

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 9 September 1993

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr D.M. Ferguson)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 September. Page 658.)

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): This is the budget we have all been waiting for. It is certainly not the one that brings home the bacon and, under this Labor Government, it appears that it is the budget that we had to have. It is not the budget that South Australia wants, it is not the budget that South Australia needs and it is not the budget that is going to start to deliver some of the solutions to get South Australia back up on its feet again. One need look only at the extent of State debt, a debt that has been engineered through the mismanagement of a blundering front bench, a blundering inept Government over 10 years, to obtain a picture of what lies before us. I quote from the report of the Auditor-General that was tabled in this House yesterday, as follows:

At 30 June 1993 the South Australian public sector net indebtedness was \$7 869 million (an increase of \$469 million) and the deficit on Consolidated Account recurrent operations for 1992-93, funded by borrowings, was \$169 million.

I refer to the Auditor-General's Report at this time of the debate because it provides an interesting insight into the problem South Australia faces and the plight that faces individuals within the State as a result of Government mismanagement. It highlights what needs to be turned around. In reference to the State's debt the Auditor-General states:

An understanding of the influence on the State of the financial assistance provided to the State Bank may be facilitated by reference to a range of economic, financial and other data. The one measure that in my opinion is most telling is the level of the State's net indebtedness.

The Auditor-General goes on to state:

Analysis of the South Australian net debt over the past four years clearly reveals the impact of the State Bank's difficulties upon the State's financial position.

The Auditor-General goes to some length to detail the fall-out from the State Bank rescue and it is on that that I wish to focus a considerable part of my address, because the Auditor-General succinctly outlines the difficulties facing us as the result of the State Bank collapse and its bail-out. The Auditor-General says, in part:

The simple facts associated with the State Bank rescue can be succinctly stated as follows: 70 years of prudent financial management was dissipated by the activities of one institution.

I repeat those words: . . . 'over 70 years of prudent financial management'. That management was decimated through one institution, an institution over which this Government had absolute say if it so desired to exercise it, an institution that continued to lose multi millions, hundreds of millions into thousands of millions, of dollars while the Cabinet, the leading body of the State, sat idly by and did absolutely nothing. He goes on further to say:

It has imposed on the State a severe financial handicap as it moves to adjust to the volatile economic environment of the 1990s

and at the same time accommodate restructuring of the South Australian economy.

The document further states:

The net indebtedness of the public sector has escalated from \$4.303 billion at June 1990 to \$7.869 billion at June 1993, of which \$2.950 billion represents financial assistance paid to the State Bank and the Group Assets Management Division.

He further says:

Pressure has been put on the State's credit rating which has been downgraded. Since around the time it became apparent that the Government guarantee would be invoked, senior public servants have been deflected from their principal duties of managing important Government activities in order to pursue a rescue and salvage program related to the bank.

That is a damning indictment of what is happening under this Government. As a result of their blunders over the State Bank they are now deflecting senior public servants from their activities within Government, from important jobs within Government, to concentrate on how they can help this Government cover over its financial ineptitude and bail it out of the problems it has created. Senior Government officials employed to undertake those roles have not been able to perform them because of this Government's problems and ineptitude. The Auditor-General goes on further to say:

To address the budgetary problems caused by the disaster, the public sector is now subject to financial pressures that would not have otherwise occurred.

These are indeed pressures that every South Australian is going to have to bear for one heck of a long time, pressures that will certainly be borne by the children and grandchildren of South Australians right across the board. It is interesting when reading the Auditor-General's words to reflect on statements made in his previous reports tabled to this Parliament, and I again remind honourable members of some of those words when he said, in part (from Volume I):

The story of the bank is one of a professionally aggressive and entrepreneurial chief executive without sufficient appreciation of the need for prudent banking controls and management; of an incompetent executive management happy to follow where their chief led without independent professional judgment; of a board of directors out of its depth and, on many occasions, unable or unwilling to exercise effective control; and, ultimately, of a bank that thrived on the full faith and the credit of the people of South Australia.

The bank was operating on the full faith and the credit of not only the people of South Australia but this Government as a whole, which refused to intervene, this Government which was told originally through a then Minister and now Premier that the State Bank was in serious financial trouble. That same Premier refused to do anything. It was a Government that was told by—

The Hon. H. Allison: He said it was being well managed.

Mr MATTHEW: Indeed, as my colleague the member for Mount Gambier interjects, he said it was being well managed. Well managed indeed: find me one South Australian who would say that the bank was well managed or that the Government acted properly in its role. From Volume XIII of the Auditor-General's Report tabled in this House, he also said:

That a few individuals, charged with the responsibility for the administration of a major publicly owned financial institution and one of its wholly owned companies, could, in the period of a few short years, allow the creation of a situation that has contributed to one of the largest financial disasters that Australia has ever experienced is difficult to comprehend. It is, nonetheless, a reality.

The social and economic consequences for all who live and conduct business in South Australia are so far reaching that South Australians will be paying for the excesses of the Bank Group for many years to come.

At the end of the day, the people who had absolute managerial control over the State Bank Group are the Cabinet of this Government and the Caucus room of this Government.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Mitchell may well interject, but I challenge—

Mr Holloway: Rubbish!

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Mitchell says it is rubbish. I challenge the member for Mitchell—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hamilton): Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr MATTHEW: I thank you for your guidance, Mr Acting Speaker. I appreciate that interjections are out of order and I thank you for your protection. I challenge the member for Mitchell and other members of the Labor Government to stand up in this Parliament and say what they did in the Caucus room to try to get their Ministers to do something about the problems facing the State Bank. How many times did the member for Mitchell stand up in the Caucus room and protest about what was happening? How many times did the member for Mitchell and his colleagues say, 'We are fed up with what is happening; something has to be done, because my electorate will have to pay'? I would be surprised if the member for Mitchell stood up and said a thing but, if he did, let him stand up and tell us. At the same time, if he does so, let him substantiate it through the minutes of the Caucus.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: I doubt very much whether the member for Albert Park stood up in the Caucus room, either. He has been very quiet in this Parliament over the State Bank debt. I would like the member for Albert Park to stand up and chastise all the Ministers for their role in sitting back and saying nothing about the State Bank disaster, for, in the words of the Auditor-General (and I repeat them for the benefit of members):

The social and economic consequences for all who live and conduct business in South Australia are so far reaching that South Australians will be paying for the excesses of the bank group for many years to come.

And that will be the case under this budget for a heck of a lot longer, because all we have seen is yet another plunder of the State Bank, ripping out \$300 million in order to prop up this budget further and in order to prop up the ALP during its election campaign as it tries to buy votes.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: As my colleague the member for Murray-Mallee interjects, it is as dishonourable as the \$2 million bribe it gave to the State Bank before the last election to hold down interest rates during the lead-up to that election. If that does not border on corruption, I do not know what does. It is absolutely disgusting that any Government would stoop so low as to bribe an institution to hold out on bad news until after the election.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Albert Park says it is a very serious allegation; it was a very serious act that was committed by this Government in offering that sort of bribe to the State Bank. If the member for Albert Park wants to stand up in this Parliament and defend his Party's action, I would be very interested to hear him do that. The fallout from the State Bank has not yet finished, because what we are about to face is a further bail-out of the State Bank. The Liberal Party has already claimed that a further bail-out,

possibly of the magnitude of some \$600 million, could be necessary if this Government continues on its present path.

The member for Mitchell did not seem to think that was right, so I will give him some interesting figures. The budget papers tell us that only \$113 million of the \$3 150 million bail-out money is left. That is all that is left to pay for future losses of the bad bank and, on the bank's own admission, that is likely to continue for at least another two or three years. The bad bank still holds \$3 000 million of bad assets.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: For the benefit of the member for Mitchell, who insists it is less than that, I refer him to page 3.7 of the Financial Statement of 1993-94. The bad assets continue to be transferred to the bad bank. In fact, an additional \$310 million was transferred in the second six months of 1992-93, including the now infamous property at 333 Collins Street, Melbourne. SAFA alone lost almost \$66 million on that property last year, including \$22 million in holding costs, which the bad bank will now have to pay. For the benefit of Labor members, that information can be found at page 46 of SAFA's annual report. It is interesting that the bad bank's valuation of the Remm-Myer property is \$15 million above the valuation of the independent valuer, and \$105 million above the Valuer General's valuation—that is detailed at page 34 of the bad bank's annual report. At the end of the day—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Albert Park interjects with 'ho-hum'. I am sure his constituents do not think that the State Bank bail-out is ho-hum. The Auditor-General does not think it is ho-hum. I wonder whether the member for Albert Park said 'ho-hum' when the warnings were given about the State Bank's loss. I wonder whether he did that.

Mr HAMILTON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The honourable member's assertion that I said 'Ho-hum' with respect to his contribution is totally incorrect.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Albert Park will resume his seat; there is no point of order.

Mr MATTHEW: Page 38 of the Auditor-General's Report, tabled in this Parliament yesterday, states:

As mentioned previously, the Treasurer's indemnity in respect of GAMD creates an ongoing commitment that is contingent upon the performance of GAMD in maximising the returns from non-performing assets under its control.

As reported at 30 June 1993 an amount of \$200 million has been set aside to meet ongoing commitments to the losses of GAMD as recorded in the accounts of GAMD. Treasury estimates the amount provided as being sufficient to meet this commitment recognising that an amount of \$87 million in respect of the 1992-93 year is a known commitment against these funds.

This is where it becomes interesting with respect to the Auditor-General's opinion on whether Treasury's allocation is sufficient and, indeed, on whether a further bail-out could be required. He states:

Nevertheless, as the assets under GAMD management are impaired and their improved performance (or otherwise) in many instances are influenced by prevailing economic and property market conditions, the long-term bottom line performance of GAMD cannot be predicted with certainty.

Those last words are important: 'cannot be predicted with certainty'. Here is the start of admissions in Government documents that a further bail-out of the State Bank is inevitable. The provisions that are there do not even cover the interest payments that South Australians will have to pay in respect of the bank.

Let us look at the interest payments that are involved. In relation to this financial year, another \$210 million in interest will have to be paid on the State Bank bail-out. All we have to do to see how much has come here under this bail-out is to go back to February 1991 when, finally, the Government publicly admitted to the State Bank's losses. There was \$52.2 million in interest paid to June 1991; in 1991-92 a further \$220 million was paid; in 1992-93 a further \$175 million was paid; and now the budget papers estimate \$210 million. In all, more than \$650 million of taxpayers' money has gone to pay the interest bill on the State Bank's losses. Not one dollar is being paid off the principal.

How many new schools could have been built with \$650 million? How many police could we have put on patrol with \$650 million? Indeed, this Government has slashed the police budget by \$3 million this year, and we have already seen the fall-out from that. Thirty-nine clerical positions will be lost from the Police Department. The end result of that is that they are being pulled out of police stations. Police officers are now being told to come off patrol and other policing duties to undertake the office duties being vacated by staff who have been given the chop by the Government. They are being given the chop for 3 150 million reasons in respect of the State Bank, and an extra \$650 million has gone to pay off the interest as the State Bank debt continues to rise. Indeed, we are now facing a State Bank debt, with those interest payments, of more than \$3 800 million. It is heading towards the magic \$4 billion mark, and it is likely that under this Government that mark will be reached.

Everyone gets their due deserts in this world. I am a great believer in justice, and I believe that the people of South Australia are great believers in justice. They have seen the debacle of royal commission reports and they have seen the disgrace of this budget document, which does nothing to move in the direction of solving South Australia's economic woes, but they know that their justice day is about to come. Election day in South Australia will be justice day: State Bank justice day, SGIC justice day and Government legacy justice day. The legacy of 11 years of Labor will be met on that justice day by the wrath of South Australian voters. Many Labor members in this House are worried about the effects of what is about to follow.

Mr Hamilton: Oh!

