

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 8 September 1993

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

BAROSSA VALLEY

A petition signed by 447 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reconsider the building restrictions upon titleholders in the Barossa Valley Supplementary Development Plan was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

CHILD ABUSE

A petition signed by 262 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.

DRUGS

A petition signed by 221 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for drug offenders was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A petition signed by 393 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reintroduce capital punishment for crimes of homicide was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

ALDINGA BEACH POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 723 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish a police station at Aldinga Beach was presented by Mr Matthews.

Petition received.

HALLETT COVE CONSERVATION PARK

A petition received by 723 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow dogs to be walked through the Hallett Cove Conservation Park was presented by Mr Matthews.

Petition received.

MABO

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: I propose to advise honourable members of developments in relation to the High Court's Mabo decision since my last report to Parliament on 3 August 1993 on this issue. Last week, the Prime Minister wrote to me regarding the Commonwealth Government's proposed legislation to resolve uncertainties created by the

Mabo decision while ensuring that native title is treated with fairness and justice. The Prime Minister also made a statement on 2 September 1993 setting out a number of fundamental principles to which his Government will adhere. These are:

1. ungrudging and unambiguous recognition of native title in Australian law;
2. a fair, rigorous and efficient means for determining who has native title, where, and what the key attributes of that title are in particular cases;
3. a just and workable regime which dealings in land can go on and which provides clear processes within which our vital land-based industries can operate;
4. the right of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to be asked about proposed actions affecting native title land, but without any special veto or 'locking up' of the land;
5. full security for people holding grants of interests in land provided by Governments in the past, and at no cost to them;
6. fair compensation for any extinguishment or impairment of native title rights; and
7. an opportunity for the States and Territories to manage dealings in land which affect native title so long as they meet the standards for recognition and protection of it set out in the Commonwealth legislation.

I have consistently stated this Government's view that there be complementary action between the Commonwealth and the States/Territories in dealing with the Mabo decision. My Government is considering actively the detail of the Commonwealth's proposed legislation on native title. Further, we propose to discuss the documents this week with other States and Territories and clarify specific provisions of the Commonwealth's draft before finalising our own position on matters of detail, especially regarding the interrelationship of Commonwealth and State legislation and processes for the handling of any native title claims in South Australia. My Government can now draft legislation to be introduced into Parliament which will be designed to remove any doubt about existing titles and to ensure that native title in South Australia is taken into account and treated fairly in future dealings in land.

For the information of members, I table today the working party report dated December 1992 submitted to Cabinet and prepared by officers of the Crown Solicitor's Office, the Department of Environment and Land Management and the State Department of Aboriginal Affairs. I also table the supplement to the working party report, dated March 1993. When considering these documents, it should be clearly understood that the effect of the Mabo decision in South Australia is a mixed question of law and fact involving two issues, namely:

1. the identification of what land in the State might be subject to native title; and
2. whether any Aboriginal group can in fact show that it still has native title to any lands in the State.

It is only with the first of these issues that the working party deals. The purpose of this examination was to determine in principle whether native title could still potentially exist in land held under those Acts. Of course, to establish a valid claim it would be necessary for Aboriginal persons or communities to prove an ongoing connection with the land and maintenance to traditional laws and customs. I cannot emphasise too heavily that the working party did not consider whether any particular area of land could be subject to a valid claim. That is a very complex question of fact which may require a court or tribunal to consider anthropological and historical evidence, the history of the use of the land since colonisation and like matters.

Against this background, the working party report examined the different types of land tenure and usage existing under, for example, the Crown Lands Act 1929, the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989, the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and the Mining Act 1971. It should also be understood that the working party report constitutes primarily legal advice to the Government regarding the implications of the Mabo decision in South Australia. It does not purport to prescribe Government policy on this matter nor indeed does it answer all of the possible legal interpretations that may be argued in respect of various types of tenure and interests in land and their interrelationship with native title.

Indeed, since the preparation of the report and the supplement, and following discussions with the Commonwealth and other States, other interpretations regarding the implications of Mabo have been submitted and raised in public debate. However, these differences in legal detail have not been such as to cause the Government concern in the formulation of its policy response to Mabo. As I have consistently stated, such uncertainty as may exist regarding the effect of the decision on existing titles will be clarified by the processes sought to be agreed and implemented by the Commonwealth and States/Territories.

Because the documents tabled today comprise legal advice to the Government from its solicitors to assist in the formulation of Government policy, no liability will be accepted for any errors or omissions or for any loss or damage suffered by any person who relies upon the advice contained therein.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the sixth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr McKEE: I bring up the seventh report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Has the Government received Crown Law advice that Mr Marcus Clark cannot be prosecuted for conflict of interest offences under the State Bank Act; is the Government considering retrospective legislation to remove any obstacle to prosecution proceedings and, if so, does the Government intend to introduce retrospective legislation to ensure that Government Ministers and Government officers can be judged by no lower a standard than former directors and executives of the State Bank?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It has been reported that Mr Marcus Clark cannot be prosecuted for conflict of interest offences relating to his association with Equiticorp because the time limit for initiating such proceedings has already expired. This compounds the Government's failure to ensure conflict of interest questions were fully investigated at the

time they were first raised here in this Parliament—as early as February 1989. The Premier has said that the Government may now consider retrospective legislation to remove that time limit. It has been put to me that, if the Government moves down the path of retrospective legislation, it should not stop at attempting to ensure that former directors and executives are prosecuted but should also ensure the law applies exactly the same standard to Government Ministers and officers.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not call upon the Premier until the House has come to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I think the Leader has been quite outrageous in the way he has been handling the latest report from the Royal Commissioner. His constant attempts to imply partiality on the part of the Royal Commissioner and to imply that he has applied a different set of standards to members of the Government than anyone else is outrageous.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is outrageous and quite disgraceful in terms of the reflection of partiality upon the royal commission, which the Leader has so clearly done, and it is outrageous by his own standards that he applied last year. The first report of the royal commission was released after he came into this place to be Leader of the Opposition. Members opposite may choose to forget about the fact that the Leader was here when the first report of the royal commission was released. What did he say about how we should treat with the findings of the royal commission, how we should treat with the work that the royal commission has done on these matters, and how it has investigated all the evidence of all the people involved, including members of the Government? Let us look at his own words on that occasion when the first report came down.

On 18 November last year in this place the Leader called the royal commission an 'independent court of unquestioned integrity and ability'. He went on to say:

No-one could complain about the exhaustive nature and fairness of the royal commission inquiry. Everyone has been heard. Everyone has been able to put their case fully.

That is what he said about the royal commission then, and now he is accusing the Royal Commissioner of partiality. He is saying that the royal commission did not apply the same standards to Government members as it did to other people in the community.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If ever there was a case of political cynicism, it is the Leader of the Opposition and his talk now.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Goyder to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Talk about a state of denial! We see it in the Leader now because he does not like what has come out in the commission's final report. He thought he might like things when he saw the first report, and that is when he praised the royal commission to the sky. However, he does not like the final report of the royal commission—he does not like the sound of that anymore at all. As to the matters that have been referred to in the royal commission, let us not forget that the royal commission has concluded that 19 people should be subject to further investigation with a

view to civil or criminal proceedings. That is the finding—19 people.

As to the two matters with respect to Mr Marcus Clark under the State Bank Act, there is advice that, on the face of it, the offence created by section 11 of the State Bank Act is a summary offence. A summary offence has a time limit applying to it, and that time limit is six months. The Leader has said that, had action been taken at the time the first questions were raised by the Opposition, it would have been in time. That is absolutely incorrect—it would not have been in time. The situation is that the Royal Commissioner identified a summary offence, but it is out of time.

The Government is asking the criminal task force to refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions all matters contained in the report to consider whether any prosecution is out of time and whether any other possible offences relating to these matters can be further investigated. It may well be—and I do not know because I am not a lawyer in these matters; it should be left in the hands of the appropriate people, including the Director of Public Prosecutions—that indictable offences will arise from an investigation that is referred to in this document. In that regard, it should be remembered that the Royal Commissioner has asked for 19 people to be further investigated.

If the task force determines—and that includes the Director of Public Prosecutions—that there are avenues for indictable offences (not summary offences) to be pursued, those matters are not out of time and, quite clearly, they can be further pursued. The question then relates to retrospective legislation. I wonder what the view of the Leader of the Opposition is on that matter, given the Opposition's view on retrospective legislation generally. The view of members opposite is that it should never apply, that there should never be any retrospective legislation.

I have referred that matter to the Attorney-General for his further advice, but I have to say, of course, there is a major problem about proceeding down the path of retrospective legislation of this order, because suddenly we put at risk not just the particular people involved here but the whole question of the nature of summary offences and the natural justice that might apply suddenly comes into question. I believe it would be a very difficult situation to say that one particular set of summary offences under a certain piece of legislation should be excised from the time limit, whereas every other area of summary offence in law in South Australia was not to be. I think that that would be a very difficult position to sustain, and I would be very interested to know whether the Opposition would support that.

I would like to know exactly what the view of the Leader is on this matter. He is so slow in coming up with any views on any matter. Certainly, on this issue, where he has raised the question, he should at least give his view as to what is his opinion and that of his colleagues. But that matter will be further reported on by the Attorney-General and I will certainly accept the advice that we receive from him. But I finish on this point: the behaviour of the Opposition in relation to this report is absolutely disgraceful, and it is disgraceful because they—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume take his seat. I ask the members of the House to conduct themselves in the way that the public of South Australia would think it appropriate during Question Time. The shouting that is going on at one another across the

benches is disgraceful. If it continues I will simply have to take action. I do not enjoy interrupting Question Time, because it reduces the amount of time that members have available to them, but I am forced to do so because of the bad behaviour of members. The Premier.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I draw your attention to the time. The Premier has been on his feet for eight minutes, and during most of that time he has been debating the question, not answering it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not accept the point of order. Every first question that is asked by the Leader of the Opposition takes approximately the same time in every Question Time. I believe that this is an extremely important question that the Leader of the Opposition has raised and it should be fully answered. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Deputy Speaker, there is no doubt that Opposition members have been enormously cynical in this matter. They have desperately wanted the Royal Commissioner to say things they would like to hear. To try to fuel that, just a few weeks ago we had the situation where they made disgraceful allegations in this place and put on a disgraceful and desperate performance to try to link in supposedly new evidence—new evidence that never was put before the Royal Commissioner, though the opportunity was there for the Leader to do that. As we know, the Royal Commissioner roundly rejected those allegations and assertions made by the Leader a few weeks ago. He has tried to have this document come out and be what he would want it to be. The Royal Commissioner, in his own words, is an independent court of unquestioned integrity and ability, and no-one could complain about the exhaustive nature and fairness of the royal commission inquiry—they are not my words but the Leader's words, and words that he will have to eat now because they are the truth.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gilles.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order. Question Time will have to be conducted properly. The honourable member for Gilles.

ENTERPRISE BARGAINING

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety inform the House what difficulties workplaces face in developing enterprise agreements? The latest annual report of the South Australian Industrial Commission states that only 41 enterprise agreements have been presented to the commission.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: For the information of the members for Bragg and for Mitcham, it is very difficult for organisations of employers and workers to be able to enter into enterprise agreements when it is first announced that they are able to do it. For the information of the member for Bragg, who grins about this information, New South Wales has had the ability to have enterprise bargaining for at least three years. There have been 272 agreements registered covering less than 10 000 employees. When one thinks about that, one recognises that there is an enormous number of people working in New South Wales, and there are 272 agreements covering 10 000.

The reason for that is that the former Minister of Labour, Mr Hannaford, who happens to be a member of the Liberal

Party and supports the Liberal Party's general thrust on this, has said to me and other Ministers of Labour that the problem is with the employers—they do not want them. They are more than happy with the awards, and so are their workers. However, the member for Bragg wants to take away a safety net.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Bragg to order.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: He wants to create a situation similar to the one that my son advised me of over the weekend where not one of the 50 females employed in a potato packing shed at Virginia is allowed to go to the toilet between 6 a.m. when they commence work and 10 a.m.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Now he says 'Come on.' All I can say to him is that that is precisely what is happening there. The member for Bragg and other members of the Opposition are babes in the woods when it comes to knowing what they do.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to take his seat. Question Time will not continue until we have order. I ask members to cease interjecting. The honourable Minister.

Dr Armitage: Name the company.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I caution the member for Adelaide.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Adelaide is pretty good at dobbing people in—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to address the Chair and not to be drawn by interjections.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:—even when he gets it wrong. They do not have the courage to apologise, either, when they get up in this House and tip a bucket on people. They are not prepared to do that. What we have seen in this State with enterprise agreements is that, at the end of June this year, 41 were registered but 62 have now been registered, and that is an increase of about 50 per cent. I am of the view that we will see many more enterprise agreements in South Australia, because even the member for Bragg knows that between the end of June and now—only two months—there have been 21 agreements, whereas a total of 41 agreements were registered in the previous 12 months. I think that is significant in itself. It also means that many employers and workers do not want enterprise agreements.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: What the member for Bragg is saying through his interjections is that he is representing employers who want to create situations where people cannot go to the loo for four hours in the morning.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: They do want to do that, because they want to take away from workers their ability to have the normal protections that the awards provide. All they are prepared to guarantee is a minimum of 10 days sick leave, unpaid maternity leave, a minimum hourly rate and four weeks annual leave. They are not prepared to guarantee anything else. All they want to do is to rip away the safety net and leave people at the mercy of employers who want to exploit them. They are not prepared to provide decent and proper protection for workers in industry.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

What assurances can the Premier give that prosecutions under the Companies and Securities Code against former State Bank directors and executives can proceed? The code requires that proceedings for an offence must be instituted within five years of the alleged offence unless consent is obtained from the ministerial council to extend this deadline. Most of the major matters to be further investigated, such as the Remm and Oceanic transactions, occurred more than five years ago. This matter is referred to at page 26 of the Royal Commissioner's report with the indication that the Royal Commissioner has taken up the matter with the Australian Securities Commission. However, a letter received by the Royal Commissioner from the ASC dated 30 July 1993 does not appear to have clarified the situation.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I understand that there might still be correspondence outstanding with the ASC seeking further clarification of that matter, because the Deputy Leader is correct in that the most recent correspondence does not fully clarify that point. If the task force wants it to happen, I would support a further approach to the ASC or the ministerial committee for any action that may be necessary to provide for an opening up of those periods.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, I am answering your question, so listen to the answer. As I have said, I understand that correspondence is outstanding and that a reply from the ASC is still awaited, following clarification being sought on that matter to determine whether or not it could be opened up. I would strongly support its being opened up so that all those matters could be pursued to the fullest extent.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order. The member for Albert Park.

EDUCATION PUBLICATION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Has the Minister of Education, Employment and Training had the opportunity to read the West Lakes Primary School parent participation publication and does she consider that this excellent publication could be a model for other schools in South Australia to adopt? The publication is a booklet, to which I have previously referred, and it encourages the involvement of parents in the education of their children. It has been put to me that the involvement of parents is critical to the education of children.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The answer to the first question is 'Yes'; I have read this publication and I think it is an excellent one. I thank the honourable member for raising this matter in the House, this school being within his area, because it is important to acknowledge what school communities and particularly school principals are doing to involve parents, and it is important also to value that involvement. This is something that could be shared with other schools around South Australia. I will quote briefly from the introduction to this booklet, the first page of which contains a letter to parents stating:

Since its establishment, West Lakes Shore School has developed a cooperative environment which fosters positive school community leadership. This atmosphere enables us to work together and develop common understandings.

The publication goes on to extend an invitation to parents, as follows:

We invite you to be involved to the extent that your time or energy permits. Parents should feel under no obligation to take up any of the activities listed in this booklet. The varying levels of contribution made by parents to school life are all valued—from parents sharing an interest in their child's learning and supporting school policies to active participation in the decision making processes of the school.

That, in fact, is what this Government has been about in this whole area of education, involving both my predecessors and myself. We have actively encouraged parents and the community in general to be involved in participating not only in decision making on school councils and in parent clubs but in matters such as reading with children in the classroom and taking sporting activities, that is, working with their and other children and the staff of schools.

I would like to pay tribute to the West Lakes Shore School, because I think it has shown the way. The booklet is very readable, it is easy to understand, parents can really feel a part of the school community, and I recommend this approach by school communities right around South Australia.

STATE BANK

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Does the Premier have any conscience about pursuing, possibly to the point of personal bankruptcy, former directors of the State Bank whose appointments he approved as a member of Cabinet when he had been warned that some of those appointed were not up to the task?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I wonder just what members opposite are saying about this royal commission report. They asked for this to be done. They asked for it to be as thorough as possible. They asked for the royal commission to investigate all manner of things. They asked for findings to be brought down by the Royal Commissioner as to what action should be taken. And what happened? The Royal Commissioner has reported. In the words of the Leader—not my words:

This is an independent court of unquestioning integrity and ability. No-one could complain about the exhaustive nature and fairness of the royal commission inquiry.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Bragg.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It continues:

Everyone has been heard; everyone has been able to put their case fully.

The Royal Commissioner has done that: he has heard everybody, he has had them put their case fully and he has given his judgment. The member for Bragg somehow expects me to say, 'We don't like this report; we'll throw it away.' He is somehow expecting us to say, 'No, we want another run at it; we don't like the judgment.' Well, we will not do that. We will stand by this. Before this report came down—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. It is unfortunate that this is the fourth time I have had to intervene, and it is shortening Question Time. I cannot allow Question Time to continue unless it is conducted in the proper way.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Before this report came down, I said that the Government would support whatever action was necessary as a result of the Royal Commissioner's report, at a stage when we did not know what findings would be made, what recommendations for further action would be

undertaken; at a stage when anybody might well have been the subject of the Royal Commissioner's view that further investigation should take place. We could not prejudge what he would come down with, but apparently we are now to prejudge that. Apparently we are now to cast a partial opinion and to say, 'Oh, we don't like what it says, so we won't bother with it.'

The member for Bragg is somehow saying that we should not be referring these matters to the task forces—the criminal and civil task forces. He is now saying, apparently, there should an amnesty from any further action. Why does he say that? He says that because what they really wanted was nothing to do with these 19 people, nothing at all to do with Tim Marcus Clark or the former board or the former management. What they were concerned with was the member for Ross Smith, and that is all they were concerned with. They wanted this report to come down and find in a damning way against him. And when it did not do so they no longer had any interest in this document. There was no partiality shown by the Royal Commissioner—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call members on my right to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: He has considered all the evidence, and he has made his judgment upon that matter. He has not shown favouritism to members of the Government, he has not shown favouritism to members in this place (after all, if the same standard were applied, we could be considered as shareholders). What the Royal Commissioner has done—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—as the representative of the taxpayers—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: He has made his judgment upon all that evidence. The member for Bragg, who is a disreputable member by some instances of his own behaviour in this Chamber, is attempting to say that, because I refuse to throw away the report; because I refuse to reject the report; because I refuse to say, 'Sorry, it doesn't pin the member for Ross Smith'—because I refuse to say any of that (because the report does not say that)—apparently that reflects upon me. Well, it is a pretty odd set of terms of reference, a pretty odd code of conduct, when that is the kind of conclusion you can draw. Quite frankly, the words of the member for Bragg count for nothing—other than to mark him as being cynical to the utmost degree.

ROYAL SHOW

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. Can the Minister inform the House how the environment is being promoted at the Royal Adelaide Show?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. We cannot continue unless Question Time is conducted properly. I ask members to stop shouting across the Chamber and conduct themselves in a proper way.

Mr De LAINE: The environment is a very important issue. I have been informed that the environment trail at the show, conducted by the Department of Environment and

Natural Resources, has been a huge success and has been widely praised.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Price for his question, which he asked obviously under some difficulties caused by the Opposition. It is important from all members' points of view to acknowledge the matter to which the honourable has referred. It is unfortunate if people have not had the opportunity to see the exhibition in the Jubilee Pavilion and to follow the environment trail around the show. I can only encourage them to do so and to support those organisations involved in putting together what I think is an excellent show exhibit, from the point of view of the enjoyment each individual receives from such educational material and the ideas it promotes, the experience itself and the potential it has for the future education of children, many thousands of whom are visiting the royal show not only with their schools but as individuals with their parents and friends.

The theme is 'Help tomorrow today', and that is a significant theme to be picked up, particularly at this time. Last year about 32 000 people visited the environment stand and went through the trail, and at the present count it seems that that figure will be exceeded quite comfortably. I want to thank those groups that participated in the exhibit, particularly the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, ETSA, E&WS, MFP Australia, Warrawong Sanctuary, STA, Waste Management Commission, KESAB, Energy Information Centre, Foundation SA, Westpac animal nursery, Scouts Association (particularly for its recycling exhibit), Department of Primary Industry, Landcare and State Flora.

The undertaking is a major contributor, in my opinion, not only to the Jubilee Pavilion but also to the whole show. Fitting in comfortably with the yellow brick road, the presentation promoting the environment has involved a number of community and commercial organisations. Recyclers SA, which has supported the Scouts recycling centre, can list the full gamut of opportunities available for recycling commodities such as cans, cardboard and cartons, and can detail the opportunities that exist to pursue this activity further.

Today we have received the award for the best display in the Jubilee Pavilion, and credit must go to the people involved—my officers and all those organisations concerned. Anyone who has the opportunity to see the exhibit will know why we have received that award. From my point of view as Minister, this is a great success and something we should encourage, and I hope that we see the idea extended into other show exhibits. Perhaps we can pursue it throughout all our regional and country shows, taking the message to those people who are not able to be at the Adelaide show. I thank the member for Price for raising this matter, because from my point of view it is a very significant contributor to the education of our community.

STATE BANK

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I direct my question to the Premier. Why has the Government permitted more than \$1.56 million to be paid in severance pay-outs to former State Bank Group officers who are now to be further investigated? Payments for severance—that is, in addition to outstanding leave and other entitlements—have been made to nine officers who are to be further investigated. These payments have been made since it became obvious that the State Bank Group was in serious financial trouble, the most recent being last October. Most of this money has been provided under the Government's

indemnity of the bank, and therefore with the Government's approval.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: These officers had legal entitlements as a result of the contractual arrangements they had with the bank. The bank has been committed to downsizing itself and its subsidiaries, and it has done that quite extensively. However, if the matters that have been referred to the task force result in further action, such as civil action—suing these people—then, of course, the money will certainly be coming back, if the case succeeds.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If, however, due process of law finds them not to have been guilty of offences or not to have been liable to be civilly sued then, of course, they will not be paying. However, that simply means that the court system—the appropriate due process of law—has found them not liable for those amounts. Again, it would appear that the member for Kavel is asking us to prejudge that entire process or somehow to break the law. I certainly have no intention of doing that.

The advice I have on this matter is that those payments were made appropriately by the bank. I know the matter has been investigated by a committee of this place, and we will see what the report of that committee says in due course. It may well comment on whether or not there were some problems with that. However, I do not have any advice on those payments having been inappropriate. In the absence of that advice, that is the situation that remains. The payments have been made. If these people are found later to be liable as a result of the recommendations of the royal commission, they will have to pay back the money.

TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Primary Industries explain the reason for the significant turnaround of profitability in the South Australian timber products operations over the past year, and what are the prospects for further employment and investment in the industry?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member has asked a particularly important question, because 12 months ago the timber products operations of the Government were losing something like \$12.1 million. When I refer to 'timber products operations' I mean the saw mills at Mount Burr, Mount Gambier and Nangwarry and Satco's interests in IPL at Nangwarry, the agency in Melbourne and Mount Gambier Pine. Just 12 months ago the Government was looking at an overall loss on timber products operations of \$12.1 million. The figures for the 1992-93 financial year showed that, as a result of a number of changes that have taken place and a number of factors, that loss has been reduced to \$3.1 million, which is a \$9 million turnaround in a relatively short time. Not only has there been a turnaround but the fact of the matter is that our timber products operations reached break-even point in about June of this year, and for the 1993-94 year there will be an estimated profit of \$9.5 million. So there has been a very considerable turnaround in our timber products operations. Some of the reasons for this—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Well, a number of hard decisions have been made, but the honourable member is quite right: it was not sustainable for Government operations to lose amounts of that magnitude. Some very hard decisions have been taken, particularly with the formation of Commer-

cial Vehicle Forward Products Pty Ltd, which means that Government operations are to compete on a better commercial footing with the private sector.

There have also been improvements in management efficiencies, and the three boards now have identical personnel. We have also improved the processing operations and efficiencies. We have been better placed as a consequence to keep our production costs down and take advantage of rising world prices. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been a shortage of timber on the world market, we have also had to contend with reduced demand due to the recession and a price discounting war that was initiated by a major competitor against New Zealand, and there have been other attempts by producers to maintain or improve market share.

So, those hard decisions have been taken. There has been a great deal of industrial disputation during the past 12 months, but the Government was determined to implement the changes necessary to turn around the very significant losses being recorded. I think that the South-East can look forward with a great deal of confidence to a stabilisation of long-term growth of the timber industry. That was reflected in CSR's decision to locate a new plant in the South-East. CSR first approached me last November in relation to this matter, and it could easily have gone to another State. The company made it quite clear that South Australia was its preferred choice. However, we had to create the right climate and we had to be seen to be doing the things that the industry wanted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member does not want to underestimate what was necessary to attract that investment to South Australia. A good deal of negotiation went on in relation to that; it could easily have gone to another State. However, at the end of the negotiations CSR established a new \$15 million plant in the South-East that will create 120 jobs, with up to 200 jobs as a result of the flow-on effect. Of course, the exports are something—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member knows where the plant is going to be. The exports will amount to something like \$50 million a year.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Well, this is particularly important, because the Opposition does criticise the Government and says that it is losing money. Here is an example in the past 12 months of how this Government has been able to turn around some very significant losses on Government operations, reduce those losses by \$9 million, and not only that but move into profit on our timber products operations and show a \$9.5 million profit in the 1993-94 financial year.

In addition, it has attracted a major investment to the South-East. The members for Victoria and Mount Gambier would be aware of the importance of the combined effect of these two occurrences, because it will mean long-term growth in the South-East in relation to this stable industry that will provide jobs and career opportunities.

MINISTERS' STAFF

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Premier. Why are eight Ministers being allowed to increase the staff entitlements of their ministerial offices this financial year, at a time when the Government is cutting hundreds of public sector jobs, and is that not yet another case of this Government's double standards? An

examination of the Program Estimates shows that staffing entitlements in the ministerial offices of the Premier, the Treasurer, the Attorney-General, the Minister of Environment and Land Management, the Minister of Education, Employment and Training, the Minister of Transport Development, the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety, and the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage are being increased in 1993-94. Total staff in ministerial offices will now exceed 142 positions.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not call upon the Premier until the House comes to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Maybe a bit of help with the member for Heysen's reading would not go astray. Of course, we have the Estimates Committees next week and the week after, and questions can be asked then. However, I will obtain a schedule on this because, frankly, the honourable member is incorrect in the analysis that he has done. So I will come back with the figures that will edify him and show him that he has misinterpreted the information.

HOUSING LOANS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations inform the House what assistance is currently available to low income home buyers and how the value of this assistance compares with commercial home loan arrangements? I understand that the member for Mitcham was on the radio over the weekend intimating that borrowers under the HOME concessional loans program would be better off with a commercial rate home loan.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I also heard the comments by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on this matter, and I must say that they were reckless in the extreme. A simple phone call, or a little more care by the shadow Treasurer in collecting the facts, could have avoided the harm that the statements have done not only to his own reputation but to people in the community who are in the market place. I issued a statement on Wednesday 18 August 1993 indicating the reduction in HomeStart Finance and HOME program rates. I am quite prepared to table that press release, and in return the honourable member might also like to table a statement of home interest rates, because he has said that most financial institutions are charging less than 7 percent. I would like to see a list of all financial institutions on a comparable basis that are charging those interest rates, because what the member for Mitcham did not say, in his very devious and misleading press statement, is that the banks that offer those sorts of rates do so for only six or 12 months before they escalate to the normal variable rate. I only hope that these comments have not greatly influenced the decisions of unaware home buyers.

The Government provides home ownership assistance to some 30 000 low income South Australians: 16 000 through the HOME program and a further 14 000 through HomeStart Finance. In addition, the Housing Trust provides a range of home ownership opportunities through initiatives such as Rosewood Village and its extensive home sales programs. There has been substantial involvement by this State Government in this area, all geared towards helping South Australian families, particularly those on lower incomes, to buy a home of their own. Home ownership is a great desire of people not

only in South Australia but right across this country, and that is still a very strong desire.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member might like to explain the policies of his Coalition colleagues in New South Wales who have sent tens of thousands of New South Wales families into despair and financial ruin because of their mismanagement of an irresponsible housing scheme. Indeed, the Fahey Government has asked officers of my department to advise on how they may overcome the difficulties experienced in New South Wales. So, the Opposition has no credibility in this area at all, and the Deputy Leader has confirmed that by his irresponsible statements on the weekend.

On 18 August I announced that the maximum rate for home borrowers would be reduced from 9.45 per cent to 8.75 per cent from 1 October. If the honourable member had read the paper or telephoned my office he would have known this, but obviously he decided that he would make his public statements regardless of the truth of the matter. He was reckless in the extreme in the statements that he made. Indeed, far from being uncompetitive I think the member would have found that this rate compares very favourably indeed with the commercial rates that are available in South Australia. I will wait to see the list that he provides that indicates that long-term housing mortgage rates are, in the majority, below 7 per cent. It will be a very interesting document for us all to read. The Deputy Leader is simply masking the fact that his Party obviously has no policies in this area and, more than that, if it ever achieved office it would simply destroy enormously valuable programs such as HomeStart.

