do that in Victoria and New South Wales, where the compulsory deduction of public servants' union dues was banned, there has been a considerable falling off in union membership. It is up to the unions to prove whether they are good enough and successful enough in obtaining union members. It should not be up to an arm of Government to wet-nurse the unions and provide them with the financial wherewithal and huge financial assets that some of them have built up—billion dollar assets—to campaign against private enterprise as we know it in this country. That is one of the things that has been killing incentive. That is another argument that we need to look at as far as this budget is concerned.

What will be the impact after 13 March on the finances of this State, whether or not the Coalition wins? I hope it does, because I think it is time there was a change. We need to restructure the whole financial system in this country, particularly the taxation system, so that we can get it back working, where we can give young people some hope and opportunity for the future, where the size of Government is reduced and where private enterprise is given the opportunity to take up the challenge of operating some of these Government organisations and expanding them the way they should be expanded. After all, the economy of this State is over 150 years old. We do not have to wet-nurse some of the operations that were established when the Colony was first founded. These organisations can stand on their own two feet and should be operating independently of Government. They do not need our support and they do not need to take up large volumes of capital and use up the valuable resources that the Government should be using in other areas to help establish new enterprises where we can create additional employment.

That is the whole problem with the socialist system that has been evolving in this country. If you keep increasing taxes and charges, if you keep supporting a philosophy that means you do not curb unnecessary growth, the bloating of the Public Service and other enterprises, if you keep expanding by increasing taxes and charges, by taking the cash flow out of the community and by taking out all these taxes, you will stifle growth, and that is exactly what has happened. The gross domestic product in this country has fallen about 3 percentage points over the past 10 years, and that is disastrous if this country is to keep going and developing as it should.

At the present moment South Australia is losing jobs at the rate of 158 a day; that is absolutely disastrous. I did not believe that I would ever see fellow banking colleagues who have had 20, 30 and 40 years banking experience suddenly being made redundant in various sectors of the banking industry. Given the impact the State Bank of South Australia has had on our own budget, it is quite right for people to criticise the financial performance of this Government. The State Bank's impact on this budget has been absolutely, disastrous. The Government cannot avoid any criticism whatsoever. The Government cannot hide behind the theory that, because the then Premier was removed, the ills of the State Bank have been cured.

The Government cannot hide behind the hope that perhaps one day it will find a suitor to buy the State Bank and get rid of it. Never, from day one, did this Government ever have a mandate to take over the operations of the Savings Bank of South Australia. The Savings Bank of South Australia was formed for and belonged to the people of South Australia. It really belonged to the depositors. It was a mutual organisation. The funds to give it backing were guaranteed by the Government and were supported by Government legislation. However, the State Government has never really controlled the board of the bank and, of course, that was never intended. Successive amendments to the Savings Bank of South Australia Act were made, and that is exactly what happened. That in itself was a disaster. For a Government to appoint, as it did in the latter years, the various directors to the board of the bank, it meant that the depositors had no say whatsoever in who should govern or steer the operations of that bank. So, the Savings Bank of South Australia was absorbed by the Government by its own State Bank. The State Bank of South Australia was operating to carry out certain functions of the State Government; I have no argument with that.

The Federal Government made certain provisions and funding available to the State Bank to provide long-term housing loans for disadvantaged people, to provide long-term lending for the rural sector and to assist commerce where that was not forthcoming from other banks. However, it was a very small operation, confined purely to South Australia, and it was a necessary machinery tool of the State Government. By absorbing the Savings Bank of South Australia, it then took on an entirely different role. Just about every family in South Australia has been affected or touched by the operations of the Savings Bank of South Australia. Thirty years ago, when you, Mr Acting Speaker, would have come to

this country, the children who attended our schools were encouraged through the school banking system to bank with the Savings Bank of South Australia. They, with their few shillings—or a few pence in many cases in the rural areas—formed a habit of saving regularly. It was the best thing that ever happened to this State, because everyone was trained in those days to save something, a few shillings, as it was, towards their own future and personal prosperity.

Those few shillings grew to become pounds (and, of course, eventually they became dollars). It was that money that enabled the Savings Bank of South Australia to lend money at advantageous rates of interest, which were slightly less than those which the commercial banks were charging, so that people could borrow money to buy their first home—the great Australian dream. That is what it has always been in this country: the opportunity for every South Australian in particular, through the Savings Bank of South Australia, to acquire their quarter acre block of land to build their own home, to have their own house, to give them security and independence and recognition of their ability. It did not matter who or what you were, whether you were a skilled or unskilled tradesman, a battler, you had a small business or whatever—everybody had the opportunity to borrow money through the Savings Bank of South Australia, generally for about a 25 year term loan. Tens of thousands of South Australians did that; they purchased their first home through the opportunity provided by the Savings Bank of South Australia. In thousands of cases it provided the opportunity to build houses on land owned and subdivided by the Housing Trust.

The Housing Trust of South Australia, along with the Savings Bank of South Australia, played a very important role in the development of this State post the Second World War. It was something of which each and every one could be proud. Irrespective of Party affiliation, people were proud of the role of the Savings Bank of South Australia. I assume the role of the Government in those days was very much a bipartisan approach to encourage home ownership. Something went drastically wrong in 1983 when we agreed to the merger of the State and Savings Banks of South Australia to form the State Bank, because a new board came in, a new management team was brought in and those strong assets and reserves that were built up were used to expand a banking operation that had no place in any other State, let alone any other country in the world. It was a dream, to build up a bank and to build up an enterprise that could return \$100 million perhaps \$200 million a year in profits to the State Treasury.

That is where the next mistake was made, because it was a poor choice of management and of leadership, and it does not matter who was in Government at the time, because the whole of the Cabinet and the whole of the Government team are responsible. Each month they are asked for statistics, which are provided by all banks—and in particular the State Bank of South Australia—to the Reserve Bank, the Treasury and the Government. Those statistics would have plotted and shown the progress and development of that bank. That is where the real truth can be found. Whilst the board may not have known what the middle management of the bank was doing and whilst the board may not have been that competent in

handling the level of the banking operation in which it suddenly found itself involved, the Treasury, the Treasurer and the Cabinet should have picked up the trend of large overseas borrowings. Twenty-five per cent of the deposits were suddenly being borrowed overseas.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: That was made clear in the half yearly reports; anybody could have picked that up.

Mr BECKER: That is quite right. As the member for Coles reminds me, the quarterly reports were there, but the Treasury should have picked all this up. Also, the statistical information was there, as I pointed out to the member for Coles at that time, that the State Bank of South Australia had the highest level of interest bearing deposits of any bank in Australia—in fact, about three times the ratio at one period. So the warning signs were there.

It is the greatest tragedy that has ever befallen the State. We will overcome that. The introduction of the so called bad bank is all illegal nonsense. There is no such thing as a bad bank. It is still the State Bank of South Australia that came up with another record loss based on the figures for last financial year. The bad bank does not operate separately. It cannot do so because all those accounts still operate. The Treasury has not licensed or registered another bank.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Nor has the Act been changed.

Mr BECKER: The Act has not been changed because it needs legislative change.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I wonder how many members in the Chamber this evening, especially those sitting opposite, will recognise the text that I am about to read. I wonder whether they will think it was the then member for Custance (soon to be Senator Olsen, and now member for Kavel) or whether it was the current member for Victoria or another member of the Liberal Party. I place that before members opposite to see whether they can guess or accurately identify who said these words; and, of course, it may have been none of them. I quote as follows:

There needs to be reform of the public sector as one of the Ostrategic responses to South Australia's current economic problems. The pressure for reform is not just economic, however. Community expectations of the public sector are changing. Governments around the world are changing the style of Public Service from being bureaucratic to being enterprising, responding flexibly and cooperatively to the communities they serve as they do things differently.

There needs to be a move in South Australia towards a new style of public sector which will mean making changes in work cultures, identifying best practice, preparing and measuring outcomes for customers with those customers, involving staff in the workplace reforms, and being constantly on the lookout for new ways to capitalise on opportunities, to solve problems and respond to those demands.

This need for reform is not a sudden event; it builds on a history of change and innovation in the South Australian public sector over many years in which we led the way in merit, equity, accountability, streamlining of awards, anti-discrimination and program performance budgeting. That, of course, speaks of South Australia the way it has been, particularly the way Playford put it together,

followed by the way in which Tonkin did things. It continues:

Governments and the communities they represent are questioning the size and role of the public sector and the relationships between elected parliaments, executive government, local government, the public sector (including the semi-government entrepreneurial business activities) and the users or recipients of services.

And so it goes on. It identifies urgent issues facing the South Australian public sector as follows:

The underlying recurrent deficit for the State needs to be reduced: the high level of debt needs to be reduced. Without positive action, the standard of living in South Australia will decline. The business climate in South Australia is perceived to be poor. There are calls for the reduction of the cost of the public sector. There has been some breakdown in community confidence in the public sector...

That is an understatement. I wonder which member opposite would chance his or her arm and say who they thought made those statements. Let me tell you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that it was none of the people I just mentioned. It was one of the senior members of the staff of the present Government, and I received it only a week ago. It came to my office from Ms Sue Vardon, Chief Executive Officer of the Office of Public Sector Reform.

It is exactly the things the Liberal Party has been saying have been wrong with South Australia throughout the past decade and exactly the sorts of suggestions we have been putting down positively in respect of the direction of change. If that does not condemn this Government and the Party of which it is comprised, I do not know what does. It is just as well that we are able to get independent honest comment from people who have the professional ability to give it. Hopefully, the Government will have the gumption and the courage to accept the propositions contained in that document where they relate to the ways in which Government can get out of the way, wherever possible, and allow people to provide the kinds of goods and services which others are prepared to pay for.

Governments do not know what is best for people. They are not able to judge most accurately what our collective individual desires are. It is best to leave that to the marketplace. By that means we will minimise taxation and open up choice. We will open up chances and ring in some changes. Before I go on with that, let me talk about something else which is topical at the present time, and I refer to the TAB.

I have been distressed to learn that people in Tailem Bend believe that their TAB, which has one of the highest, if not the highest, turnovers of any small country town in South Australia, is to be relocated. It certainly has a turnover that is higher than communities where the population is more than six times the size of Tailem Bend, because there is no other TAB between Tailem Bend and Lameroo. It serves a large area beyond the town's limits. However, I believe that punters should be able to place a bet on a race through the TAB without having to enter a hotel to do so. Tailem Bend presently has a separate, very profitable agency which is run very efficiently. As I understand it, some nefarious arrangements were entered into recently. They are not formally on the record, but they are of the kind which the member for Unley and the former management of the

TAB have been involved in. To my mind, that is despicable.

If the relocation of the TAB agency goes ahead away from a stand alone operation into the hotel, many punters will simply not patronise it because they will otherwise be forced to enter the hotel whereas they normally would not do so, and it will be uncomfortable for them. Funnily enough, many of the regular patrons of the TAB are not drinkers. Those patrons who are regular punters have presented me with a petition, which they prepared not at my instigation but at theirs. However, it is not in a form which I can present to the House, but I can put it on the record. It reads:

We the undermentioned signatory are petitioning you, our sitting member, to act on our behalf and demand that the Minister for Sports and Recreation does not permit the South Australian Totalisator Agency Board to close our TAB agency at Tailem Bend and relocate it to the Tailem Bend Hotel on a permanent basis.

We want you to ensure that the present arrangement wherein the Tailem Bend Hotel has restricted hours of operation is maintained. You must appreciate the fact that many of us punters are non drinkers and women who have no desire to enter the hotel premises even if it is only to place a wager.

You can be assured that the TAB turnover will decrease greatly should you allow the board to close our agency.

I am not a betting man. I do not enter the TAB for any other purpose than to talk to the people who work there and see what the conditions are like, especially since it is a Government agency, the same as I enter any other commercial premises in a town in my electorate from time to time. Those who do attend those premises are not my enemies. Most are my friends, but none are my antagonists. Accordingly, as is my duty and wont, I put on record their concern about what I think is a nefarious arrangement and trust that it will not be seen through. It would be wrong to put the agency within the hotel, since it is already an efficient and effective agency, second to none of its kind anywhere in South Australia.

Let me turn again to the changes that we really do need, not those which are being wrought through nepotism and philosophical determination of the Left which seems to dominate the agenda of the Labor Party in this State in particular and in fair measure across the nation. I refer to the crazy strike, or attempted strike which was a flop, held in Victoria yesterday and organised by that fellow Halfpenny. He is an Australian, and many Australians think him to be a knave or a fool, and I forgive them for having that view of him. He does not understand the imperatives that confront this country.

Let us look at the kinds of things that will benefit this country after 13 March, the date of the coming Federal election. It is most certainly necessary for us to put the record straight. We have heard members opposite, including the member for Albert Park earlier today, and Ministers when responding to Dorothy Dix questions, misrepresenting—I cannot call them lies, even though that is what they are—and grossly distorting and telling untruths about the Opposition's policies.

The fact is that the take-home pay of low and middle income Australians will rise dramatically under a Coalition Government. More than 300 000 existing income tax payers will no longer pay tax at all. The fact is that an extra \$3 billion will be spent to lift the quality

of education and to give young people the skills needed to get ahead. There will be a massive increase of new funds into TAFE and universities, and that will create extra places in tertiary education, giving everybody, including women, a better range of educational and training opportunities. Austudy benefits will rise by 6 per cent. Petrol for vehicles will be 19c a litre cheaper, and that will save about \$11 every time we fill our motor car. So, that will be extra money, not only from the income tax cuts but also from the savings at the fuel pump: if we use the same amount, we will get it for less.

It is not just food that will be free of GST. There will be no GST on child-care, health, education, rent, exports, local government, churches, charities, financial transactions or food. Why cannot the members of the Government acknowledge the truth of that? It has always been there. We have never sought to hide that, yet they misrepresent it. All those points are quite deliberately and deceitfully misrepresented. What we really need is to abolish some unnecessary and unfair taxes as well, and the whole Fightback package does just that. There will be no more payroll tax, petrol tax or wholesale sales tax and, by provision of the extra billions of dollars to kickstart the economy to bring it out of recession, there will be an incentive for investment, and that is right across Australia. Businesses large and small will have incentive to create real jobs, not the pretend jobs we get when the Government takes taxes away from business and people and then decides how it will use those taxes to create jobs.

They are not market driven but driven by the philosophical and political views of the Government. As I said at the outset of my contribution, they do not provide the kinds of goods and services that the people would have chosen for themselves had the dollars been left in their hands. No; it is all about social engineering and changing society to suit the model which the Labor Party and its left wing trade union bosses tell us we should have and should want but which we would not otherwise seek for ourselves.

What about jobs? Of course, there will be more jobs in Australia, because business will be able to get growing again. When we tax somebody and create a job in that way, the multiplier is negative. In some of the private sector programs, the multiplier is virtually nil—I acknowledge that—but in most, it is positive. Additional jobs will be created by every person who gets a job in the private sector spending the income they obtained from their work. There will be greater workplace flexibility in the agreements for payment, and that will suit particular lifestyles: people will be able to make their arrangements to go to mid-week races if they want, or anything else they wish to do, in the course of the agreements they make with their employers. If one does not want to be involved in that, one does not have to be: people can simply stay with what they have, and there is no way that can be taken away from them.

Moreover, the Labor Party has indulged in a gross misrepresentation of the way in which the Fightback package will impact on Medicare. Medicare will stay, in spite of what members opposite have said. The queues at public hospitals will decrease, because there will be tax incentives of up to \$800 for people to take out private health insurance if their incomes are sufficient to enable

them to do so. By taking the weight off the public health system, the delays for health care will go. There will be no GST on health services; I have already said that. Medicare rebates will be available for work that is done by dentists, as well. There will be special measures to assist women, in particular with mammography screening, for instance.

Let us look at what will happen to pensions. Immediately, all pensions will go up by \$24. Why cannot members opposite tell the truth about that? Members of the Labor Party have misrepresented that or simply ignored it. They have not told the public the truth. All pensions—age, service, disability, war widow, sole parent and so on—will rise by 8 per cent, which means that the single pension will increase by \$24.10 a fortnight and the married pension will rise by \$40.20 a fortnight. What will happen to family allowances under the Fightback package? They will double. There will be an extra \$1 500 a year for a family with three children on an income of less than \$30 000. That is for the needy, not the greedy—not the stuff that the Labor Party is peddling, which will benefit people in the \$35 000 to \$70 000 a year income bracket. This is aimed at the needy. Our policies address people who have the greatest need. Families with an income of \$30 000 to \$40 000 will receive an increase of 50 per cent.

Let us look at some other ways in which there are benefits. A sum of \$90 million more will be spent on child-care. If women are in unpaid work at home, they will have superannuation opportunities. Women who have moved in and out of the work force and who have little or no superannuation will be able to make catch-up superannuation contributions under Fightback. Dependent spouse rebates, whether it is for a man or a woman, will increase by \$300 a year. Sole parents will get more than \$24 extra a fortnight, as I have already said. Volunteer welfare agencies will receive an extra \$100 million. For self-funded retirees, the tax-free threshold increases to \$10 060, and the pharmaceutical benefits card will be available to people over 65 with incomes under \$50 000. Again, this is aimed at the needy, not the greedy. More particularly, the lump sum tax on superannuation will be abolished. So, we need to recognise then that these things will be of great benefit to all Australians, especially those in greatest need. The ALP has misrepresented the position, and it is about time it started to tell the truth.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, indeed—like the members opposite who are now interjecting, just as I would expect them to do. I do not understand why they cannot tell the truth and why they persist in misrepresenting what has been committed. A great deal of rapid increase in economic activity will arise, for instance, from the cut in taxes on exports. There will be a \$1.7 billion cut and, if we leave that money in the pockets of exporters, they in turn will be able to create more jobs than the Government can create with that \$1.7 billion. What is more, their products will be far more competitive on world markets, because the price at which they can sell will be so much lower.

There is no question about the fact that there will be a rapid and dramatic increase in the benefits that most Australians can derive from their efforts in consequence

of the introduction of the Fightback package after 13 March, and I do hope that, for the sake of Australia, the members of the Labor Party, whether in this Chamber or anywhere else, stop misrepresenting the truth and start doing what they should do, as a matter of honesty. It is a pity they do not because, by continuing to misrepresent the position, they bring themselves and the rest of us as members of Parliament into disrepute. We are all seen to be telling the public things which we do not mean and on which we do not intend to deliver and otherwise misleading them. That is the tragedy of the present Government's approach to its public responsibilities, not only here in South Australia but also in Canberra.

If we can get that through to the general public before 13 March, we have some hope. Otherwise, the remarks I made at the outset, quoting the document produced by Ms Sue Vardon, will mean nothing. The Labor Party itself in government stands condemned for saying one thing and doing another.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next speaker, I point out that I was out of the Chair for some of the contributions. Previous speakers have been very accurate in their presentations and have kept their remarks relevant to the Bill. I ask all contributors to the debate to keep that in mind when making their contributions. The member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I support the Bill. To do otherwise would be to deny public servants the opportunity to receive payment between 1 July and when other considerations are taken before the House in August or September. However, it is a time to analyse precisely what is happening in relation to Government taxes, actions and attitudes that reflect seriously on the activity of people in our community, their chance of employment and the length of that employment.

I wish to refer specifically to one area of Government taxation which has had a disastrous effect and which is continuing to have a disastrous effect on the hotel industry. I have brought to the House since the beginning of the autumn session over 400 signatures from hoteliers, tavern owners and liquor store operators complaining about the action taken by the Government to increase taxation from 11 to 13 per cent.