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Albert Park may be confident that, because he has a safe Labor seat, he need not worry. I would say that one is never safe as a Labor member after being part, through virtue of being a Labor member, of the collapse of the State Bank. Neither the member for Albert Park nor any Labor member in this Parliament will be safe. When South Australia hands down its verdict, we will see an end to the Labor tragedy, an end to the Labor debacle and an end to what Labor has done. But the memory will linger because the debt that they have left will have to be faced by all South Australians, by their children and their grandchildren. I cannot understand why any Labor member would smile today. They should be hanging their heads in shame because of what they have done to our State.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Under this Bill the Government is seeking approval from the Parliament to expend an estimated \$4 591 million of taxpayers' money in various ways throughout the State. My concern is that the taxpayers of this State not only have been long suffering but have not been getting value for the dollars that they have been paying. Indeed, those of us who live in isolated parts of South Australia appear to

be out of sight and, therefore, out of mind when it comes to Government operations.

In this document, which we are about to debate in considerable detail, there is little reference to people who live in isolated parts of the State or in the regional centres. For a start, there are no guarantees anywhere in this document that the Government will not proceed to reduce health services or to close any hospitals. The first question that I put to the Treasurer and to the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services is: can they give clear and definite undertakings that the Labor Government will not attempt to close hospitals as it attempted to close the Leigh Creek Hospital? We need assurances, because health services are not only important but essential to people who live in isolated parts of the State. That is the first undertaking that I require.

The next question is: will they maintain the education services which are vital for young people living in country areas of South Australia? Will they maintain the small schools? Will they maintain adequate school bus services so that students can attend and participate in the education system of this State? On a regular basis we are put through the excruciating exercise of people trying to alter school buses, and that causes considerable concern and heartbreak to people in those areas. Will small country police stations remain open? Will restrictions be placed on the number of kilometres that police officers can travel? I want to know very clearly what this budget does for people in isolated parts of this State.

It is all very well for the Government to spend millions of dollars on entertainment centres in Adelaide, on the Festival Theatre and all those sorts of facilities, but what about those people who live outside Gawler and Gepps Cross: where will they participate? There is a wish list of capital works programs for the future in these documents, which someone obviously cobbled together very quickly—things which have been brought to the attention of this Parliament on a regular basis. But there is nothing in this budget about improving the water systems west of Ceduna—nothing—and, with the amalgamation of ETSA and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, what will happen to that program? What about improving the quality and quantity of water at such places as Quorn and Hawker? This has been an ongoing saga. What will happen in relation to those matters? There is no money at this stage. Those people are entitled to a fair cut of the cake.

What about doctors? There is a critical shortage of doctors in rural South Australia. There is an ongoing hassle to try to get medical practitioners to come to country areas, whether in Coober Pedy or Peterborough. There are some simple solutions to help rectify this problem. The Government ought to provide some financial incentives for doctors to go out into those areas, but there is another action which it can take: special places should be provided in the universities and the medical schools (and also in the legal field so that lawyers can be encouraged to go into rural areas) so that country students who may not acquire the standard pass that enables them to get into the medical schools but who receive less than the standard can go through on the condition that they will spend so many years in some of these more remote and rural areas.

Most of them, once they got established there, would enjoy the time in the country areas, but the real problem is where one medical practitioner is by himself or herself and the workload becomes impossible, and it is not possible in many cases to get permanent relieving people. Therefore we

have to look at the situation. If we can spend \$40 million or \$50 million on a white elephant on Port Road—the Entertainment Centre—to appease a few people, why can we not take some positive actions to provide what most people require as the very basis of life in a decent society, that is, ongoing medical facilities, without the hassle of being short of doctors?

The Government would need to spend only a limited amount of money to achieve this objective. It is absolutely essential that we guarantee that our country districts are supplied with doctors. Therefore, I call on the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services urgently to examine this situation and do something about it, because it is no good saying, 'Well, there is nothing we can do as we haven't got any money', because we have wasted millions of dollars of taxpayers' money in various activities in other ways.

The next problem is the considerable hurt and heartbreak which is caused by the recession and the downturn in commodity prices. I believe few people understand the hurt that is taking place in rural and regional communities: high unemployment, lack of job opportunities and the failure of Governments to understand that they have not only a responsibility but an obligation to ensure that employment generating projects are put into operation so that young people can get jobs. We cannot have permanently 30-odd per cent of the young people without jobs if we want to have a decent society.

I know it might not be of much interest to the Minister, who currently has his back to me, but it is of a great deal of interest to the people who live in these areas. The tourist industry has the potential to employ many, many people in South Australia—to give them a job. Also, of course, the flow-on effects to those small country towns are absolutely imperative.

Few people in this House and in Government departments understand that unless those regional services are maintained there will be a continual decline of people in rural areas. Too many people have been forced to leave the rural and regional centres of South Australia and congregate in Adelaide. It is poor economics; it creates problems in Adelaide, when there ought to be opportunities created in those rural areas.

They are pleasant localities to live in; there is a tremendous amount of work that could be done; there is an urgent need for Government facilities, but nothing is being done. In this \$4.5 billion, which we are about to approve, there is not, in my judgment, enough emphasis placed on the regional and rural centres of South Australia.

The mining industry has great potential to develop, to improve and play a very significant role in building a better South Australia, yet the Government is talking about World Heritage listing for the Lake Eyre Basin—a huge section of my electorate. Does one member opposite stand up and say, 'It's about time we put an end to this nonsense,' or tell the Commonwealth Government to play its silly games elsewhere? It is living in fairyland; these people believe in fairies under the trees. They are trying to appease one or two odd bods who have a lot to say but of very little substance and no real understanding of the long term effects it will have on the people of this State.

Therefore, I call upon the Premier and the Minister of Mineral Resources to once and for all put an end to this nonsense and any further discussion or involvement with the listing of the Lake Eyre Basin on the World Heritage list. Not only is it unnecessary, it is undesirable, unwise and it has not

got an ounce of commonsense about it, but it will have long term effects on the people of South Australia.

The Premier should have clearly indicated in this budget that not \$1 will be spent on this sort of nonsense. It is taking us down the road to destruction to go any further with this sort of nonsense. For the life of me I cannot understand why so-called responsible people would even give one minute of their time to consider such an exercise.

The other important matter is having a clear understanding that people engaged in agriculture still play one of the most significant roles in the South Australian economy but the problems to keep young people involved in agriculture are becoming more difficult every day. I am bitterly disappointed that the Government has still failed to provide any incentive or assistance in relation to the people wishing to transfer properties within their family. The member for Mallee has raised this matter on a number of occasions. I had ongoing correspondence and discussion with the member for Ross Smith, when he was Premier. He made all sorts of noises but did nothing.

Mr Lewis: Absolutely nothing.

Mr GUNN: Nothing, and it is a simple and positive step which will solve many problems.

Mr Lewis: That was the hallmark of his premiership: do nothing.

Mr GUNN: Do nothing. I call upon the Government at this late hour to put this program into operation to start relieving some of these difficult situations which are quite unnecessary and which could be solved quite simply at virtually no cost to the taxpayer. There are many other programs in which this Government has got itself involved and which, in my view, are unwise, unnecessary and will not do anything in a long term basis to assist the proper development of this State. Unless we can encourage people to continue to be involved, keep young people in rural areas, give them some incentive, then we will unfortunately continue to have a rural decline which should not take place.

The Government has already displayed complete weakness; it caves into the Federal Government on every occasion. We have had inflicted upon us an agreement to establish a national rail corporation, which will create tremendous difficulty in places such as Port Augusta. There will be jobs lost for train drivers. There is uncertainty, and where there is uncertainty there is always concern. The decision to hand over the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line is in my view an unwise course of action and not in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

The other matter which is causing concern is: what will happen if the Government has its way with the establishment of the Southern Power and Water Authority? Why is it necessary? Why is it going in the opposite direction to what is happening in Western Australia? I wonder whether the Minister at the table has taken the trouble to read the Carnegie report, commissioned by the previous State Labor Government in Western Australia. Its recommendation was to go in the opposite direction, not to have these huge organisations but to divide them up and have more efficient organisations on a smaller basis so the costs can be more easily controlled and a more efficient and better service can be provided. My concern is that proper consideration should have been given to that report. I sincerely hope that a select committee in another place does something about it.

Any budget should be the basis of giving clear and positive direction to the business community, industry and commerce in general, in the direction the Government wants

them to go. It should be on the basis of creating incentive. It should be getting away from red tape, unnecessary hassles and controls, and providing a framework in which people can operate, expand, develop and employ. No matter what social justice strategy this Government or any Government has, unless it can provide the framework where employment can be generated, it is not worth anything. The greatest social justice you can have is to have people employed, have them occupied, so they can look after themselves in a dignified manner.

Unfortunately, the disaster of the Bannon years is such that it will leave a legacy of heartbreak and despair in this State. I put it to the House and to all members opposite: do they honestly believe that nearly 11 years of Labor Government in South Australia has left South Australia in a better position than when they took office? The previous Tonkin Government had to sort out the disasters of the Dunstan decade—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: That's why it was thrown out after one term.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: The fabricator, the Minister—

Mr Lewis: Fabricators and liars caused that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: The people of this State, when they elected the Tonkin Government, had a Government which did things. In that short time of that Government, it sorted out the Monarto nonsense. It guaranteed the Roxby Downs debenture. It is all very well for the Premier and Deputy Premier now to go to Roxby Downs and make out what good fellows they are, when they all voted against it. I wonder how the Treasurer will justify at election time to all those people at Roxby Downs his actions in 1982 when he voted against it. It will be interesting to see what sort of response he comes up with. We know that when former Premier Bannon was talking about mirages in the desert, it sounded very much like the words of the member for Briggs, who was the former Premier's press secretary. That is his style. I suggest that is one of his classic lines that has come back to haunt him.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You be careful. Don't you worry about that, my boy. You be very careful!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Would the member for Eyre address the Chair and not be sidetracked by interjections.

Mr GUNN: Quite, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would not want to do that at all. I have great respect for the Chair. It is obvious that I am fairly close to the mark because the Minister at the table is very touchy on the subject. He was making interjections across the Chamber that were quite unparliamentary. I take it as a compliment, coming from him. The facts of the matter are that the Tonkin Government gave this State a chance.

It established a number of important industries. It reduced taxation and abolished land tax on the principal place of residence, and did all those things to help families. What has this Government done? It has squandered the future of the young people of South Australia. Every member who sits behind this Government will take with him or her a legacy of \$130 million each, their share of the State Bank disaster plus all the other fiascos that have taken place. As this is the last budget, one would have thought they would try to do something positive to assist the people of this State.

The incoming Government, which will need to address these problems, will have tremendous challenges ahead of it. Those of us on this side who are looking forward to seeing

that rebuilding process take place in South Australia know full well that the people of this State not only require of us but are demanding that we change direction and give them some hope and some future. This State has a history of high employment, of being a wonderful place to live with great opportunities for young people, and in the time that I have been a member of Parliament it has greatly disappointed me to see those opportunities growing less and less.

When the honourable member and I left school there were tremendous opportunities available for young people in this State and country. This budget should be setting out on the first steps to create that situation again. That is what I want to see: that opportunities are created so that young people can have a choice and be part of the process of building a better South Australia. That is what the budget should be aimed at: building a better South Australia, creating confidence, providing facilities and services to people in the isolated communities, not taking them away.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Many of the speakers so far have referred to the State Bank disaster and the effect it has had upon this State and upon this budget but, more particularly, the effect it is likely to have on future budgets. I will not get into that field in the brief time that I will speak: I want to talk about what I believe is the second disaster for the State and what most probably in 20 or 30 years time will be seen as worse than the State Bank disaster, that is, the education system and the effect that this Government has had on the education system within this State.

In the area of maintenance alone, members may recall that back in the early days of the Labor Government they stopped cleaning windows in schools; they said they would not be cleaned. Now, at odd times, if a school committee can put enough funds together through its own effort or through funds allocated to the school, the windows are cleaned. But that was the first move. Also in the area of maintenance of buildings, millions of dollars of neglect has occurred to schools throughout the State. Doing an audit, one school in my area, Blackwood High School, came up with a figure in excess of \$1 million to bring it back to what one would call a satisfactory standard of maintenance and upkeep: just for one school.

I ask the ALP socialist members to think about that. That is one school, and it is multiplied many times over throughout the State. Government philosophy then stated that, if a teacher has been in a school for 10 years, he has to be moved on, because he may have become too accustomed to the school. That is hogwash, because a teacher does not teach the same children year in and year out. Usually a teacher has children within a high school for about two years, in some cases longer, because the students move on from grade to grade then leave the school. There is no such thing as becoming, one might say, too commonly known throughout the school with the students.