EDUCATION BUDGET

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): How does the Minister of Education, Employment and Training justify the blow-out of over \$500 000 dollars in the cost of running her ministerial office last financial year at a time when the Government is cutting back spending on education in classrooms? Last financial year the budget allocation to run the office of the Minister of Education, Employment and Training was \$813 000 but, according to the budget papers, the actual expenditure was \$1.363 million.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As my colleague the Minister of Business and Regional Development said yesterday, the Opposition is leaking like a sieve, so I thank the honourable member for this Dorothy Dix question. I just happen to have at hand the actual estimates program, and most certainly I can suggest that those figures are correct. It is very interesting, and I will explain why in a moment. The budget for this financial year is \$1.107 million which, in fact, is a reduction of \$200 000.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will take her seat. I consider this to be a very important question. Suggestions are being made that a Government department is over-spending. I ask members to listen to the answer instead of shouting down the Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Members may well have forgotten that on 1 October last year there was a reshuffle in portfolio responsibilities when the now Premier joined together the departments of Education and Children's

Services, previously held by my colleague the now Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, and the Technical and Further Education Department that was previously held by the Minister of Business and Regional Development.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Members opposite do not want to hear this because I am going to reveal some interesting facts. What that did was to bring together under one ministerial office almost one-third of Government, one-third of the public servants in this State and one-third of the budget.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is interesting that the very people who are making the most noise on the Opposition benches are those who continually contact my office, continually want ministerial intervention in terms of support, want to get answers to their questions and who want a whole range of information—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I warn the member for Heysen.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I pride myself on my professionalism ever since I have been in this Parliament and most particularly on my ministerial responsibilities. There are members of the Opposition who are big enough, and gracious enough, to acknowledge that both to my face and behind my back. There are others, of course, who would seek to try to undermine what is happening within the education portfolio. We now have in the one ministerial office, under the one portfolio, everything from birth right through to death in terms of education, care, vocational training, youth affairs and joint responsibility for the MFP. I am aware that the Opposition has two shadow Ministers working full-time to try to shadow me.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: They do not like it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: No, they do not like that. I am aware that the—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Before I actually cite the figures, I point out that I am aware that the Opposition plans to break up the new Department of Education, Employment and Training—which is now one department—and do members know why members opposite plan to break it up, back into Education and Technical and Further Education? It is because they are saying quite publicly that it is too big a workload for one Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: They know I am right. As my colleague says, they are leaking like a sieve and that is well known in the public sector.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume her seat. It is becoming quite impossible to conduct Question Time. I can hardly hear the member who is speaking above the raucous laughter. I would ask all members to come to order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: With respect to the figures—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the time and to the fact that the Minister has been debating the question for some time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not accept the point of order. I point out to the House that, if I had not interrupted the House the number of times I have, we would have got through a lot more questions and I believe people would have been much more satisfied.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am conscious of the time. I actually have the figures. I could go through every single person who is in my office; I could go through the number of people who were in the two offices when I took over, and I will be able clearly to demonstrate that now there are fewer people in my office than when I became the Minister for these two very large but vitally important areas. I have already provided some of that statistical information to the Opposition by way of replies to questions on notice. This is nothing more than a cheap attempt to try to do a beat up before the Estimates Committees. I challenge the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —to come to the Estimates Committees with their questions—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will take her seat. The Standing Orders provide that, when I stand up, the Minister should sit down.

Honourable members: Hear! Hear!

Mr S.G. EVANS: My point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, is that the Minister is now obviously debating the answer: she is not giving an answer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the point of order and I ask the Minister to wind up.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am very happy to provide, down to the names of those who were on my ministerial staff as ministerial appointments, the number of people who are in the clerical areas from the Public Service. I would be delighted to do so openly—right down to the very last cent that is spent in my office—at Estimates, and I hope the Opposition has the guts to front up then and ask the questions. I hope members opposite have that.

ORION AIRCRAFT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister of Business and Regional Development. Is the South Australian Government serious in its stated intentions to maximise the benefits to South Australia of the proposed refurbishment of Australia's Orion P3C aircraft?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Given the proximity of the honourable member's electorate—I thought there was some sort of pantomime going on on the other side of the House.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thought he was standing over Corporal Boofhead at the helm. Anyway, the fact is that the honourable member's electorate—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —at present includes Technology Park. That will be a crucial part of this project if we are successful, as we intend to be, in this bid. Certainly, the South Australian Government sees the Orion project as crucial to

further securing our position as the leader in hi-tech, high value added industries, particularly with a strong focus on defence. It is the largest project of its type currently on offer and has the potential to bring many hundreds of extra jobs to this State. I think South Australia has shown the world, through the submarine project, that it is world competitive in hi-tech manufacturing and we are well placed to win a major share of the Orion project. But we cannot be complacent about it; it needs bipartisan support. We cannot have the constant undermining that occurred during the bid to win the submarine project.

I am pleased to hear one member from the other side, the member for Bragg, saying that we will get bipartisan support for this bid because, as I said before, I went through six years of *Hansard* to see what the Opposition said about our bid for the submarine project. On the day, the Deputy Leader, who was the loudest in criticising the bid, saying it was a joke, saying it would not be on budget and saying it would not be on time, was down there sipping champagne, with his little finger sticking out, and meanwhile the Leader of the Opposition, in a bizarre irony, was up there on the dais whilst John Bannon was in the audience—the man who actually won the submarine project—and so was Jim Duncan. Corporal Boofhead was up there on the dais with a supercilious look on his face.

We are going to take this bid seriously and we are demonstrating that by the fact of the task force, which I will be chairing. The team will include the EDA General Manager of projects and programs, David Mitchell; Rod Keller from the MFP; and Bob Howe. It is interesting—and there are all leaping to their Leader's defence—that that is not what they say in the corridors, or in the library, or in the bar late at night. Let me tell a story. A few months ago—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Minister is obviously debating: he is not answering the question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I accept the point of order and I would ask the Minister to wind up.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. I can assure you that this major campaign for this \$700 million-plus project will be mounted aggressively, and the task force will be lobbying for a major share of the project for this State. We will work with other public and private sector companies and organisations over the coming months to identify additional subcontractor opportunities for South Australia and to seek Commonwealth support.

It is logical that much of the work be carried out in Adelaide at RAAF Edinburgh where the Orions are based and at Salisbury and Technology Park where a number of subcontractors bidding for the project are based. Technology Park, of course, is an enterprise zone and it has the benefit of a 10 year exemption for State taxes to new industries. The confidence of Government and industry that we can win this project is part of the 'can do' mentality that we must have in this State. We cannot afford the alibis and excuses and the whinges of the type of people that we face opposite here today.

Tenders for the project will be lodged by 15 September, and contracts and site locations are expected to be awarded in November next year. The RAAF's P3C refurbishment program has attracted wide interest because of its relevance to potential larger refurbishment opportunities in the near future. There are believed to be about 600 Orions around the world that will need refurbishing, most of which are in the

United States and Japan. We showed the world what we can do with the submarines: we will do it again with the Orion project. It is time for the whingers to disappear. Let us get on with it.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 1993.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BECKER: Yesterday during Question Time, as recorded in *Hansard* on page 602, the Minister of Business and Regional Development said, during an answer to a question to me, 'I invite the member for Hanson. I do not know where he is because he seems to be out of the Chamber.' I was present in the Chamber. I take umbrage at that remark. It is often difficult to understand the Minister of Business and Regional Development. He speaks through his nose and slurs his words. But just for his information, I was in the Chamber listening.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call on the House to note grievances, I point out that, when people are hanging around and having conferences, a disturbance is caused. If members are going out of the Chamber, they should go, and I would ask that the usual courtesies be extended to the speaker.

ORION AIRCRAFT

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Minister inferred that members of the Opposition were against the Orion project, and I simply remind members that it was a bipartisan committee which approved the loan.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The IDC?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, the IDC.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I took great personal exception to the inferences of the Minister—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Read the *Hansard* over six—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON:—that members on this side were against the Orion project. He more than inferred that: he stated that we were whingers and that we were against the project. That simply is not true. The IDC committee is a bipartisan committee, on which there are two Labor members and two Liberal members. I would advise the House that in fact rather than oppose that recommendation I was the member of that committee who did suggest that we extend the loan, which was a substantial form of assistance, to give the Government greater flexibility than it then had under the recommendation which arrived before the committee. So I

take great exception to the Minister's suggestions that we are against the Orion project and remind him that it was a bipartisan committee that approved the funds for the submission.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to take up the anger felt throughout South Australia at present over the final recommendations and findings of the royal commission report, because people in South Australia are particularly angry that the member for Ross Smith (who is trying to escape the Chamber now) and all the other Ministers, including this Minister here—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—are the Ministers who are ultimately responsible for the management of the State Bank.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the Leader resume his seat. I am particularly concerned that members and Ministers are interjecting out of their place.

Honourable members: Hear! Hear!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Standing Orders will be observed. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let us ask the question: who had the greatest control over the State Bank? Was it—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. It appears that the Leader of the Opposition is not addressing you, Sir. He seems to be appealing to the cameras, adjusting his tie and fiddling with his make-up.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I could not hear the last sentence. Will the Minister repeat that last sentence?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It appears that the Leader of the Opposition is not addressing the Chair, as Standing Orders require, but is in fact addressing the cameras.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would uphold the point of order. This point has been made by the Speaker and I would ask the Leader to address the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I ask the question of you and of the House: who has had the greatest control over the State Bank since 1984? Was it John Bannon as the former Premier, plus all the other Ministers, or was it Molly Byrne, whom they put on the board as a former member of Parliament. It is quite clear that for the last nine years the State Bank has been largely controlled by the Cabinet of the Labor Government of South Australia. Those Ministers who sit here now and try—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the Leader resume his seat. This is a five minute grievance. It is most improper that the speaker should be continually interrupted when he has a short amount of time. I would ask those members on my right who are interjecting very loudly to cease to do so so that the Leader can be heard in silence.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can understand their discomfort, because they are the guilty party. They are the people who controlled the board of the bank through the—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. As much as the Leader is desperate to appear on Channel 10—they seem to be the only people

wanting to look after him in this issue—the point of order is that there is a proper way of addressing members opposite. It is not ‘you’ or ‘they’: it is ‘honourable members’.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Adelaide to order. I accept the point of order. I ask the Leader to refer to members as they should properly be referred to.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I ask the question: who appointed the directors to the bank board? The Ministers of the Labor Government. Who failed to heed the warnings repeatedly given about the incompetence of those directors? It was the former Premier, the current Premier and other Ministers.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Albert Park to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Who were the people who decided on three occasions to freeze interest payments, which cost the taxpayers of South Australia \$2 million? It was the Labor Cabinet of South Australia. Who were the people who failed to make sure that appropriate directors were put on the board so that they had control over the State Bank? It was the Labor Ministers of South Australia. Here we have the guilty party, the men and the women who have really let South Australia down and cost the taxpayers of South Australia \$3 150 million. I find it incredible that we have one standard out there for the directors and officers of the bank, and a much lower standard—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —for the very people who sat in the Labor Cabinet—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —and controlled that bank.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Leader of the Opposition to complete his speech.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot accept the motion. We have a proposal before us that the House note grievances. If the honourable member wishes to change the Standing Orders, he will have an opportunity after grievances. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): On Saturday 28 August we witnessed the greatest piece of hypocrisy to emerge, I believe, since I have been in this Parliament. Minister Rann today spoke about the hypocrisy of members opposite. I can remember during the debate in question, at the time we were trying to get the submarine contract for South Australia, Opposition members, almost to a man and woman, being opposed to this project. They said we could not deliver; we did not have the expertise; South Australia was too small; we would have neither the skills nor the people available to achieve that.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, the member for Albert Park misrepresents me; I take umbrage at his allegation and ask him to withdraw it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am afraid that I was distracted at that time, and I am not sure what was said. What are the words at which the honourable member takes umbrage?

Mr LEWIS: My competence and my opposition to the proposal for the submarine contract in South Australia. He referred to all members of the Opposition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I cannot accept that as a point of order. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: I know what the tactic is. Let me get it on the record, because I will, one way or another.

Mr LEWIS: On a further point of order, Sir, I take umbrage again at that remark. It is not a tactic: I am simply defending my rights as a member of this place and taking what I regard as a legitimate point of order—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr LEWIS: —under Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. The honourable member will resume his seat when the Deputy Speaker stands up, otherwise the honourable member will not be here for very much longer. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: I know it galls members opposite, but the reality is that the overwhelming majority of members on that side of the House opposed the project, and the records are quite clear because the research has been carried out on this side of the House. But what did we witness? We saw the people concerned who had their snouts in the trough at the submarine launching. Mr Deputy Speaker, you would be well aware, having been there, of the speech made by the Prime Minister—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I believe that the expression ‘snouts in the trough’ is quite unparliamentary, and I ask you to rule that way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I do not believe that to be unparliamentary. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: See, they are very sensitive to this issue, Sir. The Prime Minister's statement was very enlightening, as indeed was the statement by the Minister from Sweden, Mr Bjork, in praising the workers in this State and the trade union movement for the manner in which they had negotiated a three-union agreement on that site. South Australia has benefited from the utilisation of this new technology: over 1 000 new jobs have been created within the Submarine Corporation, and we have ensured that the fabrication and assembly work, together with component manufacture undertaken by South Australian industry, accounts for an injection of \$1.8 billion into the South Australian economy over a period of four years.

Not once on this occasion, in any debate in which members opposite have participated, have we heard any mention of the benefits that have accrued to this State from such a project. The reality is that they are a bunch of knockers. They do not want to see this Government and the workers of this State succeed. Their motivation stems from their being compelled to grab for power. We have seen evidence of that repeatedly in this House. They do not care about what they are doing; in their attempts to get into power, they are pulling this State down by their constant carping and criticism. The reality is that they do not like people, particularly on this side, detailing the benefits flowing to South Australia from this submarine contract. The fact is that we have shown the world what we can do in this State, and it is about time the Opposition changed its attitude.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I wish to reiterate on this occasion the annoyance that I and no doubt other members are experiencing when Ministers use parliamentary privilege to fabricate issues and statements when answering questions from members, I refer to the question I asked yesterday of the Minister of Business and Regional Development about the future of Goodsports Pty. Ltd., a company which is under the control of the Grand Prix Board. The Minister said in his answer:

I should advise the House that I was given prior notice that the Opposition would ask this question today because it leaks like a sieve.

I have checked the sources in the office of the Leader of the Opposition and discussed this matter with my colleagues, and nobody gave anyone prior knowledge of that question being asked. All I can say is that the Opposition's offices in this House are being tampered with; they are being bugged. That is a very serious allegation, and perhaps it ought to be examined. There is no other way that the Government would have had prior knowledge of that question. We had the situation again this afternoon when the Minister of Education said the same thing.

We know it is a tactic of the Government to try to cause mischief with the Opposition, as it is with the Opposition to cause embarrassment to the Government, but this is going beyond the pale as far as parliamentary democracy and tactics are concerned. In the 23 years I have been here, I do not think I have ever seen debates degenerate to such an extent as they have in the past few weeks. I have never been in a situation where we never had the Auditor-General's Report before we were asked to debate the budget, and we have never been in a situation where we are in about the fourth or fifth week of Parliament and we do not have the printed volumes of *Hansard*, so there is a deterioration in the management and facilities provided for members, particularly members of the Opposition, and it is simply not good enough.

This indicates the type of poor administration of the present Government, which no doubt is spending more time on worrying about its re-election than getting on with administering the State.

The other point I want to make is that, when the Minister made the remark that he would invite me to go somewhere, he then said, 'I don't know where he is because he seems to be out of the Chamber.' That was a total fabrication, because I am six feet tall and weigh 17½ stone, and if anyone cannot see me sitting in the Chamber he has got something wrong with his eyesight, he is on some queer type of medication or he has a real problem. I suggest that the Minister of Business and Regional Development visit his optician and have his eyes tested before the Federal Government puts up the fees, because I was here, and the member for Chaffey would vouch for that, as would our Whip.

I am not prepared to accept this type of treatment in this House. We are here to represent our constituents, the people who genuinely want information on issues that they bring to us, and we expect in the interests of parliamentary democracy that we be provided with that information. One cannot force the Minister to answer any one particular question, but the principle exists that the Opposition has the right, as do Government members, to seek information from Ministers, and we expect to get that information.

Mr Deputy Speaker, this afternoon during Question Time we saw the continual interruptions that you had to force on the House to try to bring the Chamber back under control so that Ministers could be heard and questions asked with

reasonable decorum. The behaviour of members reflects on all members in the Chamber, and it is high time that, before the situation gets totally out of control, as we might expect in a third world country—a path which this country is being led down anyway—we reflect on the sorts of problems being experienced in the Chamber and in the corridors of this House.

I would not want to see the situation deteriorate any further; particularly after having been here for 23 years, I would have thought that the standard would improve and that members would respect the position they hold and the responsibility they have for and on behalf of the people. So, I give warning that I will not tolerate it any longer. I think other members would also encourage the maintenance of Standing Orders and insist on decorum in this place.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would prefer that the honourable member continue, but unfortunately he has run out of time. The member for Baudin.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I join with the honourable member in appealing to members to observe decorum in this House. However, I must say that I have to be a little more partisan than the honourable member has been, because it seems to me that most of the yelling and braying that has gone on, particularly this afternoon, has come from those sitting immediately in front of him, but I will say no more than that at this stage.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I also wonder whether we can really take too seriously any suggestion that one side is bugging the offices of another side in this Parliament. Really, it is quite ridiculous.

However, I want to speak on a serious topic. I want to remind members that in 1953 at the University of Cambridge in England two young men, James Watson and Francis Crick, discovered that DNA, the molecular messenger of human inheritance and of every other living creature on the Earth, carries its information in the spirals of a double helix. Our century has seen some remarkable scientific discoveries and innovations: nuclear fission and fusion, relativity, the expansion of the universe, plate tectonics, the computer, superconductivity and space flight and exploration. One could go on, but the Watson/Crick discovery is as revolutionary as any.

Many of the ailments to which we are subject are genetically programmed, and I guess as someone who has just celebrated his 55th birthday I would want to reflect on the possibility, as I do, that ageing itself may well be genetically programmed. We have just had the admission from the honourable member who spoke before me that he weighs 17½ stone—I do not know whether certain other things are genetically programmed. However, more specifically, complaints such as sickle cell anaemia, cystic fibrosis, thalassaemia and others result from mistakes in the proof reading of the genetic code. These complaints are often fatal and they often affect children. In 1991 there was an astonishing advance when a four-year-old girl successfully underwent a gene transplant, having previously suffered from an ailment that would have led to her death.

On top of it all we now have the human genome project, a project which will within the decade result in the mapping of the human genome. This is a \$2 billion project, one which is as ambitious as the project to put a human being on the moon. The reason for that is that the human genome contains

more than three billion letters in its code, but within a decade we will have cracked that code. That will enable us to do some remarkable things in the medical treatment of various ailments which we are not yet able to do. In fact, we cannot even begin to imagine some of the things that will arise from it.

Why am I taking this opportunity today to raise this matter? It seems to me that parliamentarians have two responsibilities in this area. One, of course, is to be alive to the possible effects of this project on human knowledge and health. It is unfortunate that very few people come into this place with much scientific training, so often they are reasonably shy about reading some of the excellent scientific literature available to us. I do not have a science degree, but I am fortunate in having done enough study to have some inkling of what scientists are talking about. It is important that we as decision makers in this place keep abreast of developments in this field so that in deliberations on budgets, for example, we can determine whether money is appropriately being devoted to research and innovation in the treatment of these ailments.

Perhaps even more important than that is the responsibility we have for considering the moral and legal consequences of all this. That is something about which scientists tend to be rather shy. Scientists are not comfortable with talking about ethics, and they would rather leave it to others to consider the ethical consequences of much that they discover. Yet, these are things that we cannot escape. For example, if there is the possibility of determining the sex of an unborn child, certain ethical consequences relate to that. If we discover new ways of determining genetic defects in the foetus well prior to birth, that will reopen the whole of the abortion debate, and so one could go on. Clearly, we are opening a Pandora's box, the difference being that the Pandora's box only spelt trouble. I see this as spelling a good deal of good for men and women, with many advances in medical technology that will be very beneficial to us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Custance.

Mr VENNING (Custance): My grievance speech today relates to the risks posed to Australia's rural industries by the average low level of education of our farmers, as has been revealed by a recent survey. A comparison with farmers of other countries is quite chilling. In Europe, 90 per cent of farmers have reached a level of education equivalent to year 10 or higher. In New Zealand, our neighbour with whom we are often compared, 50 per cent of farmers have reached the level of year 10, but in Australia the truth of the matter is that just 25 per cent of the people on our farms reach the level of year 10. That is quite a disgrace and it is a matter of great concern.

I am amazed that I have not heard this subject discussed at length in this House previously. It does not take a survey by a sociologist to see that, by and large, our farmers are old men. The average age of a South Australian farmer is, as I said before, 59 years. That is almost retirement age. In fact, many people have taken an early retirement package by then. It does not take an expert to know why that is so: years of failure by Labor Governments, both State and Federal, to appreciate the vital position of agriculture in the economy and the social structure of our country.

In the face of world commodity prices being kept artificially low by the dumping and subsidisation practices of many countries, the Australian farm sector has for decades

responded by increasing productivity. To their great credit they are still doing it against all odds. In the past few years, however, farmers have more and more been caught by rising input prices and static or falling commodity prices. Combine this with a run of poor seasons in many cases, coupled with the history of Government failure to give the industry the support and backing its national importance warrants, and we have the situation that prevails today.

We will have a population of ageing farmers with no young people replacing them. Given the long hours, the hard physical labour and the poor returns for high risk and high investment, why would a young man or young woman want to get involved in this industry today? Our educated younger people want and deserve something better than the uncertain—often thankless—career of a farmer. It has become a vicious circle. Cash-strapped farming families in isolated areas often cannot afford to provide advanced education for their children. The children just have to get away from the country and their home environment.

The retention rates of rural students in our secondary schools continue to lag well behind those of the urban students. A national Board of Education, Employment and Training report in 1991 found that the difference in year 12 completion rates by non-metropolitan students ranged up to 52 per cent below metropolitan rates. As well, non-metropolitan young adults, especially in the 20 to 24 years age group, participate in higher education at only half the rate of their metropolitan cousins. We are not talking about insignificant minorities here. One-third of all Australians are classified as being non-metropolitan. In South Australia that proportion is smaller but still significant. We can ill afford to allow discrimination against such an important part of our labour force in terms of education and training. The Government talks often of social justice and equal opportunity; the figures here speak for themselves. This sector of our community has certainly not had social justice, and nor has it had equal opportunity.

It will take a change of Government attitude, or better a different Government with a better attitude. Farming today is a complex business which needs business skills such as risk management, production techniques and financial and general business management. Like other businesses in this State and in the country, it also needs to be able to operate in an environment of encouragement—not the environment of disincentives and petty restrictions that surround it today. There are times when it needs to be recognised as a special case. We need a Government that will offer incentives to help our precious agricultural industries to flourish. Only then will the twin trends of lagging education levels and the drift to the cities be checked, as they must be checked if agriculture is to continue to make its vital contribution to our economy.

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): On 12 August, the member for Mitchell mentioned in this House an individual, Tony Summers, who is a friend of a prominent Liberal MP from South Australia, Ian McLachlan, who sits in the Federal Parliament as shadow Minister for Infrastructure and National Development. Most of us are aware that Mr McLachlan is a leading proponent of dry economics with a belief that business entrepreneurs should be left alone to do whatever they want to do without too much attention being given to those individuals in the community who fall by the wayside.

That is the sort of philosophy that I regret to say some elements of my own Party, the Labor Party, at Federal level, seem to have picked up from the dry loonies of the Liberal Party. It was this philosophy that led to such lunacies in Australia as the unilateral slashing of tariffs, the deregulation of the financial system and the community hero-worship of get-rich-quick entrepreneurs who resembled Gordon Gecko, the 'greed is good' anti-hero of the 1980s movie *Wall Street*.

The evidence is overwhelming that people such as Bond, Skase, Herscu, Connell, Marcus Clark, Baker and others enriched themselves while playing games with other people's money. To make matters worse, they seem so far to have been able to get away with it without suffering any dire consequences to match the misfortune they have inflicted upon others, and they seem to be able to erect legal barriers to protect themselves. While the Liberal Party concentrates on making political capital out of South Australia's misfortune, those most closely involved are having a discrete smile at the expense of South Australia and rejoicing that they have been able to maintain their lifestyle with impunity. Were these people against whom proceedings are being contemplated now all friends of the Liberal Party? Certainly, those involved within the State Bank or in other corporate disasters were a 'who's who' of the Adelaide establishment.

Look at the references some of them got from Liberal politicians. Indeed, John Hewson and Tim Marcus Clark are on the public record as giving character referees to each other. When John Hewson sought Liberal Party preselection for his seat of Wentworth, who was one of his character referees? Tim Marcus Clark. Who was it in turn that John Hewson recommended for the board of the Reserve Bank in 1986? None other than Tim Marcus Clark. As the member for Mitchell pointed out to the House, who is it who has currently been giving character references for Tony Summers, ex-State Bank director, fugitive from Bennett & Fisher and pillar of the Anglican Church? No less a person than Ian McLachlan, a Liberal shadow Minister in the Federal Parliament, who said this in the *Sunday Mail* of 11 July:

Tony Summers is an energetic, bright person. . . He's a friend, I've been to his house and he's been to mine—I guess you would say he's a business friend.

The *Sunday Mail* then went on to say:

Mr McLachlan is in a position creditors would love to be in. He has spoken to Summers in London. 'I've spoken to him a couple of times and he told me he was doing theology. . . I like Tony Summers and I think he did a great job when we worked together.'

Formerly of 58 Strangways Terrace, North Adelaide, Mr Summers appears to be living now in London. I understand that Anthony Gilbert Summers, Christine Helen Summers, and their children Hamish, Nigel, Caroline, Joshua and Magnus (not too many working class names in that lot, I note) are currently residing at 4 Empire House, Thurlow Place, Knightsbridge, SW7 2RU. The telephone number, (071) 823 9297, is listed in the name of Hamish Summers. I know this because I have a constituent (Mr Alan Paterson) who is particularly interested in the future of Mr and Mrs Tony Summers. Mrs Christine Summers is the sister of my constituent, Alan Paterson, and he and another sister, Mrs Elizabeth Meikle, are convinced that a mutual inheritance disappeared into Tony Summers' investments as a consequence of the hold that Tony Summers had over the actions of Christine Summers.

She had power of attorney for the 80 year old father of herself, Alan Paterson and Elizabeth Meikle. For 12 months prior to his death in a nursing home in 1989, the elderly

gentleman was in an extremely confused state and unable to act lucidly. During that time, about \$150 000 appears to have disappeared from his estate, for which Christine Summers was co-executor. My constituent had this to say, and I quote from correspondence:

My sister Elizabeth and myself are now convinced that the sums of money that are missing from our late father's estate were transferred in a clandestine manner from his investments, particularly with National Australia Bank and National Westminster Finance, to the Summers' property investments in Adelaide. These properties and other assets have been 'frozen' according to recent heavy publicity, and moneys that Elizabeth and I should have received in our respective inheritances are now lost forever.

My constituent was retrenched from his employment and is in a situation where he is not able to obtain legal assistance for this type of action, yet he is a social security recipient who is rapidly being impoverished in a most literal sense by the legal costs involved in pursuing this matter against an opposition which apparently has no difficulty in erecting expensive legal barriers.

The legal system often seems to operate in mysterious ways, and I am mystified at how the legal system allows the sale of some of Summer's property at Victor Harbor to be proceeded with to provide the expatriate theology student with a supply of cash with which to put up legal barriers against the very creditors who should have first call on property of that nature. I hope we as a community have better success with the prosecutions that are being considered as a consequence of the State Bank royal commission than my constituent is having with his financial and legal nightmare.

CONSTITUTION (ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES COMMISSION) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Read a first time.

Mr GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I have brought this measure before the House on two previous occasions because it is important. It brings to the Constitution Act a course of action which allows democracy to be properly pursued.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: The current Constitution Act does not give persons who believe that their interests have not been properly considered by the Electoral Commissioners the opportunity to make comment on the draft proposals. The last redistribution that took place in this State radically changed the electoral boundaries, particularly in respect of Kangaroo Island. There was a great deal of public controversy as the information was gradually leaked out of the commission that this proposition was actively under consideration. The people on Kangaroo Island sought to make representations, but those representations were completely ignored, and once the order was made there was nothing they could do.

This proposition, which is fair, reasonable and just, would have given those people the opportunity to make the most detailed submission to the draft proposals. There is nothing unusual about that. In our system in this country, all the

courts systems and all other organisations that have power to make substantial recommendations are normally subject to some form of appeal process.

Mr Atkinson: On a point of law.

Mr GUNN: I understand that the honourable member who continues to interject has some legal training. I say 'some', because from his comments it is obviously of a very cursory nature. This proposition is identical to the provision in the Commonwealth Act. On many occasions people have quite rightly made substantial representations to have the draft proposals changed because they were not considered to be sensible or practical. This proposal is simple and it is one of a number of measures that I intend to introduce in this Parliament, because I believe there is a number of things that should be done to the Constitution Act in relation to electoral re-distribution.

Mr Atkinson: It is the last time you will have a chance.

Mr GUNN: It will take more than wishful thinking from the honourable member—

An honourable member: Or any of his colleagues.

Mr GUNN: Yes, or any of his colleagues, because after the next election he will be a member not of a cricket team but more likely of a baseball team with about nine members. However, this proposal would have allowed some redress for the people of Kangaroo Island or elsewhere in the State who were rather aggrieved at the redistribution proposals.

Having appeared before a number of electoral boundaries hearings I have to say that it was quite clear that the then Chairman was the dominant person in the proceedings. He determined what was to take place, and in my view he exercised excessive influence, which was not only detrimental to many people in this State but was also unwise and unnecessary. It was a course of action that should never be allowed to occur again. I further believe that it is unwise to have the same people sitting on the commission year after year. It is important that the personnel of the commission change on a regular basis, because by doing that people do not get fixed in their ideas.

Mr Atkinson: We might appoint you after the next election.

Mr GUNN: I would say that there will be a lot of ex-Labor members of Parliament looking for jobs, but I do not think any of them would qualify for any of the positions here. The honourable member should know the criteria required for people appointed to the commission. I am not here to debate that in detail: I am here to put to the House that I believe that democracy can be properly fulfilled only if the community at large, and particularly those people who have taken the trouble to make submissions, have the opportunity to constructively analyse and comment upon the draft proposal. There is nothing—

Mr Atkinson: You mean 'To analyse constructively'.

Mr GUNN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I do not need the assistance of the honourable member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I agree with the honourable member. The member for Spence is to cease his interjections.

Mr GUNN: This proposal gives ordinary citizens of South Australia the opportunity that many of them desire; that is, to be able to make a considered judgment on the draft proposals. As I indicated earlier, I believe the people of Kangaroo Island would have welcomed that opportunity, as I believe would a number of other people in South Australia who are far from impressed with the way the electoral boundaries have been drawn.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I think that the member for Stuart was one who was quite amazed when she read the Commissioner's report. However, anyone who took the trouble to sit through the hearings did not have to think very much or have much imagination to know the way in which the Commissioner was thinking. Unfortunately, in my judgment, he never properly applied the 50 plus one principle, anyway. The unfortunate thing is that there was no opportunity for the community at large to object to the proposition—

Mr S.G. Evans: Or to make representations.