The wording on the petition presented to the House has not yet been answered in any way by the Minister; the signatories to the petition put a simple fact before the House. The document indicates that the effect is markedly to reduce the number of people in employment in the hotel industry. It also indicates that it has rocked the already serious financial circumstances of a number of hoteliers to the point where more hotels are on the market now than has been the case for a long time. If one accepts the comments made on a number of the documents returned to me through a hotelier, a number of others are not far away. In fact, that information has already been cited in letters to the Editor. I want to come back to the wording of the petition that has been presented to the House. Liquor licence holders in South Australia say:

The increase in licence fees from 11 to 13 per cent-

i. has a serious cost impact upon our business such that our continued viability is in question;

ii. is an impost which must work against increased employment or even the retention of existing employment at its current level/weekly hours;

iii. will seriously affect our chance to assist in a tourist based recovery.

This has been one of the carrots held out by the Government as an initiative that it would follow to seek a tourist based recovery for the State. Yet the very organisations that are an essential part of that recovery are being pilloried by this additional cost. The petition continues:

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will immediately rescind the Act which has increased our dues and credit any increased fees we have been called upon to meet in the interim.

One can claim that it is easy to put in a request of that nature, never expecting the Government to respond. I can accept that this Government will not respond, but I believe that it is a request to which this Government needs to give a great deal of attention, because the tax that it increased from 11 to 13 per cent was first introduced on the basis that it was to be the selfsame cost that would apply to the industry in New South Wales and Victoria.

In fact, the Treasurer indicated clearly that we were not alone—that we were not to be the only State with a 13 per cent tax. The fact is that the other States looked at the ramifications of this issue and did not proceed to increase the taxation from 11 to 13 per cent, thus putting hoteliers and liquor licence holders in South Australia at a disadvantage to their counterparts in every other State throughout the Commonwealth. That fact is resented markedly by people in the industry; a spurious argument was put forward and mouthed a number of times in this House by the Treasurer but was not factual and, I suggest, was known not to be factual at the time the claims were made when the Bill was debated.

People have written back and presented these petitions from locations throughout the State. They include people from the city and near city, people in the furthestmost points, including those who are licence holders because their homesteads are on the tourist track and so they provide overnight accommodation and liquor. They have indicated that they were not consulted nor do they believe they were represented by the Hotels Association. They believe a tremendous effort was put in in relation to poker machines but that little or no effort was made about the increase in taxation applying to licences.

They are certain in their comments to me that a number of them will no longer be members of that association, because they believe they have been let down. At a time when financial pressures have been placed on them by the imposition of this tax, they are having to find all manner of ways to make ends meet and to keep their heads above water, the removal of the cost of membership of the association being just one of the means they will take. When we look at some of the statements that came back from individual hotels, we see that the story is clear. A comment from a hotel in the Barossa Ranges is as follows:

Staff has been reduced from 10 back to 7. Turnover has dropped about 15 per cent, while all running costs, that is, power and taxes, have increased. Plus increased bank charges all help to go broke.

Similar information came from one of the hotels in Clare. More information came from the West Coast, as follows:

To whom it may concern: the past two years due to the recession and only being a farming area, all small businesses are feeling the pinch. Now with another bad season it will be as hard as the past two years if not harder. The licence fee is just another kick in the guts. The Government has to look at supporting hotels and small businesses. If we go broke, they will receive no money at all. I think it is best to take less and keep us going than to take all and hang us. Because of the bad year, the bank and the landlord do not allow us to stop paying.

That comment was right from the heart and highlighted the problem experienced by those people. Further, at least one member of the executive of the Hotels Association is named in the documents presented in the House. At least one member of the executive had the courage to come out and indicate that he also, in relation to the hotel with which he was involved, is seriously affected by the Government's action. Another example from the South-East is the following comment:

The South Australian Government's decision to increase the liquor licence fee from 11 to 13 per cent will force my hotel motel to reduce staff from 20 to 17 members. It seems the Government singles out the hospitality industry when they require funds to cover poor capital management. In 1985 the Government increased the liquor licence fees from 9 to 12 per cent, and then reduced them to 11 per cent. The Wine Industry of South Australia protested and were exonerated from this fee to save their industry. As a result employment increased in their industry. They only pay a fee of \$249 annually.

That refers to people in the wine industry who are in competition with them.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Before the dinner break I was referring to comments that have been made by a number of hoteliers and others in the liquor trade industry about the increase from 11 to 13 per cent for a liquor licence and the fact that it was unique to South Australia, because the other States that it had been suggested were potential increase licence areas had withdrawn such action; so South Australians found themselves in a singular position. I have already read several of the statements which I received, and I will briefly continue. This letter was received from a West Coast hotel:

My opinion is that Mr I. Home should sack himself for gross neglect of his duties for this absurd tax law to be passed while he was...around being the big man, trying to get poker machine legislation passed which 50 per cent of hotels don't want anyway. There are only two of us in our hotel (freehold), and because of the 11 per cent licence we have had to shed our cleaner and do it ourselves, do our own cooking and still stay open seven days a week doing up to 18 hours a day. Raising the fees another 2 per cent will mean nearly the end of us financially, physically and mentally as we are sure a number of other owner/operator hotels will be.

If any of the polities involved in this scam enter my hotel for drinks, meals or accommodation they will be refused service of any kind. It is our firm and utter belief that the licence fee should be dropped to 7 per cent which would enable all hotels the right to trade economically and viably alongside all other

businesses with the privilege of hiring staff to enable people like us to have some relativity to politicians' working hours. We are getting slightly annoyed at having our evening meal at 11.30 p.m. nightly and if we could only afford to hire a bar person and a cleaner we could live like normal people. It would be a godsend to have a weekend off now and again!

They then point out the problem with the licence increase and state, as a number of others did, that the increase is based not only on the cost of the liquor but also on the sales tax on the liquor. That is not an area directly involving this State Government but it is one that will be benefited when the Liberal National Coalition becomes Government in a fortnight's time, because sales tax will go.

It is an imposition on an imposition, a tax upon a tax, when the sales tax figure written on the invoice also attracts 11 per cent or, as it is now, 13 per cent taxation. So irate were a number of employees in the hotel business that I will read a letter which went from a number of unionists to Mr John Drumm, the Secretary of the Liquor and Hospitality Union. It states:

I write on behalf of the undersigned financial members of the LHMU to express my concern at the lack of effort, interest and/or concern put forward by the union in the recent increase of 11 to 13 per cent in the liquor licence, a rise of some 18 per cent, well outside any inflation in recent years. Whilst this may equate to only a few cents per glass it has gained front page publicity and combine this with other well documented problems (.05, RBT, speed cameras, etc.) and the Australia wide reduction in beer, wine and spirit sales, hotels (and clubs) are now reducing our hours considerably.

We believe with the recent wage increase, further increase in training levies and superannuation in its present form, these items should be put on hold. As we are the front line troops and hear the objections direct from the consumer we believe it is time the union fought the increase—or is it so close to the Government it can't see or hear? Where are you Mr Drumm?

That document was countersigned by some 45 members of the union. What else do we have? We have the situation that by this increase not only are working hours being reduced and not only are hotels finding it more difficult to meet their commitment in a number of areas but also a large number of them have been unable to pay the quarterly fee—and there hangs another story because of the further imposition which was passed on to them.

I have it on authority that in the last quarter—October to December—55 hotels could not afford their quarterly payment; and I understand from the Liquor Licensing Board that 47 licence holders could not meet the payment for the January 1993 quarter. How does this Government expect licence holders to meet the April quarter when Christmas and new year trading did not even cover the January payment? Might it be possible that the Federal and State Governments will tighten their own belts, defer wage increases, barbecues, saunas and Turkish baths, instead of passing on the largess of which we have seen so many instances?

The very clear message (from the information I have given the House this evening) is that, because of the manner in which the Government structures its budgets, its refusal to face facts, the fact that it refuses to require a proper and ethical return from so many of its employees, the fact that it is allowing motor vehicles to be used for purposes never intended and for a whole host

of other reasons, it finds it necessary to increase taxes, as I have been stating, to the detriment of the people whom we are called upon to represent.

In the few minutes I have left I want to draw attention to another taxing area where the Government has let down itself and the people of South Australia. The question was asked in this House at the time of the passage of the motor fuel distribution legislation (where there was to be a variation in the amount of additional tax to be charged on ordinary petrol compared to that for unleaded petrol which was going to give a cost benefit to unleaded petrol): was the Government intending to ensure that that benefit was passed on to the motorist; and the answer was 'Yes'. A question was asked of the Treasurer just before the Christmas adjournment—why it was that the Government appeared to be doing nothing at all to require the motor fuel industry to pass on the reduction for unleaded petrol to its consumers—and the Minister said that that is as it ought to be and that the Government would follow it up.

We find ourselves, in March 1993, with no action taken whatsoever. You can almost count on one hand the number of outlets in the Adelaide area that are giving a price differential between leaded and unleaded fuel. It is a rip-off against the public which the Government claimed it would follow through. It is a rip-off by the Government that is occurring to the detriment of industry and the ordinary private household user. It is yet another area where the Government has laid claim to greater taxes on the basis of better equity but has not followed through in a practical way to make sure that the consumer is protected.

Many is the time that members of this Government have enforced penalties on builders, operators of hotels (as we have been discussing tonight) and restaurants, retail outlets and so many other areas of operation, fining them for failing to meet certain Government criteria and yet a situation has resulted from a dictate of the Government itself, creating a differential in fuel cost, but it is doing nothing about it. Whilst supporting this measure, I would like to believe that the Government, in the few months that it has left, will do something positive to reduce this Government rip-off of the public and that it will fulfil the promises it has made to the people which thus far it has backed away from fulfilling.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Tonight I propose to use the Supply debate to talk about the issue of State debt in South Australia. For the past two years the State Bank losses have dominated the debate, as we all know, and certainly have dominated any discussion and perspective of State finances. The bank has not gone away, as we found last week's announcement showing a further net loss of more than \$100 million on the consolidated accounts of both the good and the bad bank. The overwhelming problem now is the consequences of these losses and other Government financial failures, which are contributing to the State debt.

This debt and other unfunded liabilities of the Government have serious consequences for this State's economy, which remains in sharp decline with the subsequent loss of jobs. These associated issues will dominate South Australian political and public debate for

the remainder of this decade at least. The interest payment of almost \$2 million a day will continue to impose huge difficulties on the entire South Australian community.

Let me put this issue of debt and unfunded liabilities into a further perspective. In the time that it will take me to deliver this speech—about 20 minutes—the Government's Bankcard will clock up another \$45 600 in debt. Today we will spend another \$2 million on interest to fund that debt. This crippling State debt will be a Labor legacy forcing our State to languish for decades to come unless we have new policies and new horizons for South Australia. The long Labor years have seen total State liabilities—that is, borrowings and liabilities so far unfunded—explode up to more than \$14 billion, or by June of this year more than \$9 700 for every man, woman and child in South Australia. That is the legacy that 10 years of Labor has left South Australians: a debt of \$9 700 for every person in South Australia. The yoke of debt threatens the future of thousands of young South Australians; it threatens the standards of their basic Government services, their education, their health, their public transport, their community safety; and it threatens the ability of our employers to provide jobs. It saddles our families today with ever-rising taxes and charges. It certainly saddles our employers with the highest business taxes of any State in Australia.

For much of our working lives we will be paying off the mistakes of the past 10 years unless we have a Liberal Government prepared to confront the decisions necessary to deal with our debt crisis. Our debt crisis has fuelled South Australia's job crisis and the crisis in delivery of essential Government services. Yet, the Treasurer treats our debt figures like a mere bagatelle. The Government has only one strategy: it wants the public to believe that our State debt is not a problem, when it is a matter for deep concern.

Today I will illustrate the magnitude of the problem. I will also put forward measures to confront that debt problem. First, let us consider the growth of the State debt under this Government. As of June 1982 our net State debt was \$2 600 million. As of June 1992—10 years later, largely under a Labor Government—the equivalent figure was \$7 268 million. I estimate it now to be at least \$8 300 million. But even the Government's own figures mean that since 1982 our State debt has been rising at the rate of \$1 279 000 a day, or more than \$888 for every minute of every hour of every day that this Government has been in office. Of course, that rate is now accelerating, due largely to the State Bank.

Over those 10 years the net cost of servicing this growing debt has totalled \$4 267 million in interest payments alone under this Labor Government. It becomes an even more incredible figure when we look at what that cost is now each year. The net annual interest cost is now \$700 million and will be locked in at this alarming level unless measures are taken significantly to reduce the debt level, which is not occurring. This financial year the State Government will fund total interest payments of \$978 million on our Government borrowings; that is 63c in every dollar of tax the Government will collect in 1992-93. While there are some interest recoupments, net interest costs of around \$700 million will have risen 383 per cent since this

Government was first elected. In other words, the net interest costs to South Australia have gone up by 383 per cent on an annual basis since this Government was elected.

Let me illustrate how this increasing burden impacts on the ability of the budget to continue to fund essential services. When this Government came to office the net cost of servicing the State debt represented 33 per cent of total spending on both primary and secondary school education. In other words, for every dollar spent on interest we were able to spend \$3 on primary and secondary school education. This financial year the net cost of servicing the State debt is estimated by the Government to represent 70 per cent of spending on education. In other words now, instead of the figure being \$3 on education for every \$1 on the interest bill, for every dollar on the interest bill we can afford to spend only \$1.50 on primary and secondary education.

Let us look at the health area. In health, for every dollar spent on interest we can afford \$2 to fund our public hospitals and other health services. In the community safety area, for every dollar spent on our Police Force this year \$3.40—in other words, more than three times that spent on the police—will be spent on paying the interest bill. That is how huge that interest bill problem has become. It has reached the point where it has consumed far more than we spend on public safety, despite the alarming incidence of crime within our State, and now for every dollar we spend on public safety 50c is spent on the interest payment. Just imagine what we could do for our education, our health, our public safety and all the other public services we provide if we did not have to commit that \$700 million a year—approximately \$2 million a day—to pay for interest alone on that debt.

Mr Meier: Yet they still have the audacity to try to ask for the votes of teachers and nurses.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Exactly. What astounds me is that we have SHIT having the hide, despite all of that, to come out and say, 'Do not vote for the Liberal Party. Vote for this Labor Government that has done this to education in this State,' or 'Vote for this Labor Government that has destroyed the hospital system.' Just consider the following problems: the decline in literacy and numeracy skills to the point where one in every four children as they leave our primary schools has a serious problem with literacy or numeracy; or the massive backlog in basic maintenance of our schools, estimated now to be more than \$200 million.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The former Minister of Education says that that is not true. I point out to him that it was one of his current Federal colleagues who put that figure up to a Federal Senate standing committee.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Listen to him trying to back out! No wonder the Minister is here trying to defend himself, because he has been Minister of this system of education which has collapsed in South Australia, where we find behavioural problems are now enormous and where the school maintenance bill has been allowed to blow out to more than \$200 million of undone maintenance within our schooling system. It is no wonder, Minister, that they had to shift you from

education to some other portfolio to try to save the Government's neck. We can take the example of our hospitals which, under this Government, have a waiting list of almost 10 000 patients, and the high crime rate and the lack of police presence in our streets

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He has just done so. He has done nothing, absolutely nothing since 1986.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is very hard to protect the Leader from his own side.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, we operate as a team on this side. All these failures in our basic services are directly attributable to this Government's financial incompetence and mismanagement and the massive State debt which it has run up and which must be forcibly serviced by South Australians. Overriding this presence on State services is the decline in investor confidence in South Australia caused by the failures of the State Government. By June this year, total Government liabilities of more than \$14 000 million will amount to about 50 per cent of our gross State product. In other words, 50 per cent of everything produced in the whole of South Australia in one year by the public and private sectors would need to go just to cover our debt and unfunded liabilities. This is an intolerable and unsustainable drag on our regional economy.

In response, the Treasurer argues that 30 and 40 years ago our State debt and liabilities represented a greater share of our gross State product. What that false argument ignores is that today much of our debt has been incurred by financial failure, and we have a declining economy with much less capacity to raise money to cover that debt. We are borrowing now to pay our losses. We are borrowing to pay the interest on our losses, whereas back in the Playford era money was borrowed to develop the infrastructure for a growing and developing State, the roads, the power generation system, schools, hospitals and other essential facilities to support a State with rapid growth, virtually no unemployment and with prospects for the future. On his appointment to the position of Treasurer last year, the Treasurer said that South Australian employers were 'too stupid to cross the road'.

These are the very same people forced to carry the burden of the incompetence of the Treasurer and his inability and that of his cohorts to manage the finances of this State for the past 10 years. This Government has not responded to the losses of the State Bank and its other financial failures by reducing its own expenditure and reforming its own operations to improve their efficiency. Instead, it has transferred even more of the burden to all South Australians. In particular, the Labor Government has substantially increased taxes and charges on South Australian businesses, which now pay the highest banking, petrol and water charges, WorkCover premiums and the second highest electricity tariffs in the whole of Australia.

In just five years, the Government has increased its annual tax revenues by \$500 million. That is the equivalent of about 14 300 jobs in the private sector. Increasing Government revenue like this at the cost of private sector jobs has heightened the lack of any strategy to contain the impact of State debt. Government

spending also has continued to increase in real terms, blowing out the debt even further. As a result, the Government has now been borrowing to pay its day-by-day expenses. In 1990-91, the recurrent budget had a deficit of \$116 million; in 1991-92 this figure increased to \$282 million.

This financial year a further cash deficit of about \$158 million has been forecast. This means the Government has overspent its taxes and other revenue by at least \$556 million in just the past three years, again forcing up the State debt further. As I said, this Government is now paying interest on its interest; that is how desperate it is. Any private company that got to the point of paying interest on its interest would automatically go, first, into receivership and then most likely into liquidation.

This policy that the Government has of borrowing money to pay the interest cannot be sustained other than for a very short time, and then only if it is part of an overall plan to reverse the situation. But, unfortunately, the Government has no such plan. It has continued to follow a form of financial planning and management which represents a direct and quick route to financial crisis and then, ultimately, to bankruptcy. The Treasurer attempts to mask the State's rapid descent towards bankruptcy with claims that it has a surplus of assets to protect the Government's position. Let us examine that position. As I mentioned, the official disclosed net debt as at June 1992 was just under \$7 300 million.

The Treasurer revealed to the House on 9 February 1993 that this had become \$7 400 million following the availability of audited and corrected data not available at the time the budget papers were presented to this House. He also admitted that various other amounts had to be added to estimate the total liabilities, that is, the total of Government borrowings and other liabilities which so far are not funded. These include accounts payable at a net cost of \$1 100 million—that is how far it is behind in the monthly accounts. I would be ashamed if I had outstanding debts at that level, even as a Government. That means that small business people around the State are owed a total of \$1 100 million simply because this Government is using them as a form of raising finance.