You might know the other staff members better than you would if you were moved on, but surely that is an advantage not a disadvantage. The Fairway system is a shocking example of bureaucratic intrusion and, if you like, the intrusion of the socialist philosophy into the education system. How is it fair? If one school happens to have a better group of teachers who are able to achieve better results and it happens to be a coincidence of that particular period, the chances of children from that school getting a fair go are

limited because in another school people have failed. There are examples of that all over the metropolitan area. I will not name those schools—members can do their own research because I do not want to be accused of naming one school over another—but there are examples of some staff getting better results than those at a neighbouring school in the same socioeconomic climate. Why should a school which has gained the best results through the efforts of students, teachers and staff be penalised because of those who have not?

Mr Lewis: They are not; you are mistaken.

Mr S.G. EVANS: They are penalised. Those in the same socioeconomic group are penalised. I assure the member for Murray- Mallee that that is the case, and I will provide him with some examples later if he wishes. It is an unfair scheme, and I do not care who the architect was, but I hope that the demolishers come in quickly.

Students of today have an uncertain future. They are unsure where to look for a job or which profession is the best one to head towards within society. If they are lucky enough to go to university, when they arrive they are uncertain as to which subjects they should take. They may be encouraged to do a degree in arts, which may be of very little use to them, before they can tackle, say, a law degree or find a suitable course of study to pursue. In my opinion, that is a wasted resource. Some professions already have too many qualified people. At the same time, opportunities for ordinary manual labour, whether they be in the public or private sector, do not exist, because those types of occupations are being eliminated through technology and machinery.

If I can return to the 10-year flick, why are we disturbing people who already have a tough job today in the teaching field? Teaching is much more difficult and stressful today than it has been in the past. Why do we have teachers sitting there thinking, 'My 10 years are up; someone is going to tap me on the shoulder and say, "Your home is two miles down the road, you live near this school, but we can send you anywhere up to 45 kilometres to another school. We're going to move you on"'? Even though you might be the most successful teacher within your school and happen to work in that environment and even though you have an advantage by having your home and friends close to your school, you may be sent further afield not because of any failure on your own part but just because you have served for 10 years. So, the department flicks you on.

One of the schools in my electorate lost a substantial number of teachers. The replacement teachers are quite capable: there is no complaint. I sat on the school council, and I was satisfied that those teachers should be replaced, but this policy was, and is, disruptive. It has a psychological and stressful effect on the individuals who have to move on, because they have already established a life with their partner and their children, working in with each other going to and from school or work as far as the use of the family car is concerned.

What we will do, not through our teachers or those who are working within the schools but through Government philosophy, is bring about mediocrity. We are not setting out to encourage people to achieve their best. We are putting barriers in front of those who are better than others if we say that the others have to catch up before the better ones can move on. Unless the situation is turned around and more resources are made available for schools, in 10 or 20 years time we will find that the young people who have just gone or are presently going through the education system have

problems. We now must teach children about health, sex and about trying to live together, and all sorts of other areas that were never touched on before, and the teachers have to pick up all that responsibility. We are also saying to teachers that children who are good cannot go interstate to play sport in primary school; that practice has been eliminated. That causes frustration to those who teach sport, and that is unfair while other States are developing their children to the highest degree.

While we have all that, when history is written, we will find that we may have caught up some of the State Bank debt but some of the adults, as they will be then, will have had their education process interfered with and will not have achieved their best. It will be said, 'One of the disasters of the socialist Labor Government over the past 20 years has been its interference with the education system, without making the proper resources available.' It means not necessarily more money but making proper resources available in the proper areas to achieve the proper result for the betterment of what is supposed to be a clever country.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I intend to talk only briefly today in relation to this subject but, of course, during the Estimates Committees coming up as part of the function of the debate of the budget Bill, I shall be far more vocal. I do speak today in the context that many of the public hospitals around South Australia have already made public their anger at the fact that their specific allocations have been dramatically cut, which will, of course, lead to a dramatic cut in services. First, I would like to contrast this with a document about which I have had quite a bit to say in public already, a document which was leaked to me. It was asking the hospitals about the number of patients they could remove from the waiting lists—the well-known waiting lists on which there are 9 500 suffering South Australians—'given unlimited funds'. Quite clearly, it is an attempt by the Government to purchase electoral support.

To have the health of South Australians—and letters that have been forwarded to me indicate the extent to which they are suffering, in that they are unable to go to the shops with their wives, garden, drive, socialise, and so on, because of the pain in their hip, leg or whatever—toyed with by a Government is reprehensible. It is particularly reprehensible when, as part of the pre-budget agenda setting, which this Government has indulged in recently, an all bells and whistles budget media release was made by the Minister of Health.

It is my contention that one of the major reasons South Australia is unfortunately in the mire at the moment is that for the past 10 years this Government has in fact governed with an eye not to cautious management of the funds; it has not governed with an eye as to what is best for all South Australians; it has not governed with an eye to prudent management for the future. It in fact has governed mainly on what will sit well in a media announcement. Mr Deputy Speaker, if one looks at the pre- budget media release of the Minister of Health, one finds that there was, unfortunately for the Minister, \$30 million plus identified that was unspent last year in the budget. We now find that this \$32 million, I think it was, is now, in an immediate pre- election frenzy, to be spent on relieving the pain and suffering of South Australians, many of whom have been waiting for years. Each one of those 9 500 people can legitimately ask, 'Why was that \$32 million not spent on my operation? Why have I had to put up with more privation and pain just because the Labor Government wishes to ferret away in a hollow log

\$32 million so that it can be seen to be active in an immediate pre-election period?' I believe that it is immoral.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: The honourable member asks whether I understand: I certainly understand. I understand that there was \$32 million unspent last year in the health budget; I understand that there are 9 500 people on waiting lists; and I understand that every one of those 9 500 people could legitimately ask why that money was ferreted away into a hollow log. They might well ask this, particularly when beds are being closed around South Australia ostensibly for financial reasons. In fact, some hospitals have only about two thirds of the bed numbers for which they were originally designed. I acknowledge that there are very positive things about day surgery and decreasing average lengths of stay, and indeed that is often better for health care, but why close beds when there are 9 500 people waiting to get into them? The reason? You have fluffed the economy, Treasurer; you have blown the State's inheritance. There is no money. Mr Treasurer, you and all your colleagues all the way along—

Members interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: Mr Deputy Speaker, the Treasurer now claims—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair. His references to 'you' are contrary to Standing Orders and I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Dr ARMITAGE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I do apologise. I was carried away with my enthusiasm for the Treasurer's argument, which indeed seems to be one of the great whitewashes, because the Treasurer was saying that he has no responsibility for this because he has been Treasurer only for 12 months. I would put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that every member of the Cabinet who sat around and ignored the warnings day in and day out, not only in Parliament but also from their business contacts and people around South Australia, is directly responsible—except perhaps the member for Unley because we know he always had hearing problems; the table was a bit long for him except when he wanted to hear. There is no other person responsible for not questioning what was quite clearly known all around South Australia's financial circles and which has been demonstrated in the Royal Commissioner's report.

So, those are the reasons why hospitals are closing: because the Treasurer and his colleagues have fluffed the economy. The member for Stuart laughs; but the member for Stuart is only too happy to say that hospitals at Port Augusta badly need to be refurbished. Why was it not done before? Why have your constituents had to suffer? It is because there has been no money. Where is the money? It has been blown by your colleagues.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: If you hadn't interjected, Frank, it wouldn't have been.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member not to be drawn by interjections. I am sure he has a well-prepared speech and has plenty to contribute without being drawn by interjections.

Dr ARMITAGE: I am not normally drawn, Sir, but some of them have been particularly outrageous. I refer again to bed closures—beds closed for financial reasons. Let us look at Modbury Hospital, which is in the member for Newland's electorate and in which she has had a particular interest and has been dogged in defending. Not long ago the obstetrics and gynaecology theatre was going to be closed. The member

for Stuart frequently asks questions in Estimates Committees and in other places about women's health. Why did not the honourable member complain about the closure of the obstetrics and gynaecology theatre at Modbury Hospital for financial reasons?

They could not keep it open because they did not have enough money. Because of that the women of Modbury were subjected to dangerous trips in lifts that broke down—because infrastructure was being ignored in hospitals—in the middle of delivery. They had to travel from the ward to another theatre so that they could have an urgent caesarean section. The member for Stuart is quite happy to say, 'That is perfectly okay; I'm not worried about that. Let them be locked in a lift that does not work in that crucial 10, five or perhaps two minutes.' That was the situation because there was not enough money. Thank goodness that is no longer the case, because pressure has been brought to bear and because the hospital has seen fit to change its policies.

Whilst talking about hospital matters, I draw to the attention of the House the fact that there are much broader effects in Australia as a result of our generally poor economy. Of course, of late we have all noticed the fall in the value of the Australian dollar compared with overseas currencies. This has a major effect on the provision of top, world-class care in health areas in Australia, because many of the health goods, be they equipment or drugs, are imported. So, every time the dollar falls it becomes more expensive to pay for imported goods and, hence, it is more expensive to provide adequate care for Australians.

Mr Lewis: But we could now sell it more easily overseas as an export.

Dr ARMITAGE: Well, indeed, we could. As the member for Murray-Mallee points out, there is an opportunity to sell export dollars in health areas, and I believe that is right. However, the fact of the matter is that we have to have a lot of equipment and drugs that we only utilise in Australia: they are not made here, and unfortunately we are forced to pay more because of the lower value of our dollar.

Almost the last thing I want to do in this debate is draw the attention of the House and of every medical administrator and every person involved in health in South Australia to what I believe is an immoral windfall that the South Australian Government is not passing on to people who need it. For a number of years hospitals have been expected to cover award increases, CPI increases, and so on, within their total hospital budget. It has been one of the major sources of concern for administrators in hospitals from the most major public hospital in South Australia to the smallest and perhaps the least busy hospital in the country, because, of course, one is unable to budget for award increases. However, this Government has expected that to be encompassed within the total budget figure.

We now find in relation to the Medicare agreement that our hospital based funding has a specific in-built component for award increases, CPI increases and so on. In other words, every time there is an award increase, the Treasurer's front bench colleagues get an unexpected windfall out of the award increase because the Federal Government pays the State to compensate for those award and CPI increases.

What happens with that money? It is ferreted away in yet another hollow log, because it is not passed on. That is absolutely immoral. With every award and CPI increase the South Australian Government receives an unexpected windfall from the Commonwealth Government which it then fails to pass on to the 9 500 people in South Australia who are

on the waiting lists. In fact, the Government is robbing Paul and not paying Peter. It is not fair that, when the Government is compensated by the Commonwealth for award increases, it does not pass that money on to assist the people waiting for surgery.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: There are no award increases. I wish it were true.

Dr ARMITAGE: The Treasurer makes light of this matter by saying that the Federal Government has given us nothing because there have been no award increases. I ask the Treasurer on the record, in public, whether he will make the same offer to South Australian hospitals. Will the Treasurer say to South Australian hospitals, 'If there is an award increase, we will pass the money on?' Will the Treasurer make exactly the same deal with South Australian hospitals that the Federal Government has seen fit to make with the South Australian Government?

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That's what enterprise bargaining is all about.

Dr ARMITAGE: The Treasurer interjects, but I am not talking about enterprise bargaining. I am talking about this immoral Government that has been proven to be incapable of managing the State's finances and doing nothing more than giving the hospitals the same opportunity to provide badly needed funds to the people of South Australia on exactly the same basis as the Government is getting its funds from the Federal Government. Clearly, the Government is not willing to do so, because it has no conscience and for a long time it has been happy to see 9 500 people around South Australia suffering. The Government has been waiting for the election campaign so that it could offer unlimited funds to get waiting lists down and be seen to be good boys and girls.

That is absolutely immoral, but what more can one expect from a Government which has such morality in this context, where all these people are waiting for surgery? I refer to the financial context in South Australia where \$60 million less is being paid to health from the Consolidated Account. Improved health spending for South Australians is not forthcoming from this profligate spending Government, which cannot wait to get money out of hollow logs in order to buy supposed electoral success, or at least non-electoral opprobrium. We are not getting more health funds from the State Government, but we are getting additional health funds from the Federal Government. This State Government simply does not care about sick South Australians.