Mr GUNN: Or to make representations, because he knew that once the order was signed that was it. The very limited appeal to the Supreme Court is totally unsatisfactory in a democracy. Nowhere else would these sorts of proposals be tolerated. The reason we have them inflicted upon us is quite simple. When Premier Dunstan set out on his crusade to rewrite the electoral laws of this State he thought a long way ahead. He knew full well that if he could achieve the mythical proposition of having one vote one value—writing in the provision using existing electoral boundaries, if possible—he would achieve a gerrymander that would be to the advantage of the Labor Party for ever and a day. However, he also knew that a fair appeals system in the Constitution Act would make his aims and that exercise much more difficult.

Therefore, my proposition today is to put fairness back into the Constitution Act, to avoid the situation where one person, because they have a particular bent to dominate, can control the exercise. This proposal will mean that that will never happen again. I therefore commend the Bill to the House, because I believe it is an important step that will ensure that democracy will prevail when the electoral boundaries of this State are redrawn. I look forward to its speedy passage through the House. I have a number of other provisions dealing with the Constitution Act that I will introduce in the House in the relatively near future.

Clause 1 is the short title.

Clause 2 amends section 58—Representations to the commission. This clause will require the commission to prepare a draft order of the proposed redistribution, and the draft will then be sent to each person who has made representation before the commission and be made available for public inspection. Members of the public will then be invited to make a final submission on the proposed order before it is made.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

COURT AND TRANSCRIPT FEES

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That the regulations under the Magistrates Court Act 1991 relating to court and transcript fees made on 1 July 1993 and laid on the table of this House on 3 August 1993 be disallowed.

If someone is unfortunate enough to be dragged before the courts, surely they have the right, at reasonable cost, to be able to read the transcripts of proceedings in which they are involved. What has now happened is that the Courts Department is involved in a cost-recovery exercise. In many cases it is now beyond the financial resources of people of limited means to be able to afford a copy of the transcript.

From the inquiries that I have been involved in, this matter is causing considerable concern within the legal fraternity. We are talking about not 50¢ a page but between \$5 and \$6 a page for transcript.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is not only outrageous, as my colleague quite rightly points out, but also not democratic. Surely, in a decent society, if someone is brought before the courts they ought to have the opportunity in between proceedings to quietly examine what has been said about them so they can note it. Then when they are called back into court, in their concluding remarks, they can clearly point out where they have been misrepresented, where incorrect evidence has been given about them or anything else. One solicitor told me that he had to obtain a copy of the judge's transcript because the client could not afford to pay for it. Surely this is an absolute nonsense; it is turning the courts system into an absolute farce.

We had a debate on this issue a few months ago but the Government has moved again to increase the cost. Surely it understands what we are doing. The only person who appears to support this is the Attorney-General: everyone else is concerned about it. The people administering the courts are concerned about it, but the Attorney-General is on a cost recovery exercise. Is this another penalty of the State Bank exercise that people, some of whom have no desire to go to court, suddenly find themselves being denied the opportunity to give a considered judgment to what was said about them.

I would not think that any reasonable person would expect that that should be the case. I am of the view that the majority of citizens who go to court are unaware that they have to pay the transcript fees and, when they seek a copy of them, they are horrified when the cost is beyond their financial resources. Even more concerning is that, if they are represented by a legal practitioner, if that legal practitioner obtains the transcript and has to pay for it and if the client is unable to pay, the legal practitioner is in financial difficulty. It is unbelievable that this situation should be allowed to continue. Obviously, there is a cost of having a fair judicial system, but surely there is a better way of doing things than the current arrangement. The cost of obtaining justice is terribly high in this State and this country. We need to be aware of that and it may be necessary to streamline some of our proposals, but eventually if someone is brought before the court they should be able to obtain the transcript without this massive financial burden being imposed upon them.

We have now reached the situation where, in some cases, if a matter is of a minor or trifling nature, it is better to plead guilty than to defend oneself. That is an indictment on this Parliament and the legal system: it is a clear indictment that people are placed in the situation where, if they defend themselves, they could lose the roof over their head. Members would have had people come to them who have been involved in discussing with their legal representatives how this matter can be overcome. This is just one of many fees that the Government has, unfortunately, seen fit to increase, the cost now being \$5 to \$6 per page for transcript.

Have we reached the situation where we will have to allow lawyers to tape-record proceedings? I understand that is not acceptable. If we continue down this track, they will have to tape-record the proceedings so that they can do their own transcript or play it back to know what has been said. If the court case goes for a week, the cost of the transcript will be horrendous.

We all recognise that someone has to pay the people who actually produce the transcript; it is a highly skilled operation and competent people do it. I have no problem with that but, at the end of the day, our democratic process is not a cheap operation and there are certain things that in a decent society we accept should be provided. I believe reasonable access to

the courts and the facilities is one of those things, so I look forward to this House exercising its proper duty, that is, disallowing these regulations and telling the Government, 'You have gone far enough. We have to re-examine this matter. You just cannot keep increasing these costs, because you are putting the courts out of the range of the average South Australian citizen and that is an unacceptable course of action.' I do not believe that any responsible member in either House of the South Australian Parliament should accept or be party to that course of action. I therefore look forward to the support of members and commend the motion to the House.

Mr McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr BECKER: I move:

That the seventh report of the Economic and Finance Committee on an inquiry into the use of external consultants by Government departments and statutory authorities be noted.

It is a shame that when this report was made public, in my opinion, it was not given the airing it deserved: when it was tabled in the House, a motion that the report be noted should have been moved. Unfortunately, that was an oversight by the Chairman of the committee. I do not want to be critical of the Chairman, as I am a member of that committee but, since the legislation covering parliamentary committees was amended, we are still going through a procedure of establishing the proper format for noting and tabling of reports.

The report into the use of external consultants, in my opinion, was most significant, one that should be noted by every Minister and every senior and middle management public servant, because the committee reported in the presiding member's foreword:

During the five year period considered by this inquiry, July 1987 to June 1992, an amount of \$146 million was spent on consultancies by Government departments and statutory authorities in South Australia. There can be little doubt that some of this was effectively spent on purchasing services not readily available in the public sector. Likewise from evidence there is little doubt that a vast amount of money was expended without a thorough analysis of the available services within the public sector.

So, the committee was concerned right from the outset about the sum that was involved and the procedures adopted by the various departments in appointing consultants. The foreword continues:

The evidence put forward to support the decision to engage a consultant was, in many instances, incomplete. In some agencies few, if any, records were kept and in the case of the State Bank hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of consultancies could not be accounted for in the first instance. This report covers conditions of engagement and the necessity to keep appropriate records.

Again, when we look at the operations of the Government, when we look at the operations of statutory authorities in South Australia, we note that it is a tragedy that we often have to refer to the State Bank. In the period under review, the State Bank of South Australia spent \$17 929 425 on consultancies. What an indictment it was when we discovered that, in the first instance, the bank could not give us a thorough and detailed review of all the consultancies—who was engaged, why and the procedure used. I think that indicated to us, as a committee, some of the problems that the State Bank had been experiencing over the period of that very flamboyant management.

On page 44 of the committee's report it states:

Written evidence on the usage of consultants by the State Bank revealed a number of problems with respect to information provided: State Bank consultancies for the period 1 July 1987 to 30 June 1992 are detailed in the report: there were initially 62 and the total amount spent on them was \$768 678, representing 3.5 per cent. Consultants' details were not provided regarding the problem involved. Subsequently there were 61 consultancies and the amount spent was \$534 147, involving, again, 3.5 per cent, with the purpose of the consultancy not provided. The total number of consultancies was 1 727, on which \$17 929 424 was spent. One can see that it was a huge operation within the State Bank. The committee report states:

Within the group where consultants' details were not provided were individual consultancies worth \$149 141 and \$57 110. There were three consultancies in excess of \$50 000 within the \$534 147, that is the group where the purpose of the consultancy was not provided. There were seven consultancies where neither the consultants' details nor the purpose of the consultancy was given. When questioned about the anomalies in the original submission the bank stated in evidence:

We have employed a couple of temporary people from the university to go through the past ledgers of the bank to extract all that information. The records that we do keep will not give us detailed breakdowns of where the money has been paid. . . (Minutes of evidence dated 16 December 1992, page 170.)

In written evidence subsequent to the public hearing the bank defended its position in relation to the inadequate record keeping by stating:

There were a number of consultancies reported on the schedule originally given to the committee where the consultant was described as 'consultancy' because the source documentation for each payment could not be located in the time frame available.

(Letter, 15 January 1993, from the Under Treasurer, Mr P. Emery)

The bank's investigations resulted in establishing the relevant details for each payment apart from one amount of \$7 775 which could still not be located. Evidence presented to the committee highlights similar problems in many other public sector agencies. The committee finds that inaccurate and incomplete recording systems maintained by public sector agencies provide misleading and inadequate information.

It is unbelievable to think that one of the top banks in Australia at the time, a financial institution of the size and success of the State Bank, could not give us those details. It took considerable effort to obtain the information from that organisation, and it was unfair for the committee to be treated in such a way. Is it any wonder that the taxpayers of South Australia have had to expend some \$35 million in legal and auditing fees to now find out what happened to the \$3 150 million loss, which I understand, when one takes into account the interest involved on that debt, now hits almost \$4 000 million.

The committee has recommended that changes be made to the relevant Commissioner for Public Employment circulars to disallow post-separation employment in the public sector where an employee resigns voluntarily without compensation with the specific intention of regaining full or part-time employment at a higher rate, whether the employment status is temporary, contract, consultancy, permanent or by appointment. I am sure that the receipt of a South Australian superannuation retirement benefit excludes an employee from re-employment in the public sector in the capacity of a consultant. The committee recommends that employees who resign without compensation and without the intention of regaining employment be eligible for re-employment in the future without prejudice, based on the merit principles of selection of other policies relating to outside employment. The committee found that public servants were resigning their positions and then being re-

engaged by the various Government agencies as consultants. Page 38 of the report states:

The committee received evidence from Tourism SA about an employee who was declared surplus to requirements and was subsequently appointed as a consultant. The ex-employee was engaged to ensure the completion of three separate projects on which work had previously been done. The ex-employee received a total of \$18 300 in consulting fees. It is not clear from evidence if that employee received a redundancy package; however, the committee questions the cost advantage of separating an employee before completing a task and then re-employing them as a consultant.

The South Australian Health Commission provided the committee with a total of 23 examples where persons have terminated their employment from either the central office, a health unit or a grant funded agency and had subsequently been engaged as an external consultant.

Of the 23 past employees 17 resigned, one person retired, one accepted a voluntary separation package and one person had terminated because the position was abolished.

The employee whose position was abolished received a termination payment of \$63 447 plus other statutory obligations. From the date employment ceased, which was August 1989 until 30 April 1992, the ex-employee was engaged in 17 consultancies by the central office and various health units at a total cost of \$101 837. The range of projects included appointing the joint chief executive officer of the Mount Pleasant and Gumeracha District Hospitals, assessing a cook-chill catering system, financial management and planning, general management reviews and providing a submission on the future of the Onkaparinga District Hospital. When we consider the sums involved, that is one of the worst examples: that person received a termination payment of \$63 000-odd and then went back and was engaged in the department and received another \$101 000. The report continues:

The Health Commission gave evidence concerning the central office employee who accepted a voluntary separation package. The employee received a VSP of \$36 239 and other statutory obligations. The ex-employee has been engaged in consultancy work for the commission from the period employment ceased.

The committee finds these practices of the South Australian Health Commission unacceptable. It is alarmed at the large number of past employees engaged as external consultants. The practice that allows employees who have gained valuable skills and expertise at the agency's expense to resign and offer skills back to the public sector in a consultancy capacity at a higher price should be actively discouraged.

Of the committee's many recommendations, one involved annual reporting. As a result of the Public Accounts Committee's sixty-first report on accountability, tabled in Parliament on 5 September 1990, the Government Management Board amended its guidelines entitled 'Preparation of annual reports', now requiring financial information in relation to the use of external consultants by agencies to be included in annual reports. The information shall be based on the total cost paid to the consultants grouped in ranges below \$10 000, \$10 000 to \$50 000 and above \$50 000.

For consultancies above \$10 000 the guideline requires the agency to list the title of the consultancy and the contracted consulting organisation or consultant. In the group below \$10 000 per consultancy, agencies must indicate the total number of consultancies, and the total expenditure on all consultancies for the year must be included in the annual report. The committee notes that the amended guideline was issued in May 1992, and the majority of agencies did not include consultancy information in annual reports for the financial year ended 30 June 1992. The committee expects that agencies will have implemented the guideline and included information on external consultancies in their annual report for the financial year ended 30 June 1993.

This afternoon, after Question Time, the Auditor-General's Report was tabled in the House. I have not had an

opportunity to go right through it, but on a very quick flick through I noted that the Lotteries Commission was referred to (page 175) under 'External Consultants', and it was stated that the total expenditure on consultants was \$172 000 for 1993 compared with \$223 000 for 1992. There were five consultancies. The report names those consultants under the various categories that I have mentioned, and I commend the Lotteries Commission for having done that. It has set out exactly what the committee had recommended to the Government. As I said, I cannot do justice to any other Government department because I have not had the opportunity to look through the Auditor-General's Report to this stage, but I hope that that sets a pattern for all the other Government departments, and I know that some of the Government departments are quite efficient.

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

LAKE EYRE BASIN

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House:

- (a) rejects the concept of world heritage listing for the Lake Eyre region because it does not guarantee protection of environmentally significant and highly sensitive areas, in particular the Coongie Lakes and the Mound Springs, but does jeopardise pastoral and mining pursuits important to South Australia; and
- (b) believes more energetic and speedier protection of the State's environmental and economic interests in the Lake Eyre Basin are necessary and so recommends the adoption of the Liberal Party's policy on this issue.

In moving this motion, I wish to make the point that there are some very significant environmental areas in the Lake Eyre Basin area. The Lake Eyre Basin area contains the Coongie Lakes and the Mound Springs, which are very unique and which are also very important habitats for world—

Mr Atkinson: It can't be very unique, only unique.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, they are very unique. One could put the honourable member in that category, too. I stress that the Coongie Lakes is a very significant area for flora and fauna in South Australia, and the Mound Springs are, of course, unique because they are part of the Great Artesian Basin. So, therefore, the Liberal Party has put down a definite policy for how to protect these two significant areas. That policy includes the immediate allocation of \$1 million to complete a number of studies in relation to these significant areas; and, secondly, our making sure that a management plan is implemented in these areas.

That management plan would include the fencing off of the Mound Springs to restrict tourist access and to make sure that any damage that was caused by stock would be minimised, because the Mound Springs themselves are on pastoral leases. I understand there is limited fencing at present. I have not had the opportunity to see either the Mound Springs or the Coongie Lakes but I do understand from members of my own Party who have seen them that they are unique. It concerns me that no action has been taken by this State Labor Government over the past 11 years to protect these significant areas.

The other issue that concerns me greatly is that the Federal Labor Party, immediately prior to the Federal election, decided that there should be a joint study between the South Australian Government and the Federal Government with the possibility of world heritage listing for the entire Lake Eyre

Basin region. The Conservation Council has sent me a map which outlines the area that it would like to see listed under world heritage listing. It covers a vast area of South Australia, stretching from the New South Wales border, across to the equivalent height of Port Augusta and the Flinders Ranges, and then taking in the whole of Lake Eyre itself and the basin that runs into Lake Eyre, right through to the Aboriginal lands on the western side of the State. In fact, it covers an area of 25 per cent of South Australia. I have a grave concern that we are going into a process, if we enter into that study, of locking up 25 per cent of South Australia and imposing upon it significant economic uncertainty.

Let me detail why there would be this economic uncertainty. Under world heritage listing there are significant restrictions on the activities that can be carried on within that area. In particular, it would mean that mining could not continue to operate. I know that the Minister of Mineral Resources argues against that, but what he fails to acknowledge publicly is that nowhere in the world, to my knowledge, is mining carried on within a world heritage listed area: the two just are not compatible. The OECD itself, in response to a letter sent to the Director-General of the Minister's own department, has clearly indicated the incompatibility between mining and world heritage listing. So it is stupid for the Minister to be saying that there should be sponsorship of world heritage listed areas by the mining companies. That is just unacceptable; it is just not feasible. It is like asking a mining company to take a cyanide pill—and they are certainly not about to do that.

Already we have seen, too, that the prospect of world heritage listing, or even the prospect of a joint study into world heritage listing, has created enormous uncertainty for the pastoral leases. At least one of those pastoral properties has been visited by its bank with the threat of calling up part of the bank's overdraft and reducing the level of loans permitted for that property because of the prospects of world heritage listing. Enormous financial uncertainty is created for the pastoral properties involved if the banks and other financial institutions are requiring those properties to reduce the level of their borrowings, and to do so immediately just because of the future prospects of world heritage listing. Of course, there are other very significant tourist operations within that area, and the same economic or financial uncertainty would apply to those operations as well.

I understand that, although the joint study was announced prior to the Federal election in March this year, still neither the terms of reference of the joint study nor the South Australian appointments to it have been finalised. So we have had six months of uncertainty already, which should not be allowed to continue, but I understand on top of that we are about to have a further two, three or perhaps even four years of uncertainty during that joint study by the Commonwealth and the States. One can imagine the extent to which those pastoral properties, the tourist operations and certainly mining exploration in that area will grind to a halt, or will certainly be very significantly reduced during that period as a result of the uncertainty over world heritage listing.

I know that this is of some interest to you, Madam Acting Speaker, because it is part of the electorate for which you are a candidate at the next election. I am disappointed that you have not put pressure on your own Party to ensure this issue is resolved quickly and to ensure that your Party rejects the proposal of a joint study and, therefore, rejects the uncertainty that would be imposed on one-quarter of South Australia.

I know that the current member for Eyre, Mr Graham Gunn, has been a very strong advocate for rejecting the proposal for a joint study into removing that uncertainty. He has been an outstanding advocate for the pastoral properties, tourist operations and miners who are in that area. I have been visited by some of the mine operators, and they have expressed concern about the damage that would result from a two or three year period of uncertainty. The ironic thing is that it has been this Labor Government that has carried out aerial magnetic seismic surveys over much of the State in the hope of attracting exploration to South Australia, yet much of that survey work has been carried out in the proposed area for world heritage listing. It is this Government that is about to embark on a joint study that will stop that exploration. In other words, \$12 million of taxpayers money will be wasted if we go into that joint study.

I stress that there is a clear alternative which allows this State to protect those environmentally sensitive areas, and that is exactly what a Liberal Government will do immediately it is in office. A Liberal Government will make sure there is appropriate protection of the Coongie Lakes and the Mound Springs, and that there is money to back that up. A total of \$1 million of State funds have been allocated by the Liberal Party to use in Government to implement a management plan immediately to protect those areas. I hope that this House joins with the Liberal Party and supports that policy so we can remove the financial uncertainty and at the same time make sure there is suitable environmental protection.

I know that the member for Eyre very strongly supports this motion. I know that our shadow Minister of Environment and Land Management, Mr Wotton, also very strongly supports this resolution, because he sees it as one way of immediately achieving protection for the Mound Springs and Coongie Lakes. I urge the House to support this important resolution. If for some reason we should head off as a State and adopt the policy of the present Labor Government and support what is proposed by the Federal Labor Government, I believe it will place a great deal of uncertainty on South Australia's mineral exploration. It will certainly place a big question mark over the heads of the mining operators, the pastoralists and the tourist operators.

I also bring to the attention of the House the fact that it has been the Queensland Labor Government that has rejected any proposal for a joint study with the Federal Government. It is interesting that it has seen the damage and economic uncertainty that would be inflicted as a result of participating in that study. So, it is appropriate that South Australia follows the line taken by the Federal Government and rejects this proposal. I have a great deal of pleasure in moving the motion.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this Parliament congratulates the Crows, their coaching staff, officials and in particular the players for their magnificent win in their first AFL elimination final at the MCG on 5 September and proudly acknowledges their contribution to the standing of South Australia within the AFL competition.

In doing so, I certainly wish them good luck in their encounter with Carlton this Saturday in Victoria. I am sure that all South Australians join me in congratulating the Crows

on their magnificent win against Hawthorn last Sunday. The press reported that some 55 287 people attended the MCG, amongst which were some 20 000 Crows supporters who reportedly travelled to Melbourne for the game. They went and supported the team which defeated Hawthorn, the most successful AFL team in the past decade with five premierships, and I think proved conclusively that Adelaide is a force to be reckoned with, and in fact could beat one of the top Victorian teams on their home ground.

It is interesting to see how this feat was picked up in the *Advertiser* editorial, which gave credit once again where credit was due. I quote from that editorial, as follows:

It is not difficult to find a national parallel for the Crows triumph. Ten years ago, Australia was a united and a jubilant nation, thanks to the winged keel and victory in the America's Cup. . . it was, and for all that came after it, a shining example of David taking on Goliath. So it is with the Crows. This was a football match and very much more. This is the spirit of South Australia. This is getting together, getting down to it and doing it the hard way.

Another journalist made the observation, 'Not since Neil Armstrong went moonwalking some 24 years ago has Adelaide been so captivated.' The article continues:

By 1.30 p.m. yesterday, the city's streets were silent. Shops were deserted. Pubs were quiet. Cinemas struggled for trade. Even the dinosaurs of Jurassic Park were dwarfed by the live telecast of the Crows' historic finals appearance. Hundreds of thousands of football supporters were glued to television sets across the State to watch the Crows do battle with Hawthorn.

The thing that came through to us all out of this whole phenomenon and the way South Australia has rallied to the Crows is that South Australia is now seen to be a force within the AFL competition, and the State has an enormous amount of pride in the Crows as a football club as a result of its achievements on the football arena. I can say that South Australia is very proud of Graham Cornes, Chris McDermott and the team, and also the magnificent support staff that assist at training and on competition days.

It is interesting to see how the Crows prepared for this competition. With the assistance of people such as Graham Winter, they have prepared themselves right down to the detailed mission statements. They have thought through their corporate plan and objectives. They have sought out where they want to go. They have set their goals, they have maintained those goals and they are being highly successful. It is interesting to see how private companies and corporations are looking to the mission statement of the Crows and learning that the coordination and team work on the field can be transposed back into the corporate sector, and one can learn what team work and teammanship is all about.

The Parliament and the people of South Australia wish the Crows well on Saturday. I am sure that those of us who are able to get over there will enjoy the game immensely. The Opposition intends to be there. We will be roundly supported by our Leader (Hon Dean Brown), the member for Bragg (Mr Graham Ingerson), myself as the shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport, the member for Kavel (Mr Olsen) and the Whip (Mr Stan Evans). We will all be there to see the Crows, and we will barrack to such an extent so that if we walk back onto the aircraft unable to speak because of hoarseness we will have played our small role well. We wish the team well as this season draws to a conclusion. Every South Australian is proud of the team's achievements thus far, and I know we can look forward to the Crows going from strength to strength as this season draws to its conclusion and as we look forward to new seasons in the years ahead.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I move:

Leave out the word 'and' after the words '5 September' and add to the end of the motion the words 'and expresses the hope that their efforts can carry them through to the further success this year which they so richly deserve'.

It is with great pleasure that I rise to support this motion, which I am sure will pass speedily and unanimously with the support of members of both sides and with not too much in the way of hot air. I think the air should be left to pump up the 'McSherrin', which is what we should call the football now that it has a McDonald's advertising logo on it. Three years ago on 15 August 1990 I had a lot to say to the House regarding the clandestine machinations of the AFL hierarchy and the Port Adelaide Football Club regarding a South Australian club seeking to enter the AFL competition and betray their SANFL comrades. Fortunately, that clandestine attempt failed. However, as I predicted in the House on that day three years ago, the composite Adelaide Football Club has been an outstanding success.

I have had a season ticket for the Crows on the eastern side of Football Park in the outer for the past three years, and I have shared in the pleasure of so many people (40 000-48 000 on some weekends) who have followed the Crows from their first stunning victory over Hawthorn in that night match in 1991. Last Sunday I had the great privilege of being one of the 20 000—

The Hon. M.K. Mayes: Plus.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: —plus Crows supporters (including the Minister who has just briefly interjected to indicate his support) who witnessed the stunning victory that the Adelaide Football Club had against Hawthorn. By coincidence, this great victory, as with its first victory in 1991, was against Hawthorn, that mighty Victorian club. Last Sunday it was a great privilege to have been there to see them in their first finals match. Unfortunately, I am unable to go this Saturday as I have other parliamentary duties that will prevent me from doing so, but like hundreds of thousands of South Australians I will be glued to the television set on Saturday afternoon to watch them take on Carlton for the right to enter a grand final in only their third year, and I am fairly confident they can win.

Shortly after the ball was bounced last Sunday afternoon there was a roar from the crowd as Weidemann flattened Darren Jarman with a very fair hip and shoulder bump.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: It was a very fair hip and shoulder bump, in spite of what the current member for Hanson might think. Anyway, I thought for a moment that I heard the familiar 'Weed' chant coming from the crowd. I thought, 'That can't be right; there can't be that many Crows supporters here. These must be Hawthorn supporters who are booing.' Shortly afterwards the ball went down to the Hawthorn end and seemed to go between the white posts. I heard again a great roar from the crowd seated at that end, and I had a sinking feeling that Hawthorn had scored the first goal of the match, but it was not that at all. They were all Crows supporters who were cheering the fact that it was only a point.

The 20 000 Crows supporters who were there last Sunday obviously made lots more noise than the two-thirds of the crowd who were supporting Hawthorn. The success of the Crows shows what can be done when the whole community gets behind something instead of knocking it, and I hope that their example will inspire us all in our growth as a State. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion, as amended.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to support this motion. I point out that, unfortunately, the honourable member opposite in moving the amendment has left out what I think is a very important part of the motion, that is, the words 'proudly acknowledges their contribution to the standing of South Australia within the AFL competition'. I hope that there was no significant intention in doing that. I think that is really the guts of the whole thing.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The member for Bragg has misunderstood my amendment, which is merely to delete the word 'and' and add other words to the end of the resolution. The words mentioned by the honourable member are not deleted.

Mr INGERSON: I think it is important in making this speech of support today that, as a person who is fairly directly involved in and very proud of the club, I recognise at this stage the team's magnificent effort, because there has probably been no team in South Australia in any arena that has had such immediate support from the sporting community and also what one could call almost immediate success. When we look back at the achievement of many South Australian athletes in all areas of sport, for the Crows to have come from not being in the competition to being in the top six within three years is a magnificent effort.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes: The top four now.

Mr INGERSON: I will get to that in a minute. In congratulating the club I think it is important to go back a little in history and recognise, as has the member for Walsh, that three years ago there was a traumatic period when one of Adelaide's leading clubs wanted to do it by itself. I believe that fortunately for football in this State the South Australian National Football League under the excellent stewardship of Mr Max Basheer decided to enter into the competition with a composite team. I think that has now turned out to be an excellent decision. As I have said, the result of that team's rise from zero to being in the top six is excellent.

It is also important to note what the member for Unley said, that it is has not only made it into the top six but has now moved into the top four in less than three years. An interesting method is used to work out where each team finishes and how they play in the finals series, but it has worked very well for the Crows. Hopefully, they will perform well against Carlton, who without its South Australian stars would probably be an easy team to beat. As I said earlier, I must commend the excellent work of the President of the South Australian National Football League, Mr Max Basheer, in putting together this program. I note that the member for Walsh agrees with that statement. Mr Basheer, along with Bob Hammond and a group of other supporters, was able to put together this excellent football club, but without the players and the coaching staff a football club is only a shell.

In particular, Graham Cornes, a person who has been maligned in many areas by many people over the past few years, has proven that his ability as a coach and a tactician and his ability to communicate with the young men who are involved in this football club is quite fantastic. He is backed up by some very good support coaching staff. It is important to mention when talking about any club the medical and training teams. I have a particular interest in the medical team this year as a young friend of mine has spent a lot of time with the medical staff. We must congratulate them on what they have done and recognise the effort they make to get some of the injured players back onto the ground each week.

It was interesting while watching television last Sunday to look up and see a lot of young stars who were unable to

make the team because of injury. This year there have been a lot of disappointing and quite catastrophic injuries to those young players. However, what the Crows have done for those young men, and in particular for this city, is that they have taught them that if they work hard, if they have a fairly strong desire to succeed and if they are encouraged and supported by a wide range of people—in this case, the South Australian community, in particular—almost anything can be achieved.

The reverse could have quite easily been the case. If they had been criticised when they had a few of the losses that they obviously were going to have, they would not have received the same encouragement. I believe that the backing of the South Australian community as much as the talent and other abilities that these young men have is one of the most important issues that has contributed to the success they now enjoy. The Crows have a significant tourism effect in this State, both positive and negative. They have a strong impetus when playing at home. It is an issue that we ought take up with the AFL. If the Crows get into the finals, there ought to be at least one final in South Australia so that we can benefit not only from seeing our players but from tourism. I am proud to be a South Australian, and I am proud to support the Crows.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Natural Resources): I support the amended motion and I wish to speak on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport who, unfortunately, is unable to be here at present because of a commitment and who I am sure endorses fully this support. Of course, he was there on Sunday to enjoy the spectacle, and it was a great match.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: He was, too. It was a great football match and a great experience. I intend to attend this Saturday at Waverley as well.

Mr Lewis: I thought you'd be out door knocking.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, I can door knock over there, because there will be as many South Australians over there—

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is exactly right. When we played Fitzroy, I went out door knocking, and I am afraid I got a very cool reception, so I realised I should have been at home watching it myself. What the member for Morphett and my colleague the member for Walsh have said is true. The fact is that it is fine to see the end result and to bask in the glory, as we are, but a lot of hard work has been put into this. The thing that we have going for us is that so many young players, 18 and 19 year olds, are playing at a standard which is the best football standard in Australia. When one sits on the sideline, watches just over the fence and sees the effort, energy and commitment, and the determination on their faces, it is quite staggering. I pay tribute to the management behind the team—the people who do the work, all those workers—

Mr Ingerson: And Max Basheer.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, I can go back. I was involved in that three years ago when we had an enormous disturbance in football in South Australia, and I have to say that I backed the SANFL in its position. I am proud to have been able to do that, and I can see the end result. The achievement has been so great because the management and the organisation behind the team has been outstanding. People such as Graham Winter and others who have supported the team in its efforts have all been a significant part of that machinery which has got the Crows to where they are

today. I have no hesitation in backing them for Saturday. I am sure they can beat Carlton. Their runners will outrun Carlton on the day. With talent such as young Ben Hart and Rodney Maynard coming into the side, we could not be in a better position.

I want to pay tribute to the young fellows who were out there on Sunday playing in their first finals match in the MCG. It is a hostile environment, there is no doubt about that. But they played with such commitment, dedication and experience that it was outstanding to see people such as young Bone, Sean Rehn and others put on a magnificent performance in that company against a side that has been in 12 consecutive finals. It is outstanding. I want to congratulate them. I have no doubt that they will be there in the grand final and will win the flag. That will be an enormous credit to all those people involved.