The estimated cost of the further State Bank bail-out is \$850 million, which we now know has to be committed to cover the bank's losses. Then there is the superannuation and long service leave liabilities, which involve more than \$4 000 million as of June last year. Then there is the Government workers compensation liability, that unfunded Government scheme, where there is a liability of \$150 million. This gives a true picture of the State's total liabilities as of June last year. It amounts to about \$13 500 million as of June last year. To this we must now add at least the following: first, this year's projected total budget deficit of \$317 million, which must be funded by further borrowings; and, secondly, the accrual of further superannuation and long service leave payments of a further \$300 million. This takes the total liabilities for South Australia to more than \$14 160 million or about, as I said earlier, 50 per cent of the gross State product. This Government is in debt to the tune of \$9 738.65 for every man, woman and child in South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What an indictment!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Exactly! It is a tragedy that families, particularly those who are unemployed, just cannot afford to pay. In attempting to remove this disaster from day to day reality, the Government has concocted an elaborate argument about assets to offset its debt. Let me very quickly run through a couple of the points that the Government itself must tackle with regard to its economic statement. First, it must fully identify the problem in terms of the size of the debt, and this must be done through an independent and comprehensive audit. Secondly, we need a policy for Government accountability. Thirdly, we need a budget strategy which seeks to eliminate the cash deficit that occurs. Fourthly, we need to have asset sales so that, with a reduction in recurrent expenditure and a reduction in interest payments, we can then start to meet our budget. That can only be done over a two or three year period.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I support the Supply Bill and commend the Leader on his excellent contribution to this Bill. If members opposite took note of what the Leader has said, as to his concerns on the part of all South Australians, we would be much better off in this State. Those of us who in recent times have had the opportunity to go out and meet our constituents and people from other areas whilst door knocking etc. as part of this Federal campaign have realised just how concerned the community is.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, I do not know whether members opposite are making contact with their constituents. If they are not, they should be. I am sure that many members on the other side close themselves away in their electorate offices and do not bother to talk with their constituents or listen to the concerns in their electorates, and that is of considerable concern. I realise that some members opposite do spend time dealing with matters of concern, but many others must be deaf to what the Leader has just been talking about and to the concerns of their electorates generally.

As has been said so many times by the Leader and other members on this side of the House, the State debt is disastrous. The effect it is having on every family—on every man, woman and child, and not only of this generation but on future generations—is a disaster in itself. It is the effect of the State debt, for which we are now paying and will continue to pay, on future generations that really concerns me. As a father of four children, I understand what it will mean to those children as they grow up and as they have children of their own. I am very conscious of what it will mean in having to pay the debt for generations to come.

The recent visit of the Prime Minister to South Australia, a visit of which he notified the Premier only the day before he arrived, was supposed to win votes in South Australia for the Federal Labor Government, but that visit really made it very clear indeed who is responsible for the State debt. The concern is with the Government, and totally with the Government. It was interesting that the Prime Minister indicated that the situation facing South Australia, as far as the debt is

concerned, was even worse than the Premier had been prepared to indicate, both in this House and publicly.

It was interesting also that, shortly after that visit, Federal Minister Bilney, a colleague of members opposite, was prepared to put the Government well and truly in the firing line as far as the effect that the State debt is having on the people of South Australia. We have heard repeatedly the Premier and Ministers opposite attempt to make excuses of one kind or another for the problems we are now facing. Those problems have been brought about because of the lack of management or any form of expertise on the part of the Government and on the part of the previous Premier and the current Premier in particular.

That is why it is so important that we look closely at the substantive plan for the future direction of this country and this State that is part of the Fightback package. It is a very firm plan. It is a very firm direction that all South Australians and all people in Australia can follow. If we look at the alternatives, there are very few. The Federal Labor Government has no plans. It has no goals. All it can do is continue to attack the Coalition's Fightback package and the policies that the Liberal Party has put forward to determine a firm direction for all Australians.

As I said earlier, in the doorknocking that I and other of my colleagues on this side of the House have been doing, it has been very obvious just how much feeling there is in the community about so many of the problems that have been foisted on them by both the Federal and State Labor Governments. That is why such a large proportion of the community believes it is time there was a change of Government federally and a change of Government at the State level. One of the things that is made very clear in talking with people as I move around is the concern they have in regard to the unemployment situation in South Australia. Very few families are not affected in some way as a result of this extremely serious situation with regard to the unemployment figures in South Australia. I am sure that the majority of members of this House would have members of their own family, friends or people whom they know who are affected as a result of the unemployment situation in this State.

One of the considerable concerns I have with respect to this diabolic financial situation is the impact it is having on Government departments. The areas for which I have responsibility—natural resources, conservation and environment, family and community services and the ageing—have been seriously hit as a result of the cut back in funding by this State Government. When I resumed responsibility for the environment portfolio, after some 12 months, I could not believe the conditions that I found in that department. I do not need to go into great detail about the reduction in staff numbers or in funding to maintain or attempt to maintain a number of those departments. For example, there is considerable concern in the Department of Environment and Land Management.

Many public servants in that new department are unsure of their responsibilities or to whom they should report. They are unsure as to whether or not they are responsible for certain pieces of legislation, and they are very uncertain of the funding that they have to carry out their responsibilities within that department. That is a

serious situation, because that department has a very real responsibility. There is an expectation on the part of the community generally in the State that that department will carry out its responsibility. It is not a matter of blaming the employees; it is not a matter of blaming the dedicated public servants who are attempting to carry out that responsibility. The blame has to rest firmly with the Government.

I want to refer briefly to the lack of management in our national parks in this State as a result of the level of funds provided by Government over the past 12 months for management of those parks and reserves. The *Advertiser* summed it up fairly well in an editorial on 21 January, and I will refer to it briefly. It states:

A review of the management of South Australia's national park system announced this week is overdue. It is a chance for the new Minister of Environment and Land Management, Mr Mayes, to show his teeth.

I pause for a moment to remind the House that a review into the National Parks and Wildlife Service has been going on for many years. In fact, as the Liberal Party came out of office in 1982, as then Minister I had established a review into the National Parks and Wildlife Service. As far as I can ascertain from the questioning I have been able to carry out, that review was not completed. I am sure that, during the 10 years or so since 1982, a number of reviews have been commenced but not completed, and I would hope that, if the Minister and the Government were genuine about the review that is to be carried out into the national parks, they would make sure that it is successful and that it comes up with some results and appropriate resolutions and recommendations. The *Advertiser* continues:

Such a review, however, must be completed promptly to help stop the shameful creeping environmental degradation of our reserves, which now total 20 per cent of the State. More importantly, the assessment must be frank and honest. It must probe bravely the reasons why the existing management methods for the National Parks and Wildlife Service are so seriously flawed that infestations of weeds and feral animals appear to be out of control.

I think I know one of the reasons why that is the case, and I would presume that the majority of South Australians would recognise that: it is a direct result of the lack of funding that is being provided to enable appropriate management to be carried out. The editorial goes on to state:

We are told the area of land set aside under the national park system has increased five-fold since 1985 while funding for it has merely doubled. Only 93 rangers oversee 20 million hectares compared with 128 outdoor staff running the city's parks.

That is a damning indictment on the Government, the present Minister and the previous Ministers who have had responsibility for that portfolio. It is vitally important that appropriate funding be provided to improve management and so that many of the problems we are facing in attempting to conserve endangered species in this State are considered. As we have said so many times, South Australia is the world capital of land mammal extinction. This unenviable reputation could be turned around to make us leaders in wildlife restoration if more support were to be given to the national parks by this Government. It is not a matter of blaming the

National Parks and Wildlife Service: the blame rests with the Government.

I could go on to the need for more funding in regard to coast protection in this State—a very serious situation indeed. I am sure we are all waiting for a Federal report to be brought down that will deal with some of the problems nationally but, at a State level (and you, Sir, would recognise many of the problems, being a member with responsibility for an extensive part of the coastline in this State), there have been on-going problems for a long time, and those problems need to be addressed as a matter of urgency. I could refer to recycling and the amount of rhetoric that we have heard over a considerable time about the need to encourage more people to recycle in this State. My concern is that, because of a lack of real support by the Government, many people have lost interest in recycling and have lost the desire to be involved in what is a very worthwhile activity. I can only commend organisations such as KESAB in this State and throughout Australia which do a magnificent job in encouraging people to recycle and to consider waste minimisation. However, there is a considerable need for the Government to become more involved in that area.

We could look at native vegetation and the heritage agreements program that was established by the previous Liberal Government some 12 years ago. Again, that is an area that has come almost to a standstill because of the lack of funding available for private people to preserve native vegetation on their own properties. It is an extremely important program, and I am delighted to find that the Coalition has picked up that program on a national basis. I will have the opportunity to refer to that in a motion that I have referred to in the House today, and it is necessary that people understand the importance of that program.

In the few moments that I have left I want to refer also to problems within the Department for Family and Community Services. On numerous occasions in this House I have referred to problems within that department that are a direct result of a reduction in funding. I have referred to the unacceptable situation being faced by foster parents and by INC parents. Day after day I receive representation from dedicated people who are involved either as foster parents or as INC parents in what has been recognised as a very important and successful program.

I am most disturbed about what is happening at the present time, particularly with regard to the INC program, where parents are having funding reduced. I understand that they are now being told that they will be looking after the most disadvantaged and the most disturbed young people. It has always been a responsibility of these families to look after the disadvantaged and to care for those who have been disturbed, but now I am told that the responsibility for the young people who have very real problems and who are extremely disturbed is to be given to INC parents. While those parents may be able to handle that responsibility very well indeed, they will not be able to do so if they are not given appropriate funding to enable them to carry out that most important work.

I have brought this matter to the attention of the Minister on a number of occasions, and I do so again. I

support the program strongly. I do not know what the alternatives are: I do not believe there are alternatives and, as I said in the House recently, if we look at the cost of keeping young people in Government institutions and compare that with the cost of keeping young people within families, we see that there is just no comparison at all, and it is important that that program be able to continue.

I could go on about the concern for the welfare of children generally. If I had time, I would refer to letters pointing out concern on the part of families in that area. Again, it is not the fault of those people who are committed in the work they carry out in the department: the problem results from a lack of appropriate funding by the Government. That is my concern because, right across the board and the responsibilities, there is a lack of funding by the Government.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I start this evening with a very humble apology on behalf of the majority of South Australians to that gentleman whose name has been dragged down into the mud by the unprofessional manner with which he was dealt, and no doubt he will never come back again to South Australia. But I say to that gentleman, 'Keep your bags packed because, under a different Administration, your services will be needed in South Australia to carry on the good work that has already been undertaken in this area in this State.' I refer to Mr Helliss, who is Deputy Commissioner of the Queensland Electricity Board and who was selected by the ETSA Board to be the next Chief Executive Officer of ETSA. Unfortunately, after going through the selection panel, he was not allowed by the Minister and the Premier to take up the position.

It is a scandalous indictment on the Minister. Not only is it a scandalous indictment on the Minister's handling of ETSA this time, but he has a past record of not being able to handle a ministerial portfolio and, of course, should have been sacked. I was interested to read just a snippet in the press today; one of Adelaide's leading journalists, after talking to a senior Government minder and asking why Klunder was put into infrastructure, got the reply from the senior minder, 'What damage can he do there?'

Members can see what damage can be done to the name of South Australia by the incompetent handling of this matter. They can also see the problems that it creates for all electricity consumers in South Australia when that gentleman is not able to take up his position as ETSA CEO after going through the correct process—after the Minister had consulted with the consultants who were appointed to look at all the applicants, after the consultants had recommended three people to the board, after the board subcommittee had looked at those three and made a recommendation, after the board had spoken to Mr Helliss and said, 'You are going to have this position', someone with 20 years experience at SEQEB, someone who had brought the Queensland Electricity Board from one of the least efficient up to the best in Australia, had been recommended. After all that, the Minister stepped in and overrode the board, and breached the Act.

Today he spoke with much bravado and threw his hands around, but I will go through the Act in a moment. The Minister breached the Act and has again besmirched the name of South Australia by dragging our reputation down where it should not be. Quite rightly, Mr Helliss will go back and say, 'I will never go near that State again.' To all the Mr Helliss's who have been thrown out of South Australia in the past 10 years because they wanted to get in to reform the system and do something for the taxpayers in this State, I say, 'When there is a change of Government in South Australia, apply again, because everyone will be selected on their ability and not have their selection based on the political whims of the Minister of the day.' That is the only way that we will drag South Australia back to where it used to be: a premier, low-cost State that provided government services of which we could be proud at a cost that taxpayers could afford.

I refer now to the Electricity Trust Act of 1946 and I will take the House through what the Minister can and cannot do. In answering a question today, the Minister got up—for the first time there must be real problems in the factional system over there in Caucus—and used bluff and blunder that I have not seen him use before.

The Minister threw at us that he was not a wimpy Minister, that he was not the one responsible for the \$60 million loss in Scrimber and that he was not the person who blamed everyone else and said, 'The buck does not stop on my desk': he said, 'I'm in charge of this', but he would not take any responsibility once again. Let us look at what he could have done.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I would have thought he had been on notice for the past three years, ever since the last election, and I would have thought that his notice to any Premier in control ran out many months before. I think the Minister's time has expired and it needs a Premier with some guts to do something about it. Going back to the trust, the Liberal Party in South Australia protested loudly at the ramifications of the trust being under the control and direction of the Minister. Of course, it is right that the trust's direction be under the control of the Minister; that is absolutely right and proper. Of course it is right that the board should follow the Government's line. That is what the Government is there for. But if one does not have confidence in the board or cannot allow the board to carry out its duties to run the instrumentality, what role is there for the board? How must the board feel? The board had three votes and, every time members voted for the Minister to accept their nomination, blackmail came back to the board, 'If you don't accept my nomination, if you don't review it, I'll put it to you in writing.'

How would the board feel today? I feel terribly sorry for Mr Mierisch and Mr Barnes who stood up for their rights. Over the past three or four years they have done an excellent job at ETSA, as has Mr Marrett, the CEO. The strides made in micro-economic reform and the reform that has gone on at ETSA took it from one of the most inefficient organisations in the State; now it was heading down the path of being pre-eminent in Australia, but all those reforms have since stopped, because what the Minister wanted was a 'Yes' man. He wanted someone who was weak enough to sit there and dance to

the Government's tune. Who would want to dance to the tune of this Government?

We look at the financial record of this Government. Where will ETSA go now? I am told that the Minister even overrode the board's decision to give a 6 per cent productivity rise to all blue collar workers. A 6 per cent productivity rise was something that the Opposition would support, something that members opposite who represent the union movement should have supported wholeheartedly, but the Minister overrode a 6 per cent productivity rise.

Mr Becker: The Government wanted to knock off the profit.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Exactly, and I am glad the honourable member interjected, because that is what the Government wanted to do. It said, 'We'll deny the blue collar workers their rightful productivity rise. We will deny them that.' So much for what members opposite think of workers in this State. It is a bit like the former Minister of Marine, who has cut the blue collar workers on the wharves by 50 per cent over the past seven or eight years but who has retained the same number of white collar workers. The Government could not give a damn about the blue collar workers in South Australia. What did the Minister want? He wanted to suck out more profits from ETSA into an ailing Government budget.

That is what he wanted to do—to hell with the workers, they can wait! With all the toil that has gone on over the past four or five years getting that productivity going and making sure they were more efficient, what have they got from this Minister? They got a slap in the eye.

The Act provides that the trust should be under the control and direction of the Minister. Section 17 provides:

The trust may appoint such officers and other employees as it requires for the purpose of carrying out its duties and functions. That is quite clear. The Minister sets the direction: he sets the broad guidelines of where he wants to go. It is like any financial institution, any business: it is the prerogative of the owner. In this case the owner happens to be South Australians and the person who is carrying out their will happens to be the Minister. That is quite right and proper. However, the board is appointed by the Minister—the Minister has full control over who sits on that board—and under section 17 of the Act the board has to carry out the duties of running ETSA and employing the staff, and that is a right and proper function for it to perform.

The Minister gets up today and blusters on, trying to tell us that it is impossible to remove the board. I said on a radio program that if he did not like what the board was doing he should remove it. He stood up here and said, 'What a goose is this fellow on the other side. He does not know what he his talking about. Of course I could not remove the board.' However, he can. I asked him in my question whether he had read the Act, and he said, 'Of course, I know it off by heart.' That is the first time he has ever read a report: the first time he has ever known anything off by heart.

Section 10 provides that the Governor may remove from office a member of the trust, and the Governor may do that on the recommendation of the Minister to both Houses of Parliament that that member should be

removed. So, of course, he can remove a board member. That is what he is there for—to control and direct the Electricity Trust of South Australia. The Minister can remove anyone from that board if he wishes. I know that two have jumped and the rest must feel pretty uncomfortable because what are left are the 'Yes' men, although one of the votes was five to one (and I do not know who that one was). The rest of that board are totally ineffectual because they have given in to the Minister on something that was rightly their role.

Mr Mierisch and Mr Barnes stood up for that principle and, along with Mr Marrett, they have been at the forefront of turning ETSA around and taking it towards the twenty-first century. Now that is all gone, and those two gentlemen have resigned; they have said, 'Enough.' We have Mr Helliss in Queensland who says that he will never come to South Australia again. One of the most experienced people in the electricity undertaking in Queensland will not go near this State. Now we will go through the whole \$60 000 process once again.

Mr Becker: It's a couple more jobs!

Mr D.S. BAKER: A couple more jobs. The consultants were brought in and initially consultation was had with the Minister. He put his views to the consultants. They then went out on an Australia-wide search to find the person with the most ability to carry on running ETSA—and this farce will now recur. What good will that do for the taxpayers of South Australia? What about all those ETSA workers who thought they had done a very good job and were to get a 6 per cent pay rise? How do they feel now that they know that the Minister will not support this pay rise for their efforts, and that he will not support the board in selecting the chief executive officer after going through the necessary consultancy process? How does the board feel today?

I would have thought that it would now be very difficult to get anyone to serve on the trust. Who will come in knowing that they have to dance to the Government's tune, that they cannot manage ETSA in the way that is in the best interests of the taxpayers because the Minister will interfere? All I can say to those blue collar workers out there, and all I can say to those members of the board who want to stand up and be counted, is to just hold on for a few more months. Hold on, Mr Helliss, and all those other people out there who want to come to South Australia, because I can guarantee you that in the future people will be selected on their ability and not on their political affiliation, because if ever we are to get South Australia out of the mess it is in we will have to do exactly that.

Mr Holloway: Will you tell us about the State Bank Board?

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will tell the honourable member about the State Bank Board, Mr Speaker, and you do not mind if I carry on for a few more moments about boards. Again we had the same thing happening. The Premier had the secret meeting with Marcus Clark about his nomination for the job when that was the role of the board. Second time, second failure! It is bad enough making a mistake once, but you sure as hell are dumb if you make it twice—and twice in a row it has happened. They sit over there smiling. I think it is going in one ear and out the other. People should not make the same mistake twice.

It is obvious that if you did not like the way the State Bank Board was operating you remove the board: But, of course, it was different from that because we have this secret file on the meeting that the Premier had with Marcus Clark, this cosy little deal they had going together. It has not come to light yet but it will in the next few months, I can guarantee you. We will see what went on with that appointment.

That is at the root of the problem in South Australia. Once you stop picking people on ability and interfere with the correct role of a board you start sinking the ship. If only members opposite can learn those things. The same thing happened with SGIC, only in the case of SGIC the board loaned most of the money to the Chief Executive Officer—a great fiasco. Once again the ministerial ability was not there to control the board.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: And the Chairman. I think he has done a flit to Tasmania, although I hear he is coming back. He might be coming back to buy the Electricity Trust building or something like that; he might be going to reinvest in South Australia, I do not know. Only members opposite would know that.

The next thing I want to address in the couple of minutes I have left is another potential disaster, this time in primary industry in South Australia. Already I have been critical of the ODR report, which is the McKinsey review on primary industry in South Australia. A sum of \$1 million was spent for an outside consultancy to look at what was going on with agriculture in South Australia. That could quite easily have been done internally. We have such good expertise in the Department of Primary Industries in South Australia that it was quite capable of doing that. However, what happened? We have the dream of the Premier, with SARDI being established.