The State Government is not prepared to pass on award increases that it gets, and in fact it has allocated \$60 million less out of its own Consolidated Account for health purposes. It has tried to patch up the situation by saying, 'We have done brilliantly because we have a few extra million dollars.' It does not identify that the funds came from the Federal Government but simply says, 'All is well in the health area because the funding is increasing.' Not one cent of that increase comes from this Government and, in fact, its contribution has decreased. It is no wonder that this Government is in such a poor state in the polls.

It is also no wonder that members opposite have been so abrupt in dumping the architect of some of their former financial dilemmas, the former Premier and the former member elect for Ross Smith. It is interesting to see in the paper this morning that the former Premier has some support because whilst Mr Baker, the former Beneficial Chief Executive, was incredulously saying, 'I am baffled by the billion dollar loss', it is nice to know that the member for Ross Smith is not totally without friends. It would appear that

he is without friends in the Labor Party now that he has moved to the jump seat in the back, but he is not without friends because Mr John Baker, the well-respected financial person around South Australia, believes (according to the paper):

... it was unfair that former Premier Mr John Bannon had been so harshly criticised in the royal commission's findings.

All I can say is that the member for Ross Smith, by his body language and so on, badly needs friends. I do not know that he necessarily needs friend such as Mr Baker.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: There are a lot of people who would not mind living with Christopher Skase and, indeed, living on his income. I am appalled that this Government has so little concern for the 9 500 people who are clearly suffering around South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer): Speaking of Christopher Skase, I point out that, of course, he is a very well known Lib. It is amazing how all these people are all of a sudden castigated by members opposite when they are on their side of politics. They are all their mates; they are all good Libs.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, people keep asking me, 'Where did all the money go?' I will tell you where it went—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: A pack of Libs gave it to another pack of Libs. Anyway, that was not what I was on my feet to speak about.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This is very entertaining, but I would like the Treasurer to come back to the budget debate.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank members who have spoken in this debate. The contributions varied slightly but those from members on this side of the House were constructive. They addressed themselves to the point and their contributions are the ones that ought to be commended. Unlike the contributions from this side, the contributions from members opposite really were miserable, were they not? They really are a sad bunch—a bunch of unhappy souls.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: And well they may be, because what they do not like about this budget is that it did not help their cause. The budget did not do that, because it was not designed to do that: it was designed to assist South Australians and particularly those South Australians who rely—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Murray-Mallee continues along those lines, he will have the rest of the day off. The honourable member will get an opportunity in the 10 minute grievances that follow this debate to express any point of view that he so desires.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I was saying, it was designed to assist particularly those South Australians who require from the Government services that they otherwise would not be able to receive. I do not think there are too many people in my electorate who, even if they paid no tax

at all, would be able to meet their education needs, their health needs, their law and order needs and so on. This budget is unashamed. It is a budget for ordinary South Australians. It is not a budget for the mates of Liberals.

Members opposite do not like this budget, in the same vein as they did not like the royal commission report, which they had screamed for and for which the taxpayers of this State shelled out over \$30 million. The result was not what they expected, because when we got headlines in the *Advertiser*, of all publications, stating that the former Premier had been completely exonerated, that was not what they were after at all. That came as an awful shock to them, as did this budget.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will not go through all the various contributions, because they were all of like mind; it was just one long whinge with not a single constructive suggestion being made by any member opposite—not one constructive suggestion. The Leader went even further, putting out a press release of all the terrible things that he saw as being wrong with South Australia. It was a long list of miseries; he really is a dreary fellow and, thinking about it, I thought, 'Goodness me, it does not seem to me to be quite that bad.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am sorry if there was some ambiguity about how I expressed that; the speech was awful, it was dreadful. It seemed to me not totally to equate with the facts on how the State is behaving. For example (and I am trying to keep this short), I will give only a few examples of what perhaps the Leader ought to have said and did not say. Maybe he overlooked it, so I will remind the Leader. Since November 1982, which was a significant date in the history of this State, 92 000 jobs have been created. That is at the rate of about 23 a day. I thought the Leader was saying we were losing jobs at the rate of two a day, or something like that. Why did the Leader not state that since we came into office we have created them at the rate of about 23 a day? There is a significant difference. I thought the Leader would have mentioned that.

There is no doubt that rising participation in the work force has meant that unemployment has risen. We do not try to hide that in any way. That is the result of a higher participation rate. In fact, I am pleased to see a higher participation rate and I hope there is even higher participation in future. I make the comparison that, if the participation rate today was the same as in November 1982, our unemployment level would be 8.2 per cent rather than 10.4 per cent, so again that illustrates the effect of the participation rate on unemployment figures. Again, I did not read that anywhere in the Leader's speech.

In many areas this State has done much better than the national average. For example, real GSP per head has grown by 31 per cent over the past decade and that equates to a growth of 2.7 per cent per annum, which is above the national per capita growth of 1.9 per cent per annum. We in this State have actually done better than has Australia as a whole. Again, these statistics are something that I think any member of Parliament who had concerns for the State would have used to demonstrate how well this State is doing in some areas.

What has happened to real household income over that period? In those 10 years it has risen by 14 per cent, or 1.3 per cent per annum, compared with the .9 per cent growth per annum nationally. So, real household income in this State has

increased at a greater rate than the national average. That is something that we all ought to be proud of over the past 10 years, and it is a pity that that was not in the Leader's press release. We are working smarter and better. The level of overseas exports from South Australia has grown by more than 200 per cent during the past decade.

Exports increased by 200 per cent from South Australia—a remarkable achievement. In fact, it gets better. The exports of elaborately transformed manufactures have been growing even faster than total exports in recent years, and now account for over one-fifth of total overseas exports. There are just a few things and I could give many more because I have pages of them. They are just a few things I would have liked to have seen any Leader who really had the interest of South Australia at heart put to the House and promote by way of press release; but no, we were very disappointed that that was not the case.

There are a couple of other things that I want to mention specifically before I wind up, the first of which is the question of land tax. The Leader said that the Government had broken a taxation promise and that it was increasing land tax. That is clearly not the case. We can all remember debates in this House, and even more vigorous debates in the community, about the violent fluctuations in the level of land tax that individual land-holders were paying. We came to grips with that. We were the first Government in Australia to come to grips with it. We came to grips with it three years ago, and we stated quite clearly that we would not take any real increase in land tax from land tax payers. We made perfectly clear that the take to the State would not exceed the CPI.

Land tax payers, overwhelmingly, have been pleased about that. That is one of the most sensible things that has been done with land tax for a long time. We have said that we will extend that policy for the next three years; so the smoothing effect is there. Within the various groups of individual land tax payers there will obviously be winners and losers, but on this occasion the losers are less than 2 per cent of land tax payers. Land tax payers are a very small percentage of the community and of that small per cent the only people who have an increase comprise less than 2 per cent of land tax payers. A large proportion of the remainder, the 98 per cent of land tax payers, will actually be paying less.

This seems to me to be not a bad deal. The Government's overall take will still be below the anticipated CPI. There are a couple of new taxpayers in there: Commonwealth instrumentalities which now pay tax—and we are pleased that they do—but leaving them to one side, the tax take will actually be less than the CPI. To suggest anything else is utterly misleading. I think we should expect something better from the Leader.

The Leader also raised the question of petrol tax. Members will recall that this Government (again the first in Australia), at the request of local government, put a levy on petrol to go to local government. Local government said that it needed to broaden its tax base. As this State has a fairly narrow tax base, the Government appreciated its difficulties and we were the first Government in Australia to put a levy on petrol for local government to broaden the tax base. We said over the 12 months that we would negotiate with local government what functions or shared financial responsibilities it would take over. Those discussions have been going on, although they have been slower than I would like. I have mentioned this at local government meetings and have said, 'Please get

on with it and take over those functions; we are only too pleased for you to do so.' I have not heard any complaints from local government—none whatsoever. Local government has not said to me, 'You have been ripping us off; you have not given us this money. Why won't you give us this money?' They know the money is there. It is in a separate account and we will be funding local government type functions from that account. As soon as agreement is reached on what functions will be transferred to local government, it will take the lot.

We have no difficulty with that. I should have thought that members opposite, particularly those who have knowledge of local government—and there are one or two; I know that the members for Fisher and for Light have a great deal of knowledge about local government—would be pleased to congratulate the Government on its action in broadening the base of funding for local government. We wore the flak; local government did not wear anything. We wore the flak, and the beneficiaries are local government. I cannot understand what the complaint is—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —because we did that first in Australia. As regards an agreement—and the member for Light commented 'if an agreement is reached'—I can assure the House that if agreement is not reached it will not be because of any action by the Government. I am urging, almost on a daily basis, for agreement to be reached. I have not heard one complaint from the LGA that we are stalling or doing anything wrong. They are delighted that we have done this for them, so I cannot see what the complaint is. Land tax payers have been treated more than fairly, as has local government, and by and large that is recognised.

The nonsense that was spoken by the member for Adelaide about \$60 million of State Government funds going into health in this State is simply incorrect. What has happened is what has happened in every State. There has been a change in the method of funds flowing from the Federal Government. There is nothing particularly complicated about it, but I will put on the record what has happened. I hope that it will be of assistance to members opposite, because they seem to be having some difficulty reading the budget papers.

During negotiations leading to the new five-year Medicare agreement, which began on 1 July 1993, the Commonwealth decided to change the way in which the distribution of grants to the States reflect differences in health funding needs. Previously States received hospital funds on a capita basis, adjusted only for age and sex variations between States, and differences in the health needs of the population were reflected in States' general purpose financial assistance grants, commonly known as FAGS.

The net result of this new arrangement is that \$70 million of what would previously have been general purpose funding is now received as specific purpose hospital funding. Because specific purpose funds flow directly into agencies' special deposit accounts, they are not included in the amount appropriated from the Consolidated Account. Clearly, this is not a reduction in State funding; it is simply a change in treatment by the Commonwealth between general and specific purpose funding. In fact, there is an overall increase of about \$10 million in funding from the budget after allowance is made for the changed treatment.

I know that the budget Estimates Committees will be a more appropriate forum to go into that in detail if any further discussion is required, and I shall be happy to have that

debate with whoever wishes to raise it in the Committee. In fact, I will probably raise it myself to put it on the record again, given the difficulty that members opposite are having.

When reading the Leader's speech, I looked in vain for something sensible as an alternative. I keep asking myself: where are the alternatives? There is no doubt that the Leader has been protected by the media in this State. I cannot understand why, but you get your breaks where you can. Clearly it will not last; it never does. We all have good and bad days. At the moment, the Leader is having a very good 12 months from the press as regards what they publish. Privately they say exactly what they think of him, which corresponds in the main with what members opposite think of him, which is not very much.

Anyway, Sir, there were just one or two glimmers in the response from the Leader of the Opposition to the budget speech—not very many—and to coin a phrase, one swallow does not make a summer. Nevertheless, there were a couple of glimmers: nothing that we could call a policy, but a couple of indications.

Mr S.J. Baker: You are not going to get any policy out of us.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, the Deputy Leader says, 'You are not going to get any policy out of us', and he is dead right. There is an obligation on members opposite. If members opposite feel that—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —they are entitled to be the Government of this State, then there is an obligation for them to put to the people what the policies will be should they be elected. I would have thought, not only is that common courtesy, but there is an obligation on any group of people who purported or who desired to govern the State to at least let those whom they will be governing know what they will be doing. There is an even greater obligation, I believe, on the media to ensure that people are informed about any group of people who are seeking to govern the State. I cannot believe that the media will continue to leave members opposite alone in this area of policy. I repeat: the Deputy Leader has said, 'You are not going to get any policy out of us.'

Mr S.J. Baker: Call the election.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There is now an attempt to modify that statement. The Deputy Leader realises that the old foot has gone straight in the mouth again, and there is nothing unusual about that, and he says, 'Call the election.' So we can assume from that comment that what the Deputy Leader means is that the day after the election is called all this flood of policies will come pouring out.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not know what influence the member for Chaffey has these days, but we will take it for what—

Mr Matthew: Plenty of influence.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Plenty of influence: I am pleased to hear that. So what we have managed to pin down during this debate is that the moment the election date is given the Opposition will bring down its policies.