I know there are thousands of people who will be driving to the match on Friday night. As Minister responsible for the police, I plead with them to be careful and sensible on the road, because there will be so many going over and coming back that it will put the community at risk, and some of them might not get there to enjoy it unless they are careful. So just be sensible on the road.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In winding up the debate, I refer briefly to Monday's *Advertiser* after the success against Hawthorn, which had the simple statement:

Of all the remarks made by the faithful who came to Melbourne by road, rail and air, none enforced what the Crows had achieved more than the sign: 'We came. We saw. We crowded.'

I hope that all the supporters will be able to once again sit around that sign on Sunday morning with the satisfaction that they played a part in giving support to the team. We wish the team well and, wherever they end up in the final AFL competition this year, they can truly crow from the roof tops, because South Australia is proud of them.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

LIFELINE

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

That this House congratulates the Adelaide Central Mission's Lifeline on having obtained its thirtieth anniversary, commends and expresses thanks to the paid and volunteer staff who have given many thousands of hours in helping people in crisis and wishes the new friends of Lifeline organisations well in providing further support for this magnificent community service.

It gives me considerable pleasure to move this motion, because if ever this State and this Parliament, representing people of South Australia, should be proud of an organisation, we should be proud of Lifeline, which this year and this month celebrates 30 years service to the South Australian community.

Volunteer counsellors have ensured during that time that a listening ear has been available every day and every night, 24 hours a day. In its first year, Lifeline Adelaide received 873 calls. It was the second centre to open in the world. Today, there are 40 Lifeline centres around the world, from Japan to Canada, from Fiji to South Africa. Since Lifeline Adelaide took its first call in August 1963, it has had an enormous impact in South Australia. During the course of 30 years, Lifeline has provided 10 950 days of continual service and dealt with over 360 000 telephone calls, in addition to over 75 000 face-to-face counselling appointments.

The Adelaide Central Mission has been the vehicle of linking those who help with those in need—people helping

people—and would record its application to thousands of volunteers for their invaluable contribution to this State. I strongly support the work of this organisation because of the thousands of people who have been helped during the 30 year period.

I also record on behalf of the House the thanks of all those who have recognised the magnificent assistance that has been provided through this organisation on the part of both paid and volunteer staff. As I have already pointed out, the numbers who have been helped is significant and so is the number of people who have helped in a voluntary capacity.

Since 1963, Lifeline has grown significantly, and I would like to refer to some figures to indicate just how significant that growth has been. In 1963 there were 25 volunteers; this year, 30 years later, there are 180 volunteers. In 1963, 900 telephones calls were received; in 1993, 17 000 calls were received. In 1963 there was no face-to-face counselling—that started at a later stage; this year in 6 500 situations people have been helped face-to-face.

Lifeline is a magnificent organisation and it is one that receives significant support from the community in this State. However, I would suggest that there is always room for more volunteers to help out in this vital work. I have had the opportunity to speak to those who are responsible for this organisation and I realise the immense amount of good that they do. I also realise the enormous amount of time that is put in to training on the part of volunteers and, of course, paid staff so that these people are equipped to be able to deal with some of the incredible situations that they face. I am sure that members of the House would recognise the crises that some people find themselves in and the problems that they have when they find it necessary to turn to an organisation such as Lifeline. Thank goodness we have an organisation such as Lifeline able to respond.

I understand that this year 70 per cent of Lifeline's counselling appointments have been linked to domestic violence. That, too, I am sure would be of concern to all members. During the late 1970s, Lifeline received a modest grant from the Government and for more than a decade the mission has had to rely entirely on the goodwill of the community to sustain the service at a cost of \$251 000 per annum.

If we look at a summary of the important dates, we see that it was on 16 March 1963 that Lifeline Sydney opened, and on 1 August Lifeline Adelaide opened. In 1971, the second telephone line was installed and in March 1972 Youthline opened as a telephone counselling service for young people. In 1972, 15 people trained to form a new marriage counselling service in response to the large number of calls dealing with marital and family problems.

On 1 December, an after hours walk-in counselling service became available in the evenings and on weekends. In March 1974, 34 drop-in centres opened stemming from the Youthline service. The centre is for young people not using traditional welfare services. In April 1974, Youthline Whyalla opened. In February 1975, the Lifeline Marriage Counselling Service was accredited by the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department. The service also receives Federal funding. On 22 October 1976, a new walk-in centre opened in the Mission House basement and on the same day Lifeline opened a third telephone line.

It was in 1976 that Lifeline's trouble teams were discontinued because at that stage the Department of Community Welfare opened Crisis Care and, although not intending to compete with Lifeline, the need for trouble teams decreased.

In June 1979, Youthline and Lifeline amalgamated. In 1984, Lifeline staff and many of the people who were involved began to staff a phone on behalf of the Health Commission for people wanting to give up smoking.

In April 1984, the mission opened financial counselling services, which provide a more specialised service than Lifeline can offer. In March 1986, Lifeline began its 24-hour TTY service for deaf people. In 1992, the training program implemented to assist Lifeline volunteers to counsel those concerned about AIDS and HIV was introduced. In 1992 also, the Adelaide Central Mission launched the Can the Recession appeal to raise some \$30 000 worth of food to help Lifeline meet the demand for food assistance. In June this year, the national Lifeline number was launched. So, it is quite clear that Lifeline Adelaide has served this community very well indeed.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In closing, on behalf of this Parliament and the community of South Australia, I want again to thank those who have worked and those who continue to work so hard to assist others. As I said earlier, it involves people working for people, and it is a magnificent example of what can be achieved by those who have a mission. I also want to wish the new Friends of Lifeline organisation well in providing further support for this magnificent community service. I was fortunate enough to be able to attend the actual celebration of the 30th anniversary of this organisation which was hosted by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide. It was on that occasion that the Friends of Lifeline organisation was launched. I am delighted that at this stage only a few people have made it their business to make sure that this organisation provides the much needed support for Lifeline. I commend Mrs Wylie, who has taken on the position of the chair of that organisation, and I wish her well, as I do with all who will work with her and, in turn, all those who will work towards assisting Lifeline.

Finally, if members on either side of the House have not taken the opportunity to see how Lifeline works or to find out more about Lifeline, may I suggest that they do so. I would commend Lifeline to all members. I would sincerely hope that members in this place will not need the services of Lifeline but I am sure many of us know constituents who have been helped by making a telephone call or by receiving a service provided by that organisation. I commend this motion to the House.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CYCLING TEAM

Mr De LAINE (Price): I move:

That this House congratulates the Australian Cycling Team, and in particular the South Australian members of the team, for their history making performance in becoming, for the first time, the number one cycling nation in the world at the current World Cycling Championships in Hamar, Norway.

In moving this motion I want to outline to members of the House some of the outstanding achievements of the Australian cyclists at the recent world championships in Hamar, Norway. In this series the Australian riders performed fantastically well to out-perform easily all other countries and to become, for the first time in history, the world number one

track cycling nation. The Australian team's tally for the series was three gold and two silver medals. In fact, in six events our lowest placing was seventh place. Gary Neiwand, the 26-year-old sprinter from Victoria, continued his steady progress in recent years to win two gold medals. Gary is the dual Commonwealth sprint champion, having won gold at the last two Commonwealth games, and he was the silver medallist at the Barcelona Olympic Games last year.

He has gone on to further improve and reverse the Olympic Games placings last year, winning the gold medal and becoming World Sprint Champion for 1993. He was the fastest qualifier with the best ever time by an Australian of 10.25 seconds for the fly in 200 metres, which equates with just over 70 kilometres per hour. That is a fantastic time. The silver medallist was Fiedler from Germany, who won the gold medal in Barcelona last year, with a time of 10.348 seconds; and third fastest was a pleasant surprise for Australia: 19-year-old Darryn Hill from Western Australia with a time of 10.433 seconds. That was a fabulous performance for one so young. I remember seeing this lad when he was 15 years of age, and he impressed me tremendously.

A couple of days later Gary Neiwand went on to win the gold medal in the Kierin Championship, which is a motor-paced event for sprinters. Mr Deputy Speaker, you would no doubt be very familiar with these sorts of races, being a former racing cyclist yourself. Our third gold medal came with the four-man 4 000 metre teams pursuit event in which Australia has specialised in recent years. This event was won by Australia at the Los Angeles Olympic Games in 1984. We won the gold medal, and that was followed by bronze in the world amateur titles the following year. Then followed the silver medal at last year's Barcelona Olympic Games. Now the Australians have won the gold in the world championship.

Even more important here is that the Australian team won the world championship in the world record time of 4 minutes 3.84 seconds, breaking the Russians' world record time by almost two seconds and defeating the Germans, the team that beat us last year for gold in the Barcelona Games, by almost six seconds.

The team consisted of Brett Aitken (22 years of age) from South Australia; Stuart O'Grady (20) also from South Australia and, proudly for me, a member of the Port Adelaide Amateur Cycling Club; Tim O'Shannessey (21) from Tasmania; and Billy-Jo Shearsby (20) from Victoria. This victory was truly fairytale stuff because half the team had been lost since the Barcelona Games last year. Two of the riders, Stephen McGlede from New South Wales and Shaun O'Brien from Victoria, have temporarily retired to try to earn some money to sustain themselves; and Charlie Walsh, the national coach, was telling me that he intended this year to be a rebuilding year to prepare the team for the 1994 Commonwealth Games and the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta. It proved to be an extraordinary performance, half the team comprising new members who are youngsters, and we have won the gold medal in world record time, so it is easily our best year ever.

Another two factors which made the teams pursuit gold medal win even more remarkable was, first, that Brett Aitken underwent serious surgery on a knee after last year's Olympic Games and was unable to ride his bike until December. In those few months he has been able to get back on the bike and put in a world class performance. Secondly, our team raced on conventional steel alloy framed bikes built by Brian Hayes here in Adelaide. Most of the other teams, including the Germans, had the latest state of the art carbon fibre

frames, which reputedly give many seconds advantage over the 4 000 metres. Despite that fact the Australians rode the steel frames and still took six seconds out of the Germans in the final.

The next event in which we did very well was the 1 000 metre time trial, where Shane Kelly, a 21-year-old from Victoria, won the silver medal and was beaten by a mere one tenth of a second. He also won the silver medal in the Barcelona Olympic Games. Shane was very unlucky; he has improved substantially since the games last year but a new innovation has been introduced in cycling for the standing start time trial, and I refer to starting gates. There are none of these machines available in Australia as yet, and Shane had not had the advantage of practising out of the starting gates. Despite Charlie Walsh's efforts to arrange for gates to be available during the last week to enable Shane to practise, his efforts came to no avail because they did not arrive until just before the event. So, Shane was probably the only rider in the event who had not had the advantage of practising out of these starting gates. It was a remarkable performance under those circumstances to finish second; only one-tenth of a second down.

Another silver medal was won by our tandem team of Stephen Pate from Victoria and Danny Day of Queensland in the 2 000 metre tandem event. They rode the fastest qualifying time but were knocked off their bikes in the semi-final by the Germans and were badly shaken. Despite this, they performed very bravely in the final and were narrowly defeated for gold, taking the silver medal.

It was the first time the world titles were run as an open event (that is, at the track titles), which means that both amateur and professional riders took part; but the road titles remain separate amateur and professional events. It is interesting to note that the winners of all events were amateurs, and this has been the case for many years. A lot of people think that professionals are always better, but in cycling that is not the case. The only difference between the two is that professionals ride for money and amateurs do not. Normally, the amateurs have been the better performers.

The two best performances at the world championships were Gary Neiwand with two gold medals, and the Australian team pursuit which claimed the world record. As I mentioned, there were two South Australians in that team: Brett Aitken and Stuart O'Grady from the Port Adelaide club. In addition, there were four other South Australians who were key people in the team which Charlie Walsh described as an extremely professional outfit. A large amount of the team's success is attributable to this very professional back-up team. Charlie Walsh, the national coach, has been universally recognised as arguably the best track coach in the world, and with this year's result in the world championships he is now the undisputed best track coach in the world. Charlie is being sought by many countries, and he told me the other night that he had been offered a blank cheque by one country to coach and live in that country. However, he loves living in Adelaide and the one thing that has probably swayed him to stay is the magnificent new velodrome that has been built in this city, so he will be staying on in the short term.

The next South Australian I would like to mention is Neil Craig, who is head of the Physical Fitness section of the South Australian Institute of Sport. He is a former league footballer and a top fitness expert. I believe he is one of the best fitness experts in the world. Dr Peter Barnes is the medical officer attached to the team. He is the coordinator of the medical and physical aspects of the cyclists, and he works

with them almost around the clock throughout the entire year. The other South Australian I would like to mention is a former racing cyclist with whom I raced. I refer to Brian Hayes, who is the official head mechanic of the team and, as I mentioned earlier, he built the bikes that the riders used to win their gold medals. He is an excellent bike builder and mechanic.

The other thing that makes me proud is the fact that these cyclists are drug free. Australia is among the leaders in the world in combating drug abuse, and cycling has been a sport in the past where there has been a lot of drug abuse over the years by European countries. This is being overcome by countries such as England, Canada, Belgium and Australia. Australia leads the field in this area and has introduced random drug tests, even during training sessions throughout the year. At top international level all medallists are tested, and there are random tests for other competitors.

Another point about Charlie Walsh's professionalism relates to when our team broke the world record. He immediately insisted that all four cyclists be drug tested to ensure there was no impediment to having the world record officially recognised; he is very professional. Having raced with Charlie and having known him for many years and coached with him, I think his main forte, apart from his technical knowledge and getting cyclists fit, is his ability to psychologically prepare and maintain cyclists. He is fantastic in that area.

He has the ability to get the best out of those people and get their minds right, as he calls it, and that is very important. It is probably more important than even the physical aspect. Stuart O'Grady, the youngest rider in the team, is a Port Adelaide rider, the son of one of my former racing colleagues, who has developed enormously. He only turned 20 two weeks before the world championships and he comes home as a world champion.

I remember back in 1954, when I won my first State championship, I was feted in Port Adelaide because I had achieved that distinction, but since then the Port Adelaide club has produced quite a number of national champions, with Michael Turtur and Ron Jonkers going on to win Commonwealth gold medals; Mike Turtur and Stuart O'Grady winning Olympic gold and silver medals; and now, at last, having a home grown, genuine world champion at 20 years of age. The club must find some way of recognising that tremendous feat.

One negative aspect of this matter is the reporting of these titles, and during the Barcelona Games I referred to the typical negative journalism of the *Advertiser*. These reporters are so used to being negative in this State that when they get something positive they cannot handle it. One of the headlines, referring to Kathy Watt, the Australian cyclist who won a gold medal at the last Olympic Games, stated, 'Aussie Watt crashes out in world pursuit'. The reader does not know whether she actually crashed or whether she was just defeated. In fact, when one reads the article one finds that she had had a bad day and was defeated.

The report starts off with that as a headline, that Australia went bad and was out of the event, and then down a couple of paragraphs we find the startling statement that Australia's team had just broken a world record and were favourites for the gold medal. What negative reporting! It is absolutely ludicrous. This happens time and time again with the media in this State, and it involves not only sport. It is absolutely atrocious.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I am almost out of time, so I will just close by saying that I am very pleased to be able to place on record the fantastic performance of Australia's team at this year's world championships, and I commend the motion to the House.

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

NATIONAL RAIL CORPORATION

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That this House totally rejects the decision to hand over to the National Rail Corporation the roadrailer operations and the Pasminco ore traffic on the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line and calls on the State Government to reject these proposals in the interests of all South Australians, the ongoing viability of Australian National and the employees of Australian National.

This matter is important, because traditionally Australian National has had the ability and the desire to continue to have the authority to cart ore from Broken Hill to Port Pirie. There was no need to hand over this activity to the National Rail Corporation, as there was no need to hand over to the National Rail Corporation the roadrailer operation, a concept which has been developed in Australia by Australian National with a view to improving the turnaround, making it more efficient to ship semitrailers from one side of Australia to the other at a reasonable rate, and getting them off the roads so that they can be effectively, cheaply and speedily transported across Australia.

Already the National Rail Corporation has increased freight rates, and I am told that certain companies that once used the railway—particularly that section to Alice Springs—have now taken them off the rail. One of those companies is a very large supermarket chain. I was surprised the other day to see the trucks on the road, and I have been informed since that the reason is that the National Rail Corporation has increased the freight rates by up to 25 per cent. That is already the result of this Government's weak attitude and lack of political guts to stand up to the Commonwealth Government and tell it that the operations are going effectively and not to interfere.

The concern is who and what will be next. We read in local newspapers that Ministers are making statements, but really at the end of the day they have not achieved anything. A clear undertaking was given by the Deputy Premier that they would not sign any agreement until there were built-in protections. They gave in and signed the agreement, and the Broken Hill traffic has gone; the roadrailer traffic has gone—what will be left of Australian National?

I have seen a consultant's report that clearly indicates that Australian National should keep the roadrailer service. That has gone. What will be next? The other interesting thing about all this is: how many train drivers will lose their jobs in the next few months as a result of these changed arrangements? I am told the number will be quite considerable. What will happen to those people? The State Government should tell this House how many people will be involved.

At the end of the day these two matters should have been resolved in the interests of the people of this State. This new concept of improving the freight handling facilities in Australia would have the support of most responsible Australians. However, it could have been achieved using the existing structures and arrangements involving Australian National. There was no need to have this new whiz-bang arrangement, which will now cause considerable heartbreak, ill-feeling and disruption, because people are unsure of

themselves and, in my view, it certainly will not be in the interests of the people of South Australia. We run the risk of seeing further services withdrawn and facilities downgraded because the people running the National Rail Corporation are quite obsessed, in my judgment, with dry economics and have little understanding of people and how those decisions will affect regional and local communities.

I just wonder, when this concept is totally operational, what railway lines will be affected. Will they move in and take over the Leigh Creek to Port Augusta line? Is that on their agenda? They have not said so, but they have not said they do not want to take it over. How many drivers will lose their positions at Port Augusta when this National Rail Corporation exercise is put into effect? We know they will have computerised operations and all sorts of gear. Obviously, they will start shedding people. Drivers have expressed concerns to me as late as Monday, so we are entitled to know. But what concerns me is: why is it necessary to put at risk employment opportunities in South Australia with this new concept when it is not necessary? No arguments have been advanced to clearly indicate that there are long-term advantages for South Australia. If they were concentrating their efforts on getting the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line in operation and not worrying so much about these other matters, there would have been some merit in it, but this new scheme, dreamt up by a number of people, certainly has not had much regard for South Australia. There is real concern—and it has been highlighted in the local newspapers (I am sure the member for Stuart is aware of it because she was mentioned in one of them)—in relation to the role of the State Government and its failure to stand up.

The Minister of Transport Development has indicated that she has had things to say to the Federal Minister. Well, that is fine, but what was the result? It is very easy to go along and say, 'Look, I have spoken to the Minister.' That is the oldest political trick in the world, but it does not indicate what success they have had. Anyone can talk to a Minister, anyone can write them letters, but at the end of the day what have they achieved? The Federal Minister does not have to listen but can make nice sounding noises and go away and do nothing. We are well used to that concept in South Australia, and that is what has happened in relation to this exercise.

So, this House should clearly indicate that it is not only unhappy but it will not accept these arrangements until guarantees are put in place to protect the interests of not only Australian National but the employees and services involved in South Australia.

This action is long overdue. The Government has been less than prudent in its management and its representations, and in the need to support these local communities. I therefore commend this motion to the House. There is a lot more that I could say, but I am conscious of the time factor and the fact that other members wish to bring matters to the attention of the House. I have briefly outlined the concerns expressed to me and I believe they are genuine and real, and there is a need to rectify what is an unnecessary course of action. The State Government should have shown more courage, more political guts and rejected them and assisted in improving the operations of Australian National.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GRAND PRIX

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House calls on the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board to engage only Australian artists for any concerts to be held after the main race at this year's Grand Prix and in subsequent years.

I am concerned at the amount of money spent by the Grand Prix Board in engaging overseas entertainers to put on a special concert after the Grand Prix. I do not mind being called a petrolhead. I do not mind being referred to as a motor racing enthusiast, because I do enjoy the spectacle, and I was delighted when we were able to secure the Formula One Grand Prix, but I was disappointed that South Australia did not secure a round of the motorcycle 500cc world championship. We could have had it, but this Government did not push hard enough. It was too timid at the time to accept it, but that is another story.

As far as the Australian Formula One Grand Prix is concerned, we have to look at the whole of the operation. We have to consider whether we can continue to sustain a loss of between \$4 million and \$4.5 million or more to stage the event for this country, and we also have to look at the tourism drawcard that it provides. I am a little disappointed that we are bringing in only about 2 500 overseas tourists, but on the other hand we bring in about 27 000 visitors from other States in Australia, so it does balance up a little bit of the loss with the football, but that again is another story. I believe that in the future we will be bidding as the host city for grand finals in Australian football, soccer and rugby league.

I cannot understand why it was necessary, as it was in 1992, to expend \$547 000 for the Sunday concert, and in 1991, \$632 000 for the concert. Once the main race is over, I am not interested in staying on. Having been there all day, I get fairly tired. Once the euphoria of the main event is over, I look forward to going home, and I would think that the vast majority of people in my age group or even younger would feel the same.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Well, it is. It is a bloody long day, to put it mildly, sitting out in the sun watching the cars whip around without having to wander down to some paddock and see Cher. I could not even be bothered. I would not even cross the road to see her. That turns me off. Some of the other entertainers are quite good, and we have some outstanding talent in Australia. We have young artists who have been more than successful in all countries around the world. I think it is a shame that we spend this sort of money, about \$500 000, to provide entertainment after the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. I would prefer the whole of the entertainment to comprise Australian artists.

Here is our opportunity to show off the best talent Australia has. Here is the opportunity to use the resources of our universities and institutions with respect to what they have created in the way of talent, be it in dance, orchestra or solo singers. Even our Aboriginal artists are hailed now as some of the greatest performers in the world. In fact, this year I would have gone for the Australian band, Yothu Yindi. Tina Turner—no thank you! It is reported that the rugby league spent about \$4 million making the commercial that features Tina Turner. I do not know whether that is true. I do not know how much she got out of it. It is certainly an outstanding commercial, which attracted a lot of people to rugby and highlighted rugby as entertainment and sport. However, I do not think I would pay about \$500 000 to have her perform at a concert. I think we are being used up by these foreign artists who come to Australia.

I know that rumours abounded that \$2 million was available to bring out Madonna or Michael Jackson to

perform after the Grand Prix. As a petrolhead, I think that would have been an absolute waste of taxpayers' money, to guarantee that sum of money, when there are people who cannot afford reasonable housing. There are some 70 000 people in South Australia who cannot get a reasonable job. There are tens of thousands of people in South Australia who are not fully employed to the best of their talents. I think this whole nonsense of booking overseas artists for this concert should cease and we should do all we can to encourage Australian talent for the whole of the concert, if such a concert is even deemed necessary.

I have been to many motorcycle championships, but I have not noticed concerts put on to attract people to the event. I think it is a reflection on the race itself. It is a reflection on the Formula One competitors—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr BECKER:—where we have the greatest collection of racing drivers in the world. No, if you ask me what should be done to support that event, I would go for a world championship touring car race. In other words, I would pit Australian touring car champion drivers against the best European drivers. Let us bring out the Volvos, the Vauxhalls, the Citroens and the Mercedes Benz—in other words, all the European cars—and match them against the best we have in Australia. I believe that more people from interstate would come to see Brock, Johnson and company compete against the best that Europe can offer, rather than go along and listen to some long-legged, half dressed female artist perform at such a distance that she appears like a speck.

If we have to have the concert, I believe we should use Australian artists. If we are prepared to spend that sort of money, we should spend it on Australian talent. Give them the opportunity to perform with the best facilities, bearing in mind that there may well be overseas talent scouts sitting in the audience. I challenge the Government and the Formula One Grand Prix Board to give far more consideration to Australian artists, and I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. M.D. RANN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PREMIER'S REMARKS

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House calls on the Premier to apologise to the member for Hanson for refusing to answer his verbal question on Wednesday 4 August 1993 by claiming that to answer the question would contravene Standing Orders 395 and 320 and by implying that the information on which the question was based was taken from a confidential schedule provided to the Economic and Finance Committee and for questioning the member for Hanson's integrity by such false allegations.

I have already said by way of personal explanation and grievance the concern that has been raised regarding the Premier's reply to the oral question that I raised in the House.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I do not think it is necessary to amend the motion: we know what we are talking about. The point is whether the Premier is good enough and big enough and has enough courage to admit that his advisers gave him the wrong information. A very simple apology would resolve the whole situation. It is unfortunate that it has come to this stage, that I have had to go to these lengths to move a private member's motion, using up the time of members of the House who want to raise other matters of concern regarding the State and their

constituency, and that I have to ask the Premier to reconsider his answer and to formally apologise.

I refer to page 159 of *Hansard* of 10 August 1993: the member for Playford, while speaking in the grievance debate, commented on my personal explanation regarding the Premier's statement. I will quote what the member for Playford said, because I think it is significant and important. He said:

Points were made about the various Standing Orders in respect of select committees but advice I have received from the clerk, with whom I had occasion to check out the position concerning evidence, documents and committee procedures some time ago—and I will go into that in a moment—clearly indicates that the Economic and Finance Committee—and, for that matter, the three other standing committees of the Parliament—are not encumbered by such Standing Orders.

That is clear proof, with an independent voice, as far as the political aspect is concerned, in support of my claim that the Premier was in error when he replied to my oral question. The member for Playford went on to say:

In fact, three sets of documents have come before the committee in my time in the Chair where confidentiality was agreed by all members of the committee. It was agreed that those documents would be handed back to the secretary and kept by the committee in confidence.

That reinforces my stance in objecting to the allegation that I used confidential information in posing that question. The committee evidence was not used. Subsequently, I called for those documents. I think, therefore, that it is quite clear that I did not use them. Certainly, my copies of all the documents were on my file which is kept in the office of the Economic and Finance Committee in the Riverside building. The member for Playford went on to say further:

I am not reflecting here on the member for Hanson about that, because he is a member for whom I have considerable respect, and I have always found him to be an honest and fair individual.

I therefore rest my case as far as this motion is concerned. I think we all know what it is about; it is self-explanatory. I commend to members the motion that the Premier formally apologise, and that will be the end of the issue.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETROL

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

That this House expresses its dissatisfaction with the current position whereby retail prices for petroleum products are considerably higher in most country areas than in the metropolitan area and, further, that this House condemns the major oil companies who grant frequent wholesale rebates to selected metropolitan service stations but do not extend this to country service stations.

In moving this motion, I wish to say that as a frequent road user, one who is forced to fill up with petrol frequently while on the road, I have always been concerned that in country areas there is not just a small difference in the price of petrol but a major one. I do not see how this can be substantiated. I know that the Deputy Premier also shares my concerns in this matter. In fact, he has spoken at great length on this issue and has also done a lot of work on surveys. I wish to quote some differences in prices between the metropolitan area and country areas from a statistical table which I seek leave to insert in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

WEEK	ADELAIDE	WHYALLA	PORT PIRIE	PORT AUGUSTA	PORT LINCOLN	MOUNT GAMBIER	BERRI
	cpl	cpl	cpl	cpl	cpl	cpl	cpl
1 high	66.3	74.6	70.9	71.9	69.9	71.9	69.9
low	70.9	74.9	70.9	74.9	70.9	73.6	73.9
2 high	66.7	74.6	70.9	72.5	69.9	73.2	66.9
low	71.9	74.9	70.9	75.9	70.9	73.6	73.9
3 high	66.7	74.6	70.9	72.5	69.9	73.2	72.9
low	70.9	74.9	70.9	77.9	70.9	73.6	73.9
4 high	66.7	74.6	70.9	72.5	61.5	73.2	72.9
low	70.9	74.9	70.9	75.9	64.5	74.9	73.9
5 high	66.1	74.6	70.9	72.9	71.9	73.5	72.9
low	70.9	74.9	70.9	75.9	71.9	73.6	73.9
6 high	67.3	74.6	70.9	72.9	71.9	73.5	72.4
low	71.9	74.9	70.9	75.5	71.9	73.6	73.9
7 high	66.5	74.6	70.9	72.9	71.9	73.5	72.9
low	71.9	74.9	70.9	75.9	71.9	73.6	73.9
8 high	67.3	74.6	70.9	72.9	71.9	73.5	72.9
low	71.9	74.9	70.9	75.9	71.9	73.6	73.9
9 high	66.5	74.6	70.9	72.9	71.9	73.5	72.9
low	72.9	74.9	70.9	75.9	71.9	73.6	73.9
10 high	66.5	74.6	70.9	72.9	71.9	73.5	72.9
low	72.9	74.9	70.9	75.9	71.9	73.6	73.9

Mrs HUTCHISON: The statistical table to which I refer is headed 'Petrol pricing in South Australia'. The Commissioner for Prices undertook a survey of the retail prices of super grade petrol at selected retail outlets in a number of the major regional centres in South Australia over a period of 10 weeks from the week ended 10 July 1992 to the week ended 10 September 1992. The results of that survey are as shown in the table. In the first week, prices in Adelaide ranged between 66.3¢ per litre and 70.9¢ per litre. In Whyalla they ranged from 74.6¢ to 74.9¢; in Port Pirie, 70.9¢ and remained at 70.9¢; in Port Augusta, 71.9¢ to 74.9¢; in Port Lincoln, 69.9¢ to 70.9¢; in Mount Gambier, 71.9¢ to 73.6¢; and in Berri, 69.9¢ to 73.9¢. In the 10 week high/low period, the price varied from 66.5¢ to 72.9¢ in Adelaide, and the price in the country centres remained reasonably stable, although there was a very minor difference between the high and the low. During the period of that survey, the maximum endorsed company price as set by the Prices Surveillance Authority varied between 60.18¢ per litre and 60.76¢ per litre. It is stated:

It must be pointed out that as only a limited number of outlets were surveyed in each town the prices shown as the 'high' and 'low' prices are simply the maximum and minimum prices in the sample surveyed and are not necessarily the maximum and minimum prices at which super grade petrol was being sold in each centre at the time.

A subsequent survey was carried out from 3 February to 3 March 1993, and this involved Whyalla, Berri and Mount Gambier, to show the high, low, most common and average prices paid at those centres. Whyalla, at the high end, was 73.9¢ and at the low end was 70.9¢. The most common price around the city at the major outlets was 73.9¢, giving an average of 73.4¢. In Berri it was 73.4¢, 71.9¢, 71.9¢ to 72.9¢, and the average was 72.6¢ at that centre. In Mount Gambier the price was 71.9¢, 70.4¢, 70.4¢ and 70.6¢. So, it was staying above that 70¢ per litre price, whereas in the metro-

politan area it was substantially lower because of the system of rebating or discounting.