I am quite confident in telling this House that potentially the biggest disaster to the Department of Primary Industries in South Australia is the establishment of SARDI. There is no way that you can alienate the extension officers or those people who are in applied research around South Australia—most of them in country areas—and place them under the control of SARDI (which will operate from the Waite) and have country regions operating in the manner they should. What you will have is people in primary industry working together with people in SARDI but being under different management. How, under any team or under any organisation, can you have people responsible for day-to-day activities with a different management structure above it?

The best paper I have read on SARDI was from Professor Woolhouse (at the Waite) who scathingly attacked it. He sent his report in to the Minister of Primary Industries, as have probably 100 other South Australians. I hope the Minister will listen to them, because if we continue with SARDI eventually research will be severely curtailed in this State.

It is right and proper that pure research should be carried out at the Waite Institute and it is right and proper that that should be under the management of SARDI. However, all those people involved in extension and all those people involved in applied research in South Australia must be out in those areas where they are carrying out that research and they must be out there

for the benefit of all rural people in South Australia, because if there is one thing that can drag South Australia out of the mire it is the rural sector. It is the one sector that has the potential through export income to get this State going again. If that is taken away by bureaucratic and ministerial incompetence then it is a very sad day for South Australia. I hope the Minister of Primary Industries listens to what people in the department are telling him and to what Professor Woolhouse is saying, because there is unanimous opposition to the splitting up of managerial powers under SARDI and under that ODR report.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill because it is the traditional thing to do. At this time it is appropriate that funds be allocated and that the legislation be passed through all of the appropriate stages of Parliament to enable the public service to be paid until the end of this financial year and into the next financial year until such time as the full budget debate is dealt with later in the year. I would like to follow on a little from where the member for Victoria left off in relation to his support for retention of the Department of Agriculture very much in the way in which it has traditionally operated over the past 40 or 50 years.

I am not one who believes that we should make changes for change sake. I would like to add my support to the department's efforts, which have developed over a long period, and those of the extension officers spread over the network of country areas providing practical application of their work to the farmers over that period. I am somewhat concerned that a radical restructuring of those efforts, which have been built up through necessity over this long period, could be undermined and destabilised, so that the effectiveness of the department we now have could well be diminished and the very result the Government is trying to achieve—that is, getting more productivity from the renewable resources in the State—will be lost.

I applaud what the Government has tried to do, or what it has said it wants to do; that is, to give greater emphasis to the renewable resources and the income generating industries of the State. I think we would all accept that that is the right thing to do and the appropriate way to go. However, if we undermine some of that traditional work that has been established—some of the field work involving farm trials, soil plots, and so on, working with the farmers over that period and receiving full and almost absolute cooperation from the farming community—that good work done by research officers will not be put into the extension services and therefore will not reach the farmers and improve production as the Government would like us to believe might occur.

There is no doubt that my comments tonight are in support of the area that I represent; that is, the farming community. We have just come through a very traumatic season. What was potentially, two months ago, to be the best all-time cereal harvest on record turned out to be one of disaster. The hopes and aspirations of so many people were built up. The people believed that they were going to have the opportunity of dragging back that debt burden that in some cases has been bedevilling them now for seven or eight years. There was that ray of hope,

because the bumper crops stood to represent for those farmers a well above average year and therefore provide them with the ability to reduce some of their debt burden. Unfortunately, consistent rain—seemingly week after week—brought with it downgrading of the cereal crop.

Of the grain on Eyre Peninsula, 96 per cent was downgraded from an ASW standard, or a hard standard, to a feed 1, feed 2 or, in a few cases, feed 3 grade. That meant a massive cut back in returns. It meant there was immediately a \$55 cut in the first advance. On top of that there was the loss of production through weather damage, and on top of that again there was the weight loss of grain that occurred. In effect, we could say that there was probably a \$65 per tonne loss as a result of that rain. For many people, particularly those in areas further afield who do not have direct access to the export silos, it meant a halving of their cereal returns.

To a degree that was offset by a well above average yield, because despite the losses involving weather damage and the lowering of kilograms per hectolitre, the tonnes per hectare brought in still exceeded the average. But, then again, as I mentioned, we had the weather damage that brought those returns way down.

It has been estimated that something like \$90 million dollars was denied the Eyre Peninsula as a result of the continuous rains. That \$90 million, had it been injected into the community, would have benefited the farming community, small businesses and every other service industry associated with a country town. Therefore, the confidence of those communities would have been built up, whereas, instead, exactly the reverse occurred. I can tell the House that there is some devastation there. There is a lot of heartburning going on at the present time. Banks are now calling farmers in for their annual reviews. This is a month or so later than normal because of an excessively wet summer and the wet harvest period. However, the heartburn and tragedy are starting to bite.

I am somewhat concerned that some of the undertakings given by financial institutions to the Rural Finance Select Committee—of which you, Mr Deputy Speaker, were Chairman—that they would show some compassion have not necessarily been carried through. We know that most of the financial institutions are showing some leniency in some cases. But, day by day I am hearing of more instances where there seems to be a lack of compassion and certainly a lack of willingness to work through those programs. I expect that in the next few weeks many farmers will hear more and more of those troubled times that certain other farmers are experiencing, and I call on all banks at least to recognise that the traumas of the past three months were not of the farmers' making and it will require a risk sharing by both the farmer and the financier to see it through. No-one in their wildest dreams could have built into their program the devastation and losses that have occurred over that period.

Those losses, as I mentioned, were great. I think it could be reasonably estimated that an average farm, cropping between 500 and 1 000 acres, would be looking at losses of between \$50 000 and \$75 000. I know of some larger farming operations involving two or three members of a family, and in one instance the loss was

\$250 000. Although it is a much bigger concern, that is a big loss to any farming operation. They are the dilemmas and the traumas that I believe all sectors of the community—the financial institutions, the farming community and the Governments of the day—must take into account to ensure that people are kept on the land.

I make that plea that people be kept on the land, because I believe that we are currently witnessing the removal of farming expertise from the rural community. We are losing the best farmers not because of their poor management but because they were the ones who tried to do the right thing in the early days but became caught up in the whirlwind of banking deregulation and the issues of the day, the high interest rates and all the other subsequent issues of an inflationary nature that followed. Of course, with all those inflationary issues came the increase in charges and costs.

I know that Governments have little control over the external prices received by farmers on their export commodities. However, there are many issues over which Governments do have some control, and I refer to many of the costs that are associated with any sort of business, and in this case farming and associated service industries related to farming. Many machinery agents have contacted me because they are in an absolute dilemma. In particular one received six orders for large equipment well before harvest. Deposits were paid on that equipment, some of that equipment was in the \$180 000 to \$240 000 range and, because it is all imported, orders were placed overseas to have it brought in. Most of that equipment is on board ships to be brought into Australia. Everyone knows that when it gets here the farmer will no longer be able to pay for that equipment. The agent knows that he received the deposit in good faith; he passed that onto his head office in Melbourne in good faith; and, of course, it looks as though the agent will be the person in between.

The brand new machine will land on the agent's door step, along with a bill for between \$180 000 to \$240 000, depending on the model, and the agent will know full well that the farmer is no longer in a position to pay for it. The farmer wants to get out of the deal, the machinery agent knows full well that the farmer should get out of the deal—morality tells him that—but unfortunately they seem to be locked into a position where that may not be possible. It is those types of dilemmas that seem to be snowballing.

Any business that has the ability or is of such a size that requires it to employ will find it more and more difficult to do that. They are finding that the additional costs associated with employment, the Government charges, levies, licence fees, WorkCover, superannuation, long service fees, and so on are the issues in which the Government can play a role. It can do something about trying to reduce some of those charges. Instead of when it gets into trouble just increasing its charges the Government should be doing something to bring it back. If we could bring it back and make the ability to employ a little easier, obviously more people would be employed and earning money and more people, therefore, would be paying tax, and in the long run the Government would be better off.

It is well known that, for the average employee now, the add on cost is about 50 per cent. So, the add on cost

for a person earning a little higher than the average wage, say \$30 000, is about \$15 000. As a result, if that employee cannot earn \$45 000 for his employer, there is no point in the employer even advertising the position or even trying to take on an additional employee. Until some negotiation can take place, the hard line position adopted in the past will drag us further into the mire and will make sure that those job opportunities are not created.

I have said this in the House on many occasions and I say it again: if we could only get back to the buoyancy of the rural community in the mid-1950s—and I know full well that that will never happen—and employ the number of people we employed on the land at that stage, there would not be enough people on Eyre Peninsula to fill those positions. The additional number of employees involved in primary agricultural industry some 35 years ago is about the same number as that which is unemployed now. We must look at the options that should be there for many people.

Many of my constituents have looked to some form of diversification if they can. We have a thriving deer industry. Canadian elk have been imported into the area. We now produce one seventh of Australia's velvet on Eyre Peninsula. It is an industry that has grown-up only in the past four or five years, but to now produce one seventh of Australia's velvet—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: Of the velvet, the deer antler. It commands a high price. The better quality product is in the vicinity of \$185 a kilogram, the lower price \$135 a kilogram. Of course, it is big dollars. The more that industry can expand the better. The abalone industry is looking good. They are getting into aquaculture, and unfortunately the heat wave the other day taught some of the entrepreneurial aquaculturists that they must take into account some other factors, because the water just became far too hot for the stock and some of them died because of the heat. But then again stock in just about every other form died as a result of the heat and for much the same reason.

It is those entrepreneurial industries that seem to be able to pick up and take off. Of course, it is possible that our current adversity will start off a series of new industries that may well become a resource and an income earning base for the community. I refer particularly to tuna farming on which there is a value adding of the product from \$6 a kilogram to in excess of \$40 a kilogram, with a top price of about \$85 a kilogram. That is for the absolutely premium product of sashimi tuna. Admittedly, it is very costly per kilogram to get the tuna to that size, but there is big investment into the industry. I hope we will see continued investment into the industry, because that will create more wealth for South Australia and Australia. The tuna being farmed are not in addition to existing tuna quotas. All farm tuna are caught and brought in out of existing quotas; therefore, there is not an increased burden on the fish stocks. It is a reapplication of the existing quota into a value adding form, and I do not think any member in this House could argue that that is not the right way to go.

Of course, as with any new farming method there are some critics. Some people are somewhat concerned that

Boston Harbor will be filled with fish farms. But the size of a pond is 40 metres in diameter, about a quarter hectare and, even if we had 100 ponds, we would finish up with 25 hectares out of a harbor comprising hundreds of thousands of hectares. The amount of surface area taken up by sea ponds is very negligible. The income that can be generated for the State is very significant. The work opportunities it will create will be in excess of 100 or more. Already, there is a massive demand for pilchards. A completely new industry has developed as a feed stock for the tuna farms. There is not sufficient fish in southern Australian waters to feed the stock; therefore, they will have to get into manufactured or grain-based feed. That again is another new industry, and so it goes on. So, a new industry has the ability to create several other new industries, and it is that type of thing that we must further develop. The Government of the day must recognise these things and must try to help cultivate and develop these new industries.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member asked about the Murray River and the carp, which could well be a food stock for the tuna. I will not enter that debate without further research, but maybe that is a possibility, because it has been estimated that within five years the tuna farming operations will be looking for between 25 000 and 30 000 tonnes of pilchards or an equivalent. We will not be able to get that sort of tonnage. Already it is brought from Western Australia and from Tasmania, and of course we cannot continue to do that—the costs are just too prohibitive. The Bill before us is to appropriate sufficient funds to pay the Public Service for the end of this financial year and the beginning of the next financial year. It is something that we all recognise as part of the legislative process. For that reason, I support the Bill.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): In debating the Supply Bill currently before the House, it is right and proper that we consider the use the Government is applying to the moneys of the people of South Australia. I remind the House that this is the Year of the Indigenous People although, from the silence of Government Ministers opposite, one would hardly know that that is the case. I remind the House that some time ago I drew its attention to the plight of Aboriginal people in this State, and several weeks ago I wrote to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in this State and put some questions to him. Most Government Ministers reply fairly promptly, I presume, to letters written by members of their own Party and by members of the Opposition but, on this particular matter, I have yet to receive a reply. That disappoints me, because it was a very serious matter and the letter was not written lightly.

The plight of Aboriginal people in this country is a serious one, and it was highlighted today by the Minister in a statement involving a recent incident at Ceduna. Ceduna has been in the news on and off for many years for the same sort of problem. I am reminded of the time some years ago when I went there to visit the local Lutheran pastor who was the foster parent of an Aboriginal child. The pastor had a particular problem. He was raising an Aboriginal child in Ceduna, and that child was suffering because, on the one hand, to many of

the white people in Ceduna he was seen only as an Aboriginal child, and they expected the problems which they often associated with Aboriginal people in Ceduna. On the other hand, the child's own people, the Aborigines, saw the child as white, so the child was one of those unfortunate people caught firmly between two cultures.

In an effort to help him, the Lutheran pastor wanted to send him to Immanuel because the lad was talented and showed every promise of being a leader of his people. However, when he approached Government instrumentalities for help, he was told that he could not get help because the child had a good home environment. It was pointed out that, despite the home environment, the child was disadvantaged because he had to live in a country town, and if he went away to school he possibly had a chance of becoming a university graduate and a role model and leader among his people, but the Government instrumentality would not accept that. It basically said that, if the lad came from Yalata and did not have adequate housing and clothing, it would send him to a secondary school in Adelaide, pay all his fees and try to help him succeed.

I do not blame the instrumentality for adopting that approach, because it has found with many people who come from that disadvantaged situation that it is very difficult for them to make the transition and finally succeed. The Minister at the table well knows the problems he had as Minister in the area of Aboriginal education, because it is a very difficult and complex area. Unfortunately, for the child in question, who had some chance of succeeding, no funds were forthcoming. I find that incredible.

At about the same time as I was in Ceduna, I happened to pick up an Aboriginal newsletter which revealed an astounding fact. It calculated the amount of money per head that had been spent on Aboriginal people in the previous decade, and estimated that the per head expenditure for each Aborigine in that decade had been over \$1 million. The article very succinctly went on to state, 'I don't see many Aboriginal millionaires in Ceduna.' The point that the article went on to make was that millions of dollars have been poured into Aboriginal affairs with very little direct result for Aborigines, but very cosy jobs for a great number of white bureaucrats. The Aborigines themselves see this as a problem. I believe that it lies at the heart of the problem for the Aboriginal people, and it is a subject that not only this Parliament but all Parliaments of Australia should be discussing in this Year of the Indigenous People.

Whilst it is very easy for us to sit here and point to South Africa and say how dreadful South Africa is, in their own subtle way I believe Governments have inadvertently created a form of apartheid for the Aboriginal people of Australia, because we have created a disfranchised people whom we claim to elevate, but we do more to keep them from achieving their full potential than we have managed to elevate them. As I have said, we have created a disfranchised people.

We talk much about partnership, and that has become fashionable. We had a Federal Government that talked about a treaty of reconciliation. The idea of that treaty was to put behind us, once and for all, the cultural cringe that springs from the wrongs that were done to the

Aborigines in generations past, and to create a new and dynamic partnership. However, that does not seem to have succeeded and will not succeed because no partnership was ever successful where it was born of paternalism. Partnerships that are successful are born of mutual respect and trust. Until Governments of this nation stop their paternalistic attitudes towards Aboriginal people, and until they consult them and treat them as equals, and ask what they want and not tell them what they will give them, very little will be done to help them.

The other day I came across an astounding fact which I think captures our attitudes meaningfully or otherwise towards these people. It is this: regardless of income, every Aboriginal child in this State receives a school card. That is one of the biggest insults that could be perpetrated on Aboriginal people. Before a non-Aboriginal child can receive a school card, they have to come from socioeconomically disadvantaged circumstances, but the act of being Aboriginal is sufficient to entitle somebody to receive a school card. I put it to the Minister presently in the Chamber that, based on my understanding of the rules, the children of Dr Willmot, who is an Aborigine and a professional person, as well as a leader of not just Aboriginal people but the entire community, and is in receipt of a very high salary, would receive a school card.

If that is the case, it is an absolute disgrace that a man of that standing could allow this Government to say to him, 'Because your children are Aboriginal, they are somehow disadvantaged and deserve a school card.' If I am wrong, I hope that the Government will correct me and tell me that I am wrong. If I am right, I hope that the Government will do something to change that situation because, if I were Dr Willmot or any other prominent Aborigine in this society, I would be not only disgusted but deeply ashamed at that paternalistic and patronising attitude that is inherent in that type of decision making process.

Much was done that was unjust. Much was done that was wrong towards the Aboriginal people, but many of us have lived here now for four and five generations, and this land represents our dreaming too. If we are to go forward, we can only do so by acknowledging the wrongs of the past, putting them behind us and starting again with an equal partnership. In that regard, I was heartened because last week I was privileged as part of the education select committee to go down to the school at Raukkan to take evidence.

It is a wonderful little community. It has all the hallmarks of a prosperous, thriving community that is seeking to find a place for itself in Australia in the 1990s. What heartened me most was that when we went through the doors there was a young Aboriginal teacher there who was fully qualified. He told me that he was a member of the Ngarrindjeri people whose traditional home is around Raukkan, or Point McLeay, as it was called. He told me that he believes there are now some 100 or so Aboriginal people teaching in the department. The Education Department is to be congratulated for this giant leap forward in what must be the past five or 10 years, because I think the Aboriginal people will take their true place as equal partners in this society only when there are role models—when there are teachers and police aides—another innovation for which this

Government must be given acclaim. It is a good and positive initiative.

The only proviso I would put on that is that I believe it is unfortunate that we have not had a few more police aides a little more quickly, because there are certainly other areas of the State, such as my own seat in the southern area, which could benefit greatly from one or two police aides, and I would rather have them this year than in two or three years' time. Having said that, I will not be churlish, because the Government deserves credit where it is due; it has instigated the program and it must be commended for it. The problem is very often too little too late. It is not just this Government; I want to be clear that I am not condemning this or any particular Government in Australia or saying that this Opposition would be any better. I am putting forward this debate in a serious manner as to why this whole Parliament and other Parliaments should look at the problem and hopefully make Australia the better for our considerations.

Daisy Bates, who is proclaimed as a philanthropic person who did a great deal of good amongst the Aborigines, actually went to Ooldea to smooth the pillow of the dying race. She believed, as did many people, that the Aboriginal nation was on the point of genocide, and she thought it was her Christian duty to go out there and smooth the pillow for them as they were dying. I do not think we believe that any longer. I believe that the Aboriginal population numbers are again increasing, but we have replaced that missionary mentality with a cargo cult mentality which I think does not serve them well at all and which serves us even less. We tend to throw money at programs to try to create a new program which is supposed to accomplish something but which is largely generated from our own ideas and, when it accomplishes nothing, we run away at a rate of knots and try to pretend the fault or the problem does not exist.