Mr S.J. Baker: Absolutely.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 'Absolutely' from the Deputy Leader; 'absolutely' from the member for Chaffey.

Mr Matthew: Would you like draft copies?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The contributions by the member for Bright are never ones that I take seriously. He is just a squeaking—

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is very difficult to take the member for Bright seriously in anything. I will skip over the member for Bright. I notice that a gentle nod came from the member for Light. I have a bit of respect for his word. So we have established that the minute the election date is announced the policies will come flooding out. There can be no excuses. It is on the record from all these eminent people opposite.

There were one or two hints of where we might be going with this Opposition. In relation to competitive tendering, the Leader and the member for Adelaide have a bit of a fetish about hospital cleaners. I have only heard about competitive tendering with regard to hospital cleaners. This will be the saviour of the Health Commission. I do not know how many cleaners they think we have. I assure members opposite that, if they think that by calling tenders for cleaning hospitals there will be a substantial improvement in funds to the Health Commission, then they are wrong, because the public sector reform process has very significantly increased efficiency in that area.

If members opposite feel that there is still a lot of fat in the cleaning services then, should they unfortunately move over to this side of the House, they will be very disappointed. I assure members opposite that there are not thousands and thousands of cleaners in the Health Commission, all there to be privatised, thereby saving hundreds of millions of dollars. It is not there; you will be disappointed. Apparently that is one area that will be the financial saviour of the State.

Asset sales is another. SAGASCO—yes, we have already done that. I am getting sick of members opposite pinching our policies but, okay, asset sales—SAGASCO is going. The State Bank. Fine. You know we have already said that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That's right. I would point out that these are also on the other side of the ledger as a financial asset. So, if you think you will get your net debt down by anything significant, you are wrong. You are wrong again; you will have to go back to the drawing board.

Unspecified land: how much land do you think the State owns and how much do you think it is worth? Everything you have mentioned together will go nowhere near reducing the net debt of this State by \$1 billion.

An honourable member: You created it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Never mind about that. These are your policies to reduce it. I can tell you now that everything you have mentioned, at the most generous valuation, will not come to \$1 billion. It will not reduce the net debt of this State by \$1 billion and that is even with stealing some of our policies. Quite frankly, I do not know where they are going to go. The reason I do not know is because it was not in the speech. There was nothing in the speech about it. All I can do is surmise.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Traditionally in Australia we hold elections on Saturdays and, if a huge misfortune befell the State, and members opposite had a majority I can tell you what would come out within a fortnight. They would say, 'Oh, asset sales will not fix it up. Sacking cleaners will not fix it up; there are not enough of them. We were wrong; we thought there were a lot more cleaners. We thought sacking cleaners in hospitals would fix everything up. That

is not the case. We will have to increase taxes and we will have to sack more than cleaners.' That is what will happen.

There is not one commentator in this State right now who could not set the type page or prepare the news bulletins for the Monday after the election if these characters opposite were to win. They could do it now: 'Huge tax increases; slash and burn in the public sector; increase cost sizes; sorry about the police but we cannot afford it; blame the previous Government. Not our fault but the police have to go. Nurses have to go.' We all know you will have to bring in a mini-budget, a financial statement. It will be there within 72 hours and everybody knows it.

What we did in this budget was to meet and in some cases exceed every target that the Premier laid down in the Meet the Challenge statement—met and exceeded every target. I can tell you, as the Treasurer, that was not easy to achieve. But we met it and in many cases we exceeded it.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Creative accounting.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No creative accounting. It must really annoy you. I have all the newspapers here: the *Financial Review*, the *Australian*—all the quality press, all saying what we have said, exactly as it is. What we have done is good. Of course the right wingers amongst them want us to do more; they want us to throw people out in the snow. That is fair enough; that is their point of view; we disagree with it. Not one of them has said that there has been anything shonky, anything untoward, or that we have not met our targets. This budget, like this Government, is fair but affordable. I commend the second reading to the House.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be referred to Estimates Committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the House note grievances.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am not the primary speaker in this debate, but that opportunity will be taken up by another member at a later stage. The matter I want to address is one which I find quite obnoxious, one which creates great problems for members on both sides of the House through their electorate offices, and I refer to marriage breakdowns and the tug of war that exists in relation to children, quite innocent victims of a very unfortunate set of circumstances. But from time to time, it gets even worse, because you get a couple of real rats that enter into the equation.

I want to relate to the House at this time my concerns about the future of a 9½-year-old girl in my electorate. The father, a school teacher, walked away from the mother quite early in the child's life. Divorce followed, he subsequently married again, further separation occurred and, after that further separation, suddenly decided he wanted access to the daughter whom he had not bothered to contact and did not even see in the hospital when she was born. That child, who did not know her father was, by his own decision, suddenly forced into a position of being required to be available on a contact basis with the father.

That is not an unusual set of circumstances, that is, to have contact with the father if the court so orders. What is unfortunate is when the father turns the attempt to make contact with the child on and off at whim. Being a school teacher, with seven weeks holiday over Christmas, he did not want any contact with the child but decided to go away and pursue his own interests, nothing at all relative to the child.

So, a great deal of tension and difficulty is created. Then we find that the father suddenly decides, even though the Family Court in the first instance gave the mother total responsibility for the child, that he wants greater access. So, he goes into court with a solicitor who, *apropos* my earlier comments about rats, is no less a rat than the father in this equation, because he goes into court and openly brags that he will not charge his client any fees. But they expect the mother, who is in employment and who looks after the child with the assistance of her parents, to pay full tote odds. The legal aid prevaricates as to whether or not the mother, who has a position in TAFE, should be able to obtain any assistance.

Over a period, with psychiatric reports and other activities all of which point to the fact that the mother is providing for her daughter, and which highlight the confusion and difficulties that arise whenever the child is forced into the presence of the father, he goes back into court saying that the child was warm towards him, there were no problems, and he thoroughly enjoyed the encounter (even though the child was reserved before she went and quite distressed when she returned, saying that she wanted no further contact). The mother, who has had to deal with the child's bed wetting and having nightmares, has also had to contend with receiving reports as the years went by of frequent periods of distress at school, those periods of distress more particularly following these enforced periods of access by the father.

The father has turned those access periods on and off at his whim and sometimes just has not turned up, having made arrangements to do so, so that the mother's efforts have all been in vain: having to fit in with the arrangement for the daughter to go with the father, because that was the way the court decided; the child being not only confused but not wanting to go and then being even further confused when, having been advised quite firmly by the mother that it was a requirement that she go with the father, he has not turned up.

Then there were further discussions in court, further costs against the mother, and further bragging by the fellow rat—the legal adviser—that he was there looking after the father, demanding certain benefits for the father but not charging him, with the mother having spent \$9 000 in addition to legal aid that she received. The father took the mother to court for contempt because the child, in the mother's absence (under the court's direction she had to leave the house 20 minutes before the father arrived to pick up the daughter), locked herself in a bathroom and would not come out. The mother, who was not there, had told the child of the importance of fulfilling the dictates of the court—a free court for the father and one incurring costs for the mother.

So, now, the mother has spent in excess of \$10 000, having accounts outstanding of over \$5000, and the father, still persisting with his demands that he have access to his daughter, whom he has not seen or attempted to see for the past nine months, is forcing the mother back into court, even though her legal advisers are telling her that they will be unable to go into court with her and give her any assistance unless she makes available \$15 000. That is the situation confronting the mother if she wishes to enter the court to protect the child she has looked after since birth: the child, now 9½ years of age, receiving psychiatric attention and quite obviously not being comfortable with the father and quite distraught when access by him is forced upon her.

And do not let anyone say that age 9½ is too young to understand. Members opposite will fully realise that a child from about 18 months to 2½ years is fully able to understand

the traumas and the problems of being used as a rope in a tug of war. It will always be held that there are two sides to any question—it takes two to tango—but if the mother was vindictive and was withholding the child, not seeking to protect the child, that would be another matter. I can assure the House, from long experience of the family from which this mother comes and from my knowledge of the mother, that she has bent over backwards to try to assist and is being assailed by a rat of an ex-husband who, having had two wives, is now living with a *de facto* and has a solicitor backing him up, going into court and not charging a penny for the representation!

Why, I ask? The legal profession has a lot to answer for. I am not referring to all members of the legal profession, there are those whom one can respect, but I have no respect for a father who uses a daughter in a tug of war. I have even less respect for a solicitor who will prostitute his profession to assist such a father in a series of events that will destitute the mother. The little bit of equity that she will retain in her house will be gone while she goes out to find that \$15 000, and here is the nub of it: with no guarantee that they will not persist afterwards because it is not costing them, it is costing her.

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): In the brief time that is available to me today I wish to concentrate in a little more detail on my earlier address on some of the aspects of the State debt and ultimately the effect that they will have on the South Australian Police Department. Numerous members have said in this House recently that we are now facing a State debt of \$8 000 million, but the other worrying dimension of the State debt is unfunded liabilities. This budget shows that unfunded superannuation liabilities have increased by a further \$719 million in the last financial year; long service leave entitlements by a further \$10 million to now level out at \$500 million; and workers compensation unfunded liabilities for the public sector by \$15 million to \$165 million. The alarming figure that one gets when all those unfunded liabilities are added together is about \$5 000 million on top of the State debt of \$8 000 million. So, in reality we are facing a State indebtedness of \$13 billion.

The Government decided to solve this problem by putting up an assets sale program, which was a key part of its economic statement and its debt reduction strategy. It is interesting to note in the budget papers that the Government missed the target yet again by \$50 million. It targeted the sale of assets worth \$120 million, but it only sold assets worth \$70 million. That is not the only area in which it missed its target. It said that it would invest heavily in the creation of private sector jobs and it put up \$40 million for industrial development programs, but it only spent \$18 million. Industry was expecting \$40 million but the Government spent only \$18 million. At the end of the day industry suffered and the jobs that the Government said it would create were not created.

Then came the economic statement. The Government said that it would throw in a further \$40 million, but it spent only \$30 million and it missed its target again by \$10 million. The Government then said that it would put in place a payroll tax rebate scheme at a cost of \$10 million, but it only put in \$5 million and it missed the target yet again. It said that we would have economic recovery and high-tech through the

MFP, but it has missed the boat again. We were to be the smart State, the State that would have high-tech.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: It missed the boat. The Minister asks whether I opposed the submarine project. The Minister well knows that I was at the submarine launch; he well knows that I was not in Parliament at the time the submarine proposal was launched; and he also well knows that I supported it publicly on numerous occasions. It is a fabulous project, but that is about all that this Government has to hang its hat on, because it has missed the target every other time. Of course I am not opposed to the submarine project. But the Government has missed the target continually.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: What do I mean by 'missed the target'? Let us look at the Building Better Cities program. It promised to spend \$40 million on that program, but it underspent those moneys by \$10 million. This Government is missing the target time and time again. When it targets asset sales it does not make it. When it says it is going to put up money to create incentive, it does not put it all up. It goes further. It said that the bad bank would cost it only \$230 million last year but in fact it cost us \$290 million. So when it comes to estimating a debt, it is wrong, it costs more, and when it comes to putting up money to fix it, it is wrong, it cannot do it. When it comes to putting up money to create incentive, it cannot do it. This Government has failed in absolutely every area.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The honourable member asks, 'What are your policies?' We have highlighted what we would do. We have already put down a program that will reduce the State debt by \$1 000 million. In doing that, we believe we can get back South Australia's AAA credit rating by 1997. We have outlined our program, the South Australian Recovery Program, under which the asset sale will take place. We have already said that it will concentrate on surplus land, on the remainder of SAGASCO, the State Bank and parts of SGIC, and those will go a substantial way toward reducing those debts. But at the end of the day, after all those failures, let us look at what the Government is doing to vital parts of our community, to vital parts of Government service, such as the South Australian Police Force. Again in the budget this Government has slashed police funding by \$3 million, at a time when our community is facing spiralling increases in serious crime. It is interesting to note that, following the budget cuts, the Police Commissioner put out a bulletin to all members. He said, in part:

The budget cut will necessitate very tight financial management across the whole department.

And further, that as a consequence there will be:

... a slight reduction in civilian staff, to be implemented in support areas and by changing the mix of police and civilian staff at some stations.