This is the issue that really is of major interest to people in country areas, because petrol can be discounted and rebated at the whim of the major oil companies who will allow certain service stations to be able to offer petrol at a much cheaper price. Whilst I agree that this is a good thing for the city areas, I do think, in the interests of justice and equity, it should also be applied in country areas. One of the arguments being promoted for not using that procedure in country areas is the fact that the sites are low volume sites and, therefore, the economies cannot be justified. I do not happen to agree with that, and there is still room within that margin for the offering of a discounted rate to country motorists the same as applies in the metropolitan area. I know that the Motor Trade Association also was concerned about the major differences in those prices between city and country areas.

This matter has also come up at the Ministerial Council on Consumer Affairs, and I know that the South Australian Minister, the Hon. Anne Levy, was part of that debate at the last meeting. A motion was moved at that Ministerial Council of Consumer Affairs that this matter be looked at around the nation as an issue that all Governments would need consider—certainly this Government will want to look at it. But it was also raised by the Victorian Government, which was showing a great deal of concern with regard to that. The Victorian Government has a backbench committee looking at this issue, and I imagine that will be reporting in the foreseeable future on the problems that can arise through this issue.

I am looking forward to getting some feedback from the South Australian Minister of Consumer Affairs, the Hon. Anne Levy, about this issue, which is one that will involve, concern and interest all the rural constituents I know of. In order to travel in country areas, normally you have to travel

a long distance and, because fuel is an integral part of that travel, it is a big cost in country areas. If a subsidy, or rebate, as is offered in the city areas, was available, I am sure that that would go a long way to assisting people in country areas.

I applaud the recent Government decision to offer people in country areas a lower rate that gave them an advantage of 2¢ per litre in some areas—particularly in my own, to which I will refer. Supposedly it was to assist the retailers in country areas to make that price a little lower, because there would be less of a subsidy on it. I was very interested in that occurring. Unfortunately, that has not occurred with the recent Federal Government decision, and I will not talk too much about that issue, because I believe there is a motion before the House that we will be debating later. That obviously has had an impact on what was an excellent decision by this Government to help country motorists. It was virtually put at risk by the recent Federal discussion to increase the price of leaded petrol. Again, I was most concerned about that decision.

In the interests, as I said, of justice and equity for country people, it is up to this House to put pressure on the oil companies and to make them realise that there is a need for them to offer the same sort of rebate or discount to people who live in country areas. I do not think they should be put at a severe disadvantage. I can recall occasions when I have paid for petrol in Adelaide at about 61¢ per litre and then gone back into the country areas and paid about 75¢ per litre. Whilst I am realistic enough to know that there has to be a small difference, I do not believe that it has to be as marked as was that difference at the time.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON: If members look at the figures and at the State licence fees for country areas like the northern Spencer Gulf, which add up to 6.6¢ per litre as compared with Adelaide's 8.94¢ per litre, and given no other wholesale rebating or subsidies, they will see that it would allow the country areas to come more into line with city prices and *vice versa*. However, that is not the case, because that is negated by this wholesale rebating that occurs in the metropolitan area as opposed to the country area.

I know that this has been a long-running dispute with the PSA and that the new Chairman, Dr David Cousins, has said that the heavy discounting by city petrol stations this year had signalled a crack in the anti-competitive pricing practices of the oil companies. So, he sheets the blame home to exactly where it belongs, that is, oil companies, with their anti-competitive pricing practices. I know also that the Minister at the table, the Hon. Frank Blevins, has had a long-running debate on this issue and that he has had considerable contact with the Motor Trade Association, as well as with his own city council, as have I in my area.

So, in summary—realising the time constraints on us this evening—I would like to read the motion that was passed at the Ministerial Council of Consumer Affairs in Sydney on 30 July 1993. This motion, which was framed by the South Australian Minister, the Hon. Anne Levy, was moved by the Victorian Minister, who had raised the issue as well, and it was seconded by our Minister. The motion states:

The Ministerial Council on Consumer Affairs expressed its concern at large price differentials in petrol prices between metropolitan and country areas throughout Australia. While recognising that an inquiry is currently being conducted by the Industry Commission, Ministers resolved to continue to monitor the situation.

It was also resolved that whilst that is occurring they would continue to keep in touch. Our Minister will also keep in touch to see what happens with that back bench committee in Victoria. I believe that the interest being shown at that level indicates a gross inequity in what is occurring and what the oil companies are actually doing. The oil companies must review their practices and give country service stations the same access to wholesale rebates as those which apply in the metropolitan area. I urge all members of the House to support the motion.

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

PENSIONERS' SHARES

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to reconsider the iniquitous legislation which includes unrealised increase in the value of shares within the social security income test.

The background to this motion is that in its 1992 budget the Commonwealth Government introduced a measure to assess increases in the value of shares under the Department of Social Security income test; in other words, if a pensioner held a portfolio of shares and those shares increased in value over a specified period, the increase in that value would be classed as income under the income test regardless of whether or not the shares were sold—in other words, regardless of whether or not the actual income was realised.

That legislation went through the Senate last year, supported by the Opposition, and it was due to come into effect on 20 or 23 September this year, depending on whether it related to the Department of Social Security or the Department of Veterans' Affairs. I believe this legislation was essentially unfair, in that under the present Department of Social Security rules any dividends paid on shares are quite rightly classified as income under the income test. Similarly, the value of shares held is quite rightly included as assets under the assets test. So, already the structures that the Commonwealth Government has put in place to ensure that welfare is targeted towards those who most need it cover, in my view, the situation regarding share ownership.

In addition, if the owners of shares did make a considerable capital gain then, of course, under the capital gains tax those pensioners, or indeed any other taxpayer who realised on that gain, would be liable for capital gains tax. So, the structures were already in place to allow for that eventuality.

I believe the measure is unfair. It is already covered and in a sense this is a bit of double counting. Compare what happens with an increase in the value of shares with, for example, a property. If a pensioner holds \$100 000 in shares and the value increases, under these new rules it would have meant that any increment would be counted as income and it would therefore reduce their pension. On the other hand, if the same pensioner held the same value in real estate then, of course, any increment in the value of that property would not be included. So, rather than making the system fairer, as was argued by some Federal Government Ministers, I believe that the reverse is arguably true.

The other objection that needs to be made against this measure is that it is also economically unsound. We are at this time in our country's history trying to encourage people to invest. What we need in order to create jobs in this country is investment in industry. Of course, the share market is the way that most small pensioners and income earners would make their investment. Investment through the share market

into companies that produce real goods will lead to increasing employment.

However, if we place a tax upon those shares then what will happen—and this has already occurred—is that a number of pensioners will sell their shares. Instead they will put their investments into other assets that are not included under the income test; for example, real estate. Already some pensioners who had small holdings of shares have sold them and moved the money into real estate or some other form of investment that is not covered by this test. However, all those other forms of investments are not likely to create jobs and they are not encouraging investment, particularly at this time in our country's economic history. I believe that that aspect of this measure is also most unfortunate.

I have been approached by a number of the pensioners in my area. Certainly, not a great many pensioners in the community are affected by this measure, but nevertheless a number of pensioners have small shareholdings and, although they may not have been affected by this measure, just the threat of it has been sufficient for them to sell their shares. I think that is most regrettable, because it will of course mean that raising capital for companies in this country will be even harder and it will tend also to encourage foreign investment and purchasing of our shares, which is also not necessarily in the long-term interests of this country.

I am pleased to say that since I gave notice of this motion a month or so ago the Commonwealth Government has reconsidered the legislation. It has changed the policy to the extent that it has removed the retrospective element; that is, shares held by pensioners prior to budget day 1992 will no longer be assessed as income. However, while there has certainly been an improvement in the position—and I welcome that—I think it is unfortunate that this measure remains in place, for the reasons I indicated earlier.

Under the Commonwealth Department of Social Security means tests it is possible after recent changes for pensioners of reasonably well off means to receive fringe benefits. I believe that a pensioner couple, provided their combined income is less than \$32 000 a year and provided their assets are just under \$300 000, could receive at least some pension, even if it is only a few cents a week; but as a result of receiving that small pension they would now be eligible, after the Commonwealth Government changes, for fringe benefits that may be worth anywhere between a few hundred to a few thousand dollars a year.

What that means is that some pensioners (who, of course, would be far better off than most of the pensioners in my electorate), who own a house worth half a million dollars (because the family home is not included under the test), who could have other property and assets worth up to nearly \$300 000, and who could be receiving some fixed income from other investments, could be receiving social security by way of fringe benefits. On the other hand, after this test, there may be pensioners of much lesser means who may own their own home worth far less and who may not be receiving any other income apart from their investments and dividends on shares, but if there is a sudden increase in the value of those shares it could dramatically reduce their pension and force them into poverty. I think there is the possibility under this test for unfair situations to arise, and that is why I believe that the Commonwealth Government should reconsider the measure.

Also, while only a small proportion of pensioners might be affected, I think we have to look at the precedent this might set, because one of the problems we have with the

share market, apart from investing in shares being important for the long-term economic prosperity of this country, is that shares should be regarded as a long-term investment and therefore the returns that one would get from investing in the share market will only be returned over a number of years. Of course, what we tend to get in relation to the share market is rapid increases in value followed by falls, but this test would mean that during those periods when shares rose rapidly pensioners with not a significantly large share portfolio could easily have their pension quite considerably affected.

On the other hand, if their share values fell during a slump in the share market then, of course, there would be no compensation for them and they would be caught in that situation. Therefore, I think that the nature of share investments is another reason why the treatment I have outlined is rather unfair.

While I am strongly critical of the Commonwealth Government in this regard, I should at least recognise that it has made a great number of improvements in retirement income policies generally and, until this measure earlier this year, one could cite a number of measures, some of which I have mentioned in this place on earlier occasions, that are highly desirable: for example, the great growth in superannuation coverage across the work force, the fact that pensions have been raised for the first time to in excess of 25 per cent of average weekly earnings, the extension of fringe benefits to which I referred earlier, and so on. I think that up until this recent change the Commonwealth Government has had a fairly good record in terms of improving pension incomes, but with this particular measure I believe that it really has, as was suggested by one commentator in the press, lost the plot.

I am pleased that the Commonwealth Government has at least revised the matter and removed the retrospective element but I still pursue this motion because I believe that the whole principle of this matter needs to be revisited by the Federal Government. In addition, one could speak at length about some of the problems that will arise from actually interpreting this particular policy. It is not just a question of disagreeing with it in principle but it does give rise to a number of difficulties in the way that this measure will be interpreted. I will not go through those here because I believe that, after all, they are matters that the Commonwealth Government will have to consider, but I would hope with the passage of this motion that the Commonwealth Government would look again at this measure and come up with a much fairer way of dealing with the assets testing and the means testing of pensioners. I ask the House to support the motion.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I will speak briefly to this motion, because the House should know that a message in a similar vein to this motion came from the other House and, by speaking to this motion, we would not need to go on with that message from the other place. We know that the other place supports the concept of the member for Mitchell's motion, and I, too, support the motion and the views expressed by the honourable member. I want to make one point: it is true that the Liberal Party supported this particular measure through the Federal Parliament. The reason they found that necessary was that the Bill contained other matters that provided a benefit for pensioners and, as no amendments were going to be accepted, there was no choice: take the lot and provide some benefit for many other pensioners and have this matter looked at later.

On that basis the Federal Coalition fought to have a Senate committee look at the matter and, of course, the evidence presented to that committee included other representations to the Federal Government from pensioners, retirees and members of Parliament on all sides of politics. They got them to change the rules so that at least this measure of taking into consideration any increase in the value of shares when assessing people's entitlement to a pension would apply only to shares purchased from August 1992 onwards.

That was a move in the right direction. I think it was forced upon the Federal Government and I have to give credit to those members of the ALP who were prepared to stand up and fight on that issue. It may sound strange for somebody from this side of the House to give credit to members of the ALP but I think that when credit is due it should be given. I am sure that that involvement had a big influence upon the Federal Government in changing its policy.

I recall immediately after the last Federal election the Prime Minister saying that what we needed was to encourage Australians to save. I think everybody remembers that comment: encourage Australians to save. When we have some frugal people who may live in a modest home and invest their money in shares, to set out to penalise them for an asset which they had not capitalised on was unfair. I think it was completely contrary to what the Prime Minister was telling the Australian people to do, and I know the member for Mitchell was going down that same path in criticising that measure. If we are not careful and we keep up the sort of attitude that the Federal Government has in relation to taxing those who are frugal, we do not encourage people to save: we encourage them to spend everything and live on the system. That is not what we want.

This particular group of people are, in the main, over 60 years old and have suffered from the Depression and/or the Second World War. They may have served in the armed forces or worked in munitions factories and out in the fields in pretty tough conditions. They were the ones who helped put this country on its feet during the Depression and afterwards, and they really have not had many of the luxuries that some other people have had. Many of them are on very low incomes but they were frugal enough to save for their homes and then look at different ways of investment. The honourable member was correct: if Government is going to apply this sort of tax on savings through shares, a person is better off buying a property and, in the end result, being a pensioner.

I do not need to say any more; time is short. Another place has put the point of view on behalf of the Party to which I belong, and put it very well. The other place has passed a similar resolution. I ask this House to support the resolution moved by the honourable member, because I think it will send a message to the Federal politicians, regardless of which Party is in power, that this sort of measure is unfair and discriminates against those who are trying to help this country get out of a hole. I ask all members to support the motion and I congratulate the honourable member for moving it.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I thank the member for Davenport for his support.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

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

That this House urges the Government to prepare, in consultation with landowners, local government and the community, a regional environment management plan that recognises the unique ecological nature of Hindmarsh Island, the Murray Mouth and areas adjacent to the Coorong, and that this plan be implemented as a matter of urgency.

I am sure that there are many members in this place who have fond memories of the Coorong and Hindmarsh Island. I certainly have, having spent many of my childhood holidays in that area. It is a magnificent part of South Australia and one that I believe the majority of South Australians would want to protect. I am moving this motion tonight as a result of a public meeting that was held recently, called by the Friends of Hindmarsh Island and organised with the Conservation Council of South Australia. It was a public forum to discuss the Hindmarsh Island bridge and matters relating to the Murray Mouth and the Coorong, the economics and the environment. It was a very successful forum.

There were a number of speakers, including Associate Professor John Noye, Applied Mathematics at the University of Adelaide, who spoke on matters pertaining to the environment and its management. Margaret Bolster, the Vice President of the Conservation Council of South Australia, and Dr John Hatch, Senior Lecturer, Economics Department of the University of Adelaide, also attended, and my colleague the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, the shadow Minister of Transport Development, was also one of the speakers at that public forum.

As I said, the purpose of the forum was to explore the proposed Hindmarsh Island bridge versus, I guess, the ferry debate. It provided the opportunity for a number of other matters to be addressed. The forum concluded that a bridge to Hindmarsh Island, once in place, would effect irreversible change to the status of the island, its population and its ecology, and therefore to the total economy of the Murray Mouth/Coorong region. It was made clear at that meeting that Tourism South Australia is of the opinion that the immediate benefit opportunities from the proposed Hindmarsh Bridge would be at the expense of those long-term tourism opportunities that would be compromised as a result of free, unthinking visitation to what is now an island.

Hindmarsh Island is a rare thing—an island in an estuary. It is significant to the Lower Murray, the Murray Mouth, the lakelands and the wetlands and their wild fowl population. International agreements are in place protecting the migratory birds from China and Japan. There are prime assets of regions. It was determined at that meeting that these assets should not be throwaway currency in pursuit of a bit of politically expedient orthodox development. It is not my intention to refer specifically to the construction of the bridge tonight, although I do feel very strongly about it. I believe that all the options for improved access to Hindmarsh Island need to be explored before this multi-million dollar bridge is constructed. I would suggest that there are a number of other ways to improve the approach to the island, including the use of ferries in periods of high demand. I would suggest also that the views of the residents of the island must be taken into account.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: While the Deputy Premier can lean back in his seat and suggest that we should be making a decision, I would suggest that that decision should be made after the appropriate consultation with the people who are to be affected has taken place. That is not the case. Whatever decision is ultimately made, it will be important to

conserve the quality of the island and the environment around the Murray River mouth. I certainly support the call made by my colleague, the shadow Minister of Transport Development in another place, to defer the decision to let a contract for construction of the bridge until after the State election. I too believe it would be quite inappropriate for the Government, in the countdown to an election, to let a contract worth more than \$6 million for the building of a bridge which may, in the end, not be the best resolution of the present problems of access to Hindmarsh Island.

A number of people have referred to the wonders of the island, the Coorong and the Murray Mouth, one of those being Colin Thiele, who is very well known and recognised and respected for his strong views regarding the area referred to in this motion. He has said on a number of occasions that the island and its bird life has played an important part in the total context of the Coorong region. He is quoted as saying:

... some areas of wilderness should be left untouched as hunting grounds for the imagination. And if you chop them all up with speed boats and marinas, you'll lose all that.

In his 1986 book *Coorong*, Mr Thiele writes:

For thousands of years the Aboriginal people lived in harmony with this environment, achieving what modern jargon calls 'perfect ecological balance'. Europeans driven by the triple urges of commercial expansion, personal gain and... [greed] have never been good at attaining such a balance, or even at recognising the need for it. Coupled with this, among some of them, has been... [an] insensitivity to the natural environment, ignorance, selfishness and cruelty towards wildlife. It is clear, therefore, that the creation and enforcement of a comprehensive management plan for the Coorong region is a daunting task.

It is a daunting task, but it is essential. The fragile ecosystem of the island and the Coorong is a focus in the saga of whether the bridge should be built.

A number of people have spoken out about the need to protect the wildlife. The South Australian Ornithological Association President, Dr David Robertson, has told the Environment, Resources and Development Committee—an important committee of this Parliament, which is investigating the Government's decision to build the bridge—that diminishing bird numbers already have been noted on the island from records compiled over 70 years. Mr David Paton, of the University of Adelaide's Department of Zoology, has said that increases in human traffic activated by a bridge, particularly along the shorelines and wetlands, would erode the diversity of bird life and other aquatic life in the fragile region.

According to the report that has come out of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, more than 100 species of birds exist on the island, including a number of internationally protected migratory birds. The same report lists an obvious decline in bird species and numbers, coinciding with increased human activity and water sports deterring birds and threatening their habitat by thinning the reeds along the shore.

At the meeting that I referred to, organised by the Friends of Hindmarsh Island, there was considerable discussion about the need for a management plan for this area. Local people and landowners in the area voiced their opinions and support for such a plan, but also strongly indicated their desire to be involved in the preparation of such a plan. I believe that is essential, as I believe the involvement of local government is necessary in such a plan. But I would urge the Government, rather than continue to consider the need or otherwise for a bridge in that area and the ramifications that that bridge will have on the area if it is built, to think about establishing a

management plan that recognises the unique ecological nature of Hindmarsh Island, the Murray Mouth and the areas adjacent to the Coorong; and, having prepared that management plan, that it be implemented as a matter of urgency. I urge the support of the House for this motion.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LEADER'S STATEMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Meier:

That this House congratulates Liberal Leader (Hon. Dean Brown) on his recently released statement 'Make a Change for the Better' and acknowledges the vision and positive benefits for South Australia's future contained within the 'Freedom to Grow' Liberal Vision Statement.

(Continued from 18 August. Page 354.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Several members of the Opposition have already spoken effectively on the member for Goyder's motion addressing the Liberal Leader's vision statement for South Australia. First, I wish to refer to comments that were made by one or two members on the Government benches. The member for Albert Park spent quite a considerable time during his address on this matter blaming the Liberal Party for a number of ills, which he perceived took place during the period of the Tonkin Government from 1979 to 1982, when in fact the Labor Party has ridden for the past decade on initiatives which were put in place by the Tonkin Government.

From 1979 to 1982 the Liberal Government put in place a whole range of initiatives from which the Labor Party has benefited immensely. For example, it ensured that the Roxby Downs and Stony Point liquid schemes were put in train. While the member for Albert Park said he could not remember anything good coming out of that period, I remind him that the Stony Point gas liquid scheme—which he questioned by asking, 'How do you train people for jobs?'—was put into effect very efficiently. We were desperately short of mild steel welders for that Stony Point petrochemical scheme. The pipeline had to be constructed, so we trained about 400 welders very quickly and efficiently in a matter of a few months through the TAFE scheme.

We rented factories which were spare and used the assistance of a number of private employers and organisations, such as Commonwealth Industrial Gases, which were kind enough to supply us with additional equipment. We trained those young people, and older ones, through TAFE, and within a very short time the petrochemical gas pipeline was under construction. As the member for Whyalla will acknowledge, it was built very effectively and very efficiently and has certainly benefited the State.

The Roxby Downs scheme was decried by the then Premier Mr Bannon as a mirage in the desert. However, it will bring royalties into South Australia for at least the next 100 years and has the potential to be a 300 to 500-year mine, with additional reserves having been located by Western Mining in that area.

We established Technology Park; facilitated the first international hotel in Adelaide in the city square; secured the Commonwealth Government's support for the first international airport terminal; established the O-Bahn, which is now a tourist attraction as well as a public facility of which the Labor Party is very proud and uses to take people to official openings now and then; we initiated the River

Torrens Linear Park; and we started the development of cultural institutions along North Terrace—the Art Gallery, the Museum and the Library. What did the Labor Party do in 1983 when it came to office? It slashed that \$50 million development of North Terrace, and it is only just beginning to take off again now—12 years down the track. In fact, the Labor Government is trying to take credit for the development, even though it delayed it for 12 years and the Liberal Party initiated it under the then Minister Murray Hill.

The Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation was enacted by the Liberal Government when the Dunstan Government had done nothing but make promises for a number of years. The promises were not fulfilled—there was delay after delay. We also supported the Maralinga Aboriginal land rights legislation, which was enacted in 1983-84. The Liberal Party certainly has nothing to be ashamed of with regard to its relationship with Aborigines in South Australia. In fact, it was this Government and Sir Thomas Playford himself who promised the Maralinga lands to the Aborigines as long ago as 1948 and set the pattern for an improved relationship with Aborigines in Australia. As I said, we have nothing to be ashamed of in South Australia as far as our relationship with Aborigines is concerned.

Another thing I find amusing in retrospect is that, when the Liberal Party introduced the Casino legislation in 1982, almost to a man the Labor Party opposed that legislation on the first reading, and it simply lapsed. I cannot recall any other legislation being rejected on the first reading. However, as soon as the Labor Party won Government in 1982, it took steps to start legislating for and building the Casino. That was a fine dose of pragmatism—a complete about-face. It just goes to demonstrate the hypocrisy of negotiations when dealing with the Labor Party. I found that to be one of the strangest events ever to take place in this House—a complete volte-face within just a few short months.

The Labor Government is to be congratulated for the Grand Prix and the submarine development, which we do support contrary to snide allegations made by the Minister of Tourism earlier today. I simply want to point out to the House in the few moments left to me in supporting this motion that the Liberal Party demonstrated, during its very short term of office, that it was a very prudent and effective manager. It left the State with a very small deficit. In fact, within three years of the Liberal Party's losing office, the deficit had blown out from a few million dollars to over \$400 million, and that was predicted by the then Premier Mr Bannon in 1983. I have the 1982-83 *Hansard* quote at page 1151 in case members want to refer to it.

The Tonkin Government proved that it was a prudent manager. It left the State with a low debt, a small deficit and, as I said in debate yesterday, South Australia's indebtedness increased from 1960 to 1982 by \$100 million a year. That was practically a fixed increase. Yet, in the first year of the Bannon Government—1983—the deficit increased by \$300 million, by \$400 million in 1984 and by \$300 million in 1985—\$1 billion borrowed in three years to throw the State into chaos. That profligate spending set in train the pattern of events which led to the State Bank fiasco. There was no sense of prudent management in the first three years of the Bannon Government, and there was no sense of prudent management in its last three years, nor in the intervening period—it was a decade of disaster.

Members on the Government benches are trying to make out that the Liberal Party is still to blame, after not having been in office for more than a decade, for the present ills of

South Australian society. I find that laughable in the extreme. In fact, the Labor Party has literally ridden on the back of Liberal Party initiatives, the initiatives I mentioned at the outset of this speech, with very little new coming from its own mind. At the moment it is a tired Government with nothing new to offer to the people of South Australia. I suggest that the vision statement of the Leader of the Opposition is deficient in only one sense, and that is that he does not take enough credit for the initiatives and long-term benefits given to South Australia during the three years of the Tonkin Liberal Government. That was a time when the finances of South Australia were kept in excellent order, when State charges and taxes were reduced, when the staffing within the State was prudently managed, and when South Australia was able to compete very effectively on national and international markets.

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

MEALS ON WHEELS

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr Armitage:

That this House—

(a) notes with pleasure the decision of the National Meals on Wheels Association Incorporated to hold a National Meals on Wheels Day on 1 September 1993;

(b) acknowledges the purpose of such a day is to bring to the attention of the general public the importance of the Meals on Wheels Service to the aged, infirm and disabled;

(c) encourages volunteers to contact their local Meals on Wheels Branch, or the Central Office, to offer their services; and

(d) congratulates all involved with Meals on Wheels in its nearly 40 years of service to South Australians.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 489.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I am very pleased to support the motion moved by the member for Adelaide with respect to Meals on Wheels. The honourable member outlined the establishment of the concept of Meals on Wheels in South Australia. I am very proud that Meals on Wheels was first established in Port Adelaide, which is in the heart of my electorate. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute in the highest possible way to Doris Taylor, MBE, who founded the concept in December 1953 and established the first kitchen in Port Adelaide in 1954.

The then Mayor of Port Adelaide (Mr Harold Moore), to whom the member for Adelaide referred in his speech, arranged for the Port Adelaide City Council to donate a block of land to site the first kitchen in South Australia, and I can certainly remember clearly the block of land, because it was right next to my wife's aunt's place. It was a very rough block of land, and that is probably the reason it was given—it was not much use for anything else. Nevertheless, Doris Taylor and an eager band of helpers got together and, with sweat and blisters, levelled out the block and established the first kitchen there.

The first kitchen consisted of a 37ft Nissan hut, which was donated by a local business. It was officially opened on 23 October 1954 by the then Governor of South Australia, Sir Robert George. Five months later, the second kitchen was opened at Norwood by the Hon. Norman Makin MHR. On 11 February 1982, the Port Adelaide kitchen was extended and very fittingly named the Doris Taylor Memorial Kitchen.

I have some information which no doubt will surprise the member for Adelaide and in fact most other members of this House. At that time Doris Taylor took a great deal of interest in politics and used that forum to assist in helping people in

the community. In fact, she became a member of the Australian Labor Party and on at least one occasion was campaign director for the former Premier, the Hon. Don Dunstan.

Mr Lewis: Did she ever win endorsement?

Mr De LAINE: No. She was a wonderful lady who did a tremendous amount for many people. Doris Taylor died on 23 May 1968 at the age of 59 years. Today, as the member for Adelaide mentioned, Meals on Wheels is a massive operation, with thousands of volunteers serving thousands of recipients. The large army of volunteers come from all walks of life and are all unpaid, volunteer workers. The volunteers are involved in all facets of the service, such as planning, buying, preparation, cooking, packing, washing up, cleaning and delivering, and included in the delivery service is the serving of meals and driving. I am pleased to hear that the member for Adelaide is involved in that regard, driving for the Adelaide branch. I know that the Speaker is likewise involved in the Semaphore branch of Meals on Wheels and has been for years. From memory, he drives for the organisation on Friday mornings. It is a very good service and a very worthwhile commitment by those members.

Meals on Wheels Incorporated sees itself as accountable in three areas, with three directions for the faithful and economic usage of all moneys received. It is accountable, first, to those who use its services, for the availability of its services, with eligibility determined by age or the medical needs of the individual rather than preferential treatment on account of race, colour, creed or social status; for the quality of its services and its recognition of the individuality of each person; and for its concern that each person should be supported where necessary and rehabilitated where possible.

Secondly, it is accountable to the general community for the quality of its services; and for the positive and appropriate usage of donations and bequests made, fund raising efforts supported and voluntary service given. Thirdly, it is responsible to the various levels of Government for the faithful and economic usage of money received as subsidies; for the quality of its services; for its adherence to agreements reached in application of funds received and services provided in accordance with policy statements issued; and for its efforts to supplement Government support with voluntary assistance wherever possible. These directions, policies, values and the constitution were set up by Doris Taylor in 1954 and remain virtually unchanged today.

I know of no other more worthwhile community service than Meals on Wheels as it takes this most valuable service right into the homes of people who perhaps otherwise would have to leave the home that they love and go into a nursing home or some other institution. As the member for Adelaide said, the value of this service is not only the meal and its nutritional value but the human contact with volunteers who deliver the meal. I have had first hand experience of this; I have been in homes when meals have been delivered and the rapport between the recipient and the volunteer is great to see. They look forward to contact with those people. They get to know them well and they exchange a few little pleasantries. Volunteers sometimes assist by doing little errands for these people. It is a wonderful concept and I applaud those people who put themselves out and who go to this trouble for these needy people.

I would like to pay tribute to and thank the army of volunteers who organise, prepare, cook, serve, drive and deliver meals to thousands of recipients in South Australia. They do an absolutely wonderful job. I regularly attend the annual Christmas dinner of the Meals on Wheels branch at

Port Adelaide and witness the continuous service award presentations for volunteers at this branch. Many volunteers have given long and dedicated service over many years, some even up to 35 years. At Port Adelaide one long serving volunteer, Mrs Jean Clark, whom I know particularly well, was one of the original 11 helpers in 1954 and she retired because of ill health only a couple of years ago. I think that she gave about 36 or 37 years of service—a fantastic effort. Another old chap who was there for many years was in his 90s and he helped regularly in the kitchen to prepare the food.

These volunteers give so unselfishly of their time for the benefit of others, and I hope that new and younger volunteers come on stream as time goes by so that these older volunteers who have done so much to help people over the years can, in turn, receive this marvellous service when they require it later in life. With those few words, I have much pleasure in joining with the member for Adelaide in congratulating the Meals on Wheels people who have been involved over the past almost 40 years.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the motion. I have an interest similar to that of some other members who give to Meals on Wheels. As a young man I was a member of Apex—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am still young; thank you, Deputy Premier. The Apex Club of Stirling arranged for Doris Taylor to come along, and it decided to attempt to raise money to form a branch of Meals on Wheels in Stirling. To its credit, that Apex Club letterboxed the whole district on one Sunday saying that it would call on the next Sunday to raise the \$4 500 that was necessary, because at that time the Government gave a 2 to 1 subsidy to build kitchens. One gentleman in town, a migrant from South Africa, said that, if the \$4 500 was not raised, he would make up the balance. In fact, Apex collected the \$4 500 in one day. I think it was a magnificent effort. I was the inaugural Chairman and with a gentleman by the name of Mr Fred Lowe we were able to start our kitchen. I have just finished serving for 20-odd years as Chairman of that branch.