I go back to the example of Ceduna. Many people sit in the city and read their newspapers and think that country people are in some respect racist. Some people in the country are the least racist people I know. They will certainly comment on things which they see wrong and with which they do not agree. That does not necessarily make them racist: it makes them people who acknowledge problems in their community and who are prepared to speak up about them. If Ministers sitting comfortably on green benches at North Terrace do not realise that there are problems in some of those country communities for all the people who live there, I suggest they travel to Ceduna, Yalata, Koonibba and other Aboriginal communities and look at them, because it is easy to sit here and say, 'Everything is right with the world. We are a wonderful Government and we get it all right.' It is a lot more difficult to go out there and see it.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am told that there is a parliamentary committee that goes out there several times a year, and I am glad there is; it is a pity this Parliament does not hear more about the work of that Parliamentary committee. It is also a pity that this House does not involve itself more in the affairs of Aboriginal people, at least to help them to get the framework for an equal partnership.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The honourable member opposite says that I participate in the debates. That is true: I can remember two or three in the two or three years I have been here and, considering how important a part of the community they are, I would say that is very scant regard indeed. We have given much more time and attention to much more peripheral issues than to the Aboriginal people of this State, and the honourable member opposite knows that full well.

In the little time that is available to me I want to illustrate my point by saying that some people consider it so fortunate to be Aboriginal that one of the latest scams is to go to somebody prominent such as you, Sir—somebody well known in the community—and get that person to certify that the person appearing before them is Aboriginal or has Aboriginal blood. They can then write to the Taxation Department and get a special Aboriginal tax file number. Having got a special Aboriginal tax file number, if that person wants to apply for Austudy, they fill out the application form and quote their Aboriginal tax file number. Seeing that number, Austudy accepts that claimant as an Aboriginal person. I believe that the proceeds of such a scheme are lucrative indeed, and I also believe that some of those people can claim no Aboriginality at all in any segment of their family or in any definition that Aboriginal people would apply, but they think it is worth doing because it is a way around and through the system—frankly, it is a way of abusing the system.

Again, I make a plea to all members in this House that it is time we looked at this problem seriously and constructively and that, when we write to Ministers about this problem, it is time we got some answers. I do not expect them to know all the answers and to say that, yes, they can solve it tomorrow, and I am sure you do not, Sir. I am looking not for that but for some constructive dialogue and perhaps for some hope that Aboriginal people in the future will get a better deal than they have had in the past.

In the context of this Supply Bill, I am absolutely certain of one thing: if we just keep applying money and dreaming up schemes in this place and telling them this is what is good for them, we will never help them, and we will not help them for the next 20 years if that is the approach. The problems are many but there are solutions, and those solutions can be found if we are constructive, if we talk and if we listen. I think that we in this place are quite good at talking, but I do not think we are quite as good at listening. If we got out there for a change and listened to what they are telling us and tried to help them instead of trying to help ourselves and hoping the problem will go away, I think we would do much better.

I labour that point for one reason only: it shows to me and to many members of the Opposition one of the basic deficiencies of this Government. I acknowledge the member for Flinders, who spoke about problems in the rural areas, I acknowledge the words of the Leader and I acknowledge the words of many of my other colleagues who have noted deficiencies in other areas. I would finish by saying that in many ways the problem which I have highlighted and which all of us on this side of the House have highlighted tonight is one problem alone, and that is a problem of too many members opposite who

are too tired to carry on their job. They have been here too long.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Albert Park interjects, but they have not given him a go on the front racetrack. He has sat at the back and worked hard. He is one of the draughthorses over there. He works hard, but they have these tired people on the front bench—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Draughthorses have big hearts—never forget that.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): At a time when finances are at a low ebb—in fact, they are worse than that; they are in tremendous deficit in South Australia and are beyond the low ebb—it is hardly likely that the tide will be back in for South Australia for a few decades, but I would like to put a couple of propositions to the Minister of Primary Industries, first, about the fisheries industry and, secondly, about the dairy industry. The propositions will cost him absolutely nothing and may save money.

Turning first to the tray fishing industry in the South-East, I issue an earnest and fervent plea to the Minister asking him not to introduce an April fishing season closure this year. There have been hints around the cray fishing industry for the past several months that an April closure may be necessary because of a shortage of fish stock. However, I would remind the Minister—I do not know what advice he is getting from his directors or deputy directors—that there is a distinct possibility that the 1 650 tonne total allocated catch for this season may not be realised by the end of April, and it is highly likely that it will not be realised by the end of March, because this year the season has not been good.

We have had more wintery and autumn weather than good strong summer weather. As a result, there has not been the usual amount of fishing possible during the past few months. Secondly, many of the fishermen, particularly the younger, newer ones in the industry, are faced with several bills. They are buying houses and often their own boats and crayfishing pots; they also have buy-back debts to the industry, so that they have multiple bills for which they have budgeted, for which they have allowed for, from the income of an April catch.

Naturally, they also have bank commitments that their bank managers are hopeful they will meet and, if they do not, it will place a greater burden on them in the winter months and during the coming season of 1993-94. There is also the local economy in the South-East fishing ports to consider. Winter seasons are never good. They are certainly long, cold and discouraging of tourism, which augments the summer incomes for the stores and businesses at those ports. If the season were to close a month earlier—during April—they, too, would suffer heavily from the reduction of business, because the fishermen do bring much business to the ports.

The possibility of an October 1993 closure, in other words, a later start to next season's crayfishing, is one of the alternatives that has been put to me. That appeals, because October is a time when berried females—that is,

female crayfish carrying eggs—are plentiful. There are allegations about the somewhat dubious practice of scrubbing off the berries and presenting those females as unimpregnated females. I am not suggesting that all fishermen do this. Most of them—and they are supposed to do this in any case—return those females back to the sea when they are brought out of the pots. That too creates a problem for the berried females, because they are subject to predation by octopus, squid and fish as they go from the surface of the sea to some 500 or 600 feet down and then to the bottom and the rocks, where they are once again safe.

An October closure would give some added security to the trays and a greater chance that the females would be able to lay their eggs and have them hatch out on the reefs. The other alternative is for an April 1994 closure, in other words, a little over a year from now, and that, too, would allow the fishermen, the banks and the community to adjust and budget accordingly. Certainly, it would give everyone time to plan their budgets and for the current feeling of resentment that is around at the possibility of an April 1993 closure to subside.

I am also told that one of the major suppliers of bait to tray fishermen in the South-East has budgeted and obtained supplies for an April closure and that two container loads of bait are currently on their way to, or are about to be landed in, the South-East from New Zealand. That supplier will have to pay for the two container loads of bait and, if he cannot use the bait during the current season, he is faced with another substantial cost, because electricity charges are not cheap. He will have the extra cost of refrigerating throughout the winter months and holding the bait until the next cray fishing season.

There are two schools of thought in the South-East. One of them comes from the wealthier and more secure fishermen who are financially secure and who are not really worried whether or not a month is lost from the season. But I suspect that the vast majority of fishermen in the South-East—probably 80 per cent of the fisherman—would be in favour of keeping the season open for April and closing either October or April next year, because they do not have excess funds and they have heavy commitments to banks for boats, houses, the cray buy-back scheme, the pots they have purchased and so on, as I said when I started my contribution. They themselves in the majority are a largely supported group so far as the local communities are concerned.

I ask the Minister to weigh up the advice that he receives from officers and to consider the request that I make to him here. I am sure that the member for Victoria, who is the shadow Minister of Primary Industries, would wholeheartedly support my request. We have discussed this matter. I ask the Minister not to close the season this April but allow the season to conclude at the end of April and then make some alternative arrangements for preservation of the stock in 1993-94, with the possibility that the 1 650 tonnes (TAC) could be increased even to 1 900 tonnes for the next season. I feel sure that would placate all the fishermen in the South-East and would still give a reasonable chance of allowing the fish stock to increase.

The second issue that I would like to raise with the Minister is that of the dairy industry in the Lower South-

East. During the last debate on the dairy legislation—and I am not allowed to advert to that debate in the same session, so I will refer simply to one issue—I did not have time to raise the question of the disposal of the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory and its assets.

I have been asked by farmers and by herd testers in the Lower South-East to request the Minister to allow that laboratory to remain completely independent and freely accessible, not only to HISCOL, which does the majority of herd testing in South Australia and which charges other herd testing organisations a fee for service for access to the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory, but also to keep the laboratory freely open, not through HISCOL, to other South Australian herd testing organisations, of which there are two or three.

The reason I bring this to the Minister's attention is several fold. One thing which concerns me is that a senior member of the dairy section of the Minister's Department of Primary Industries has been publicly referred to in the press. In the Farmer and Stockowner of 13 January 1993, under the heading 'Farm costs and returns', a note appeared about dairy herd recording charges for 1992-93. In the Herd Improvement Services of South Australia Co-op Limited (HISCOL) one principal dairy officer (whom I will not name in Parliament) is listed as a contact officer in addition to the Chairman and another employee of HISCOL. In other words, a Department of Primary Industries dairy representative is also a member of the HISCOL board and an official contact person for HISCOL.

I find that disturbing because I can draw no other conclusion than that the Department of Primary Industries, through that direct contact, would have to be sympathetic towards HISCOL, otherwise the officer would not be named as a contact person—and not only sympathetic but this person would have to have a very intimate knowledge of HISCOL's activities in order to be able to promote HISCOL's activities among dairy farmers throughout South Australia; otherwise why bother to list that person as a contact?

Immediately underneath that advert is the South-East Herd Improvement Association Inc. (SEHIA), and the only contact people are Gary Beckman and Angela Robinson, both dairy farmers in their own right. There is no mention of anyone from the Department of Primary Industries representing their affairs. I believe the conclusion I draw is perfectly justified. I have written to the Minister to ask him to consider that and also to consider whether the advice he receives from his own department can therefore be regarded as objective rather than subjective. I believe that that is a very important point.

The Independent Herd Testing Association wrote to the Minister and put some nine reasons to him as to why it should have continuing independent access to the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory. I do not propose to repeat those nine points in this debate because the Minister will be aware of them and they will be in my letter to him in any case. However, I point out that the Minister has been told that the independent testers have not been refused access to the laboratory. That is true, but it is deviously true, because the access they have been offered is through HISCOL.

HISCOL receives the services of the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory free of charge, yet HISCOL charges other herd testers a fee of \$5.47 per test which I consider to be exorbitant under those circumstances, particularly when I introduce another factor, that is, that identical services obtained by the South-East Herd Improvement Association from HIO Victoria cost only \$2.10 per test—that is, \$1.60 for the service and 50C additional for an interstate client. That is substantially less than the \$5.47 charged by HISCOL.

It is little wonder that when the South-East began to use Victorian services HISCOL reduced its charges to meet the competition. That immediately begs another question: if HISCOL can reduce its charges from \$5.47 to \$2.10 per test, was it charging exorbitantly? Was it profiteering at the expense of the South-East dairy farmers with its original charge? If it was not, it also begs the question: is it being subsidised now with the lower rate and by whom, especially since it has the services of the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory free of charge?

I believe that the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory should be kept intact. Its staff and services should be available to farmers throughout South Australia. That would prevent there being a monopoly of the service. It would give a State-wide equity of service, and that is something I am sure the South Australian Dairy Board and the Minister would be in favour of—they are not in favour of monopoly, surely! Perhaps a small fee or levy could be charged against the farmers to offset any costs of the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory.

I say that with some doubt, because I do not think that any dairy farmer across Australia is paying a substantial fee. I believe Victorian dairy farmers pay \$23 per farm per annum for their herd testing services (which is very small), and I have heard a rumour that South Australian dairy farmers might be charged as high as \$400 per farm per annum for herd testing services. I do not think any other dairy organisation in Australia pays a fee for its herd testing services. They are self-sufficient, and I believe that the MMB could very well be self-sufficient under the scenario I have just described.

I ask the Minister to consider those points. As I have said, tomorrow I will officially put to him a submission in writing outlining what I have said in the debate this evening and also put to him one or two other points of clarification. I am not critical of the *modus operandi* of officers of the Department of Primary Industries, of the senior officers in the dairy department. They have a job to do. If one of them is appointed to the HISCOL board he has a duty to perform in relation to HISCOL. That is not his fault; it is part of the appointment, it is part of the job. I simply question whether a man can serve two masters: HISCOL and the Department of Primary Industries and the Minister and, at the same time, the dairy farmers in the South-East and elsewhere who do not use HISCOL and who prefer to go to other herd testing organisations because they are looking for a fair go with regard to the charges they have to pay for the testing of their cattle. It is very important.

Finally, a small issue (as far as almost everyone in the House would be concerned) involves a Mr Kevin Harris in my electorate, whose small farm is located opposite the new Mount Gambier gaol. He has smiled upon that

newly constructed gaol and is not one of its vigorous protesters at the moment, but he would like a fair deal from ETSA. The ETSA linesmen have been very sympathetic, friendly and cooperative towards Mr Harris, but he asked me to inspect the site, which I did, and I found that the new electricity supply to the Mount Gambier gaol crosses Benara Road twice within a space of 200 or 300 yards in order to arrive at the gaol. New posts are being constructed and one of those on the electricity supply line has crossed the road to Mr Harris's farm only to cross back again to the other side to get to the gaol which is to be located on the corner of Mr Harris's property. He has simply asked whether, first, there might not be an alternative supply line and, secondly, why the electricity has to cross the road twice when it was already on the side of the road on which the gaol is to be located just a few hundred yards down Benara Road.

I have inspected the site and cannot rationalise the reason for that double crossing of the road and the offending of Mr Harris. I ask if the Minister can look at that and see if some amicable and simple solution cannot be arrived at. As I said, I am not critical of the ETSA officers in the South-East who have been very sympathetic, friendly and, cooperative and probably have to accept pre-ordained orders from afar.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): I move:

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

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (NO. 1) (1993)

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): I move:

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

Mr SUCH (Fisher): In the short time available to me I would like to canvass some issues that particularly relate to my electorate and, of course, on which the finances of this State impact in a most significant way. The first issue relates to Flagstaff Road. We have all heard of the film and book *The Never-ending Story*: that seems to be the title of that road. Something in excess of \$8 million has been expended and a project which has been going for seven years is still not anywhere near completion. It is an absolute disgrace and scandal that the residents of the southern suburbs are being denied that facility for so long. For political purposes, the people working on that road have been taken away and used on other sites, which in itself is not bad, but the increased costs to the taxpayers and the community and the inconvenience to the people of my electorate are quite considerable. So, the residents of my electorate—the largest in the State—have to suffer an unfinished road that was promised prior to the last election. Obviously it

was offered in order to try to entice them to vote a different way—albeit unsuccessfully.

I think Flagstaff Road is an example where, if given the job, private contractors could complete it in less than half the time. I am not critical of the Department of Road Transport because it has been used for political purposes in order to try to win votes for this Government elsewhere by taking away equipment and personnel. This issue concerns the people in my electorate and I will keep raising it. The sooner that project is finished the better, and I am told now that that is possibly the middle of this year—but I will believe it when I see it.

Another issue of concern to the people of my electorate relates to the provision of TAFE facilities. It is interesting to note that in the southern suburbs, and that means south of O'Halloran Hill, we have two TAFE colleges—Noarlunga and Kingston—yet in the northern suburbs one finds five TAFE colleges. However, more importantly, the offerings provided by TAFE institutions, colleges and campuses in the south are significantly less, which means that particularly young people, but also mature aged students, from the south have to travel long distances, often by public transport, to access TAFE courses in areas a long way from where they live.

In fact, if one looks at the statistics provided to me today by TAFE, one finds that in the southern area less than 4 per cent of the population is enrolled in TAFE colleges, whereas in the northern division the rate is over 8 per cent. We all know that the southern suburbs have the highest youth unemployment in Australia—much higher than other areas—yet the young people of the south in particular, but also mature aged students, are not given a fair go in terms of provision of TAFE facilities and it is about time the forgotten south got a fair go in this regard.

TAFE is an important sector and will become even more so as people come to realise that not everyone can go to university or indeed should go to university. We have to change the mentality in this country that has downgraded the contribution of technicians, technical people, and trades people. We have to get away from the mentality that everyone has to have a white collar or go to university. Yet, the people in the south are denied the opportunity to access readily some of the TAFE courses.

The opportunity exists in the south, because of the wine industry and horticultural activities, for a significant expansion in the offerings in the areas of horticulture, viticulture, aquaculture and hydroponics. Some of those areas have great potential and I am keen that this Government moves quickly to increase the offerings and access opportunities for people in the south.

Employment is another significant issue in the southern area. As I have indicated, we have the highest youth unemployment in the whole of Australia. The Australian Bureau of Statistics has indicated that 92 000 South Australians are unemployed. However, what many people do not realise is that to be classified as employed by the ABS one has to work for only one hour for payment or profit during the week. Or, if one is in a family business, one is employed if one works for one hour or more without pay in that business or on a farm. In other words, to be classified as employed a minimum of one hour's work gets one into the employed category.

If one thinks about it that provides quite an unrealistic assessment of the extent of unemployment in the community. In fact, as has come to light recently, the unemployment level in Australia and South Australia is at least double the figures quoted by the ABS. Whilst the ABS figures are an estimate, and I have no doubt about their accuracy as far as they go, people should also focus on the actual recipients of social security benefits, because they are actual persons and are not represented in terms of an estimate. When we look at unemployment statistics we should bear in mind that the figures are in reality much greater than the ABS figures would suggest.

In relation to other issues, affecting not only my area but the whole State, we find that this week—which should be a week of celebration for thousands of our young people going to university and TAFE colleges—somewhere between 2 000 and 4 000 qualified young people did not get into those institutions. I am not talking about the several thousand who did not qualify—did not get the grades—but those who did qualify and still did not get in. That is a tragedy for them and a waste of talent for this society, because the people concerned have been encouraged to stay on at school and to aim for university or TAFE and yet when they get to the gate they are turned away on the basis that there are no places.

I am pleased to see more people staying on at school, but it is not fair or reasonable that we encourage young people in particular, but also mature aged students, to stay on at school and when they qualify for university or TAFE they are told, 'Sorry, there is no place for you.' That situation must be addressed and it is part of the wider consideration of getting the message across that, first, not everyone should be aiming for university; it is not necessarily the appropriate place. However, we must expand in particular what is offered by the TAFE system and through other approaches to training.

What we have at the moment is more and more people going back to repeat year 12, to do a year 13, in the hope that they can get into university or TAFE the following year. We have this cruel, continuous cycle where over time the entrance qualifications to get into various courses at university and TAFE colleges are getting higher and higher. That produces a situation where many of our young people and mature aged students will still not get in because the places are not there. The Government, which has created this situation, should be addressing it and providing the opportunity for those who have followed the path and sought to get a higher standard of education.

I would like to mention quickly the Craighburn development, which is on a property half in my electorate and half in that of the member for Davenport. It is a very important issue. For many people it is out of sight, out of mind. But if we see that property built on to a considerable extent, we will be judged harshly by future generations, because Belair Park will not be able to cope in recreational terms, and we will have housing development from Seaford to Gawler, with very little in terms of open space. It is important that all the details relating to that development are made public so that the people can make an assessment of what this Government has entered into in respect of the proposed development.

The southern part of Craighburn, the old Minda farm on the southern side of the Sturt River, is increasingly being developed, and I urge all members to go and have a look so they can see the significance of further development on the northern side of the Sturt River. It is not an issue which will go away. It is an issue not just for local people but for South Australians both now and well into the future. Future generations will be harshly critical of this Government for allowing that beautiful piece of land to be built on.

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

The Hon. E.C. EASTICK (Light): I want to address a document which was circulated to all members entitled 'Revitalising South Australia: A Vision for the Public Sector, Draft Paper for Consultation, Adelaide, Office of Public Sector Reform, December 1992.' This document is both naive and yet refreshing. It is refreshing in the sense that at long last it would appear that somebody in Government has taken heed of the message which members on this side of the House have been offering to the Government for a long time. Sue Vardon, the Chief Executive Officer of the Office of Public Sector Reform, has made the following statement:

It is important that we listen to the wisdom and experience of individuals as well as organisations and all comments—informal or formal, personal or organisational—will be appreciated. That is not a situation which this Government has followed in the years that it has been in office. A great deal of advice has been given based on reality, business experience and the evidence of actions taken elsewhere, yet the Government has thumbed its nose at a proper approach and proper consultation. I say it is naive also because of some of the statements which appear within the document. The document (page 2) states:

The range and extent of service is under threat as the financial position forces a service level the community can afford, not what the community expects.