What has actually occurred is that there are now 39 civilian positions to go in the Police Force in crucial areas—positions that are presently occupied by Public Service Association members undertaking clerical activities. So far we have been able to establish that 15 clerks from metropolitan police stations will go, that six country stations clerks, at Whyalla, Kadina, Clare, Mount Gambier and part-time positions at Mannum and Woomera will be targeted, and it also appears as though areas of prosecution will also be targeted. The end result of that will be that in those station areas police will be pulled out of operational duties to undertake clerical activities where they no longer have support. If police are taken off

operational duties, the only end result of that can be a lesser police presence. I would like to see one Labor member stand up in this Parliament and defend reducing the operational police presence at this time. I doubt whether any of them would do so—because to ask them to do that is to ask them to defend the indefensible.

I would like to remind members of the sorts of things our Police Force is facing at present. At this stage, the latest available public figures we have on crime are from the 1991-92 Commissioner's Annual Report, and we await with interest the one to be released in a couple of months time. From that report we are able to see that violent crime has increased by 207 per cent in just 10 years of Labor Government; rapes and attempted rapes by 293 per cent; serious assault by 147 per cent; motor vehicle theft has gone up by 128 per cent; larceny has gone up by 10 per cent; break and enter by 85 per cent; and robbery by 277 per cent. With regard to white-collar crime, which includes such categories as false pretences, fraud, forgery and misappropriation, there has been an increase of 117 per cent. With all these spiralling increases this Government now makes the Police Department part of the subject of its slash, with a \$3 million cut in its budget, which means that it will not have the operational police in the community to tackle these problems.

I say that we need more—not fewer—operational police. More operational police are required to combat these problems. If, as a community and as a Parliament we are to be able to offer protection, we must support the Police Force by providing it with the resources it needs—not cutting the hell out of it because this Government has blown the bank. This Government has blown not \$3 150 million on the State Bank but some \$3 800 million because, according to the figures revealed in the budget, the interest bill has now reached \$650 million. I for one am prepared to stand up in this House in public and say that we need a stronger policing presence. The hard-working officers, the men and women of our Police Force, need the support of resources to carry out their duties effectively. It is an absolutely outrageous proposition put forward by the Government that the Police Force should have its budget slashed. I call on the Treasurer to re-examine that proposal and to give the Police Force the funding it needs so that it can carry out its activities, otherwise the electorates of members of this House will not be safe.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The European carp has been described as a curse and an ecological disaster to the Murray-Darling River system, and that is because the European carp, as mud digesters, are destroying the aquatic weeds and feeding on the native fish fingerlings. However, there is the potential to convert this noxious fish into a valuable export resource. That matter was touched on very briefly last night by the member for Flinders, and I have had a number of discussions with him in relation to the tuna farming industry at Port Lincoln, which is a very valuable export resource. The member for Flinders also pointed out to me that, at this stage, the tuna farming operation at Port Lincoln uses something like 20 tonnes of pilchards a day, and it has now reached the stage where pilchards, or the equivalent, are being imported into Australia from Japan to meet the requirements of the fish farms.

We have the situation in the Murray-Darling system where there are literally tens of thousands of tonnes of European

carp. It has been suggested, and I fully support the idea, that carp could be caught in large quantities, processed—and by ‘processed’ I mean being minced up, with food additives added to the minced carp, and then put into sausage skins so that it resembles the size and shape of a pilchard—and be fed to the tuna in the tuna farms. I do not believe that there would be any problem whatsoever in providing 20 tonnes of processed European carp to the tuna farming industry at Port Lincoln or anywhere else in South Australia. As I said, tens of thousands of tonnes of carp are available in the Murray-Darling system, particularly in the South Australian backwaters of the Murray River.

However, there is a problem: in the past the Fisheries Department has not been prepared to allow people to fish effectively for European carp for this purpose. The Minister responsible for fisheries should provide special permits to enable many people out there—besides licensed professional fishermen—to come into the industry for the sole purpose of catching this noxious fish. Not only would they be doing the Murray-Darling River and the ecology of that system a great favour by removing thousands of tonnes of European carp from that river system, but also they would be providing a valuable resource to the tuna farming industry of this State.

Of course, that industry has proved beyond any doubt to be a very high value-added industry for South Australia. However, it seems to me that it is absolutely absurd to have a situation where we are importing fish in the form of pilchards from overseas when we have tens of thousands of tonnes of European carp, which I believe could adequately do the job. I believe the Minister responsible for fisheries should encourage his department to work in close cooperation with Port Lincoln’s tuna farming industry, with the people along the river in South Australia, professional fishermen and others who would be interested in catching vast quantities of European carp.

Of course, the logical place to catch that fish is in the shallow backwaters. We should be developing methods for doing that and we should also be developing an effective processing procedure that is acceptable to the tuna. Whether there are additives that need to be included in the processing of European carp to supply all the right minerals and the bulk that the tuna require would be for the scientists to determine but, certainly, the base material is there. I can only go on the discussions I have had with the member for Flinders, who has indicated to me that at this stage 20 tonnes of pilchards are required per day.

With the tuna farming industry the success it is, I can see little reason why it cannot expand. So, there could well be the requirement of 30 or 40 tonnes of European carp per day. This would have a significant impact on reducing the numbers of carp in the river system, and it would also help greatly in the revival of the native fish species, such as the callop and the Murray cod, which are recognised as two of the premium freshwater fish in Australia.

However, we do have this problem of European carp being mud digesters. As a result of that habit and of their removing food value from that mud, they destroy all the aquatic weeds and, of course, that removes the normal habitat of the native fish species of the Murray-Darling system. I seriously ask the Minister responsible for fisheries to consider carefully what I have said today and involve his department in an in-depth study of the requirements of the tuna farming industry and make it possible for additional people to come into the river fishing industry purely for the purpose of taking European carp. I know that the department has always had a great fear

that, if it issues special permits or additional licences for the purpose of taking European carp, the fishers will catch a callop or a cod. That fear has to be overcome because of the sheer size of the potential industry that I am talking about and the enormous economic value that it could be to South Australia in the form of export earnings and also in protecting the ecology of the Murray-Darling system in South Australia.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I think it is well known that some years ago I was born with a disability and subsequently I was fortunate enough to have that disability fixed at the cardiology unit of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. In 1988 I embarked upon the first of a number of walks to raise money for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital’s cardiology unit. In common with many others who have a second chance at life, I came to appreciate what life is all about and to see it in a different perspective.

I raise this matter today not to talk about myself and what I do but to highlight why I and a number of other teams over the past five years have embarked on projects to raise money to buy much-needed equipment for this hospital located in the western suburbs of Adelaide. It is reasonably well known that in South Australia we have the highest ratio in Australia of heart disease, and in Adelaide’s western suburbs we have the highest incidence of heart disease in this State. I find it sad to see particularly working class people suffer and suffer badly, as do their families, through the loss of loved ones from heart disease. During the walks on which I have embarked—

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I thank the member for Stuart for her kind interjection. During the many walks on which I have embarked, I have often questioned why we have to be reactive rather than proactive to this disease. During my last walk, which involved a team of other people, when thinking about our farewell from Westfield Shoppingtown, involving children from Little Athletics and others, I questioned why we should not have a proactive campaign in western suburbs schools so that children could be made aware of the problems of heart disease. I wondered how to do that.

One woman who walked part of the way with me and who will walk with me next time to Port Pirie and return to raise funds for the hospital is Mrs Allgood, who lives in Semaphore Park and who plays an active role in the community. She is known to a number of members on this side of the House. I have always been of the view, which was reinforced by the contribution of the member for Light, that children at an early age understand and can comprehend complex issues. As to the proactive campaign that I talked about, I believe this was an ideal opportunity to raise the matter in schools and educate young students.

However, being a political animal, I was also aware that as we were leading up to the next State election it could be seen that I was in some way trying to promote myself through schools and students. Therefore, I chose to ask Mrs Allgood whether, as part of our team, she would go into schools and discuss the matter with school principals. I have to say that her approach has been a delightful one. She has been active—

Mrs Hutchison: She’s a delightful person.

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, she is, and she has been active in obtaining material from the Heart Foundation, the Anti-Cancer Foundation and many other organisations in South Australia. The material has been parcelled up and she requested Professor John Horowitz, Head of the Cardiology Unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, to talk to students. I am

advised that that occurred yesterday, and I am further advised by the Principal and by Mrs Allgood that about 250 students attended an assembly and listened to Professor Horowitz talk about the problems of heart disease, particularly in the western suburbs of Adelaide. He talked about the causes of heart disease and why it is important to have more and better equipment at this hospital which services that part of metropolitan Adelaide and South Australia where we find the highest incidence of heart disease in the State. I was advised by the Principal this morning that the students raised very probing questions.

Before I come to that, I am advised that the professor told the students about the equipment that has been purchased by the previous walkathon teams and how they assist patients. He spoke about a balloon pump and the rhythmic machine, illustrating to the students the importance of this equipment. He also emphasised the dangers of cigarette smoking, poor dietary habit, lack of exercise and so on which can impact upon people later on in life.

I am advised that the questions raised by these young students were in-depth. They asked questions such as: what does a balloon pump do; how does it assist the professor and his staff; and above all how does it assist patients? Many of the children expressed concern about their nanna or grandpa who had suffered a heart attack, had open heart surgery or had died from a heart attack or heart disease. The children were very concerned as to how they could prevail upon their relatives and members of their family to give up cigarette smoking. Why is it that cigarettes impact upon their health? In my opinion these children were able to gain a greater appreciation of the problems of heart disease and more specifically who would look after them if their mother or father died from heart disease.

So, it was very sobering to have this message relayed back to me this morning and I was very pleased to receive it. The reason I raise the issue is to recognise the sponsors over the past five years who have contributed in excess of \$161 000 to the cardiology unit, and that is a charity direct situation. Those many people have put in thousands of dollars out of their own pocket and sought no reward for it apart from wanting to do something for the local community. I believe that through the Ministers of Health, Education and Recreation and Sport, and maybe others, this is an ideal opportunity for the Government to grasp the nettle, go into the schools and promote this proactive campaign to address the horrendous problems of heart disease in this State.

The fact that the children are able to pick it up very quickly reinforces the belief that I have held since our children were born that children will pick up and understand issues at a very early age. I would like to place on record my appreciation to all those people and particularly the lady to whom I referred for the wonderful work they are doing, and I just hope that that proactive campaign snowballs throughout schools in the western suburbs and indeed metropolitan Adelaide.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to use this brief period to discuss a couple of issues that I recognise as being very sensitive in the Family and Community Services portfolio, the first one being maintenance for dependent students over the age of 18 years. I want to say at the outset that I realise that the principle of 18 year olds receiving contributions for tertiary study is enshrined in legislation and case law, but it is of concern to me and, I believe, to a number of people in the community. I would like to be able to refer

in some detail to particular representations that I have received on this matter. Regrettably I am unable to do so, because the matter is *sub judice* as it is currently before the court.

I want to refer to the broad picture as it relates to representation that I have received on this matter. One of the people who have contacted me (and I say 'one' because there have been a number) has told me a story regarding his own situation. He has been requested to continue paying maintenance for a child who has turned 18 years of age. Earlier this year this person was asked by the Department for Family and Community Services to agree to pay an increased amount of maintenance, with the understanding that when the child reached 18 years he would no longer be required to pay maintenance. That is certainly how the person who has made representation to me has seen the situation.

I understand that the Department for Family and Community Services has disagreed with that assessment. The situation now is that this person is in court and has been asked to respond to a departmental request for maintenance for his son while his son continues on with tertiary education. I understand that this person has been exceptionally conscientious in respect of paying maintenance. I further understand that he has never seen his son, who was born after he separated from his wife 18 years ago, and that his son has lived during that period of time with his former wife and I think now he is currently living with his grandmother.

At the outset I indicated that it was a sensitive issue, because it is, and I would be the last to suggest that if an 18 year old or 20 year old was in desperate need of support it would be the responsibility of a parent or the Government to provide that assistance. However, I find it very difficult that a parent in the circumstances to which I have just referred should be placed in this situation. Representations have been made to the Minister in this case. I have seen a response from the Minister which I believe to be most unsatisfactory. I should also point out to the House that at my request the department has sent me details regarding the matter of maintenance for children over the age of 18 years, and in that statement it is pointed out that it is not a recent phenomenon for maintenance to be sought for children who have attained, or who are about to attain, the age of 18 years.