I know the difficulties that Meals on Wheels faces today as it strives to get more volunteers. At the beginning of Meals on Wheels—and we are talking about a period of 40 years—there were not as many dual income families. In those days, one partner would go to work and the other would stay at home and do the washing, mending, cooking or work in the community on hospital auxiliaries or whatever. Whether or not that was right or wrong is not for me to judge, but the fact is that in those days for the percentage of population it was much easier to get volunteers. We now have volunteers working in these kitchens who themselves should be receiving Meals on Wheels themselves. They are up to 80 years of age and they serve as volunteers because it is difficult to get people who have dual incomes to understand that there is another need within the community. The world of semi-luxury of some has overridden the opportunity, the desire or the inclination or perhaps the knowledge that volunteers are required. That makes it difficult in many areas for Meals on Wheels.

This has nothing to do with socioeconomic conditions: it is just a matter of changing attitudes of society, even though we have changed the method of preparing meals. In many cases the meals are prepacked and brought into the kitchen and heated or Meals on Wheels works through a hospital and not necessarily through its own kitchen. I do not disagree

with that; I am just saying that the system has changed. One of the kitchens in my area will hold its annual general meeting tomorrow night. It is not the kitchen to which I belonged for so long.

The member for Price is correct in saying that it is not only a meal that is delivered to these people. Many of the recipients are elderly or handicapped. They may not have close relatives or, if they do, those relatives may live a long way away, perhaps a day's trip away or even overseas. So, it is just the thought of having someone to call on them five days a week with a friendly smile and a question, 'Is there something else I can help you with?' Or if the person is unwell, the volunteer might notify the doctor if they believe that is necessary, because there is a tendency when we get old and slow down a bit to say, 'I'll put up with it and hope that I'll be better tomorrow.' There is not the attitude of seeking medical advice. Quite often the helpers or deliverers are the people who offer comfort or advice or take action when required.

When you serve on Meals on Wheels, you learn one thing: you may find that one of your clients has passed on. Sometimes they have been deceased in their home for more than a day. You will ask the neighbour, 'Have you seen Mr or Mrs So-and-So?' and the neighbour will say, 'I saw them last Sunday and they weren't very well.' During that period they have passed on, and the neighbour has not gone to check. They know that someone is unwell, but that neighbourly attitude that we used to have of knowing what was going on in the community has changed, because we have motor cars. We tend to hold our friendships back where we came from and use a motor car as a means of travel. I find that amazing because of my background of being raised in a village.

With reference to Meals on Wheels, I was aware of what the member for Price said about Doris Taylor having belonged to the ALP and having been Don Dunstan's campaign manager. In fact, she told us that when she came and encouraged us to start a branch of the kitchen in the Stirling district. No-one held that against her. Everyone is entitled to their political belief, and I wish more people would be open about it instead of being frightened that they might lose a bit of business or a friend because of their political belief.

This organisation is a credit to its founder, a lady in a wheelchair who was dedicated to her cause. She fought for and operated the organisation right to the end. She attended public meetings, sometimes in the Hills on very cold nights, and she was not afraid. Indeed, had she been afraid, she would have failed. I commend her, as I did at the time of her passing, for the effort she put into the organisation. I also thank all those people who have worked within my area and other areas as volunteers, whether they be supervisors, cooks, delivery people, welfare officers, staff officers or members of the medical teams who, when a person may be in need, give the advice necessary for that person to receive meals.

It can be difficult for volunteers to accept a situation when they call on a home attached to which may be a flat in which the elderly person in question lives and having to deliver a meal to that person whose daughter or son may be leaving the premises at the time, say, to go and play tennis. When asked, 'Have you ever thought of helping Meals on Wheels' or, more particularly, 'Have you ever thought of cooking for your parent (or parents) who live next door?' the daughter or son may simply ignore them. That sort of attitude is difficult to contend with and tends to prove that affluence is not the

best thing for a society. I urge the House to support the motion and commend the mover for introducing the measure.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I will be very brief in my comments, but I would like to add my support for the motion. The Meals on Wheels organisation in my electorate, which encompasses both Port Augusta and Port Pirie, is to be commended for the work it has put in over the years. As the member for Adelaide said when moving the motion, a number of people in his own branch of Meals on Wheels had earned certificates for long and meritorious service in the organisation. I, too, could say that about people involved in the two organisations in my electorate. I know that Meals on Wheels has been having a lot of problems in trying to attract other helpers to keep the services going, and particularly in country areas that is a great difficulty. Very often, a husband and wife will go around to swell the numbers in order that the meals can be delivered.

I recommend the healthy nutritious meals that are served, and I am sure this happens right across the board in all the Meals on Wheels organisations operating throughout the State. Not only do Meals on Wheels members organise healthy and nutritious meals: when they visit the people in their homes they are supportive, they are friends and they offer companionship to the people there. Often you will find that very lonely people have these meals taken to their home and look forward each day to having that bit of companionship and friendliness. The service provided fulfils a great need in our community.

I commend the motion to all members and support the initiative to try to attract more people to support the organisation's activities, in both the metropolitan and country areas. Along with other members who have spoken to this motion, I add my congratulations to Meals on Wheels for the valuable work it does in the community.

Motion carried.

STATE DEBT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That this House endorses the principle that all funds generated from major sales of State Government assets be directed to the reduction of State Debt.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 200.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

After the word 'House' insert the following words: 'notes the success of the Government in reducing the State debt from 23.5 per cent of GSP in 1982-83 to 15.4 per cent of GSP in 1989-90 prior to the impact of the State bank, and'

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, it has become the custom of this House that a motion that negates the original motion should not be allowed. In fact, we discussed this matter previously and, if the member wishes to put forward his own motion, I will be delighted to debate it on its merits. This amendment does, indeed, negate the original motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have only just heard the amendment. I would like to have a look at it, and I will make a decision as to whether it negates the original motion. In the meantime, I will let the member for Mitchell prosecute his case, so to speak.

Mr HOLLOWAY: In this motion, I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is trying to support the principle that Government spending and revenue raising decisions

should not be affected because of the cash flows received from an asset sale. That is what he appears to be suggesting. Of course, one thing we should realise is that, if one is to reduce the debt of the State or indeed of anything, there are really three ways of doing so: first, to increase revenue; secondly, to reduce expenditure; and, thirdly, to sell assets and use the income thus derived to reduce debt. So, really, if one is to do any of those three things, it will have the effect of reducing debt. If a sale of assets is used to increase revenue or to enable reductions of expenditure that would otherwise occur then, of course, it has the same effect of reducing debt. In that sense, the honourable member's motion really is almost a tautology.

I want to make clear that the Government's position is that we should be using the sale of assets to reduce our overall level of debt, and that has already been made clear by the Premier when he made a statement on the proposed sale of the State Bank, indicating that such moneys would be used for that purpose. Indeed, it is even referred to in the latest report we had today from the Auditor-General. On page 39 of the Auditor-General's first report, he makes the very important point:

Asset sales, no matter what size, present a once off benefit. The targeted assets to be sold will not be replaced. The Government has stated that from a financial perspective it will seek to ensure that the State's budget position in the long term is improved or at least indifferent between sale and retention of the assets concerned.

One of the key ways in which any Government can reduce its overall debt is to reduce the calls on expenditure into the future, and indeed this Government has already embarked upon that course over the past few years. Through a very successful program of voluntary separation packages within the Public Service, the Government has been able to reduce the long-term calls upon Government expenditure, in that way very effectively managing the State debt. Of course, it is interesting that in his speech on this matter the member for Mitcham accused the Government. He said:

Already the first \$236 million—

he was talking there about money from the Commonwealth for the possible sale of the State Bank—

has been earmarked for voluntary separation packages. That means clearly that, if this Government continued in power, we would have more and more money squandered from asset sales on things other than debt reduction.

What could be more effective than the use of money in that way to achieve debt reduction? Indeed, the Auditor-General in his report makes that very point. At page 39 he states:

In taking the path to reduce expenditures, because of its very nature and size, the greatest opportunity for cost saving is in the area of human resources. In this regard the policy that has been adopted to achieve savings has been to offer separation packages to those who wish to leave the public sector. This is reflected in the use of VSPs and TSPs over the past three years. Indeed, full-time equivalent positions in the State public sector work force reported in financial paper No. 1, table 7.11, evidence employee reductions of some 4 600 over that time.

So, it is really nonsense for the member for Mitcham to suggest that the use of Government funds in this way is somehow not reducing debt. Of course, he also chooses to ignore what his colleague in Victoria (Mr Kennett) is doing as far as his methods of reducing debt are concerned. I read yesterday that the Kennett Government is borrowing something like \$1.3 billion to try to reduce the size of the work force to offset long-term debt. Of course, the member for Mitcham fails to mention that point.

I would also like to comment on some other matters that

the member for Mitcham raised during his speech. He made the rather stupid claim that South Australia is twice as bankrupt as the City of New York. First of all, it is a nonsense statement. You cannot be twice as bankrupt: you are either bankrupt or you are not—and South Australia certainly is not. I point out that the definition of 'bankruptcy' is, of course, that liabilities exceed assets. On page 27 of the Auditor-General's report, it is stated that in 1993 the assets of this State will be some \$27.384 billion against liabilities of \$13.8 billion. So, the net assets of this State are some \$13.5 billion. That is compared with net assets in the 1992-93 financial year of \$12.893 billion. What nonsense it is to suggest that this State is bankrupt.

In his speech, the member for Mitcham said that the debts of South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania have accumulated well beyond their capacity to repay. Again, in the recent budget we saw that that is not the case. Indeed, the strategy that was brought down by this Government earlier this year sets out the program that will reduce this State's debt quite substantially over the next three years.

In his speech, the honourable member also made a number of rather ridiculous claims about debt reduction. In the short time remaining to me I would like to point out just how successful this Government was in reducing debt during the years prior to the State Bank when, of course, we were dealing with those parts of the public sector directly under the control of this Government. Again, on page 7 of the Auditor-General's report, a graph is set out of the net indebtedness of this State as a percentage of gross State product. Indeed, the Auditor-General has set out two tables. One of those tables points out what the debt would be without the State Bank rescue package, and the other sets it out with the package.

It is pointed out that in 1990 the State debt was 15.2 per cent. If the State Bank package had not been necessary the figure would be down to 14.6 per cent this financial year. So, the point that needs to be made is that in those areas where this Government was directly responsible—that is, within that part of the public sector that is the direct responsibility of Ministers—there has been a steady reduction in the debt of this State from virtually the day that this Government came into office back in 1982.

Of course, the State Bank has had a substantial impact upon the debt of this State. It is something with which we all have to grapple. Nevertheless, the only way we can cope with that debt is to be sensible. The sort of suggestions put forward and hysteria exhibited by the member for Mitcham do nothing to help the situation. The fact is that this Government does have a strategy for dealing with debt. It has a track record in the past of showing that it can cope with it and, indeed, over the past year or so progress has been made.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I rule the amendment in order.

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

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister of Justice (Hon. C. J. Sumner), the Minister of Transport Development (Hon. B.J. Wiese) and the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage (Hon. J.A.W. Levy), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the

Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

CLASSIFICATION OF FILMS FOR PUBLIC EXHIBITION (ARRANGEMENTS WITH COMMONWEALTH) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

In July, 1983 the Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers with responsibility for censorship matters agreed that the Chief Censor should classify films, videos and publications on behalf of the States and Territories to achieve a uniform system of classification.

Currently, the classifications assigned by the Chief Censor are received into South Australian law by way of 'corresponding law' provisions in our Acts.

Both the Acts dealing with censorship matters prescribe certain Acts as 'corresponding law' in the Regulations made under those Acts. The Regulations made under the Classification of Publications Act, 1974 provide that the Classification of Publications Ordinance, 1983 is corresponding law for the purposes of that Act. Similarly, the Regulations under the Classification of Films for Public Exhibition Act, 1971 provides that the Ordinance, the Theatres and Public Halls Act 1908 (NSW) and the Films Act, 1971 (Victoria) are corresponding law for the purposes of that Act.

The Chief Censor has recently taken advice from the Office of General Counsel, Commonwealth Attorney-General's Office, that as the classification assigned by the Chief Censor is received into South Australian law by way of a 'corresponding law' it is not classified under our legislation. Therefore, the Chief Censor is not performing a service on behalf of South Australia and cannot charge a fee for such service.

The Chief Censor has been collecting fees on behalf of South Australia for classification of films, videos and publications. The express power to collect fees has not been granted in either Act. The Chief Censor has advised that fees will cease to be collected in respect of South Australia from 1st August, 1993. Currently, the fee for classification in South Australia is set at \$35.00 as it is in each other State and Territory. Under existing arrangements, \$15.00 is retained by the Chief Censor and \$20.00 is returned to each State.

Most of the other States have legislative provisions which empower the Chief Censor to classify films, videos and publications on behalf of their State and to collect a fee for that service.

The Classification of Films for Public Exhibition Act, 1971 ('the Act') has been amended to empower the Chief Censor to classify films, videos and publications on behalf of South Australia and to collect fees in respect of that service.

Further, prior to amendment of the Act the offence of exhibiting a film classified 'MA' was included in the Regulations made under the Act. The opportunity has been taken to include the offence in the Act and to increase the penalty to \$500, in line with the penalty attached to exhibiting an 'R' classified film to a person under 18 years of age.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

The current Act provides that a film must be classified under a corresponding law or by the Minister. The Bill removes this mechanism for automatic classification under a corresponding law and instead provides for classification by the Commonwealth pursuant to an arrangement. The definition of corresponding law is consequently removed.

Clause 4: Insertion of s. 3A—Arrangements with Commonwealth with respect to classification

The new section provides for an arrangement whereby the Commonwealth classifies films on behalf of the State under the Act and collects fees on behalf of all States and Territories. The Minister may override a classification assigned by the Commonwealth.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 4—Film not to be exhibited unless classified

As well as substituting references to the arrangement for references to the corresponding law, this amendment updates the references to classifications.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 5—Alteration of classified film prohibited

This amendment substitutes references to the arrangement for references to the corresponding law.

Clause 7: Insertion of s. 6A—Admission of persons to 'MA' films

The new section makes it an offence for an exhibitor to allow a child between 2 and 15 to attend an MA film if not accompanied by a parent or guardian. The offence is equivalent to that currently in the regulations except that the penalty is increased from \$100 to \$500.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 8—Advertisements

This amendment is consequential to the updating of the classifications in section 4(1).

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 9—Illegal publication of advertisement, etc.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 10—Evidentiary provision

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 11A—Film to which classification has been assigned may be lawfully exhibited notwithstanding law of obscenity, etc.

These amendments substitute references to the arrangement for references to the corresponding law.

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 14—Regulations

This amendment makes it clear that the fee for classification fixed by the regulations applies to classification by the Commonwealth as well as classification by the Minister.

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

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS (ARRANGEMENTS WITH COMMONWEALTH) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC (BREATH ANALYSIS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

The purpose of this Bill is to remove the requirement that the police facilitate the taking of a sample of a driver's blood at a hospital or surgery when so requested to do so by the driver following a positive breath analysis. Section 47f of the Road Traffic Act currently enables a person who has been subjected to a breath analysis by a member of the police force to request a blood sample to be taken by a medical practitioner for analysis. About one in four drivers requests a blood test following a reading on a breath analysing instrument that exceeds the prescribed limit. Based on past figures, it is estimated that approximately 2 000 drivers would request a blood test annually. When a request is made for the blood sample at a random breath testing (RBT) station, the RBT site will usually be forced to close down as it will lack the personnel to be maintained. Two police officers are required to escort the driver to a hospital or surgery where the blood sample can be taken. The police must do all things reasonably necessary to facilitate the taking of the sample. The sample must be taken within one hour of the request being made and at a place not more than 10 km distant. This procedure wastes police resources, is costly to the police (approximately \$130 000 per annum) and to the driver who must pay for the sample to be taken and for his or her portion of blood to be analysed. In the past hospitals have not always been reimbursed by the driver.

If a hospital is not in the vicinity, it is sometimes difficult to find a doctor who is willing to take a sample of blood.

In April 1987, the Police Department began gradually to introduce the infrared-based Dräger Alcotest Model 7110 instrument. As a check on the performance of the infrared instruments, all blood tests which had been taken within 60 minutes of positive breath analyses at metropolitan area breath test stations from July 1990 to May 1992 were compared with the breath analyses by statistical analysis. None of the 1 409 breath analysis results was shown to be incorrect by the subsequent blood test. There is now among the scientific community a growing acceptance of breath analysis as a highly accurate measure of the actual pulmonary arterial blood alcohol concentration at the time of the test.

Under the proposed system, a driver at an RBT site will be requested to submit to a breath analysis in the same way as before. That is, a screening device (alcotest) will first be used and any driver who does not register the prescribed concentration of alcohol will be allowed to drive away. Where the screening device indicates the driver has the prescribed concentration of alcohol in his or her blood, he or she will be requested to submit to the breath analysis on the Dräger instrument. The driver will be given two successive tests a short time apart with the lower reading (if any) being used for evidentiary purposes. Duplicate testing, which has already been carried out on a trial basis, provides a double check against false high readings due to mouth alcohol or regurgitation. Where a driver refuses or fails to submit to an alcotest or breath analysis, he or she will, as in the past, be charged with the offence of refusing or failing to comply. However, if a person can show good cause for not submitting to an alcotest or breath analysis by reason of some physical or medical condition but appears to have consumed alcohol, he or she will, under the proposed new arrangements, only be able to avoid prosecution for refusal or failure to comply by requesting a blood test.

The defence of good cause is dealt with under section 47e(4). The requirement for a blood test in the circumstances of good cause to refuse an alcotest or breath analysis due to some physical or medical condition is dealt with under the new subsection (5a) of section 47e. An example would be where a person has had a tracheotomy and is physically unable to supply a sample of breath. Where a driver has good cause for such a reason and submits to a blood test, the cost of the test will be met by the Crown. However, any driver who registers the prescribed alcohol concentration from a breath analysis will still be able to contest the accuracy of the breath analysis by analysis of a blood sample, but in future will have to make his or her own arrangements to attend at a hospital or surgery for the taking of the blood sample. The police will no longer be obliged to attend with the driver. These drivers will be given oral advice on the procedures that must be followed, and handed a card with precise instructions on those procedures, together with a sealed blood test kit. Regulations will be drawn up setting out the procedures for drivers requesting a subsequent blood analysis. The police will, however, still be required in certain circumstances to provide assistance with transportation arrangements for drivers outside the Metropolitan area who request a blood analysis after a positive breath test, since it may be difficult for such drivers to make their own transportation arrangements. Provision is also made in the Bill for registered nurses to be able to take blood samples for the purposes of these provisions outside the Metropolitan area.

These new procedures will improve the efficiency of the police force in dealing with drivers with the prescribed alcohol concentration, reduce police costs and allow for more efficient operational times in detecting drink drivers. It is anticipated that the number of drivers requesting a blood analysis (good cause excepted) will fall significantly with a consequent reduction in disruption due to the demand for this service at hospitals and doctors' surgeries. Drivers will, however, continue to have the right to use the results of a blood test to challenge the accuracy of a breath analysis.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 47e—Police may require alcotest or breath analysis

Under section 47e(3) of the Road Traffic Act it is an offence if a person required to submit to an alcotest or a breath analysis refuses or fails to comply with the requirement or reasonable directions given by a member of the police force for that purpose. Subsection (4) of that section provides a defence of good cause for any such

refusal or failure. The clause adds a new subsection (5a) that must be read in conjunction with the amendment to section 47f proposed by clause 4. Under the new provision, a person may not raise the defence of good cause based on some physical or medical condition unless—

- a sample of the person's blood was taken in accordance with section 47f;

or

- the person requested that a blood sample be taken, but—
 - a member of the police force failed to facilitate the taking of a sample of the person's blood as required by that section;

or

- a medical practitioner was not reasonably available for the purpose;

- the taking of a sample of the person's blood in accordance with section 47f was not possible or reasonably advisable or practicable in the circumstances by reason of some physical or medical condition of the person.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 47f—Police to facilitate blood test at request of incapacitated person, etc.

Section 47f currently provides that the police must, on the request of a person who has been required to submit to a breath analysis, facilitate the taking of a sample of the person's blood. The results of analysis of the blood sample may then be used in proceedings for an offence against section 47b as evidence under section 47g(1a) to show that the breath analysis reading was inaccurate. The clause amends section 47f to remove the right to request a police-facilitated blood test in every case. Instead, under the amendments, a police-facilitated blood test need only be provided at the request of a person who has refused or failed with good cause to comply with the requirement or directions for the alcotest or breath analysis by reason of some physical or medical condition of the person. Under the amendments, any such blood test will be at the expense of the Crown.

Clause 5: Insertion of ss. 47fa and 47fb

As mentioned above, the police-facilitated blood test under section 47f will, as a result of the proposed amendments, be provided only for persons who refuse or fail with good cause to comply with a requirement or directions for an alcotest or breath analysis by reason of some physical or medical condition of the person. Instead, it is proposed that a person who has submitted to a breath analysis (and has been shown to have the prescribed concentration of alcohol in his or her blood by that analysis) may make his or her own arrangements for a blood test in accordance with procedures prescribed by regulation, using a blood test kit that will be supplied on request. This clause inserts new section 47fa to provide an exception to the proposal that such drivers must make all their own arrangements. Where the breath analysis occurs outside the Adelaide Metropolitan area and it appears to the police that a person who has requested a blood test kit will fail, despite reasonable endeavours, to make safe and appropriate transport arrangements within two hours after the breath analysis to attend at a place where a blood sample can be taken and dealt with in accordance with the regulations, the police must make those transport arrangements for the person if he or she so requests.

Where the breath analysis takes place outside the Metropolitan area, this clause also provides for an exception to the current requirement that blood samples must be taken by a medical practitioner. New section 47fb permits registered nurses to take such samples outside the Metropolitan area for the purposes of section 47f or the procedures prescribed by regulation under section 47g(1a).

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 47g—Evidence, etc.

Under section 47g, in its current form, it will be presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary based on the results of a blood test under section 47f or 47i, that the concentration of alcohol indicated as being present in a person's blood by the results of a breath analysis was present in the person's blood at the time of the analysis and throughout the preceding 2 hours. Now it is proposed that a person who has submitted to a breath analysis may arrange his or her own blood test in accordance with procedures prescribed by regulation. As a result, section 47g(1a) is to be amended by the clause so that the results of such a blood test may also be used to rebut the presumption of accuracy of the breath analysis. As a further consequence of these changes, it is proposed—

- that the current advice and warning under section 47g(2a) will be replaced by oral advice and a written notice as to the effect of the evidentiary provisions of section 47g(1) and (1a) and as to the prescribed procedures for such a blood test;

and

that a blood test kit of a kind approved by the Minister will be provided by the police to facilitate such a blood test if the person so requests.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 September. Page 606.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): We well remember during the 1989 election some of the literature that was sent out in our electorates at the time and signed by the then Premier. Certainly we well remember the circular put out in the electorate of Peake, as follows:

Hard work over the past seven years has put South Australia in a position to reap benefits of policies that have given us low unemployment, strong leadership, a sound economy and a sensitive approach to the environment.

My Government's strategy for the 1990s is aimed at consolidating our gains. We are making life easier. . . We have targeted youth training to make sure all young people have the opportunity to finish school and get the necessary training to help them find work.

Labor understands that while development is important to create jobs, our environment is also important. We are going make South Australia the recycling capital of the nation and emphasise tree planting. Only Labor will balance the needs of the environment with development.

On election day I need you to give me a strong mandate to continue working for all South Australians. . . Yours sincerely, John Bannon.

The letter, which is on parliamentary letterhead, contains the claim that it was not produced at public expense. Since 1989 we have come to expect all sorts of wild and woolly statements and, during the period leading up to the 1989 election and after, the Opposition questioned the Government on the role and performance of the economy, particularly in respect of the State Bank. I refer now to a speech given by Rod Nettle, an economist with the South Australian Employers Federation, on 13 October 1992, as follows:

In my 14 years as an economist, 11 of which I have spent in South Australia watching and analysing the change in the South Australian economy, I have done my level best to avoid making politically biased statements and speeches. I have seen my role in this State as an objective commentator on matters fundamentally dealing with the economic management and the health, wealth and prosperity of this State.

But, no more Mr Nice Guy! Now is the time for all of us, including me, to start to hammer the core issues of South Australian management economics as practised by our Government in order to cure those ills which have made South Australia the 'basket case' economy which it is.

In my professional life, having conducted research and studies in a number of national and international economic regions, I have never seen a worse run and worse performing economy than this one has been for the past 10 years, and the cause of that miserable performance is its political management at both the State and Federal level. . . We are one of the best fed, best educated, naturally well endowed, nice place to live economic disaster areas on the face of this planet.

The speech continues in that vein and then sets out what should be done in relation to improving the economy of this State, which is to reduce the debt. What happened to South Australia in the past four years can be reflected only in the fact that we have had to spend somewhere in the vicinity of \$35 million to find out what went wrong with the State Bank. I understand a document has been published estimating the cost of the royal commission at \$10.3 million; the Auditor-General's inquiry at \$13.24 million; and the combined

inquiry bank legal costs and legal fees for the bank amount to about \$11.5 million. All up that amounts to \$35.5 million to tell us that some 19 officers and board members of the State Bank should have their actions and activities investigated. That in itself is a tragedy.

I do not think that anybody has yet sat down and thought through what will happen if certain people in the banking industry who served the State Bank at that time, and particularly the directors of that bank, are prosecuted for not carrying out their job. It means that every director of every company in Australia will have to insure themselves, and the cost of insurance will be absolutely astronomical. Nobody will want to take on a job where decisions are made to lend money, and there will be horrendous problems in the financial sector. It comes down to the overseeing of the management of these organisations. The Treasury of this State was charged with the responsibility because it was the Government's bank. The Government of this State cannot deny it was its bank. It was the people's bank, which was taken away from the people and operated by the Government of the day. The Government all along should have supervised the management of that bank.

The biggest mistake was that the Government guarantees were allowed to roll along. In other words, as a Government and as a Parliament we should have transferred the responsibility of the Government guarantees to the Reserve Bank like all other banks, and then we would not have had to face this horrendous bail-out. The Auditor-General's report was released in Parliament today. Normally it is released on the first day we come back after the State budget is presented to Parliament. Tucked away in the Auditor-General's statement we find that the value of Government guarantees given out by this Government—and these figures are unaudited—amount to at least \$46 000 million. In other words, this State Government is up for guarantees worth \$46 billion.

If something goes wrong and the world economy collapses tomorrow, we could be up for \$46 000 million in borrowings of the South Australian Government Financing Authority, the State Bank and all the other debts and guarantees that have been given by the State. We do not even have the assets to cover that. South Australia is not even worth that much. So, when you start to analyse the financial responsibility and the behaviour of the current Government, is it any wonder that the people of South Australia, Rod Nettle and everybody else are starting to say we are a basket case?

When you look at the performance of the Federal Government in the past few weeks in presenting its budget and the reaction and the eruptions that have followed that miserable performance, is it any wonder that overseas countries are looking seriously at Australia? Our dollar has fallen, and we do not know what that has cost us. It will be interesting to hear whether our State Treasurer can tell us what that has cost us, and we want to hope and pray that interest rates do not go up overseas because a large percentage of our borrowings are in overseas currencies. It has been totally irresponsible management of the financial affairs of this State when you consider that we are totally bankrupt if anything goes wrong. This is the worst form of gambling that I know, and the sooner we start to get rid of some of those liabilities and responsibilities the better off future generations of this State will be.

As a politician and representative of the people, I cannot allow this State to remain in the financial mess in which it appears to be at the moment. As I said, that \$46 billion is unaudited. It could be worse and, as I said to my colleague,

the member for Mitcham, our shadow Treasurer, 'I thought we were up for about \$40 billion'. He started to shake his head and said, 'It could be closer to \$50 billion'. If that is the case, our future does not look too good. We have to reverse that situation and start tackling the problems as quickly as we can. Of course, there are many people who are disappointed with the report of the royal commission. Certainly everybody was looking for blood but, as I said, if we prosecute one or two of the directors and some of the management of the bank, the ramifications will be immense.

There has always been one policy in banking: you never lend any more than you have; you never commit your clients to any level of repayment on loans or debts unless they can service those debts without any embarrassment to them; and you never extend your loans over the value of the assets because you always have two sets of valuations on your assets. You have the current market value and the sale value, and you work the loans according to the sale value. That is commonsense banking, and it has been the policy since the year dot as far as bankers are concerned.

I think that, if money is lent in good faith, if it is lent on the figures and the profile presented to the bank by the client, there is little ground to move. Robin Millhouse taught me something when I first came into this Parliament and he called for a royal commission into something. Robin said, 'Never establish the terms and conditions of a royal commission unless you know the result you want to get'. I think that the Government has played around with the people of South Australia. It set out the terms of the royal commission knowing that the final result would be what was achieved. There must be further investigation of the possibility of prosecution. What annoys me is that it has cost us \$35 million that we can ill afford to waste in South Australia, yet we still have not got anywhere.

I think it is time we called it a day. I would rather have that \$35 million spent on trying to boost the economy of the State, creating further employment so that we can clean up the mess and get on with the job of developing South Australia, because I still believe we have a brilliant future if it is properly managed and handled. If John Bannon made any mistake as Premier, the mistake he made was to allow managers to manage, because he was let down by the management in many respects. He was also let down by the middle management.

I well remember one of the directors of the State Bank coming to me in December 1990 and accusing me of asking questions that were destabilising the State Bank, and to cut it out. I wrote out on a piece of paper on the top of a filing cabinet six questions and I said, 'Go back and ask your board these six questions. They will not be able to answer them; they will have to take it to the directors of Beneficial Finance Corporation. They will not be able to answer them, because it is middle management that has been playing around with all those financial institutions', and it was the middle management of Beneficial Finance that caused a lot of the problems.

There is one man whose name stands out from the first day that I was ever given any information, and he has escaped attention all the way through. I am not going to name that particular person—I know who he is—but he was responsible for a lot of the decisions that were made. He was in that middle management and he then went to the top management after a few got shunted sideways, but he has escaped, and I suspect there are a few others in there who have escaped as well and who were the perpetrators of some of the horrendous

little schemes that brought down Beneficial Finance and subsequently the State Bank.