That is fresh and desirable, but it is also a factor which ought to have been the Government's highest priority ever since it took office. It has certainly been drawn to the attention of the Government time and again. It is all very well to increase taxes and other charges to provide services which everybody wants, but in many cases the public cannot afford them and would expect the Government to take the initiative and say, 'No' because the feasibility of the project just did not add up. If that is what will happen in the future, so be it, because it will be a tremendous advantage. It is interesting to find that such a statement appears as a new initiative in a document which should have been the bible of the Government ever since it took office.

Under the heading 'Financially Responsible' (pages 6 and 7), the document states:

All agencies will explore the potential for developing a commercial charter, and for re-examining how budgets are used to achieve objectives. All agencies will demonstrate responsible financial management.

I believe that that was a challenge to every head of department from the year dot. Surely it was the expectation of any Government and of any department which it created that there would be a demonstration of responsible financial management, yet it is spelled out

here as though it is a new initiative, as something that has not occurred in the past. We know it has not occurred in the past—one has only to look at the examples of SGIC, SAFA, the State Bank, the Woods and Forests Department and Scrimber. There are dozens of examples where this first principle of responsibility has gone by the board and not been a fact of life from a Government which does not and has not put the reins on the organisations that it has established and should have from day one.

However, the first part is mind boggling. Having regard to what took place with the State Bank and its commercial charter in the broader sense, we are being told that each department of the Government in future will have a commercial charter. Surely the Scrimber factory was part of a commercial charter, but what a disaster that was for us. I am not adverse to those areas of Government which provide a service being commercially viable and commercially responsible and being structured in that way. But to seek to suggest under 'Financially Responsible', a major heading of this document, that each department should have a commercial charter when we full well know that commercial enterprise is not a feature of many of those organisations which are there to provide a service to the public but not a business service to the public is ridiculous.

On page 9, there is another statement which I find a little surprising. Under the heading 'Timeliness' it states:

Particular attention will be paid to the State Government's own commercial transactions, including the payment of bills.

How often have members from both sides of the House drawn attention to various Government departments and Ministers of the failure of their departments to meet the bills when presented? Earlier this evening, during his contribution to the Supply debate, the Leader drew attention to \$1 100 million worth of outstanding liabilities, moneys overdue 30 days and not paid to business in this State. Those who have country electorates are well aware of the problems which arise for the local police station, the schools and other Government departments in getting plumbing and electrical work undertaken. Where one has a good SACON office—and thank goodness in the Barossa Valley we have an excellent SACON office—a proper approach is made. But where it is away from the close confines of a SACON office, quite often the school, police station or hospital, as the case may be, will seek from a local businessman a correction of a failing, say that the service is urgent or the community requires the service which is at fault. The tradesman could go out and three, four or five months later he is still waiting for the department to find the three invoices for the same service that he has been asked to send on three occasions.

Motor mechanics associated with garages and the like are called upon to service school buses and are then refused, for a variety of reasons, payment for their accounts for over seven, eight or nine months. Government Ministers have come into the House from time to time and said, 'Hence forth we will pay on the dot.' It is easy to say but it is not a quality which is delivered. It is a fact of life that the Government neglects to pay small debts to people who find that a big impost

on their total outlay. Often they are asked, 'Why did you do it this way; why did it cost that much; and why didn't you submit an invoice?'

In actual fact they submitted an invoice for the work, and submitted a duplicate invoice two months later when they were requested to do so, but five months later nobody is able to find the invoice. It has been conveniently lost, and the tradesperson is still waiting for their funds. Obviously, they have lost any benefit that they would have received from the profit of the materials used, and any profit on their time because of the delay in receiving payment. Yet, they have to pay their taxes. If they fail to meet an expiation notice within the 60 days given, they are put before a court. If they fail to pay their taxation by the due date, there is another impost, a tax upon the tax, because there is interest to pay, but is interest paid on the outstanding accounts from Government? Of course not, and that is why I find this statement at page 9 so interesting in the larger context. It further states (page 10):

Consideration will be given to local government acting for the State Government—

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): On 21 September last year there was a very interesting article in the business section of the *Advertiser* by Calvin Noack. It reported that Australia's tax level is the second highest in the Pacific rim. I guess it is something that we in Australia, and certainly we in South Australia, know and appreciate. We have seen in the past year or two some 60 000 plus Australians leave this country, the highest number on record, double the previous highest figure which occurred in the 1970s, and there must be a reason for it. Obviously, if the Government is taxing the people too much, they will revolt against it, and one way that we still have left, other than through elections, is to leave the country. This study of some 12 Asian nations, reported by Mr Noack, was conducted by a Sydney accounting firm of Arthur Andersen. The report states:

And the taxes we live with in Australia are usually incorporated into the costs of production which add to the costs of our exports and thus reduce their international competitiveness.

How true that statement is. How clear it is and has been for quite some time when we look at our national account deficit. We keep talking in terms of billions of dollars per month. It is ironic that, when it came down a little on this last occasion, an ABC reporter indicated that it was great news. I feel sorry for that reporter. We are still going into debt at a rate of billions of dollars per year. We are still sinking at an enormous rate, but the reporter says we are not sinking as fast as we were. We not only have to stop the deficit but we have to completely turn it around and make up for the mess that has been created over 10 years where our deficit has gone to nearer \$200 billion, some \$160 to \$180 billion, compared with some \$20 billion when the Labor Government took over.

The countries being compared in this article include Australia, Singapore, the Philippines, Taiwan, South Korea, Thailand, Japan, China, Hong Kong, New Zealand, Indonesia and Malaysia. The tax in most of

these Asian nations tends to be consumption oriented, in other words, a GST-type tax. In most cases it is below 20 per cent of the gross domestic product (GDP). The article continues:

Total tax revenue to GDP is 30.8 per cent in Australia and around 38 per cent in New Zealand—

which had only just started under a GST when this article was written—

but under 20 per cent in Hong Kong, Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines and Thailand.

Mr Noack also states:

This high tax burden represents an additional cost that Australian business must meet in competing with other producers in the region. When compared with the Asia Pacific region, our tax levels are so high that 'unless the higher tax revenue is used efficiently to fund things such as infrastructure, education and industrial development, the Australian economy will find itself increasingly at a disadvantage in this region.'

Again, how right Mr Noack is. It is so very clear to anyone with even an elementary understanding of economics. Mr O'Keefe, the author of the Arthur Andersen report, cited payroll tax, customs and excise duties, stamp duty, resources rent tax and petrol levy, institutions duties as some of the inbuilt taxes that are helping to ruin this country. He concludes by saying:

Consumption-based taxes—

in other words, GST-type taxes—

which occur at the point of sale and are not included in the cost of production can recoup these lost revenues while providing us with more cost effective exports which boost our balance of payments.

And, of course, we want to see our car industry progress. At least we want to see it get some strength back, rather than continue to see thousands of people put off from the car industry, as has occurred over the past few years. That is an absolute tragedy. We have seen the car industry grind down. Now the Labor Government is trying to put on a pretty face, a false face, at election time and cover up all the mistakes it has made.

In this Federal election, the Coalition offers huge benefits as it relates to this article from Mr Noack in the area of consumption taxes, and the benefits include the following: middle Australia will have income tax cuts of 25 per cent; 320 000 additional families will pay no tax at all; and petrol tax will be abolished. Every tank full of petrol will cost around \$11 less—that is, 19 cents per litre less, and businesses will be nearer 26 cents per litre less. GST pays for income tax to be slashed and enables seven job destroying taxes to be abolished. As we know, there is no GST on basic food, child care, health, education, rent, exports, council rates, churches, charities and financial transactions. It is a very fair tax.

Hospital queues will be reduced with big tax rebates for private health cover and, of course, Medicare stays, as the Opposition has always made very clear. Union power will be curbed; there will be more jobs and higher wages with job contracts; and a work environment that works for the workers will be part and parcel of the Coalition's policies. There will be a 50 per cent reduction in business taxes to restart small and large business and help create not just thousands but millions of jobs in this country at a time when unemployment is over one million in real terms, but the unofficial figure is

much closer to two million. With GST, those who have been avoiding tax will no longer get away with it. We will be stamping out that black market. Those people who avoid tax at any cost will no longer be able to avoid it under the GST.

The elderly and low income earners are protected. I dare say every pensioner in this country knows there will be an automatic 8 per cent increase to counter any increase in costs, and the increase in costs is expected to be below 4 per cent, so in real terms pensioners will be twice as well off as they were before. Family allowance will be doubled, so families will be far better off, and I would hope that all people with children take notice of that. Under the Coalition's policies, families will be looked after much better than they have been in the past. Certainly with that will go more secure jobs.

It is interesting that a person like Mr Noack identifies Australia as dragging behind the Asian nations. He realises, as do so many of us, that we must get into the Asian markets. We have heard this Government say year after year that its plan is to get into the Asian markets, yet we are seeing very little action, if any. The examples are few and far between. When they have come, invariably the Government has not supported them or has given them minimal support but, even if the Government had given them support, those entries into the Asian markets were obviously limited because of our tax structure. The way it currently exists means we are disadvantaged from the word 'go'—a complete change is needed. A complete change of Government and a complete new way of looking at the way our economy performs is needed. We know that our country has been going backwards, that no-one's job is secure, that in so many cases our kids are going from school to the dole and that our health system is failing almost everyone and certainly the elderly. Long-held standards and values are breaking down and powerful interest groups control the Labor Government. Labor has had 10 years, and it has failed. Labor cannot fix it; Labor has no plan.

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): In this debate I wish to ask the Government one question: what policies does the Government have for the public of South Australia who are in need of health and hospital care? What policy would the Minister of Health present on behalf of the Government to the people of South Australia? What finances are available through the Supply Bill to address what is a very serious problem inherent in critical health needs of all the communities we each represent? That includes the members who sit on the Government benches. What finances and what policies does the Labor Government have to provide basic health care for any individual who requires medical procedures to alleviate their pain and suffering? I do not believe there are policies from the Labor Government, which has continually wasted the time of this Parliament asking itself Dorothy Dix questions on Coalition policies and denouncing the Federal Coalition's policy to create a tax incentive for people to take out private health insurance.

The thousands of people who are waiting months for surgery in public hospitals are being conned by a Government which has no policies, which is fighting for

its political life and which is prepared not just to tamper with the truth but deliberately and untruthfully to fabricate its monstrous misinterpretations of Liberal policies, when most sensible people would agree that these tax incentives to assist people to have a choice in health care are in their own best interests. In having a choice, they will actually be able to get into our hospitals instead of waiting months and in some cases years. In fact, I recollect that just recently the shadow Minister of Health said that he considered that two of the Federal Labor Party politicians had actually shown some of that sense that we talk about in having conceded that there was sense in that tax incentive proposal.

The shadow Minister stated that the retiring member for Grey, Mr Lloyd O'Neil, in one of his speeches in Federal Parliament last year, urged the Federal Government to provide for rebates for those taking out private health cover. Mr Rod Sawford, the Federal member for Port Adelaide, one of the strongest Labor seats in Australia, apparently also agreed with this. In a letter to a constituent late last year, Mr Sawford stated that the Government 'ought to seriously consider incentives by way of tax concessions or rebates to encourage people to remain in private health insurance'. The solution to the public hospital crisis appears to be obvious to everyone with the exception of the Labor Government.

I want to relate the problems of health care in my own constituency and in doing so I will refer to the Modbury Hospital, but first I make quite clear that my references to the Modbury Hospital do not reflect upon the quality of care provided by medical staff and nurses: rather, these people have my admiration, as they have to extend their abilities and workloads to care professionally for the people in their charge. I want to relate to the annual reports of the Modbury Hospital over the past couple of years. I refer first to the annual report of the Modbury Hospital for 1990-91, because it was in this report that I noted certain areas of negativity in relation to funding elements and to problems inherent within the health system. That annual report states:

I think the past 12 months can best be described as yet another year of having to grapple with a situation of competing priorities and limited funds; and unfortunately the picture looks none too bright for the next financial year or for the year after that. This report must also describe our disappointment at not being able to achieve some of the hospital's long held objectives for the development of major new services, and for the significant expansion of existing services. A case in point is the proposed geriatric care and assessment and short-term rehabilitation service which has been on the drawing board for some considerable time.

When it was reported that there was disappointment in their not being able to achieve some of the hospital's long held objectives, it was also apparent in that year that there was disappointment that they had to disband the enrolled nurse and midwifery postgraduate programs at Modbury Hospital. It was said in the report that it was with regret that the hospital had to report this decision. The report states:

The former catered mainly for students from affiliated country hospitals, but the same hospitals now find that they are no longer able, financially, to support the program. The midwifery program...was judged to be no longer viable.

The report goes on to state:

All of this is perhaps a sign of the times but nevertheless the almost total demise of the hospital's school of nursing... is a sad moment for the hospital.

Although there were diminished services, the report also states:

The volume of surgical work at Modbury Hospital warrants the opening of a 'booking' theatre to provide time for semi-emergency work and it is hoped that the additional beds will be opened in the future plus the introduction of new surgical services such as ophthalmology.

In the annual report that was presented for this year, the picture is not much brighter. In fact, it appears to be somewhat worse. The report states:

In the previous annual report, it was recorded that the financial outlook remained bleak. Understandably therefore, the hospital, like all others, entered the 1991-92 financial year with a now familiar degree of trepidation about how much longer it could continue to do the same amount of work, or more, with less money. In preparing its 1991-92 budget, the hospital had to take account of the following: a \$300 000 arbitrary cut to be absorbed; except for the national wage increase, all other award increases to be funded internally; revenue estimates determined using a reduction figure of 2 per cent in the number of ordinary private in-patients in the metropolitan area; no funds would be available for increased activity; no additional funds for award restructuring (at a cost to this hospital in the order of \$100 000).

It was also stated:

... the clouds of doom and despair about next year's budget are already gathering, and another challenge in financial management seems inevitable for 1992-93.

Keeping in mind that we are talking about a major hospital facility, which should be increasing its services to cater for one of the fastest growing populations in the northern area with a catchment area around that hospital of around 250 000 people, what has the Government done about this situation? On 24 July 1991, the Government launched a green paper on area health services administration in South Australia. The discussion paper argued that area health services was a means of improving the coordination of health services and achieving administrative efficiencies. The hospital's report on that green paper states:

After much debate and careful consideration of the issues, the board of management resolved that it could not support the proposal as set out in the discussion paper. Along with many other respondents to the discussion paper, the board identified the following major issues:

- * There seemed to be no clear justification for such radical change.
- * There are no proven successes for regionalisation or 'areaisation'.
- * The proposed new arrangements might simply result in an extra layer of bureaucracy.
- * The opportunity for local community involvement would diminish [as it has in the past]...

In the few minutes remaining I would also like to put the human face on the problems that face the constituents who attempt to gain entrance to the hospital procedures to alleviate their pain and suffering. I have a letter from a mother of a five-year-old child who suffered at least eight bouts of tonsillitis in the past 12 months. The mother was appalled that she had to wait a considerable time to see a specialist to start with; she was then even

more appalled to find that the original appointment made in early November for 20 March 1993 has now been deferred until 30 September 1993. That child has been suffering for more than 12 months and it will take another 12 months before they can get into the system.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): One of the greatest disasters befalling South Australia at present is that the ratio of the cost of living in this State is about three times higher than the national average. I understand the current ratio of CPI for Australia is .7 per cent, yet in South Australia it is just over 2 per cent. Of course, that is having a tremendous impact on employment opportunities in small businesses.

In South Australia high levels of taxes and charges are levied on small business. We happen to have the highest rate of bank charges—FID and debits tax—the highest rate of State petrol tax, the highest workers compensation premiums, the highest water costs and the second highest electricity costs. All put together, those charges are having a tremendous impact on the opportunities for small business to employ and improve their lot in South Australia.

It is a tragedy that presently 158 South Australians are losing their jobs every day. In December 1992, the last month for which figures have been published, 4 900 South Australians lost their jobs. The South Australian unemployment rate of about 12 per cent is one of the highest of the mainland States. The figures for long-term unemployment underline the depth of this tragedy:

19 600 South Australians have been put out of work for between one and two years. A further 18 600 have been out of work for more than two years. In November 1991 the number of South Australians classified as long-term unemployed—that is, without a job for at least a year—was 22 000. The November 1992 figure is 38 200.

These figures highlight the difficulties that people in South Australia are experiencing. The average worker in this State is hurting. The average citizen is angry at what has happened, because it is not their fault. It has been the fault of the incompetent Federal Government, the impact of that Federal Government on the South Australian Government and the fact that the South Australian Government has been unable to grasp the nettle and balance its budget and manage the State finances. The State Government has allowed huge losses to be incurred by Government trading enterprises. What have we got?

We have a huge pool of unemployed people. Not only do we have the very high level of unemployed people in this State but we have a large number—a number that we are unable to calculate—who are under-employed. Many people have been able to obtain employment but not at the level of their satisfaction. When we analyse these figures, we see that the average duration of unemployment in South Australia in November 1991 was 51.7 weeks. In other words, the average person was out of work for 12 months; it took them 12 months to find a job.

That period has risen dramatically over the past 12 months, and an unemployed person in South Australia can now expect to be out of work on average for 67.3 weeks—10 weeks more than the average duration for

unemployment nationally. What an absolute tragedy. If one loses one's job, if one is made redundant through no fault of one's own, it will take about 67 weeks to obtain satisfactory employment. In many cases, people may never obtain employment again.

This is a tremendous waste of human resources so far as South Australia is concerned. People in the 35 to 54 age group have a disastrous potential opportunity to obtain employment. Their average duration of unemployment in South Australia is 86.3 weeks—22 weeks more than the national average. Is it any wonder that people in South Australia are becoming disillusioned? They are disillusioned with the current Government, they are disillusioned with the Federal Government, and they are absolutely spellbound at present because of the tactics being undertaken in the Federal election campaign.

In the Federal electorates of Adelaide and Hindmarsh, we have seen one of the roughest campaigns that we have witnessed for many years. In fact, I cannot recall a campaign of the like before; it has been an absolutely deceitful and dishonest campaign by the Government organisations and the trade union movement, which have decided to step in and interfere in the natural processes of democratic elections.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: We know how some unions behave when it comes to elections. We know the standover tactics that they use. We know the way that they will employ certain people to intimidate voters when they go along to the polling booth on polling day. We know how they escort voters into the booth and stand over them so that people can say, 'Yes, we followed the how to vote line.' Of course, our polling booth scrutineers have been trained to observe this and will report on all such incidents from now on.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I can talk from experience, because we have been subjected to this type of activity for years in some of the booths in my electorate. There is no shame in admitting that in some areas we would get 22 per cent of the vote. When we started to make sure the game was played properly, we improved our vote. When people are reminded that there is freedom of choice, that they have a right to vote according to their conscience and that it is a secret ballot—when they are told it is a secret ballot, which they appreciate—the vote changes dramatically.