The department also states that there is a great body of Australian legislation and case law that enshrines the principle that children who are in need of financial assistance to enable them to complete their education are able to seek that assistance from their parents, and it goes into some detail.

I share the concern that has been expressed by this person who has made representation to me. The situation now is that his son is, I understand, receiving Austudy support, but that parent is still required to continue to pay maintenance, never having seen that child. This person, having for the full 18 years diligently paid maintenance, is now required by the department through the court to continue to pay maintenance, although the young person has turned 18 years. This is a matter that I intend to raise in more detail when the court proceedings have concluded.

The other matter to which I want to refer is a statement by the Federal Opposition Family and Health spokeswoman, Senator Jocelyn Newman, that appeared in the *Advertiser* earlier this year. She felt that teenagers were lying about parental abuse so that they could claim Government handouts and use the money for all sorts of undesirable purposes.

I have some sympathy with the comments that have been made by Senator Newman, who has made the point that since the introduction of the homeless allowance in 1986 the number of teenagers claiming it nationally had jumped from 942 in 1987 to 10 485 in June 1993. Under the scheme the rates vary depending on whether teenagers also receive job search allowance, sickness benefits or special benefits.

A 16 year old claiming a job search allowance with the homeless component receives \$214 per fortnight, compared with \$129 per fortnight for a teenager living at home. I agree with the request made by Senator Newman for this matter to be investigated by the Federal Government and for a new process to be introduced to look at teenagers' claims before they are paid the allowance. I am aware that some teenagers are networking their information to help each other leave home. In many cases they are endangering their lives with drug abuse, etc., in the process. I believe that is a very serious situation.

I want to conclude by reading into *Hansard* a letter that I received from a constituent. She states:

There is something terribly wrong with Social Security in this country. My daughter's boyfriend and two friends have moved away from home and are renting a house together. All are unemployed although one is attending a 'LEAP' course. One is 17 and receiving \$130 per fortnight; another is 18 and receiving \$250 per fortnight because she is living away from home; the 'LEAP' course pays approximately \$300 per fortnight, all paid by Government funds. If they are having trouble paying the rent, they can apply for rent assistance, and the \$600 bond on the house was paid by the Housing Trust.

They decided they needed some food, so they went to Care and Share, who gave them a large box of groceries, no questions asked. This week they are trying Community Welfare.

After all these handouts, these kids have plenty money to go to the pub every Thursday night and get drunk and to buy cigarettes and take-away food. All of them smoke marijuana and if one of these girls gets pregnant who will support her; Social Security, of course.

These kids all have homes where they could live with their families, yet the Government sees fit to pay their way for them.

My husband and I are at our wits end because our daughter spends most of her time with them and can see no wrong in what they are doing.

We have tried to instil in our children respect for others and correct moral behaviour, yet because the law allows children to leave home at a young age we have no control. Kids are taught their 'rights' at school and then the Government pays their way for them.

Surely the system should be looked into and things made a little tougher so they would be more inclined to look for work.

I would suggest that that is the view of a number of parents. It is a matter that is continually being raised with me: the ease with which young people are able to leave home and be assisted by the Government.

Mr SUCH secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

QUESTION

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

SOIL CONSERVATION-ANIMAL AND PLANT CONTROL

In reply to **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** 5 August 1993.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I have given due consideration to the Member for Goyder's request for an extension of time to respond to the Soil Conservation/Animal and Plant Control discussion paper.

In view of the lateness of the season and other extenuating circumstances, including the mouse plague, I am prepared to instruct the Working Group to extend the response time to 30 August 1993.

I must, however, draw the attention of the Member for Goyder to an inaccuracy in his statement of 5 August 1993, related to council contributions to Animal and Plant Control Boards.

Under the present animal and plant control system, councils contribute up to 1 per cent urban rate revenue plus up to 4 per cent rural rate revenue. No change is proposed to these contribution rates in the discussion paper. I trust that this clarifies the situation.

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I wish to inform members of the Government's plans for constitutional reform in this State and to release the South Australian Government's submission to the Republic Advisory Committee established by the Prime Minister.

The Constitution of the State is basically contained in the Constitution Act of 1934. This Act was, as indicated in its long title, an Act to consolidate certain laws relating to the Constitution. The laws that were consolidated dated from the 1855-56 Constitution Act, and some of the language of the 1855-56 Act is still to be found in the present Act.

Age alone is not a reason for reform but, as members are well aware, the language of much of the present Act is archaic and basic questions such as when a member's seat becomes vacant are unclear, as highlighted by the Cleary case in the High Court last year. Another example which arose recently is the lack of clarity in the power of the Legislative Council in relation to money Bills. These are questions which must have clear answers.

The Constitution Act does not, of course, contain the whole of our constitutional arrangements. Recently the Australia Acts have been passed which, among other things, clarify the powers and functions of Her Majesty and the Governor.

The Constitution of the State is also to be found in documents such as the Letters Patent and also in other statutes. For example, section 23 of the Acts Interpretation Act provides that where in any Act the Governor is authorised or required to do any act, matter or thing it will be taken to mean that the act, matter or thing may or must be done by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Executive Council.

Other important aspects of our constitutional arrangements are not written down at all. For instance, there is no mention of the role of Cabinet in the Constitution Act. Important conventions which govern the way our system of representative democratic government operates are not to be found in any statute or other instrument.

There are several reasons why it is opportune to examine the State's Constitution now. Prominent among these is the South Australian Government's support for a Federal Republic of Australia.

The Government considers that it would be unsatisfactory for all references to the monarch to be removed from the Commonwealth Constitution while the monarch continues to be a part of the constitutional structure of the State. Accordingly, there is a need to examine the State's constitutional arrangements with a view to removing the monarch from them.

The Government believes that the republican debate gives the people of South Australia an opportunity to examine the

respective roles of the three tiers of government. In recent times, we have seen not only the Federal Government performing functions formerly performed by the States, but more functions devolving on local government. It is time the proper powers and functions of the State Government were examined in a systematic way within the State.

The relationship which should exist between Federal, State and local government in Australia was considered by the Advisory Council for Inter-Governmental Relations in 1982. More recently, the Constitutional Commission examined the distribution of powers between the States and the Commonwealth. A non-government body, the Constitutional Centenary Foundation, of which Sir Ninian Stephen is Chairman, has now been established to look at the Commonwealth Constitution after nearly 100 years of operation.

Another recent development which makes it timely to consider the State's constitutional arrangements is the enactment of the Courts Administration Act, 1993. This Act raises questions about the accountability of the judiciary and the proper recognition of the independence of the judiciary. The Chief Justice has requested that the independence of the judiciary be enshrined in the Constitution.

Australian Constitutions, unlike more modern Constitutions, do not specifically recognise any fundamental rights and freedoms, although the recent decision of the High Court in the case of political advertising on television has implied a right of freedom of communication, and other cases which may have a bearing on constitutional rights and freedoms are pending.

The Tasmanian Constitution is unique in recognising freedom of religion. Our own Supreme Court pointed out in 1984 in the case of *Grace Bible Church Inc. v Reedman* that the common law has never contained a fundamental guarantee of the inalienable right of religious freedom and expression.

As Australians, we are fortunate to live in a democratic and pluralistic society which, by any standards, accords a high respect to the dignity of the individual and which recognises many rights and freedoms consequent on that dignity. There is a perception that the Australian community does enjoy most individual and democratic rights, even though they are not expressly enacted in law.

The courts have developed important protections against abuse or arbitrary use of power by Governments and officials but the current content of the common law protection of fundamental rights is limited. It is the nature of the common law's protection of rights that it develops slowly and in a piecemeal fashion without any coordinated underlying doctrine. Furthermore, the lack of electoral mandate and electoral accountability curtails the range of policy-making activities in which the judiciary should legitimately engage.

All common law rights and freedoms are vulnerable. They are all subject to the principle of sovereignty of Parliament. Undoubtedly, at times Parliaments have not only failed to bring forward legislation to protect basic rights and freedoms but have enacted statutes encroaching on basic rights.

The South Australian Government considers that it is time that the basic rights and freedoms of the citizens of the State were spelt out in a Charter of Rights. The Charter would deal with basic civil and political rights as well as equal rights for women. It would provide a set of minimum standards to which the actions of the State and others must conform.

The Charter of Rights envisaged by the Government would provide a statement of rights which would be used in

the interpretation of legislation. At present there is no such touchstone which judges can use to interpret legislation so that it can achieve its objectives.

The Charter would keep Parliament aware of fundamental rights and freedoms and sensitive to the effect of its activities on such rights and freedoms. It would require the elected Parliament to take public responsibility for its adherence to or departure from any of the provisions of such a Charter of Rights.

The Charter would be an important means of educating people about the significance of their fundamental rights and freedoms. Citizens would have a readily accessible set of principles by which to measure the performance of the Government and to exert influence on policy-making. An awareness of basic rights and fundamental freedoms among citizens and a desire to uphold them are powerful weapons against any Government seeking to infringe those rights and freedoms. In this way, the proposed Charter of Rights would be a forceful influence on the Government, its officials and agencies.

The Government intends to issue a document on the proposed Charter of Rights shortly to allow community consultation on the proposals. This will be the first in a series of discussion papers examining constitutional arrangements.

Issues to be considered will include:

- whether powers should be referred to the Federal Government;
- whether powers should be transferred from the Federal Government to the State Government;
- whether power should be devolved on local government;
- modernisation of the Constitution Act, including recognition of the role of the Executive in Government;
- entrenchment in the Constitution of the independence of the judiciary;
- accountability of the judiciary;
- the appointment and powers of the Governor, including the need for a Head of State;
- recognition of the original inhabitants of the State;
- the need for a bicameral legislature and the number of members of Parliament.
- sources of funding for the three tiers of government; and
- accountability of Government to the people.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Murray- Mallee to order.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. The House has given leave for the Premier to make a statement. I would ask all members, including the member for Murray- Mallee, to take notice of the fact that leave is granted and allow the Premier to complete his statement. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The issues I have mentioned are critical to the future of our State as it approaches and enters a new century. The Government believes there should be a wide and well informed community debate on these matters.

The Attorney- General will have responsibility for the production of discussion papers on these topics to encourage that debate before proposals are finalised and presented to Parliament.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. F.T. Blevins)—

South Australian Housing Trust—Financial and Statutory Reports, 1992-93

By the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Mount Lofty Ranges Management Plan—Response to Report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of Parliament

Planning Act—Crown Development Report—Department of Marine and Harbors development proposal.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the minutes of evidence given before the Legislative Review Committee on the Corporation of Thebarton by-law No. 8 concerning cats and move:

That the minutes of evidence be received.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr De LAINE (Price): I bring up the seventh report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee on an inquiry into the Hindmarsh Island bridge project and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

HINDMARSH ISLAND BRIDGE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Government now abandon its plans to fund the Hindmarsh Island bridge in view of the unanimous recommendation of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, tabled in Parliament just a few minutes ago, that the bridge be reassessed and that access to the island be improved by augmenting the present ferry service with a second ferry?

The committee's report unanimously calls on the Government to seriously address the competing interests of heritage, environment and development posed by the construction of the bridge. The committee also urges the preparation of a regional management plan encompassing the whole of the Murray Mouth, the Coorong and southern waterways and a critical analysis of the environmental impact of further residential development on Hindmarsh Island. The unanimous findings of the committee, which has Government representation on it, is in direct conflict with the statement this week by the Minister of Transport Development that the Government is committed to the construction of the bridge at an estimated cost to taxpayers of \$6.4 million despite community, financial and environmental concerns.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It would be interesting to know exactly what the Leader of the Opposition feels about the Hindmarsh Island bridge as he is the local member for this area. It is interesting to note that he has studiously

avoided any reference to his own position as the local member in asking the question. It is also interesting to note that he does not have the support of councils in that area, which have written not only to me but I am certain they must have written to the Leader as well indicating their support for the bridge. I have not had the chance to read the report—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Maybe the Leader is actually saying something; maybe he actually has a position on something. I thought I heard him say that he actually believes in something. Perhaps he is saying that he does not like the bridge.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Okay. We will move right along. I got it wrong. I thought for a moment that we got a position from the Leader on something—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order, but I will not recognise the honourable member until I can hear what he is saying.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is normal procedure for the Premier to address his reply to the Chair and not to call upon his colleagues.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and ask the Premier to address the Chair.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I apologise, Sir. In this one instance, the Deputy Leader is quite correct. I have not had yet had a chance to read the report as it has only just been tabled. I note that the Leader had a typed question on this matter, but the report has only just been tabled in this place. The matter will be considered by the Government. That certainly will be the case as we are obliged to and will willingly do so. We will consider all reports of all parliamentary committees, so the matter will be considered. However, I understand from the Leader's question that the report may recommend that a second ferry be used.