It was the side benefits provided to the staff that caused many of the problems: the bonus schemes for obtaining loans, and bonus schemes for obtaining the source of funds from anywhere in the world. That bank and finance company borrowed money from every tax haven in the world and, as I have said before, we have no idea whether it is clean money, bad money, laundered money, drug money or whatever. That is where all the responsibility should have come back to the State Treasury, because the statistical data was being fed into the Reserve Bank, the Reserve Bank was plotting it, and the Treasury official should have had that information. The Federal Government, which deregulated banks, has to take some of the responsibility as well. The State Governments that had State owned banks virtually lost control of what was going on, because they were not doing the job properly. They did not have the expertise and they did not have the will or the desire that the Reserve Bank has to protect people's money. Now we pay for it, and we pay very dearly for it. It has not stopped.

In the *Sunday Mail* of 5 September 1993, under the heading, 'Entertainment Centre boss speaks out—big profit for "white elephant"' an article written by Andrew Holman—and the management of his paper should give him a lesson in economics—states:

The Adelaide Entertainment Centre is tipped to announce an operating profit this year of about \$1.5m. The figure compares with \$1.7m last financial year, contradicting claims the centre had become an embarrassing white elephant. Entertainment Centre Manager, Mr Ian Fraser, would not disclose the 1992-93 profit but said the drive for new efficiencies ensured continued prosperity, despite the recession and a downturn in the number of touring acts.

These efficiencies included a gradual cut over the past two years in full-time staff, from 22 when the centre opened to nine full-time employees, and an innovative enterprise agreement for 270 casual employees which has drawn national acclaim.

'Our cash position is first rate. There is no smart counting, nothing hidden,' Mr Fraser said. 'There are accounts the Government prepares on their investment which may show the profit as a return on its \$55m investment. That has nothing to do with us. Our commitment is to manage the centre as efficiently as possible. "Jesus Christ Superstar" was the most successful event of the year, drawing 110 000 people, more per head of population than any other centre in the nation.' Mr Paul Drennan, who is in charge of venue hirings, said the centre has secured another major international act. Details would be announced later.

This is the sort of entrepreneurial blurb that we get from time to time from those who seem to think the rest of us are fast asleep. In the Auditor-General's Report, presented to State Parliament today, for the financial year ending 30 June 1993, at page 9, under 'Adelaide Entertainment Centre—Income and Expenditure Statement for the year ended 30 June 1993', we see that the income was \$4 365 000; expenses were \$4 831 000 and there is therefore an operating loss of \$466 000. That does not come out as a thumping great profit as we read in the *Sunday Mail*. The accumulated loss—

Mr Gunn: Creative accounting!

Mr BECKER: As the member for Eyre says, it is creative accounting, and we are becoming accustomed to all sorts of things. The accumulated loss as at 1 July was \$349 000, the total accumulated loss, therefore, is \$1 016 000. Let us be honest and look at how they obtained the revenue. The revenue from the various events was \$2 260 000, and other operating revenues totalled \$1 657 000. A considerable amount of that money, I assume, is what we call corporate licences. Do not forget that we have corporate boxes there, and this is what the dispute at the Entertainment Centre is

about. Those corporate boxes are propping up the Entertainment Centre, whether anybody likes it or not, so the entrepreneurs can say what they want, but as far as we are concerned as taxpayers that is what is saving the Entertainment Centre.

The staging of the various events cost \$923 000, and in the previous year it was \$1.7 million while the income from events was \$3 990 000; other operating revenues totalled \$1 334 000, and the lease revenues were \$43 000, giving a total revenue of \$5 367 000. The administration for 1993 was \$913 000; centre overheads were \$799 000; depreciation was \$1 808 000 and, of course, that does chew into profits—we accept that. Management fees and related expenses totalled \$225 000. Repairs and maintenance were only \$127 000, and lease expenses were \$36 000. So, the staging of events, administration, centre overheads, management fees and related expenses took up a considerable amount of money in relation to revenue from the events. So, really, it was the other operating revenues that helped the Entertainment Centre.

The number of patrons for the 12 months was somewhere in the vicinity of 250 000 compared with 400 000 the previous year. If 100 000-odd people saw 'Jesus Christ Superstar', the rest of the events did not attract many people at all. I think it is about time that the public record was set straight. It is about time that we jumped onto the media.

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

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): There are a number of issues to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. Let me begin by drawing attention to the problems which we confront in the area called Murray-Mallee, soon to be known predominantly as Ridley, in which public infrastructure is being destroyed as only vandals could do it. That is happening across the board, I would have to say. I have problems with the way education services are being provided and administered, and I have problems with the way funding is provided for the maintenance and construction of roads.

Let us look at the implications for roads at this point. Just now, in consequence of the policy decisions that have been made over the years by Australian National and the agreements that it has made for the conditions of employment of the people who do the business of fetching and carrying, the cost of using rail has become uncompetitive compared with the cost of using road, in so far as the charge made by the service provider is concerned. But there is another hidden cost and that is the cost of the public infrastructure involved. That, in this case, is the difference between the minimal recurrent maintenance costs on the rail compared with the enormous costs that would otherwise be incurred in a continuing way by the destruction of our roads.

It has to be recognised that no longer is the grain grown in that district carried predominantly by rail but increasingly it is carried by road. The cost of the repairs to our roads is borne by the local community from the grants that they get from the Federal Government, with no adjustment to the formula after the decision to send that heavy freight across their unsealed roads has been taken, and also from rate revenue. Our district councils cannot afford to increase the collections they make from their ratepayers. Ratepayers are already so strapped for cash that they could not sustain an increase in the demand made by their elected representatives in local government, regardless of the value of their property.

The rate varies according to whatever is needed to provide all those services, predominant amongst them being the cost of repairs and maintenance of their roads.

That road network is being destroyed not because they want it to be destroyed or because they aid and abet its destruction but because they have no choice in it. The decisions are taken outside their districts, wherein the grain trains are simply cut out. Australian National has the prime contract but, instead of putting the grain on trains, it is putting the grain on road—and those roads, I would have to remind the House, are not sealed roads and they do not have footings on foundation material which are adequate to carry that measure of freight—that quantity, that volume, indeed that weight—and that is the nub of the problem.

Today there was a meeting at Loxton, called by the Loxton district council. I think all members of this House should recognise and commend the initiative that was taken by the district council of Loxton in arranging that community consultation to consider the future of the railway lines and services in the Mallee. We ought to let people know that we support the efforts that they have made to ensure that the people who could get together today to talk about those problems have a better understanding of the options available for the future role and function of the rail network throughout that part of the State, if not anywhere else.

What we need to do, of course, is to look more closely at the way in which we use the rail road along which steel wheels travel compared with the unsealed rubble road or the bitumen road along which rubber wheels travel. How is it, I ask you, and any other honourable member who cares to listen, Mr Deputy Speaker, that it can be cost-competitive and more cost-efficient to put one man in control of a vehicle which shifts only around 25 tonnes of cargo at a time over several hundred kilometres than to put one man crew in charge of another vehicle that will carry up to 1 000 tonnes, even 2 000 tonnes, of the same commodity on steel wheels along a rail road? To my mind, there has to be something crook in the way in which the bigger single unit of carriage is operated for it to be less cost-effective, because we know that steel lasts longer than bitumen and we know that, if the wages paid to one man can meet the cost of managing the carriage, the train, of that grain for 25 tonnes, it ought to be less expensive per tonne if there were 2 000 tonnes involved. Something is very much amiss.

That means, in my judgment, that the future use of railways has got to be through the private sector to enable either hybrid vehicles or dedicated grain vehicles and locos to run along those rail roads and carry the grain. It will make our roadways last longer, it will reduce the cost to the public purse (which cannot be met by the people who live there) and it will ensure that we make much better and much more effective use of the existing asset of the rail that is there, and the great benefit to everybody is that to do that makes the road safer.

Imagine within a year or so in an average season having 200 semitrailers with 25 tonnes or more going around the Devil's Elbow every day and coming along either North Terrace and/or any other arterial road through to the Port. That will congest the traffic to such an extent that it will increase the risk and the number of collisions, which will result in property damage and bodily injury, if not death. So the few million dollars that it will cost us to make the rail road available to the private contractor will be much less than the cost we will otherwise incur as a community if we do not make it available.

The next matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is the number of bankruptcies that are occurring in South Australia since the time I arrived here—let us say 1980. I seek leave to have inserted into *Hansard* two tables

setting out the number of bankruptcies in each of the States from 1980, and the national total, through to the present time.

Leave granted.

FINANCIAL YEAR	NSW & (ACT)	VIC	QLD	SA	NT	WA	TAS	TOTAL (AUST)
1980	1 208	1 227	694	959	22	578	265	4 953
1981	1 166	1 274	808	951	30	624	287	5 140
1982	956	1 289	642	804	30	548	292	4 561
1983	1 161	1 315	703	912	36	729	295	5 151
1984	1 161	1 107	865	775	40	705	256	4 909
1985	1 185	897	1 011	662	42	597	270	4 664
1986	1 406	932	1 280	923	60	652	328	5 581
1987	1 772	1 289	1 744	1 353	62	916	398	7 534
1988	2 051	1 633	1 799	1 495	82	946	498	8 504
1989	2 010	1 503	1 407	1 327	85	759	344	7 435
1990	2 230	1 809	1 591	1 319	75	1 088	440	8 552
1991	3 382 (391)	3 189	2 460	1 653	81	1 846	480	13 091
1992	4 703 (362)	4 081	2 914	2 031	99	2 314	638	16 780
1993*	4 545 (345)	3 557	2 499	1 812	72	1 742	589	14 816

* Figures for 1983-1991 taken from Annual Reports on operation of the Bankruptcy Act, 1966 by the Attorney-General. Figures are for bankruptcies and orders for the administration of deceased debtors. Figures for 1980-1982 and 1992-1993 come from figures faxed by ITSA.

FINANCIAL YEAR	NUMBER OF BANKRUPTCIES	POPULATION* ('000)	BANKRUPTCIES (HEAD OF POPULATION)
1980	4 953	14 695.4	0.000331 (1 per 2 967 persons)
1981	5 140	14 923.3	0.000344 (1 per 2 903 persons)
1982	4 561	15 184.2	0.000300 (1 per 3 329 persons)
1983	5 151	15 393.5	0.000335 (1 per 2 988 persons)
1984	4 909	15 579.4	0.000315 (1 per 3 174 persons)
1985	4 664	15 788.3	0.000295 (1 per 3 385 persons)
1986	5 581	16 018.4	0.000348 (1 per 2 870 persons)
1987	7 534	16 263.3	0.000463 (1 per 2 159 persons)
1988	8 504	16 538.2	0.000514 (1 per 1 945 persons)
1989	7 435	16 833.1	0.000442 (1 per 2 264 persons)
1990	8 552	17 085.4	0.000501 (1 per 1 998 persons)
1991	13 091	17 335.9	0.000755 (1 per 1 324 persons)
1992	16 780	Not Available	0.000968** (1 per 1 033 persons)
1993	14 816	Not Available	0.000855** (1 per 1 170 persons)

* The population estimate to 1989 is taken from the 1992 Year Book Australia. The 1990 and 1991 populations are taken from ABS Cat No. 3221.0. June 1990 and Preliminary June 1991 'Estimated resident population. . . '.

** Figures compiled using 1991 preliminary estimate.

Mr LEWIS: From the table of figures it can be seen that there was a dramatic increase in the number of bankruptcies between 1986 and 1987, and then again a further large jump

between 1990 and 1992. In South Australia it has been worse, particularly in 1986. There are two reasons why the figures are bad and a couple of others why the levels have occurred

in addition to those two principal reasons. The first one is the across-the-board economic mismanagement of the Keating Government—as it was then, Keating was the Treasurer and Hawke was the Prime Minister. Their incompetence became even more apparent in 1986 when they sent the country spinning into recession so that we were all told that it was a recession we had to have, and we reached the status of a banana republic in so far as profitability of small business was concerned.

More than 90 per cent of the people I represent have had negative incomes for the past few years. That has to be accepted. There can be no doubt about the incompetence of that management, because those farmers are as efficient as farmers anywhere on earth in doing what they do; they do it extremely well with very limited resources to produce what they produce, yet they have had negative incomes in consequence of the policies that have been imposed on them by Governments. It is not their fault; they are not incompetent; they have done things even better with less. But elsewhere in the economy during that time the level of bankruptcies rose by around 30 per cent. In South Australia, it went up by more

than 50 per cent. As members will see, the level in South Australia rose from 662 in 1985 to 923 in 1986, and then in 1987 it jumped to 1 353—that is more than double in two years. Not only was it incompetence of financial and fiscal mismanagement at the Federal level but also here, and in addition in South Australia the other factor was that the Casino came into operation in December 1985. A number of those bankruptcies, I venture to say well over 100, and probably in the order of 200 each year or four a week, were in direct consequence of people acquiring the habit and the mistaken belief that they could gamble themselves to wealth and prosperity. Only recently we have seen on the front page of our local newspapers the tragic consequence of one person who found the temptation too great and suffered from the mistaken belief that it was possible to make money out of gambling in the Casino. There can be no other explanation as to why South Australia's bankruptcy rate increased. However, members will be interested in the figures contained in another couple of tables, which I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Arrangements Assignments & Compositions
(Part X)

	1993	1992	% change	1993	1992	% change	Total 1993	Total 1992	% change
NSW	4200	(4341)	-3.3%	97	(200)	-51.5%	4297	(4541)	-5.4%
ACT	345	(362)	-4.7%	10	(18)	-44.4%	355	(380)	-6.6%
VIC	3557	(4081)	-12.8%	302	(373)	-19.0%	3859	(4454)	-13.4%
QLD	2499	(2914)	-14.2%	89	(97)	-8.3%	2588	(3011)	-14.1%
SA	1812	(2031)	-10.8%	55	(99)	-44.4%	1867	(2130)	-12.4%
NT	72	(99)	-27.3%	0	(3)	—	72	(102)	-29.4%
WA	1742	(2314)	-24.7%	131	(156)	-16.0%	1873	(2470)	-24.2%
TAS	589	(638)	-7.7%	8	(7)	+14.3%	597	(645)	-7.4%
TOTAL	14816	(16780)	-11.7%	692	(953)	-27.4%	15508	(17733)	-12.6%

Note 1: The figures in brackets are VERIFIED for the financial year ended 30 June 1992.

Note 2: All the above figures refer to personal bankruptcies only (and not corporate insolvency).

* Further details and the verified annual figures are published in the ANNUAL REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT 1966 for each financial year, released during the budget sittings of Parliament and available from the office of the Inspector-General in Bankruptcy, Insolvency and Trustee Service, Australia, Canberra.

BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS—(PROVISIONAL AND UNVERIFIED)

Bankruptcy District	No. of Bankruptcies and Admin. orders (Part IV and Part XI)			No. of Arrangements, Assignments and Com- positions (Part X)		Total	
NSW	2996	(2230)		82	(148)	3078	(2378)
)	+52.3%)
ACT	400	(*)		17	(*)	417	(*)
VIC	3098	(1809)	+71.3%	288	(179)	3386	(1988)
QLD	2424	(1591)	+52.4%	61	(59)	2485	(1650)
SA	1655	(1319)	+25.5%	122	(53)	1777	(1372)
NT	89	(75)	+18.7%	(0)	(0)	89	(75)
WA	1849	(1088)	+69.9%	133	(116)	1982	(1204)
TAS	480	(440)	+9.1%	6	(6)	486	(446)
TOTAL	12 991	(8552)	+51.9%	709	(561)	13 700	(9113)
					+26.4%		

Note: The figures in parenthesis are confirmed for 1989-90.

(*) included in NSW figure for 1989-90.

Mr LEWIS: The tables show that there is a marginal fall in the number of bankruptcies nationally per head of population anticipated when they come out for 1992 and this year. That marginal fall reached its peak when 1 in 1 300 people in 1991 became bankrupt: 1 in 2 000 had been the figure for 1989. That is an increase of about 50 per cent. Now it has

fallen to 1 in 1 100. This year, 1992-93, it is anticipated to be 1 in just over 1 000. The reason why it will not be quite that bad is that the law has changed. People no longer are being bankrupted by their creditors because of that change in the law. It costs over \$3 000 today in Government charges to bankrupt someone. It is not worth it for a creditor to pursue

his or her debtor and bankrupt them as an ultimate solution. Bad money managers are simply left to go on, either struggling or, more particularly in some cases, continuing to defraud other honest traders, because the law has been changed to make it so expensive for a creditor to bankrupt a debtor who refuses to pay or cannot pay their debts. No, bankruptcies these days are being taken by people who petition themselves because they simply want to be absolved of the responsibility of paying their debts.

To my mind, that is a tragedy not only for the community at large because nefarious small business operators can get away with \$30 000 or \$40 000 a year (from five or six creditors) and live very well, and those creditors know they will not get any money because the person they are pursuing is a man of straw, so they let them go to suck off somebody else. That continues from year to year, and I have first-hand experience of that sort of thing. It is iniquitous for the law to stand as it does, because there is no means by which it is possible to prevent those people, who are really little con men, from continuing to incur these social costs on the rest of us. But they live well; they live a darn sight better—three or four times better—than someone on the dole, doing the things they are doing.

The law ought to make it possible for someone who will not or cannot manage their affairs properly to be bankrupted by their creditors without incurring that huge penalty of Government charges of over \$3 000. So a flag can be sent up to ensure that others understand the warning that needs to be heeded.

The next matter to which I wish to draw attention is the role and function of Parliament itself. Since I have been here, all members, yourself included, Sir, will know of my determination that Parliament should not be subject to the direction of the Executive, nor should it be subject to the direction of the bureaus and the bureaucrats who run them. Yet that is what is still happening in our Parliament. It is especially the case where Treasury tells Parliament what it can do and what resources it will be given to do the job it has in front of it.

Parliament's responsibility is not only to provide Government with the means to pass legislation to do the things the Government wants to do: not only is it there for that purpose but also it is there to ensure that the Executive Government of the day is accountable. It should never be treated as a rubber stamp for the sake of Government (and that is one of the benefits we have with the bicameral system). If it is restricted in the resources at its disposal, as I know that you realise, Sir, it cannot function properly to make Executive Government accountable. It cannot put sufficient pressure in prospect on each Minister or the departments supplying the Ministers with the information and/or doing the Minister's bidding, because it is hamstrung in that it lacks sufficient funds to function.

It is my judgment that, before any Bill can be introduced into this place to appropriate revenue for the purposes of providing for the payment of capital works and salaries which the various bureaus and authorities of Government need, we ought to require in the Constitution of this State that Parliament appropriate for itself from Treasury what it knows it will need to cover its expenses for the ensuing year. No civilisation can survive unless it is a parliamentary democracy, and no parliamentary democracy will survive if that Parliament becomes subject to the whim of Executive Government. Yet, that is what we increasingly have here in this State.

We must take control of our own destiny as an institution and manage the affairs of expenditure within this institution, to provide the forum for society at large to secure the survival of democracy and accountable good government. I am saying that on the eve of an election in which it is virtually certain that the Government will change hands. I urge all members opposite to take heed and at least support the notion now, otherwise the chance to do anything about it may be lost.

I want to cite something that I saw on page 11 of the *Australian* of April 1992, written by Paddy McGuinness, who referred to what has been happening in the New South Wales Parliament. The gist of it is summarised in a couple of paragraphs, as follows:

The guts of this proposal is that the New South Wales Parliament should take a much greater degree of responsibility for managing its own affairs than has hitherto been habitual, with all sides of Parliament represented in a management board, or 'Parliament Commission'—

and I say a Joint Parliamentary Service Committee—

which would have the job of determining the Parliament's own budget and imposing a higher degree of accountability on the Parliament and its members. It is a strange aspect of our democratic system that the elected members of Parliament have had very little control over their own affairs, even while they have to vote for or against a total governmental budget presented to them by the Executive.

Further in the article, he says:

However, the essence of the proposal is that Parliament should manage its own affairs, even to the extent of determining its own budget. It should, too, manage its own sitting hours and procedures: there is something quite strange in a situation in which the Executive decides when and for how long Parliament should sit, when it should be convened and when prorogued.

I say, 'Thank you, a thousand times thank you, for the sane commentary of a journalist who has taken the trouble to think it through.' More strength to your arm, Paddy. If we do not do that, we will end up with an even bigger mess than we have at present. We have struggled, as you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, to improve efficiency as far as possible through the efforts of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, particularly in the operation of *Hansard* and the preparation and printing of those our records.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I pick up the debate following the member for Murray-Mallee. His comments remind me of a quotation from a book entitled *The Decline and Fall of the Athenian Republic* by Alexander Fraser Tytler, who lived at the end of the eighteenth Century. This quotation needs to be referred to, as it was written long before American democracy had been tested, and I believe it is rather timely. He writes:

A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves money from the public treasury. From that moment on the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the public treasury with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy always followed by dictatorship. The average age of the world's greatest civilisations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through the following sequence: from bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to selfishness; from selfishness to complacency; from complacency to apathy; from apathy to dependency; and from dependency back into bondage.

They are sobering thoughts, but it is something that we should ponder. I wonder where we are at this point in that wheel of evolution of democracy. I believe we have gone through liberty to abundance, abundance to selfishness and selfishness to complacency and that we are now going through complacency to apathy, apathy to dependency, and dependency leads back into bondage.

Every member has had the opportunity to say something about this budget. I for one must admit that whilst I can read all these documents and papers it is somewhat difficult to be able to establish exactly where we are at in terms of the budget debate. The budget has been put before us indicating a \$120 million surplus; however, when we get into the summary of consolidated accounts and receipts we note within that figure that \$160 million is included on return of capital. To my way of thinking that clearly indicates a \$40 million deficit rather than a \$120 million surplus. Those are the sorts of figures that one must question and ask what they are all about. I note a further \$3 million for service fees and reimbursement works that was not included in last year's figures. All those sorts of things make it difficult to understand where we are at and how these figures are evolving over a period of years. Unfortunately, we cannot get figures to do a direct comparison over the past 10 or 15 years to see exactly where we are going on a graph because the ground rules change, and as they change people become confused and this becomes almost impossible to do. I would even go so far as to say that perhaps those ground rules have been changed so as to confuse many people.

This budget is obviously an election budget, one designed not to offend many people, but at the same time not many people will get any great benefit from it. They are the sorts of issues that I think we will find hard to be able to read into the legislation as it comes out: just what is hidden and what are we likely to find? We are already finding a series of increases in budgetary matters, in taxes and fees and those subtle taxation measures that seem to be coming in almost on a daily basis.

Therefore, we must ask whether we are correctly managing our affairs. When I say 'we' I mean the Parliament, if the Parliament is given an opportunity to do that. We must also assess to what extent the State Bank fiasco has brought about the difficulties that we are facing. In the Auditor-General's Report tabled today in State Parliament there is some very interesting reading which we should be able to take in and which hopefully the people of South Australia will be able to take in in due course. It is obvious that the Auditor-General is concerned, first, about the method of accounting and, secondly, about the accountability of some of the reporting of the various Government departments and the main issue, the overall fiscal management.

I would like to quote two or three extracts from volume I of the Auditor-General's Report under the heading 'Net indebtedness of the public sector', as follows:

The indebtedness of the public sector at 30 June 1993 was \$7 869 million (an increase of \$469 million) reflecting primarily the impact of the payment to the State Bank and GAMD of \$650 million and borrowing from the Consolidated Account of \$317 million. Over the three-year period from June 1990 to June 1993, net indebtedness as a proportion of Gross State Product has increased from 15.2 per cent to 25.7 per cent. In the absence of the impact of the State Bank indemnity, it is estimated that the change over this period would have been a decrease from 15.2 per cent to 14.6 per cent.

We can see from that that we are facing some very serious problems over a long period to be able to correct that unfortunate state of affairs. The Auditor-General con-

tinues: Net indebtedness does not take into account other liabilities of the public sector such as employee entitlements and creditor accounts unpaid at 30 June 1993. A more comprehensive view is provided by a statement of estimated net assets of the total public sector reported later in section 2.5 of this volume.

My concern about accountability is shared by the Auditor-General. On page 3 of his report he states:

Notwithstanding the developments referred to above—

that is, matters related to the GAMD and the State Bank fiasco—

it is my opinion that there remains considerable room for improvement in public sector financial reporting. This is to ensure that financial reporting is transparent and understandable to its users. I have reported in the past that whole of government financial reporting that extends to include a consolidated presentation of financial statements for the public sector would assist to meet this requirement. During 1992-93, the Government announced its intention to pursue this and other matters as part of its public sector reform agenda. In line with this agenda, there is an expectation of accelerated development in financial reporting and control processes.

I believe that last sentence is a gentle slap on the wrist. The Government said it was going to do it, but so far it has done nothing, and there is the expectation of accelerated development in financial reporting and control processes. I think the Government needs to take heed of the fact that the Auditor-General has identified this factor. The Government has identified it, but it is not seen to be doing very much about it at this time.

The member for Murray-Mallee, in making reference to accountability in financial reporting, quoted a statement from the New South Wales Government as reported by a journalist. I wish to refer to another quotation in the Auditor-General's Report on page 43 of volume I where reference is made to New Zealand. He states:

In New Zealand, chief executive officers are required to provide a certificate, with respect to the maintenance of an adequate level of internal control, as part of the financial report. The recent Victorian Commission of Audit contains a recommendation that a similar practice be adopted in that State. The requirement for a chief executive officer to present such a certificate would, in my opinion, see a greater emphasis placed on internal control systems which would lead to improvements through the adoption of alternative practices based upon assessed risk. Such a direction would be consistent with the public sector reform agenda which proposes the adoption of 'best practice'.

It is clear that Governments of the day, not just that of South Australia but elsewhere, see a far greater requirement to adopt best practices for financial reporting. Until that takes place, we will have this continued scepticism of the general public, and certainly all sectors of the community—including members of Parliament—will experience difficulty in being able to understand the financial records as they are put forward. I have heard many members tonight and yesterday refer to the creative accounting in respect of the budget figures, and one cannot help but come to that conclusion when the books are so difficult to understand.

One of the issues that arises out of the announcement about the State Bank today is that the debt looks like being much more than \$3.15 billion—in fact, it is \$3.4 billion. When speaking to members and members of the public I often remind them of the extent of that. If we divided that \$3.4 billion by the total number of rural enterprises in South Australia, that is, every hobby farm, every farmer and station owner (all 14 386 of them), we would get \$236 340 per rural establishment in South Australia. That is the enormity of the problem and the enormity of the debt.

If members were watching television earlier tonight they would have seen reference to the wool stockpile. We all know that it is a stockpile of enormous proportions, and the amount of money tied up there is, in everyone's view, enormous. However, it is still less than two-thirds of the State Bank debt. The four million bales of wool that are tied up across the nation and the world in various depots amount to only about two-thirds of the State Bank debt. So, there is a big problem. We are arguing that our liability against gross State product is now at 25.7 per cent when, had it not been for the State Bank debt, it would have been down to 14.6 per cent.

All that does is put enormous pressure on Governments and Government departments, because they have no money with which to move. They cannot get into areas of job creation. After all, the only way we will get out of this problem is through job creation, and job creation occurs not by throwing money at job schemes but by encouraging employers to create jobs. For them to be able to do that, those jobs and positions must be viable and they must be able to earn money. There is so many add-on costs on which the State Government can have influence that today many people, where the potential for employment might have existed, are now looking for reasons why they should not employ rather than why they should. That is an attitudinal problem in some instances, but if one looks at the figures and all the add-on costs that are required to be met—and nobody is arguing about the rights of an individual—one sees that the bottom line is that, unless that person can earn for the employer at least 50 per cent on top of the wages in most industries—and in some of the high risk industries it can be double the base salary for the add-on costs—that job will not be created. So, there is that ongoing problem.

One of the issues that is ongoing, and it will be for a considerable time, is that of rural finance. I have made my views fairly clear on my attitude towards the sale of the State Bank, because rural finance is an area where a State bank, properly structured, can provide assistance in times of stress, drought and unusual circumstances, and we certainly have had those over the past few years. If the State Bank is retained and if it gets back to the original charter for which it was established, it will be able to play a greater role in helping the primary producers, the small business people and the home owners—basically every South Australian. It would be of enormous benefit to those people.

I am concerned at the way we are going. Banks seem to have changed their ground rules. They have dropped the guidelines that they had before, and they are becoming tougher on clients who are in a risky position. I have been involved—and no doubt in recent times many other members have been in a similar situation—in trying to get some rationale and commonsense from a number of banks. We all know that, if we have a series of forced sales, land values will drop. When land values drop—and they are dropping now, although hopefully they are starting to stabilise—they put at risk so many more people. After all, it is a book entry, whilst those land values are artificially deflated by banks, in some cases, exerting pressure. I am not arguing that some people are not financially viable, but I do know that there are many instances where, with a little bit of consideration by banks—and I am not saying they should give away money—and accommodation in respect of extending a loan or allowing these people to get into some other enterprise under close control, there is more than a reasonable chance of those people working out there problems.

The other issue that worries me—and it is something which the Government must pick up—is the farmer whose husband or wife seeks off-farm work to give them housekeeping money to keep the farm alive. In some cases where the wife has gone out to work—for example, she has been able to get a job as a school teacher, a nurse or a domestic—she earns more net income than the entire farm. The Rural Finance Division, when doing the books, might then discount the income that has been accrued off-farm and, therefore, decide that the farm is not viable.

Madam Acting Speaker, no doubt you would know of many such cases where the property has been able to be kept alive only because of the initiative of the individuals creating another business or getting off-farm work, be it school teaching, nursing, and so on, and thereby generating an additional income for that overall partnership operation. The present rules do not appear to accommodate that. I am rather cross that those people who are showing initiative and incentive by getting off their backsides and trying to help themselves by creating something are being penalised as a result of doing just that. Obviously, those who do not look for other sources of income will go under. However, it seems now that the bureaucracy, as it is, is not recognising the initiative being shown by these people.

I am disappointed that so far I have not been able to find in the budget papers any reference to the Year of the Family. I am quite concerned about that, because the matter has been raised in this House a number of times over the past 10 or 12 years. When this State Government is able to recognise the Year of the Family in concert with the Federal Government, we will be in there doing our bit. I can find no reference to the Year of the Family.

The member for Chaffey raised various issues. I do believe there is an opportunity in the Riverland to harvest carp to use as feed stock for the tuna farming industry, but that is an issue that I will take up at another time. However, it is another potential enterprise, given the will and the cooperation of Government departments and the Government of the day, from which some benefit hopefully will be able to be accrued.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): In addressing budget issues, there are a couple of matters that immediately come to mind, the first being funding for the Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education, formerly called Adelaide TAFE. The Capital Works Program (page 17), under the heading 'New Works', states:

Adelaide Institute—Stage 5
Commencement January 1994; completion December 1995.
The proposal is to construct a new building in the south-east corner of the campus on land currently occupied by old inadequate buildings and car parks. The stage 5 proposal will enable activity currently in leased accommodation to be consolidated, on the existing site, and permit some internal modifications to be made to the existing college to achieve greater efficiencies.