If we take away the heavy-handed activity of some of those who want to dictate to the people of this country, we have a different situation. We will be watching them. We will be watching them with delight. I would like to take a camera along if I could; if we could, we would, because then we could prove what is going on on our side of the city. We are certainly getting sick and tired of the will of the people being denied. People would like to carry out the freedoms that they come to expect and enjoy in Australia.

Regarding the unemployment situation, when we look at the whole issue of the current Federal election, we understand why unions are getting upset. They are annoyed because they can see their opportunities will be limited under a Hewson Federal Government. Unions have already seen what has happened in New South Wales, and particularly in Victoria, where the

compulsory deduction from a person's wages no longer applies. We look forward to the day when that will happen here—when Government employees will be free to choose which union they want to join. They will have the opportunity to practise freedom of choice.

I recently conducted a survey of 1 534 people in Thebarton, Hindmarsh and West Hindmarsh to find out whether they supported compulsory unionism. The survey was conducted in the heartland of the Labor Party, an area where the Liberal Party gets 22 per cent of the vote. As to the question 'Do you support compulsory unionism?', 23 per cent said 'Yes'; 74 per cent said 'No'; and 3 per cent said 'Don't know.' If that is not a clear indication of the attitude of the people in the heartland of Labor territory in the new electorate of Peake and certainly in the Federal electorate of Adelaide and of what the people think of compulsory unionism, I do not know what evidence members opposite want.

Let us look at the second question: 'Should the 17.5 per cent leave loading be abolished' 'Yes' said 53 per cent, 'No' said 40 per cent and 6 per cent do not know. Again, this is from the heartland of the Labor Party. So the reason these people are getting upset is because the union power base will be eroded with the freedom of choice to be given at the next election. I think it is a wonderful opportunity for the people of these suburbs on the western side of the city to elect two extremely valuable contributors to the political process—Trish Worth in Adelaide and Chris Gallus in Hindmarsh. I believe that this Federal campaign has not been spelt out properly to protect and give the people the opportunity to practice freedom of choice, and that is exactly what we are going to see on 14 March.

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

**PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT
(MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 3 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 March 1993

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

151. Mr BECKER:

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQE-885 attending to on Friday 18 September 1992 at approximately 8.05am at the eastern end of Victoria Square, Adelaide?

2. Who was the female passenger who alighted from this vehicle carrying shopping bags?

3. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

4. Were the terms of Government Board Circular 30/90 being observed by the driver of this vehicle and if not, why not and what action does the Government propose to take?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The answer is as follows:

1. The driver of the Government vehicle registered VQE-885 is a Government employee who works in the State Administration Centre and who was travelling from his home to the State Fleet Car Park in Gawler Place at the rear of the State Administration Centre.

2. The woman passenger who alighted from the vehicle on Wakefield Street at the eastern side of Victoria Square is employed by the Government and was also working in the State Administration Centre. She was attending an early morning meeting and had a considerable amount of documentation for this meeting in the 'shopping bags'. She therefore chose to alight at the corner of Wakefield Street and Victoria Square instead of the State Fleet Car Park.

3. The vehicle is owned by and registered to State Fleet and at the time in question, was leased on long term hire to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

4. The driver of the vehicle is an Executive Officer at the EL1 level and as such is provided with a Government vehicle for home to work travel.

COMMUNITY GRANTS

224. Mr BECKER: What grants are to be given to community based associations and organisation this financial year, how do they compare with the previous year and what are the reasons for any reduction or increase?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The Department for Family and Community Services administers four funding programs which provide resources for community based associations and organisations. These are:

1. Grants for Seniors: In 1991-92, \$160 670 was allocated to projects. In the current financial year \$182 145 has been allocated. The increase comprises an allowance for inflation and the carry over of some unclaimed funds from the previous financial year.

2. Home and Community Care Program: Community based associations and organisations will receive grants totalling \$8.6 million this financial year. This represents an increase of \$700 000 over grants provided in 1991-92 which totalled \$7.9 million.

This increase comprises an allowance for indexation and the full year effect of projects commenced part way through 1991-92.

3. Supported Accommodation Assistance Program: In 1991-92 funding under this program totalled \$13.68 million. The same level of funding is available for 1992-93. Additional growth funds are still being negotiated. Funds to cover increased costs associated with superannuation have been provided.

4. Family and Community Development Fund: In 1991-92, \$5.465 million was allocated to community based associations and organisations. This was increased to \$5 520 370 for 1992-93. The increase was provided to allow for inflation.

Two industrial awards covering most of the services funded are currently being considered. Sectors will be restructured to minimise the potential cost increases, however, additional funds have been set aside to cover some of these costs.

South Australian Health Commission

The attached tables provide the financial information requested.

With regard to the Minister's special grants line, funds provided are usually of a 'one-off' nature. There are, however, a small number provided on an ongoing basis for a set period of time.

Explanations of all other differences are provided within the attachment.

| ORGANISATION | 1991-92 | 1992-93 | EXPLANATION |
|---|---------|---------|--|
| MINISTER OF HEALTH, SPECIAL GRANTS LINE | | | |
| Asthma Foundation | 8 000 | 8 000 | 10 year interest payment on a loan |
| Gumeracha Council | 7 030 | 7 000 | 5 year interest payment on a loan |
| Aboriginal Medical Service | 3 000 | — | One-off |
| Australian Kidney Foundation..... | 3 500 | — | One-off |
| Australian Red Cross | 15 000 | 15 000 | |
| Catholic Family Planning Association | 18 050 | 18 100 | Indexation |
| Heartbeat Inc . | 2 000 | — | One-off |
| Mental Health Self Help Groups | 11 500 | — | One-off |
| Royal SA Deaf Society | 7 500 | — | One-off |
| Australian Co-ordinating Committee on Organ Registries and Donation (ACCORD) | — | 17 000 | One-off |
| Brain Injured Network of SA..... | — | 348 | One-off |
| Council of Remote Area Nurses | — | 4 000 | One-off |
| Rotary Club of Adelaide | — | 100 | One-off |
| Southern Fleurieu Skills Training Project | — | 200 | One-off |
| PUBLIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FUNDING | | | |
| <i>AIDS Matched Funding Programs</i> | | | |
| AIDS Council of SA..... | 597 238 | 587 000 | 1991-92 allocation included one-off grants of \$23 000 for HIV Study Grants and \$14 000 to provide additional accommodation resources, installation of security system and upgrading of premises for disabled access. Further one-off funding has been allocated by Commonwealth for 1992-93. HIV Study Grants for 1992-93 have not yet been finalised. |

| ORGANISATION | 1991-92 | 1992-93 | EXPLANATION |
|---|---------|---|--|
| Family Planning Association | 98 000 | 4 000 | 1991-92 allocation represented a one-off grant of \$38 000 under HIV Study Grants and \$40 000 for HIV/AIDS Education for people with Non-English Speaking Backgrounds (NESB) and \$20 000 for development of skills and materials to educate disabled people about sexuality and AIDS. |
| Youth Sector Training Council | 65 000 | 100 000 | 1992-93 allocation for continuation of HIV/AIDS NESB project for 1 month, after which Ethnic Com. Council will fund. Additional funding allocated in line with agreement with Commonwealth and priorities identified by HIV/AIDS Education and Prevention Task Force for training of workers with young people. |
| Haemophilia Society | 30 000 | 30 000 | |
| Gay and Lesbian Counselling Service | 15 000 | 15 000 | |
| Adelaide Diocesan AIDS Council | 30 000 | 30 000 | |
| Ethnic Communities Council | — | 50 000 | To develop HIV Education strategies and programs for people with Non-English Speaking Backgrounds in SA. |
| <i>Other Public and Environmental Health Funding</i> | | | |
| Australian Red Cross Society | 10 000 | 2 000 | During 1991-92 Australian Red Cross Society underspent by \$4 000 on screening and counselling services as part of screening component of Blood Pressure Awareness Program. Australian Red Cross has advised \$6 000 required for 1992-93. |
| National Safety Council of SA | 70 000 | 70 000 | |
| SOCIAL HEALTH BRANCH GRANTS | | | |
| Aboriginal Health Service (Hypertension Project) | 55 000 | 60 000 | Time-limited project extended |
| | | (Conditional on financial statements being submitted) | |
| Aboriginal Health Service (Aboriginal Women's Health Promotion Project) | 10 500 | — | Extra funds offered for production of a video in 1991-92. Project finished in 1992-93. |
| Council of the Ageing (SA) | 71 000 | 40 000 | Time-limited project extended |
| Injury Prevention Forum | 133 500 | 55 000 | Time-limited project extended |
| Community and Neighbourhood Houses and Centres Association | — | 50 000 | One-off grant |
| Arthritis Foundation | 18 000 | — | One-off grant |
| Adelaide Central Mission | 142 597 | 171 324 | Agreed to under contract for more funds in 1992-93. Extra funds offered to extend services. |
| | | (yet to be approved by Commonwealth) | |
| Adelaide City Mission | 219 123 | 266 582 | Agreed to under contract for more funds in 1992-93. Extra funds to be offered to address OH & S issues. |
| | | (yet to be approved by Commonwealth) | |
| COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION GRANTS TO COMMUNITY BASED GROUPS | | | |
| * Indicates that additional Funding was provided in 1991-92 for the Disability Services Interim Award leaving a smaller amount to be provided in 1992-93. | | | |
| Adelaide Central Mission | 4 450 | 4 450 | |
| Ain Karim | 11 200 | 6 100 | |
| Anglican Community Service | 395 000 | 184 150 | * & one-off client funds in 1991-92 |
| Autistic Children's Association | 49 988 | 51 188 | Inflation |
| Avail | 9 400 | 6 300 | * |
| Alternate Accommodation for Intellectually Disabled/ Community Accommodation for Intellectually Disabled | 224 600 | 130 800 | * & one-off client funds in 1991-92 |
| Australian Association for Mental Retardation | 1 750 | 1 750 | |
| Barkuma Inc | 772 300 | 533 100 | * & one-off funds 1991-92 |
| Barossa Enterprises | 131 251 | 79 200 | Additional client funds 1991-92—one-off funding |
| Bedford Industries | 110 800 | 111 000 | Inflation |
| Community Accommodation Support Agency | 32 250 | 44 300 | Inflation and Redirection of Gambier Contracts funds |
| Community Lifestyles Inc | 24 900 | 21 950 | * |
| Community Living Options | 151 300 | 104 300 | * |
| Community Living Project | 328 800 | 272 000 | * |
| Diocesan Assoc. for Int. Disabled | 23 900 | 22 250 | * |
| Elizabeth Bowey Lodge | 175 550 | 57 250 | * & one-off funds 1991-92 |
| Excel Enterprises | 47 050 | 36 400 | * |
| Gambier Contracts | 23 100 | 13 100 | \$10 000 redirected to CASA |

| ORGANISATION | 1991-92 | 1992-93 | EXPLANATION |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| Heritage Industries | 30 600 | 20 600 | \$10 000 redirected to Miroma Cottage |
| Holiday Explorers | 128 600 | 128 850 | Inflation |
| Housing Connexion | 445 300 | 394 050 | * |
| Intellectually Disabled Accommodation Association | 1 300 | — | One-off funding 1991-92 |
| Interchange | 120 100 | 113 300 | * |
| Lifestyles Assistance and Accommodation Service | 80 250 | 73 200 | * |
| Lower Eyre Pen. Soc. for Handicapped | 13 100 | 11 300 | * |
| Median Club | 6 000 | 2 800 | * |
| Melaleuca Crafts | 23 450 | 19 900 | * |
| Millicent Work Options | 12 950 | 7 350 | * |
| Minds Inc | 34 500 | 174 550 | Funding for one-off client issue |
| Miroma Cottage | 70 550 | 21 350 | * & \$26 800 one-off funding 1991-92 and \$10 000 redirected from Heritage Industries |
| Mirrenbina Club | 4 550 | 1 350 | * |
| Ngeringa | 115 500 | 103 900 | * |
| Northern Regional Council | 16 000 | 16 050 | Inflation |
| Orana Inc | 340 200 | 205 600 | * & one-off funding 1991-92 |
| Parents Project | 110 000 | — | One-off funding 1991-92 |
| Pathways | 22 950 | 23 000 | Inflation |
| Phoenix Society | 69 300 | 69 450 | Inflation |
| Pirie & Dist. Spec. Needs Prog | 20 500 | 20 050 | * |
| Port Pirie Central Mission | 47 994 | 35 750 | * |
| Pride Industries | 40 000 | — | One-off funding in 1991-92 |
| Quantum Housing | — | 18 000 | One-off Funding for Co-ordinator position |
| Riverland Respite | 17 300 | 11 500 | * |
| Riverland Sport and Recreation Association for the Intellectually Disabled | 21 600 | 21 600 | |
| Self Advocacy for Intellectually Disabled | 373 | — | One-off funding 1991-92 |
| Spastic Centre of SA | 1 297 380 | 1 241 150 | * |
| SA Sport and Recreation Association for the Intellectually Disabled | 54 400 | 54 400 | |
| Strathalbyn Com. Skills Project | 31 800 | 27 450 | |
| St Mary's Child and Family Welfare | 71 000 | 71 000 | |
| SA Association Intellectually and Developmentally Disabled | 9 400 | 9 400 | |
| Tatiara Employment Support Group | 14 800 | 12 850 | * |
| Tenancy Support Inc | 15 000 | 37 050 | Funding for one additional client |
| Training and Evaluation for Change | 12 950 | 12 950 | |
| Vocational Resource Agency | 7 000 | 5 500 | * |
| Western Housing for the Intellectually Disabled ... | 124 000 | 184 350 | \$60 000 increase due to additional clients |
| Wirrawee | 18 350 | 16 300 | * |
| Leveda Inc | 1 292 400 | 1 498 000 | Additional one-off funding |
| Salvation Army Sobering Up | 405 933 | 365 900 | 7.5 per cent Commonwealth reduction in National Campaign Against Drug Abuse funds, \$10 000 advance paid 1991-92 for 1992-93. |
| Port Augusta Sobering Up Service | 380 454 | 353 700 | Social Justice funds, one-off grant of \$5 200 paid 1991-92, \$20 000 advance paid 1991-92 for 1992-93 |
| Port Adelaide Sobering Up Service | 372 095 | 333 400 | 7.5 per cent Commonwealth reduction in National Campaign Against Drug Abuse funds, \$10 000 advance paid 1991-92 for 1992-93. |
| Adelaide City Mission—Innovative Health Services for Homeless Youth | 232 656 | 243 230 | Agreed budget between SAHC and Hindmarsh Centre. |
| Ceduna Sobering Up Service | 139 900 | 141 200 | Social Justice Funding |
| OCARS-Employee Assistance Program | 130 685 | 112 800 | 7.5 per cent Commonwealth reduction in National Campaign Against Drug Abuse funds, one-off grant of \$8 700 paid 1991-92. |
| Community Welfare Department | 71 000 | 65 700 | 7.5 per cent Commonwealth reduction in National Campaign Against Drug Abuse funds. |
| Blue Light Disco | 6 500 | 6 200 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of Drug and Alcohol Services Council (DASC) funds. |
| Vital Statistix Theatre Group | 3 000 | — | One-off grant 1991-92 |
| Rotary Club of Burnside—video | 2 000 | — | One-off grant 1991-92 |
| West Beach SLSC | 900 | — | One-off grant 1991-92 |
| Aboriginal Sobriety Group | 872 | — | One-off grant 1991-92 |
| Alcohol and Drug Foundation—Australia | -700 | — | Funds returned 1991-92 |
| Archway—Dale Street | 206 479 | 198 100 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds. |
| Bethesda | 167 167 | 156 900 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds, \$2 000 advance paid 1991-92 for 1992-93. |

| ORGANISATION | 1991-92 | 1992-93 | EXPLANATION |
|---|---------|---------|---|
| Salvation Army Bridge Program | 141 304 | 130 400 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds, \$4 000 advance paid 1991-92 for 1992-93. |
| Mission—Breakthrough Services | 131 000 | 122 100 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds, \$2 000 advance paid 1991-92 for 1992-93. |
| Mission—Kuitpo Community | 111 950 | 104 700 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds, \$2 000 advance paid 1991-92 for 1992-93. |
| Westcare Baptist Mission | 65 990 | 62 700 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds. |
| Adelaide Day Centre (Moore Street) | 40 000 | 30 400 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds. First quarter paid June 1992. |
| Mission—Community Houses | 34 200 | 31 900 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds. |
| Offenders Aid (OARS)..... | 32 900 | 30 900 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds. |
| Aboriginal Grant | 20 300 | — | One-off grant 1991-92 |
| Daughters of Charity | 20 000 | — | One-off grant 1991-92 |
| Alcohol and Drug Foundation SA | 19 500 | 18 500 | 5 per cent reduction as part of redirection of DASC funds. |
| Flinders University (NCETA)—Education | | | |
| Development Program | 50 000 | 50 000 | Set agreement |
| Mission Learning for life..... | 249 900 | 196 000 | 7.5 per cent Commonwealth reduction in National Campaign Against Drug Abuse funds, first quarter for 1992-93 paid June 92 as per contract. |
| Drinkwise Community Grants..... | 17 783 | 10 000 | Campaign reduction |
| Flinders University (Prof. Berry—Monitoring | | | |
| Evaluation Research) | 18 500 | 18 500 | Set agreement |
| Harm Minimisation/Needle Exchange Program: | | | |
| Pharmacy Guild | 10 000 | 30 000 | Set agreement—program established towards end of 1991-92. |
| Alzheimers Disease and Related Disorders Society | 16 800 | 1 900 | Funding responsibility transferred to Federal Government. |
| Anorexia Bulimia Nervosa Assoc. Inc. | 5 200 | 20 700 | Additional funding for Counselling Service |
| Assoc. of Relatives and Friends of the Mentally Ill | 4 600 | 5 400 | Support for hotline service |
| Bereaved through Suicide Support Group | 4 500 | — | One-off grant approved by South Australian Mental Health Service (SAMHS). |
| GROW | 340 000 | 315 700 | Budget reduced due to over-expenditure, replacement of motor vehicle and equipment purchases in 1991-92 and expected increase in receipts in 1992-93. |
| Obsessive Compulsive Neurosis Support Group | 4 740 | 2 400 | One-off grant approved by SAMHS Board, 1991-92 |
| Self Help Manic Depressive Psychosis | 53 800 | 52 300 | One-off grant provided 1991-92 |
| Panic Anxiety Disorders Association | 4 500 | 12 500 | Support for hotline service |
| Mental Health Association and Resource Centre ... | 130 600 | 126 900 | Inflation allowance, carryover increases awarded 1991-92, offset by one-off funding grants in 1991-92. |
| Marion/Brighton/Glenelg Health and Social Welfare | | | |
| Council | — | 6 000 | One-off grant |
| Schizophrenia Fellowship..... | 32 420 | 67 400 | Continued operation of the Fellowship Drop-In Centre at Kent Town. |
| Invicta..... | 39 000 | 27 100 | Basic allocation is \$27 100. Additional funds provided in 1991-92 from Commonwealth. |
| METRO SERVICES DIVISION COMMUNITY GRANTS | | | |
| Hindley Street Youth | 26 900 | 27 200 | Inflation Allowance |
| Para Districts Counselling Service..... | 187 100 | 189 200 | Inflation Allowance |
| Salisbury West Grants Fund | 40 000 | 40 000 | |
| Survivors of Torture and Trauma Assistance and | | | |
| Rehabilitation Service (STTARS) | 73 000 | 33 000 | Metro Health Contribution |
| | — | 40 000 | Community Services Contribution |
| Marion Transport..... | 57 800 | 58 400 | Inflation Allowance |
| Marion Youth | 50 300 | 50 800 | Inflation Allowance |
| Hindmarsh Council | 55 100 | 55 670 | Inflation Allowance |
| Thebarton Council..... | 51 670 | 52 190 | Inflation Allowance |
| Tea Tree Gully Youth | 49 200 | 49 700 | Inflation Allowance |

Please note that grants from Intellectually Disabled Services Council, Drug and Alcohol Services Council, and SA Mental Health Service are not reported in 'Information supporting the Estimates'.

Commonwealth refers to Commonwealth Government.

MURRAY DARLING BASIN**279. The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:**

1. Is the practice of clearing native timber for the planting of pines in certain areas of the Murray-Darling Basin, as described on page 74 of the 1991 Annual Report of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, still proceeding and if so, where and with what end in mind?

2. How does the evapo-transpiration effect of a given area of pines compare with, say, a similar area of eucalyptus forest?

3. What prospects are there for revegetation of the basin being achieved by extending the planted areas using native species only?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. This part of the report refers to New South Wales. Inquiries in that State have found that the establishment of new pine plantations in the Murray-Darling Basin is occurring on ex-farmland previously cleared for farming. Any removal of native vegetation from these farms is mainly related to 'scrubby regrowth' that reflects the run-down nature of the properties on which the plantations are being established.

The New South Wales Forestry Commission has a policy of not clearing remnant native forests for pine plantations. Private forestry companies must comply with various Acts and Regulations related to sound land management when establishing new plantations.

The establishment of pine plantations should be seen as another form of primary production. Pine plantations in the Murray-Darling Basin supply the timber processing industry with raw material for a range of uses including pulp, preservation wood, sawlog and veneer timbers. There are no areas suitable for pine plantations in the South Australian part of the Murray-Basin.

2. The evapo-transpiration effect of a given area of pine forest compared with a similar area of eucalypt forest is about the same. Differences can occur where the deeper rooting pine species are able to access ground water at lower levels that are beyond the reach of eucalypt roots. Where both forest types have access to the same sources of water, differences in evapo-transpiration are relatively small.

3. Wood production from exotic or native trees is another form of primary production. Where a commercial return is required, the species used in revegetation are dictated by market demand. There is a demand for pine sawlog, veneer log, preservation wood and pulpwood and for hardwood chip.

Research is being carried out into growing hardwood sawlog in plantations. This may lead to opportunities for revegetation with native trees species that are marketable to industry. Encouragement for farm forestry may further assist in development markets for native species.

Where revegetation for conservation purposes is required, without the additional benefit of a financial return from timber, non-commercial native species could be planted.

Therefore, species choice depends on the objectives of the planting program and, where applicable, the market that is being aimed at.

Within the general farming community, there is considerable interest in the re-establishment of native species within areas of the Murray-Darling Basin for the purposes of salt mitigation and erosion control works.

In these and other instances where the Department of Environment and Land Management is asked to provide advice, considerable emphasis is placed on the replanting of the use of locally collected seed for either direct seeding or the germination of seedlings.

MURRAY RIVER**304. Mr BECKER:**

1. What action can the Government take to ensure debris including logs, planks, offcuts and uncut trees washed into the River Murray from forests and lumber yards situated in Victoria and New South Wales is not washed into South Australia during the high water flow this summer?

2. Is the Minister aware that such debris is collected at Torrumbarry Weir, cut up into smaller pieces and thrown into the River to be carried down stream through the open lock at

Mildura into South Australia and if so, why has no action been taken to stop this pollution?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. Most of the fallen timber on the floodplain is a natural phenomenon as are the high river flows which inundate the floodplain and transport the timber and other natural debris downstream. Fallen timber provides a valuable habitat for certain aquatic species such as fish and invertebrates, consequently only those snags which can cause operational problems at some weirs such as Torrumbarry Weir, or those which pose safety hazards to river users are removed. Forestry operations along the river interstate entail a high standard of utilisation of actual fallen timber, as a result there are no significant amounts of man-made debris such as off-cuts being deliberately allowed to enter the River Murray during high flows.

2. Torrumbarry Weir is located in the midst of the Gunbower-Perricoota Forests and is the first structure downstream of the Barmah-Millewa Forests (the largest red gum forest in the world), as a result naturally fallen timber and other natural debris can build up quite rapidly at times against the weir trestles and present a risk of overturning one or more of the trestles. To avoid this the snags are cut apart and the timber removed to the river banks by winches. However in the process, some small amounts of debris may unintentionally pass through the weir. The small amounts of timber that do pass through the weir would be indistinguishable from later accessions downstream. There is no wilful depositing of timber into the river at Torrumbarry, the management practices in place are in fact designed to remove the timber. It is because of these management practices, I do not believe that any additional action is necessary.

HOUSING COOPERATIVES**306. Mr BECKER:**

1. How many housing cooperatives operate in the central districts and how many houses do they each maintain?

2. Have these cooperatives been subject to audit since 1 July 1992 and if so, why and what were the findings?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. 24 Cooperatives operate in the Central Districts area which extends from Grand Junction Road to Darlington. These cooperatives managed a total of 511 properties as at 30th June 1992.

A list of these cooperatives and number of dwellings are as follows:

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Central Western | 17 |
| CHINA | 17 |
| CHOW | 12 |
| Hindmarsh | 41 |
| House One | 17 |
| Housing Plus | 20 |
| Inner City | 8 |
| Inner Southern | 16 |
| ISIS | 15 |
| Kensington/Norwood | 30 |
| Marion | 17 |
| MERZ | 13 |
| Mile End | 22 |
| Northern Suburbs | 120 |
| PARQUA | 26 |
| PEACH | 30 |
| People Run | 14 |
| ROOH | 4 |
| Riverside | 10 |
| Southern Support | 29 |
| SPLIT | 13 |
| SWICH | 5 |
| Turtle | 7 |
| WACH | 8 |

2. All registered cooperatives must under Section 47(i) of the Housing Cooperatives Act ensure that financial statements are prepared and audited in respect of the preceding financial year.

Regulation 9 of the Act requires registered cooperatives to prepare an Income and Expenditure Statement or Balance Sheet in accordance with Schedule 3 of the Regulations.

Regulation 10 of the Act specifies the content of an audit report.

The authority has received audited statements from the groups listed above and is currently assessing the statements and preparing reports.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

322. Mr BECKER:

1. Does the Government propose to construct a tunnel under an extended south-west runway at Adelaide Airport at an estimated cost of \$20 million and if so, how was the amount arrived at, when is it envisaged that work will commence and how long will it take?

2. If a tunnel is not proposed, will traffic be diverted on roads around the extended runway at an estimated cost of \$8 million and if so, how was this amount arrived at?

3. How many vehicles, on average, use this road each day?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The replies are as follows:

1. & 2. The Government supports the proposal to extend the south-west runway at Adelaide Airport. Its present length imposes restrictions on some existing operations, and, most importantly, it reduces our opportunities to gain new long-haul routes in the future. The Government's support of course implies an intention to carry out necessary road infrastructure changes to allow the development to take place, subject to agreement over funding being reached with the Federal Government.

The proposal is contained in the Federal Airports Corporation's Draft Adelaide International Master Plan which in 1991 examined various options for future runway configurations, one of which was to extend the main south-west runway. It quoted indicative costs of \$20 million to construct a tunnel under an extended runway and \$8 million to divert Tapleys Hill Road around it and to build a new Patawalonga crossing.

The cost estimates were made by the Department of Road Transport in 1989. They were based on preliminary design calculations and available geotechnical information and intended as indicative costs only. Obviously the cost of a road diversion is an easier calculation than that for a tunnel, and the DRT believes the 1989 \$8m estimate to still be substantially correct. The tunnel cost would be subject to many more variables and detailed design work and site inspection would be required to validate the indicative cost. However, in mid-1992 the DRT re-estimated indicative costs to be closer to \$30 million based on a more thorough assessment of the substrata in the area.

None of these cost estimates included assessments of how long the works would take.

The timing of these works will depend on when the development that will drive the extension of the runway is agreed by the Federal Airports Corporation and the Federal Government.

The FAC, in its draft Master Plan, cites an 'indicative scenario' of the development being undertaken between 1985 and 2000. Before then the proposal as a whole will be subject to further assessment of its social and environmental impacts and more detailed study of its cost.

3. The Department of Road Transport's 1992 traffic count indicated that a total of 37 800 vehicles per day used Tapleys Hill Road in the vicinity of the airport. That total includes all traffic in both directions over a twenty four hour period.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

339. Mr MATTHEW:

1. What is the name of the fleet management system used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles, from whom was the system purchased and under what terms and conditions (including cost)?

2. If any department or agency does not use a fleet management system what manual methods are used?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The reply is as follows:

1. None of the departments or agencies under the Attorney-General's responsibilities operates a fleet management system.

Attorney-General's Department

2. The Attorney-General's Department does not own or lease any motor vehicles other than those hired from State Fleet.

Therefore, it is not necessary to use manual records of any significance other than to record which vehicles are allocated to the Department, who is the officer responsible for each vehicle and to verify invoices for hire charges from State Fleet.

Court Services Department

The following manual methods are used to assist this agency in the administration and maintenance of vehicles.

(i) Individual dockets are maintained on each vehicle presenting a full history on the vehicle from purchase date to salvage date. Dockets contain registration papers, Mobil petrol card details, copies of servicing and maintenance invoices, any accident reports and associated repair costs and salvage advice slips including the vehicle sale price.

(ii) At the end of each month odometer readings are sought and recorded for each vehicle to assist the fleet manager in organising of appropriate servicings.

(iii) At the end of each month odometer readings are sought for each vehicle and recorded on a chart. This chart assists the fleet manager in the following:

- arranging of appropriate mileage servicings;
- rotation of vehicles between various country and city locations to ensure maximum performance is gained from each vehicle, and
- vehicle replacement projections.

Other Departments or Agencies

No other department or agency within the Attorney-General's responsibility uses any form of fleet management system as their vehicles are all on short or long term hire from State Fleet.

341. Mr MATTHEW:

1. What is the name of the fleet management system used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles, from whom was the system purchased and under what terms and conditions (including cost)?

2. If any department or agency does not use a fleet management system what manual methods are used?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The reply is as follows:

Department of Road Transport

1. The Department of Road Transport uses an in-house built system called "Major Plant Management Information System" (M.P.M.I.S.). The system was developed by Departmental personnel and first used as a management tool in 1978. The system has evolved and been enhanced as and when necessary for operational efficiency.

2. Not applicable.

State Transport Authority

1. There are two separate systems in the State Transport Authority, one for the buses and railcars and the other for service vehicles.

To assist in the administration and maintenance of its buses and railcars, a system was developed "in-house" and implemented in all bus depots and the railcar depot in 1986. Called the Vehicle Maintenance System, it generates all vehicle routine services and records the maintenance performed on each vehicle. The system is currently being upgraded to operate on the STA's Unix network. Although the Vehicle Maintenance System was designed to also cater for the trams, because of the small number of trams in operation (only 18) the card record system has continued in use.

The State Transport Authority is in the process of placing an order for the purchase of "Fig.FLEET" fleet management system from Risk Finance Services at a cost of \$6,500 for the management of service vehicles.

2. Currently, the above systems are supplemented by the following:

- Manual recording of vehicle distance;
- Manual recording of fleet fuel usage;
- Vehicle replacement schedule using Lotus spreadsheet.

There are plans to automate the above processes in the future.

Department of Marine and Harbors

1. The Department of Marine and Harbors does not operate a Fleet Management system. However, one Departmental Division is using a PC based package (MPC Fleet Management purchased in 1989 from Tulsa Pty Ltd at an approximate cost of \$1,000) to assist in maintaining vehicle use details. The Department is taking steps towards leasing from a private or government agency which would incorporate a Fleet Management system.

2. Manual methods used vary from Division to Division across the Department but all records contain details of vehicle, registration number, driver, date used, kilometres travelled and vehicle replacement date. The Department also maintains central computerised records of all vehicles covering make, registration number, location, repairs, maintenance and fuel costs.

Office of Transport Policy and Planning

1. The Office of Transport Policy and Planning does not have or operate a fleet management system.

2. The Office of Transport Policy and Planning operates three (3) cars on long term lease from State Fleet, thus the Office relies on State Fleet for all fleet management services other than refuelling and specific use allocations. Vehicle bookings and allocations are performed manually using a diary to record the driver's name and the period of use.

342. Mr MATTHEW:

1. What is the name of the fleet management system used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles, from whom was the system purchased and under what terms and conditions (including cost)?

2. If any department or agency does not use a fleet management system what manual methods are used?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

Department of Environment and Land Management

The Department of Environment and Land Management operates the former Department of Lands vehicle fleet and the majority of the former Department of Environment and Planning Fleet.

The former Lands vehicles are managed under the State Fleet System. The former Environment and Planning fleet uses a computerised fleet management system developed in house.

Department of Aboriginal Affairs

The Department of State Aboriginal Affairs uses the State Fleet management system.

South Australian Police Department

The South Australian Police Department acquired a computerised Vehicle Fleet Management System from the New South Wales Police Department in February 1989 at no capital cost to the Department. The system was developed by the New South Wales Police for their specific requirements and was provided under a police information exchange agreement.

The software program was modified to satisfy the needs of the South Australia Police Department at an approximate cost of \$42,000.

Metropolitan Fire Service

The fleet management system used by the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service is Main Pac (Maintenance and Planning Control). This system was supplied by Cruickshank Technology Pty Ltd at a cost of approximately \$24,000.

Country Fire Service

1. The Country Fire Service uses a manual fleet management system.

2. The manual system of fleet management within the CFS encompasses the processes ranging from budget to disposal in accordance with internal and external policies and guidelines.

The methods utilised within the manual system ensure control of the vehicle fleet, maintenance standards and compliance with Government guidelines.

These methods include:

- Financial planning for budget replacement, maintenance and disposal
- Monthly reports from financial and supply functions are produced to control actual costs against anticipated costs.
- Monthly returns from custodians for mileage and fuel usage contribute to the optimisation of the vehicle fleet.
- Monthly returns from the fuel contractor assist in the monitoring process.

EXPIATION NOTICES

352. Mr MATTHEW: How many traffic infringement notices were issued in each of the years 1991 and 1992 to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by each department or agency under the Minister's responsibility, what was the reason for each notice, who paid the fine and, if the fine was paid by

the department or agency, why was it decided not to make the driver pay?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The reply is as follows:

Attorney-General's Department

Because the Government has a policy that no traffic infringement notices are to be paid by Departments, this Department has not maintained records of the number of infringement notices issued to staff whilst driving Departmental vehicles.

The notices have, in every case, been forwarded to the officers responsible for the vehicle at the time of the offence. It is understood that all traffic infringement notices have subsequently been paid by the officer concerned.

It is estimated that the number of notices issued to employees of the Attorney-General's Department would be less than 10. In each case, the reason for the notices have been exceeding speed limits.

Court Services Department

This agency has not maintained a record of the number of traffic infringement notices received. In the last financial year all infringement notices were for speeding offences and all were paid by the drivers—none by this agency.

State Electoral Department

Two traffic notices were issued to drivers of vehicles leased by the Department; both of the notices were

- related to exceeding the prescribed speed limit
- paid for by the driver

Ombudsman's Office

The office has no knowledge of any traffic infringement notices having been issued to staff of the Office while driving Government vehicles during the periods in question.

Legal Services Commission

The Commission keeps no records of these notices. Any received from State Fleet are passed to the individual driver concerned for personal payment. The Commission does not pay fines on behalf of its employees.

354. Mr MATTHEW: How many traffic infringement notices were issued in each of the years 1991 and 1992 to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by each department or agency under the Minister's responsibility, what was the reason for each notice, who paid the fine and, if the fine was paid by the department or agency, why was it decided not to make the driver pay?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The replies are as follows:

State Transport Authority

The number of notices issued are:

January to December 1991

85 Traffic Infringement Notices issued:

- 81—relating to speed camera offences
- 4—relating to traffic light offences.

All the fines, with the exception of one instance, where the driver of the vehicle could not be identified, were paid by employees.

January to December 1992

184 Traffic Infringement Notices issued:

- 171—relating to speed camera offences (19 were subsequently withdrawn)
- 13—relating to traffic light offences (7 were subsequently withdrawn)

With the exception of seven instances where the drivers of the vehicles were unable to be identified, all fines were paid by employees.

Department of Road Transport

No records available for 1991-92.

Department of Marine and Harbors

1. Eighteen notices have been issued to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by the department in the last two years.

2. Seventeen notices were for speeding and one was for disobeying a traffic signal.

3. The drivers paid the fine in all cases.

Office of Transport Policy and Planning

1. Three traffic infringement notices have been issued to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by the Office.

2. All were for speed camera offences.
3. All fines were paid by the drivers of the vehicles.

BOATS

367. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many boats are used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility, what is the name of each boat, who owns it and, if it is not owned by the department or agency, what are the terms and conditions of its lease?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The replies are as follows:

Department of Road Transport

1. Number of Boats 45
2. Names of Boats 26 Un-named (The majority are small aluminium punt-type hull propelled by oars. e.g. life boats for ferries.)

| | | |
|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| | 19 Named | |
| Nalta Yuki (Towing Vessel) | | Grebe (Ferry) |
| Water Hen (Ferry) | | Dotterel (Ferry) |
| Coot (Ferry) | | Finch (Ferry) |
| Heron (Ferry) | | Stilt (Ferry) |
| Quail (Ferry) | | Plover (Ferry) |
| Cygnets (Ferry) | | Cockatoo (Ferry) |
| Ibis (Ferry) | | Osprey (Ferry) |
| Swan (Ferry) | | Gull (Ferry) |
| Pelican (Ferry) | | Swamp Hen (Ferry) |
| Albatross (Ferry) | | |

3. All boats are owned by the Department of Road Transport.

4. Not applicable

State Transport Authority

1. None.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not Applicable.

Office of Transport Policy and Planning

1. None.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

Department of Marine and Harbors

1. Number of Boats 33
2. Names of Boats

Technical Services Division:

Andrew Wilson
Kowarra (Currently on hire to Fire Brigade)
Trident
Investigator

Aquila
2 Dinghies
2 General Work Boats

Regional Ports Division

PV Norman Carr
PV Gillespie
PV Natani
PV Miralga
PV Yorke
PV Eyre

(PV means Pilot Vessel)

Marine Safety Division

9 Patrol Boats, MH03S, MH04S, MH06S, MH26S, MH30S, MH29S, MH55S, MH58S, MH59S.

Port of Adelaide Division

PV Tarooki
Capt G S Bergland
Des Corcoran
MV Tingara
MV Carina
Conch (Self propelled pontoon)
2 rubber inflatable dinghies
1 aluminium dinghy
(MV means Motor Vessel)

3. All boats are owned by the Department of Marine and Harbors.

4. Not applicable.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES REVIEW GROUP

377. **The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**

In relation to the implementation of the GARG program in each department or agency for which the Minister has the responsibility—

(a) what was the identity and annual salary payable at the time of each position abolished; and

(b) what is the annual recurrent cost saving for each other measure implemented?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Please refer to the report titled 'Report on the Government Agencies Review Group Program' dated November 1992 which was tabled in the House by the Hon Attorney-General on 26 November 1992.

Accessing records in all agencies to ascertain names and exact salary levels would be an extremely time-consuming process. The report tabled by the Hon Attorney-General provides exact information across agencies and bottom-line cost savings are unchanged.