The estimated total cost is in excess of \$20 million. However, the Program Estimates (page 2.17) states:

Stage 5 redevelopment of Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education (total cost \$19.7 million), a major redevelopment for which consultations and feasibility studies are still being conducted to determine the most appropriate location.

Within the same parcel of budget papers we have a contradictory set of proposals. The Capital Works Program is suggesting an extension to the existing site, and that is the most logical and rational proposal—and that is what the college council, staff and students want—yet at the same time the

Program Estimates suggests that the Government is looking at an appropriate location and is still conducting studies to determine it. That is amazing, because to this point in time almost \$500 000 has been spent on architectural fees to assist in the redevelopment of the existing Light Square site.

I come back to a point that I have made previously in this place: the Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education, from council members right through to staff and students, wants the redevelopment of the existing site. What we have, presumably from Treasury and against educational advice in order to bail-out the bad bank, is a proposal to use Commonwealth money—possibly contrary to Federal funding guidelines—to purchase Chesser House in the Grenfell Street area and to foist that onto the institute. It is totally unsuitable, it will require major modifications and it is completely inappropriate in respect of access, parking, fire safety and a whole host of other things. Here in the budget papers we have this bizarre dualistic approach to that very important institution, the Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education.

If the Government is fair dinkum about creating real alternatives to universities as part of the training revolution, it must start treating those institutes as mature, responsible, independent and autonomous bodies. That is simply not happening. A good example, as I have just indicated, comes from the budget papers. It is fine to talk about advancement and progress in the training area.

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.

Mr SUCH: So, it is fine to talk about the training that is required for our people but, if that is to be of a high standard via the institutes, those institutes must be accorded proper recognition and respect, and treated as mature training institutions. That is not happening and it is certainly not reflected in the budget papers.

Furthermore, I discover that the Government is funding consultants to develop a logo to cover all the 10 institutes. Once again, that is a bizarre approach when the institutes need to develop their own autonomy and to become known for what they can and do contribute. Without consultation, the Government will foist on them, seemingly, a standard logo that all will use.

That defeats the purpose of having these autonomous institutes, because they must be known by what they do in terms of excellence and their offering in the training area. The institute operating in the Riverland area will want to have an identity that reflects what it does and the regional character of the area it represents and serves. In that case, it is the Barossa area as well as the Riverland. Once again we have an example of the Government's treating these institutes like kindergartens. The logical, sensible approach would be to allow each institute to develop its own logo and to have something that is appropriate to its region and the people it serves. That apparently is not the Government's intention.

Similarly, I am concerned about the lack of progress in the establishment of the State Vocational Education Training Authority, which should be in place now, because the Federal Government through its own authority, which is up and running—the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA)—requires a State-based training authority to coordi-

nate and oversee the spending of Commonwealth funds in the training area. But in South Australia we still do not have a Vocational Education Training Authority, which is part of this new training revolution.

The training authority will accredit courses offered not only by what were TAFE colleges, now institutes, but also by private providers. One does not have to be terribly bright to realise that if the authority does not exist there is some difficulty in accrediting courses. That also flows on to the wider training area. We now have many industries, in fact virtually all of them, up and running in terms of training programs, from the construction industry right through to the various services areas, which are waiting and wanting to see this Vocational Education Training Authority established. It looks from my reading of documents that it will be some time before we see that authority operating in South Australia. That is just not good enough in this day and age.

An education matter which comes generally within the higher education area but which also impacts on all the educational and training areas is the trend and movement towards open learning. I am sure that members would be aware of the value of an open learning approach, which is offered by many of our institutions, including the University of South Australia. The open learning approach offers greater access for people throughout the State and the country, particularly people in rural areas. It provides increased access for a whole range of training and skill development, at a significant reduction in the cost. The courses are of particular benefit to groups such as Aboriginal people in remote areas and other people in rural communities.

Yet there was little media coverage of the recent launch of a significant new series in that program, provided and created by the University of South Australia in conjunction with the Open Learning Agency of Australia and the ABC. It is an excellent new series entitled 'Aboriginal Australia'. It is a sad commentary on the media in our community when things as fundamentally important as the expansion of the open learning mode—which encompasses not only Aboriginal education but all sorts of areas, such as economics and so on, that people can study for pleasure or vocational purposes—do not warrant coverage by our print media.

On the other hand, there is plenty of coverage of things that are bizarre and extreme, yet something as fundamental as a giant step forward in the training area is conveniently overlooked by some of the large sections of our media. I find that not only disappointing but also quite sad in the sense that as a community, if we are to get the best from our educational institutions—whether they be universities, institutes or the Education Department—people need to be aware of these things. The assistance of the media to promote them and make people aware of them and to join in the recognition of the transformation that is occurring is important.

A different topic which stems from the budget and which concerns me relates to the lack of funding for the Flinders Medical Centre. One looks in vain in the Capital Works Program to find funding for the much needed accident and emergency facility at Flinders Medical Centre. I spent some time looking through but to no avail, because there is no funding for it. At the rear of the document there is basically a wish list of possible future capital projects with an underlined section which states:

... inclusion of a project on the list does not imply Government commitment to proceed with the project.

Lo and behold, Flinders Medical Centre accident and emergency upgrade is included, and it states:

Major extensions to the accident and emergency service to provide improved 24 hour service particularly for children and radiology.

Yet no funding is allocated. It is part of the wish list, appendix 3, at the back of the Capital Works Program. Flinders Medical Centre is an extremely efficient hospital and I defy anyone to look at ways under current arrangements whereby more fat can be squeezed out of it. There are extensive waiting lists and people admitted for accident emergency situations are having to be accommodated in unsatisfactory situations—in corridors and elsewhere—yet we find in this budget no provision at all for funding that accident and emergency facility. To say that the staff and the people of the southern region are disappointed and annoyed is an understatement.

Flinders Medical Centre serves a massive and rapidly growing population, yet what does it get in the budget? It gets zilch. Whilst I would not want to detract from what other areas are getting, anyone who is fair minded can see that the hospital needs in the southern area are significant and the upgrade of the Flinders Medical Centre is long overdue.

One additional point is that in the budget paper reference was made to provision of 1 000 places for young people aged between 17 and 24 years to undertake training and work experience in the public sector. Unfortunately, that is a con job, because my investigations show that there is no agreement with the Commonwealth to fund those places. The State Government has written to the Federal Government asking whether it will assist in funding those places, and it wants the funding under two categories: Jobskills and CareerStart. Under Jobskills the Commonwealth picks up the total cost of about \$270 per week plus a bonus of \$3 500 per trainee to help pay for workers compensation and so on. So under that category the State Government makes a profit and does not have to dip into its resources at all.

Under CareerStart, the State Government would have to make some contribution and, obviously, if it took on these people and offered them jobs at the end of the training there would be a cost involved. What was presented as a wonderful gesture by this Government towards the unemployed youth is very much a cruel hoax, because it is not set in concrete, and my information from Federal sources indicates that they were totally unaware of this offer that was made by the State Government in the budget. They had no knowledge that the Government was to pull out of the air this magical figure—and the fine print says 'up to 1 000', not '1 000'.

There is also a claim that, of the 400 engaged under the same program in the previous financial year, nearly half have found ongoing employment in the public sector. That is not true. My inquiries have established that fewer than 150 have jobs or might get jobs, and that is a scenario that is totally different from half getting jobs in the public sector. Fewer than 150 have, or might get, jobs. What was presented as a major plank of this budget was a conjurer's trick to try to fool the people of South Australia that this Government was doing something for unemployed young people. It is only in recent times that the State Government has taken on trainees at all.

The Public Service is ageing rapidly: those who are left are ageing for various reasons, not only biological. Because there is an election in the wind, the Government has suddenly decided to make a couple of announcements to give the impression that it will create places for young people, but there is no commitment to provide jobs for these 1 000

trainees even if the Commonwealth comes to the party and assists in the funding.

That whole aspect of the budget was nothing more than a PR exercise designed to try to fool the people of South Australia; it was cobbled together so quickly that the Federal department which has to fund it was totally unaware of the offer. No doubt it was surprised when it received a letter some time after the announcement asking for funding so the State Government could piggyback on the Commonwealth Government's trainee scheme and in so doing create the impression that it is serious about youth unemployment. It is a very serious situation when in South Australia we have the highest youth unemployment in the country, and to play around and engage in those PR hoaxes is cruel and one of the cheapest forms of political gimmickry that a Government can engage in.

Finally, I make a relatively minor point in the scheme of things but nevertheless one of some merit. In July I wrote to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee asking whether it would review visitor and tourist facilities at Parliament House. I asked in particular whether consideration could be given to appropriate signage welcoming visitors and tourists, possibly in different languages, and informing them of access for observation of proceedings, availability of Parliament House tours and so on. I asked whether the committee would consider some appropriate souvenirs suitable for sale to visitors and tourists. I stress that I was seeking this action in the context of assisting the dignified promotion of Parliament House, which is a key element of the cultural life of this State. The response I received yesterday from the Chairperson of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, I am pleased to say, acknowledges that some attention will be put into improving signage and that facilities in this place for visitors and tourists are generally inadequate. I am pleased to inform the House that the committee intends to provide signage using graphic symbols which are recognisable by people from various cultures.

The Joint Parliamentary Service Committee felt that the sale of souvenirs was best left in the hands of the old Parliament House establishment next door. I do not dispute that that is the appropriate place for the major sales, but I still think it would be worth considering in the future, particularly if this Parliament is ever upgraded to the point where it truly reflects its importance in the community. Tasteful mementos could be offered to people, or sold at a minimal charge. It extends beyond that, because for too long this Parliament has sold itself short and put up with inadequate facilities, some of which are being partly addressed at the moment. But when you bring visitors in here and schoolchildren, it is very difficult to offer them even a cool drink. Sections of the media have a lot to answer for by continually denigrating any attempt to upgrade this place into a reasonable facility.

This place belongs to the community and it should be accessible to visitors, tourists, residents and citizens of South Australia so they can view proceedings in a dignified and comfortable way; and so it can serve as a proper educational facility as well. That does not currently exist, and I am not blaming the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, but it is something that we as a community must address.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This afternoon the Auditor-General's Report was presented to the House. It is an interesting document and one that will take some time to analyse. I chose to head straight to the South Australian Housing Trust—an area in which I have had concerns for

some years. It is an area that has not received the full public analysis that it has deserved over recent years. I telegraph to the Government and the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations that he would be well advised to get his disciples in the Housing Trust working on the preparation of numbers and figures. We will be having a very close look at the financial management of the South Australian Housing Trust. I am sure that members on both sides who take part in that committee will find it interesting, because it is well known that the Housing Trust is approaching a very difficult time in its history in that, as I am now told, it is almost financially insolvent.

Back in 1991-92 the Auditor-General was ringing the warning bells. In fact, in his current report he states:

Last year I reported certain aspects which caused me to issue a Qualified Independent Audit Report in respect of the 1991-92 financial statements.

He then goes on:

A comprehensive report on these matters was provided to trust management to ensure that appropriate action would be taken to rectify the situation. In addition, the report covered a variety of problems which were encountered during the 1991-92 year end audit, which caused difficulties in completing the review and assessment process.

The report also identified a need for trust management to ensure that staff charged with the responsibility for coordinating/preparing the annual statements:

- . are fully conversant with the operations of the trust; and
- . have a knowledge of Accounting Concepts, Australian Accounting Standards and the Treasurer's Instructions.

What he is really saying is that the people who do the bookkeeping for the trust are not qualified, which is a very serious allegation. He continues:

... concern is expressed that it has taken some 16 months to get in place a satisfactory debt raising recovery procedure for the collection of excess water charges from tenants, a Government initiative reintroduced in 1992.

Once again, warning bells are being rung with respect to procedures not being adopted. The first thing I did was to look at the total assets of the trust, which we all know sit at around the \$2 billion mark, and then I looked at the liabilities, which currently sit around the \$1.4 billion mark. That shows that the trust is absolutely submerged in debt. I believe there is cause for concern when you link the two together, because you see that we have a trust submerged in debt and at a stage in its history where its board is gravely concerned about its future viability, and we look back and see that the Auditor-General has been highly critical of its financial management.

The Auditor-General's Report refers to the revaluation of assets, and concern is again expressed that it has not been achieved. As a consequence, in the 1992-93 financial statements under the heading 'Property Assets' it has reported on action taken and its intention to revalue all vacant land and to finalise a strategy to revalue all rental properties by 1994. That was supposed to be completed in 1993.

Once again we have financial mismanagement at a time when the trust is becoming insolvent. Questions will be asked during the Estimates Committees as to how the Government and the Minister allowed the Housing Trust to get into this state of financial insolvency with a huge debt problem hanging over its head. Along with this problem the poor financial management is worrying the board considerably. This is a very difficult problem, and one that we have had only a couple of hours to look at this afternoon, but I can assure the House that further analysis will be done.

I think it was to be expected at the beginning of an election year that we would not see the usual hike in State taxes in the budget, which we have seen regularly in the past. However, we were not spared the usual hike in State charges—the build up came some weeks and months beforehand but, nevertheless, they were there. The State tax take is expected to increase from \$1.571 billion to \$1.615 billion—a rise of 2.8 per cent. The much publicised reduction in FID is being offset by revenue from business franchise fees in the form of tobacco, which is up \$25.6 million, and petroleum up \$16.9 million. The Treasurer wants the public to believe that the pain is over. He has been out in the public arena, on television and in the media, trying to convince the public that the pain is over. That is absolute and utter nonsense.

The State Government need be under no illusion—it is currently sitting on a steady 35 per cent popularity in the polls because people are hurting. They know why they are hurting and they are reacting accordingly. Those polls are not fluctuating any more—they have settled down to a steady 35 per cent. These people know they are hurting because of the financial mismanagement of the State. They are hurting because of the decisions of a Labor Cabinet, which is lined up opposite us—purely and simply, incompetent people making wrong decisions. This Cabinet contains men and women who have put more into their political passion over the past five or six years than thinking about the good of South Australians.

The Cabinet has racked up a public sector net indebtedness of \$7.869 billion as at 30 June this year, or \$5 375 per head of population for every man, woman and child in this State. The debt is now heading for \$8.110 billion by 30 June 1994. The most frightening figures for a State like ours, a small State with a small population, is that the total liabilities are now running at \$13.847 billion with accrued superannuation liabilities increasing by \$719 million to \$4.264 billion. I find that quite frightening.

Members of the public who suddenly realise what is hanging over their head will have every cause to be concerned. It is no wonder that we are losing South Australian companies interstate and to South-East Asia as fast as they can go. There is nothing in this budget that gives any hope or inspiration to companies employing South Australian workers to stay in South Australia if they are becoming non-viable. The manufacturing industry in this State is in survival mode. It has been forced there by the economic policies of the Labor Party and Trades Hall on South Terrace. Through this budget, the Arnold Government had an opportunity to set some new directions, but instead we copped the pre-election budget which is purely designed to get the Labor Party past polling day with a minimum of fallout.

The manufacturing base and those South Australians that it has the capacity to employ have been badly let down. I have searched through the budget and I cannot find anything in it that will do anything to stimulate our manufacturing base. Without that manufacturing base we will have no employment. I am familiar with one such company that has been forced to look offshore so that it can survive here. What happened to that company should be put on the public record for everybody to understand.

The company has been Adelaide based for some 50 years and principally involved in the manufacture of small electric motors: in actual fact, it is Australia's only manufacturer of one specific type of motor. This company has moved the majority of its manufacturing activities to Malaysia to provide a cost base that will allow the company to maintain and

increase its market share whilst achieving some sort of reasonable profit. Labor MPs opposite do not seem to care about it very much, but if they did they would have noticed that, due to the fluctuations in our currency over the past five years, imported products have flooded our market, giving the South Australian consumer the opportunity to purchase those products at prices below what our own South Australian firms can afford.

Fortunately for us, our tariff policies at the Federal level have enabled the importers to maintain their position in our domestic market, whilst our South Australian manufacturers have been frustrated by increasing costs associated with labour and raw materials. Because of this threat to South Australia's businesses we have seen, and continue to see, South Australian eyes being turned to Asia.

My eyes turn to this budget, and I repeat: there is nothing in this budget to stop the drift of business out of this State, interstate and to Asia. It is not a question of these companies being disloyal to South Australia, but rather a case of setting up in South-East Asia to complement the South Australian operation and, if at all possible, enabling it to stay in business.

Many of their moves into places such as Malaysia are to preserve the South Australian investment, and Government members should get their heads out of the sand and realise what is going on in this State at the moment. China, India, Indonesia, Burma, Vietnam, Malaysia and Singapore—they are all being targeted and poised as a springboard for a serious threat to our economics and corporate opportunities. I know we are all rushing around and saying, 'We have to get in on this', but I think we have to be very careful.

Whilst it is nice to get involved in the Asian markets and the manufacturing activities up there, it is no good all our companies moving out because it is no longer cost competitive to stay here in South Australia and everything is happening up there. Whilst it is the case that the Asians are being employed, we end up buying the products back here and our factories are empty.

Malaysia is a good example to analyse and compare in the terms of a budget debate and the economic exodus from this State. South Australian companies are finding Malaysia's capital base, its enormous growth, its geographic location, its Westminster legal system, its international accounting standards, stable government and English-speaking population to be irresistible when looking for location criteria compared to what can be provided here in South Australia.

South-East Asia is also proving to be a prudent investment decision for many companies, given the strength of the region and its commercial attitude with respect to its valuation of intellectual property and, most importantly, the price earning ratio attributed to medium-sized manufacturing industries, which once flourished here in South Australia. It is a blight on this Government and gives us no joy to receive reports on how we are represented to and perceived by the commercial sector in Malaysia. Given time, the same reports will start coming back from points farther north around Vietnam and other areas opening up in Indonesia.

I am reliably informed by the company to which I have referred that its cost of labour in Malaysia is approximately one-tenth of the cost in Adelaide and the local Malaysian labour force is in most cases well educated, English-speaking and highly productive. Trade unions are represented but commercial principles are not compromised. Penalties are non-existent and morale is high. Their raw materials across the board are approximately 25 per cent less expensive than

in Adelaide. For example, aluminium is 20 per cent less expensive than in Adelaide, and steel is 70 per cent less expensive. The 'big Australian', BHP, has an export price on steel which prejudices the local manufacturer in the order of \$US360 a tonne in Malaysia and \$US525 a tonne here in Australia.

Time is running out for this Government if it is to do anything at all for our manufacturing base and if it is to try to do something to help it compete with the Asian product. Clearly, I am talking about employment opportunities for the South Australian work force versus the creation of employment for South-East Asian workers. I know who I would prefer to employ, and I know to whom I would be giving encouragement by way of gearing up my budgets. My loyalties lie back here with our South Australian workers. They should be the objective of the State Government and, indeed, I find this budget a distinct lack of support in that area.

I now turn to another agency within the budget, namely, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). It was interesting to read the objectives of this new department and the claims of greater cooperation that would exist in the way of new housing developments and the way they will be established. We are told in the papers accompanying the budget that the South Australian Urban Land Trust will acquire the land identified by the Government's metropolitan development program. We are told that planning and the staging of land release will be determined by the Office of Planning and Urban Development. The Urban Land Trust will release the land when needed. Close links will be maintained with other agencies, such as transport and the like; and, finally, the private sector will meet the housing needs. In other words, it will go out and build the houses.

The Government here, on its own admission, in its own budget papers, has omitted the private sector completely from any involvement in the land, the land banking, the sale and holding of land. It is obviously a deliberate attempt to isolate the private sector and continue much of the same operation that we have had in this State now for many years, whereby the Government thinks it is the only agency and authority that should have anything to do with the holding, zoning and passing on of land, whether it be broad acres or zoned subdivided land.

The Government is not the panacea; it is not the be-all and end-all in these matters. The private sector has the capacity to get this State going again and should be given that opportunity. It is totally unacceptable to the development industry, to all those involved in commerce and business, to see a socialist Government flexing its muscles and nailing its flag to the masthead in matters such as this by sending out, as I say, a very clear signal to the private sector that the Government's only interest in the private sector is to allow it to go out there and actually carry out the construction activities.

There is also a contradiction in the papers accompanying the budget, where it is stated that the development division of the Department of Housing and Urban Development will be responsible for the supply of broad acre land required for residential development in the future and will provide consultancy services for major projects and development on strategic sites, such as surplus Government land. I have found a statement in another part of the budget indicating that SAULT (South Australian Urban Land Trust) was going to do that; in this part of the budget it will be conducted by the development division of HUD—two separate agencies, both

claiming to have that role. That matter has to be cleared up. It is just another example of the Government having thrown together these departments and the departments still being unsure about their roles.

The budget contains many concerns for the urban planning industry which I will raise during the Estimates Committees. I am afraid that the Minister's 1993-94 budget brief becomes very ethereal in parts. It waffles and does not get down to specifics; it is meant to sound good, but it does, I believe, indicate a department waiting for some firm leadership. It talks about HUD having a new vision for South Australia which offers forward geared planning as opposed to the old system which was reactively geared to negative controls. The new planning system might be an improvement but the talk about the one-stop shop has to be proved, as do all these other streamlining matters.

We have not yet seen the State strategic plan. The regulations are not yet in. Many other matters which would give guidance to the industry are not there. The industry, the Opposition and the public have doubts about the veracity of this budget.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The State Labor Government, through this budget, has abandoned those very people who depend on it the most. The State budget which has been brought down has been ruthless on those families who have been unable to survive the ravages of the recession. As the Opposition has predicted now for sometime, a considerable amount of money has been pruned from the provision of services by the Family and Community Services Department. This will mean across-the-board cuts in services by non-government agencies at a time when these services have never been needed more, and at a time when the Premier has continually suggested that there would be no cuts to services as a result of this budget or any other actions of the Government.

The fact is that the budget cut in support for community services will mean that this Government has reduced by some \$10 million the money available through Family and Community Services to the underprivileged in the past three years. Up to now, these cuts have been met by efficiency savings within the department. This additional amount will mean a reduction in departmental staff and cuts to the voluntary agencies. All welfare experts are aware that at times when unemployment is high the demand on welfare support is up by at least 50 per cent. Unemployment and economic recessions take a very heavy toll on families and individuals in need. Domestic violence, child abuse, juvenile crime, drug addiction and alcoholism (and so we could go on) escalate as frustration grows with the unemployment queues.

This budget, coming on the heels of the Federal budget, is a double whammy for the underprivileged in a number of areas. Organisations such as Meals on Wheels or the Royal District Nursing Society will be forced to pay a considerable amount more in the way of petrol, for example, and other areas as a result of these budgetary measures. The representations that I receive, and I am sure those that the Minister is receiving, would suggest the grave difficulties that are being faced by voluntary agencies, the non-government organisations in this State.

I do not know how many more times I have to say it in this place, but I invite all members of the House to go into their local communities, to talk to representatives of St Vincent de Paul, the Salvation Army and other agencies which are out in the community helping those people in need. These

agencies are stretched to the absolute limit. Now, as a result of this budget, we find that they will be dealt with severely in the lack of support from this Government.

It is not just a matter of my concern for Family and Community Services: of course, it is across the board. As so many of my colleagues have said over a long period of time now, we can recognise through all Government services the ramifications of the State Bank disaster. In relation to the E&WS Department, for example, complaints are coming in day after day about the state of infrastructure in South Australia, whether it be in the metropolitan area or country areas. I suggest that when the same water main bursts six times in six weeks in six different places we have to question the priorities of the Arnold Labor Government. When an anguished E&WS Department officer, tired of trying to patch up a pipe beyond repair, suggests to residents that they contact their local MP because they cannot go any further, we realise that the problem is overwhelming.

It is obvious what has gone wrong. The State Government is preoccupied with merging the E&WS Department and ETSA, to camouflage the amount of money it is taking from the organisation, which this year happens to be \$22.8 million. A total of \$22.8 million will be creamed from the E&WS Department to go into general revenue as a result of this budget for 1993-94. The Premier and the Treasurer are getting down on the funds which should be going into replacing corroded and fragile pipes and which should be going in to revive the infrastructure in this State. They are depleting the cash reserves of the E&WS Department, so there is a minimum of resources available for maintenance, let alone capital works. One only needs to talk to any of the E&WS Department's officers to recognise the frustrations and concerns that they have about the responsibilities that they are supposed to be carrying out on behalf of this Government.

The only interest of the Government is diverting the money that should be spent on infrastructure and other areas into programs which it hopes to use for its electoral purposes. This Government is running around like a headless chook, making all sorts of announcements in this pre-poll period so as to distract people from how it has managed the State's economy. Many of their services that the Government is supposed to be providing are suffering and, in turn, the community is having to accept the ramifications.

I will use another example just to indicate how desperate the situation is in the E&WS Department. I recently received a letter from a constituent, one of a handful of people who have a class 2 water drilling licence. I would suggest that the outside 20 such people in this State would have that licence. They have received a letter which reads as follows:

You are advised that your class 2 well driller's licence issued to you under the Water Resources Act has expired on 30 June 1993. Please take note therefore that you are no longer authorised under the Act to undertake well drilling practices in South Australia, and contravention of the Act could lead to severe penalties.

When my constituent inquired why they had not received a reminder notice about this, they were told that the E&WS Department could not afford to send out reminder notices. The department did not have the resources to send out reminder notices to some 20 people at the outside. How far do the people in this State have to go under this Labor Government? Here we have people who are carrying out a responsibility, an important part of industry in this State, and that is the sort of response they get. It is no good for the Government to sit back and recognise that their employees

through the departments are very sympathetic and apologetic to my constituent and others. The fact is that the service is just not being provided.

Let us look at another situation that we have seen in latter weeks: the changing of the name yet again of the Department of Environment and Land Management. Six months ago it was the Department of Environment and Planning. Then it was determined that it should be the Department of Environment and Land Management. Now we have the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. What's in a name? Obviously not much when the Arnold Government is trying to freshen up its image, I would suggest.

It is quite obvious that the Government believes that new names for the departments headed by tired and stale Ministers is the way to go. The Premier is also attempting to use the new titles to disguise the fact that little is happening within certain areas of Government responsibility, such as the environment. The Department of Environment and Land Management, previously the Department of Environment and Planning, has now been renamed the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, but at what cost? It is almost a joke when speaking to people from that department, because it is going around, 'Well, we won't get new stationery, cards or letterheads printed, because the name is likely to change again.' It has happened three times in six months; what will the next change be?

The Arnold Government is trying to fool South Australians into thinking that by a name restructure it is actually doing something constructive when most of the changes are merely cosmetic. I understand that the constant name changes for the environment department in South Australia have cost taxpayers a lot of money in recent years. On top of that, the 1993-94 State budget reveals that the Government has chopped expenditure on the Department of Environment and Land Management again by \$14 million—from \$116 million to \$102 million. So much for the desperate need for improved management in our national parks, for example, and so much for the real action that is needed to protect the environment in this State instead of ongoing cosmetic treatment, as I said earlier.

Apart from the proposed Environment Protection Agency and the coastal sand replenishment program, there are few, if any, new major initiatives for the environment contained in the budget. Any environment spokesperson, such as Minister Mayes, who is refusing to recognise the need for improved funding, should take the consequences. All that Minister Mayes seems to recognise as a significant initiative is the re-greening of the old Hackney Bus Depot, which he refers to as a key environmental initiative and which I called for as a matter of course in June this year. Obviously the Minister is just marking time.

The Arnold Government is taking for granted those people who place great emphasis on the environment obviously in the belief that it has to pay only lip service to conservation values to gain their support. I assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that that will not be the case, because people who are genuinely interested in conservation in this State can see through what the Government is trying to do. They can see through the fact that the Government is prepared to change names of departments and responsibilities for services just to hide the real facts. The real fact is that the Government does not care about the environment of this State.

I refer to the merger of the E&WS and ETSA, a matter that has been dealt with in this House recently, so it is not appropriate for me to go into detail, but I point out that even

the Public Service Association is less than impressed with the announced reshuffles that have taken place regarding Government agencies. In a recent statement under the heading 'Where is the saving? PSA not convinced on departmental shake-up', it states:

The changes are driven by the political imperative of lowering the profile of the public sector. The public sector is a large and complex beast and even if it is underfed and skinny at the moment you still can't hide it in a cabbage patch.

There is concern within the Public Service about the breakdown in the services that should be provided to the people of this State. Obviously, we would support strongly the private sector wherever it has a responsibility. If the private sector can do it as well as or better than the Government, the Government should get out of the road and let the private sector do it. However, there are many responsibilities that can be only those of the Government. When those services are reduced, people suffer, and plenty of people are suffering at present.

This budget is all about Labor's future. It is not about our future or that of South Australia. It claims an artificial surplus after taking \$160 million of capital from the State Bank. Once again, Labor is using the State Bank as nothing more than a cash cow despite a specific warning against this practice by the royal commission. This means that Labor has abandoned its debt reduction strategy for what is a blatant election budget—nothing more, nothing less.

South Australians continue to pay further instalments on Labor's failure with the \$287 million losses on the bad bank and the \$42 million SGIC loss. If the Premier, any of his Ministers or any member on the Government benches at present believes that the report that was handed down yesterday will mean that people will forgive the Government for the disastrous situation that we all face—not only that we face but, in particular, that our children will face—it has another think coming, because I assure the House that the people with whom I have spoken today can see through it. Despite all the excuses that might be made and despite all the huffing and puffing by the Premier in this House yesterday and again today suggesting that the Government was not to be blamed, the people can see through it. When the election comes, whenever that might be, they will react accordingly—there is no doubt whatsoever about that.

Just as the Government has reduced the value of the State Bank, it has also reduced the worth of SAFA by \$300 million to help pay for the State Bank's losses. Labor cannot even be trusted to meet budget targets set in Meeting the Challenge, the document so strongly advanced by the Government at an earlier stage. Instead of just under 2 500 jobs being cut in 1992-93, the actual reduction was only 751. How much have we heard about the Government's aim to reduce public expenditure in that area? The Government can huff and puff as much as it wants. It can try to hoodwink the people of South Australia and to suggest to them that it is here to serve them and that that is what it is doing. More and more people in the community realise that their essential services have been reduced. Despite what the Premier is saying, they will be reduced further.

The people in this State have lost absolute confidence in this Government, and at the next election will, by the way they vote, reflect their thoughts on what this Government has done for the people of South Australia. It has done nothing; it will do nothing; it needs to be replaced with a Government

that has direction so that it can rid South Australia of this tired Government that just uses this budget to try desperately to hang onto office. It will not work.

Mr MATTHEW secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 9 September at 10.30 a.m.