That matter, likewise, can be considered, but I have to say that, in the present circumstances, where there are competing demands for Government funds, many of which come from members of Parliament seeking to represent their areas, when there are many demands for alternative uses of dollars available, frankly a second ferry across to Hindmarsh Island would be a pretty poor use of those funds. Because, as the Leader himself well knows—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —the taxpayer-funded punt that goes across there at the moment costs money and recurrent costs. Every year it costs money and, as the Leader also well knows, if that were then taken off and replaced by—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Victoria apparently wants to be have a toll on that punt. I think he had better talk to the Leader, because the Leader—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to sit down, and I call the member for Victoria to order.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Victoria, because I want to hear the answer to the question, and I am sure other members do.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The cost of building the bridge has quite clearly proven to be cheaper than the

ongoing recurrent cost of the existing punt, let alone the extended cost of a new punt across to Hindmarsh Island. So, it simply would not be a cost-effective means of addressing that issue. I know there are various concerns about the heritage value of the island, and nobody would support development in any part of the State beyond the capacity of an area to cope with that development. However, the same principles apply to all parts of the State. All parts of the State want a reasonable level of development.

I am sure that the Leader is not about to suggest that we should stop development in this State, and I am sure that he is not about to suggest that development should not happen. I know that that is the view of some of his colleagues and, of course, the member for Coles is quick to stop any development if she can. However, I thought the Leader favoured development taking place in South Australia. We will consider the committee's report very seriously indeed, but we will do so on the basis of what we think is in the best interests of the State, recognising the protection of those unique characteristics of our environment, including the heritage of our environment. We will consider all that and come down with a response.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader is trying to bait me at the moment to come down with an immediate response. I was given a copy of the report just seconds ago after the Leader asked his question, and I think it is grossly unfair to expect me to respond to a report comprising 37 pages and say what we are going to do on all those recommendations. I will not do that.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I know that is the way the Leader would want to operate, but that is not the way we will do so. That knee-jerk reaction from him simply will not be the hallmark of this Government. It is important, however, that the Leader not hide behind this report and that he let it be known where he stands.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am letting it be known where I stand on this matter. We will consider that. We will certainly take into account all those issues. I have not hidden how I feel about the Hindmarsh Island bridge and the need for development in this State. It is about time the Leader let his own views be known on those self-same issues.

STATE DEBT

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Does the Premier intend to introduce a special new tax on all South Australians along the lines of the levy introduced by the Victorian Premier Mr Kennett, and has he considered the universal application of the user-pays principle just espoused a moment ago by the member for Victoria? Advice has recently been given by Mr Kennett to the State Opposition on how to win government and how to reduce State debt in the Kennett way if it did become the Government. During a recent visit to Adelaide, Mr Kennett (who was very unhappy with Hawthorn's defeat by the Crows last Saturday, I might mention) was described in the *Advertiser* of 26 August as follows:

Priority should be given to introducing new taxes on families and individuals.

He emphasised the value of a \$100 special levy on every household in this State.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I was aware of Jeff Kennett's visit to South Australia. He flew into South Australia and addressed a business lunch in this State. What was the topic of his address? It was to give some advice to the Leader of the Opposition of this State as to what he should do. Mr Deputy Speaker, do you know why he did that? Because shortly after the election of the Kennett Government in Victoria, the Leader said on the Keith Conlon program, when asked about whether or not the Kennett responses to Government applied in South Australia:

Well, if you look at the issues and what has occurred in Victoria and compare it with what has occurred here, Keith, you will see there is enormous similarity.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: He says, 'That's right.' Then, of course, Jeff Kennett hears the Leader, above the ruckus he has caused in the Victoria—the people shouting in the streets and protesting in the community—and he says, 'Don't worry Dean; I'll come across and give you a hand. I'll come across and give you some advice as to how to go about it.' So he comes to South Australia and on 26 August, the following was reported in the *Advertiser*:

The Victorian Premier, Mr Kennett, has given the State Opposition some tips on winning government at the next election and addressing the State debt. . . He also suggested that if the Opposition won the next State election, it should move quickly to address the State's debt by introducing new taxes and should shake-up the public sector.

That is his advice. I know that the honourable member has asked me whether we would introduce this poll tax that exists in Victoria. I can say that the answer is a clear and unequivocal 'No.' It is about time that the Leader, who is receiving this advice with Jeff Kennett looming over his shoulder telling him that he should do the same in South Australia, said, 'Jeff Kennett, you are wrong. Jeff Kennett, your answers are wrong. Jeff Kennett, your policies are wrong. Go home and stay home.' He should say that he would not do that in this State. Again, when listening, we hear a deafening silence from the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader who rushed to be alongside Jeff Kennett after he was made Victorian Premier, the Leader who could not wait to stand on the steps of Parliament House beside John Hewson when he was in favour is equally one who runs for cover—but not with alternative words. He has had put to him, 'Put on a tax, Dean; put on a tax.' It is about time Dean stood up and said, 'No; South Australia does not need that.'

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Why have Government Ministers still failed to identify all the financial guarantees and indemnities they have given in the name of taxpayers and does not this failure demonstrate yet again that, if former State Bank directors and senior executives were negligent, Government Ministers are equally guilty? Two years ago the Auditor-General reported that 'an accurate and complete picture of the totality of the Government's guarantees and indemnities was not available'. He further stated:

The importance of this information lies in the need for an awareness of potential commitments and to ensure that there is in place an appropriate management strategy in respect of such commitments.

Such a strategy was not in place to protect the State Bank guarantee. Despite the State Bank disaster and the Auditor-General's warnings, he is forced to reveal in this year's report that all these guarantees have still not been put on the record.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In fact, most of the guarantees are. However, I certainly do take the Auditor-General's point, and it is a point that my Deputy Premier, as Treasurer, and I share: they should certainly be on the record. Indeed, both he and I asked some time ago that that work be undertaken to list comprehensively all the guarantees that might be outstanding. It has been up to the agencies to respond to the inquiries from Treasury in that regard. Most of the situation is pretty clear on that matter.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, progress is being made. I make the point—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: While we have had control of this situation, significant progress has been made. I can assure the Deputy Leader that the requirements of the Auditor-General will be fulfilled because they should be fulfilled.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety advise the House whether South Australia still has the best industrial relations record in the country and, if so, how does it compare with that of Victoria?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I would like to thank the member for Gilles for his question. The honourable member asked a question in respect of the industrial record of South Australia. I think we in South Australia, both the unions and the employers, would be very proud of the fact that we are able to operate in this State with only 44 working days per 100 000 employees lost in industrial disputes. We can compare that level with that in Victoria, where it is 429 days per annum. One must appreciate that the reason for that huge difference is the attitude of the Government in Victoria, which has undertaken a course of action to ensure that workers who have expected to have certain rights in this country have had them taken away from them. We have an Opposition here who is yet to declare its hand in this matter; it has yet to guarantee certain things.

We have the situation where Kennett has been over here advising members of the Liberal Party about how they ought to behave themselves. For the information of this House, I will repeat what was stated in the *Advertiser* of 26 August: 'introduce new taxes and should shake up the public sector'. What Mr Kennett wants to be able to do is to create a situation in this State so that he can hide behind South Australia. One only has to take it a bit further. In Western Australia, a Leader of the same Party before the election made quite clear, 'I am no Jeff Kennett', and actions speak louder than words: he is not. On the industrial relations scene, he has been more draconian and he is causing more pain and taking away more rights from workers in that State.

One also has to take into account Mr Kennett's comments in this matter: 'working very closely with Dean Brown after the next election'. Does that mean that in this State we will see all those sorts of things that have caused problems in Victoria? If the industrial record of the Tonkin Government is anything to go by, when the Leader was the Minister of Labour, we will see a very significant increase in the number

of industrial disputes. All I can say is that we do not need a Jeff Kennett style of Government here, and you will not have it whilst we are in government.

WORKCOVER

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Has the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety given approval for the Chairman of the Workcover Board to make a proposal to a number of Government departments offering to manage their workers compensation, health and safety programs and, if so, why, given the clear conflict of interest? Mr Les Wright was a Minister's employee when he was appointed Chairman of the WorkCover Board. I have been told that Mr Wright has recently made submissions to various Government agencies and departments including the Commissioner for Public Employment, the Health Commission, the Children's Services Office and the Education Department proposing that he should manage their compensation, health and safety programs. Mr Wright is making this offer through Les Wright Consulting, his private company, in conjunction with Jardine Insurance.

When Mr Wright left his position in the Minister's office, I understand, he was allowed to remain Chairman of WorkCover only if he agreed not to become involved in any workers compensation business in South Australia. This condition was meant to avoid any potential conflict of interest situation arising. However, the allegations put to me suggest that Mr Wright is using Government positions he has occupied to pursue private interests.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question. The matter of Mr Wright undertaking business as an individual in this State ought to be applauded by the members opposite, who complain frequently about people who have been in Government not knowing how private enterprise works. The member for Fisher is saying that Mr Wright has no skills to offer other people. The situation is the same as that involving the Leader who, when he was defeated in this House by the current Whip, went out and used the experience he had as an ex-employee of the Department of Agriculture, and used it extremely well as a very valued consultant.

He used the skills he had gained in this House as a politician, and he did that very well. I was very proud of him for being able to do that, because he had worked in Government, he had been in this place, and he had demonstrated that he could do something when he went out into private enterprise. Why bucket a person who has the initiative to do that? Mr Wright has raised with the board what he intended to do when he became a consultant and that conflict has been advised to the board and they are kept fully informed of it. I have a lot of confidence in Mr Wright. I also have a lot of confidence in the WorkCover board and I have the confidence that there will not be a conflict of interest.

When you have people with extremely good experience, you use them. I can imagine two Crows supporters opposite saying to Graham Comes, 'Because I coached you when you played at Glenelg, you can't play on Saturday. They would be saying, 'You'll be using your best players, and so you should', and we are using our best players. Why should not a person who has those skills use them? Are we are going to adopt the very narrow star chamber approach here where we will say to anybody connected with the Labor Government, 'You cannot have work in this State because you have skills'? That is precisely the message coming across from members

opposite; a witch hunt against people with extremely good skills. The Opposition does not want to see them used because they know that they will be effective.

LABOUR SURVEY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. What is the content of the labour force survey figures released this morning?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I know members of the House are interested in the labour force figures that were released this morning. These are the monthly figures with respect to employment and unemployment. I am very pleased to inform the House that South Australia's unemployment rate has fallen by .4 of a percentage point in the past month to 10 per cent, which is now the lowest level of unemployment in South Australia since June 1991. South Australia has recorded the second lowest unemployment rate of all the States. We are second to Western Australia, which comparatively has a good unemployment rate of 9.3 per cent, and it is certainly well below the national average of 11.1 per cent.

I think it is important not just to look at what is happening from month to month. Everyone in this House, and certainly myself as Minister, acknowledges that the figures can be a little volatile from month to month. Therefore, I think we should look at what has happened in the past 12-month period from August 1992 to August of this year. I am delighted to be able to inform the House that during that period there has been a gradual increase in the number of people employed in South Australia whereby the change—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: We will get to that in a moment. You will have egg from one side of your face to the other. It is interesting that the Opposition members, day after day, cry wolf about unemployment. The moment someone has an opportunity to provide them with the facts they do not want to know. Since August of last year, we have seen an increase in employment of 7 000 people. In the same 12 month period we have seen a reduction in unemployment (that is, a reduction in the number of unemployed) by 13 100.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Just in case Opposition members, who are desperate to try to make sure they talk South Australia down, want to suggest that these figures over a yearly period are an aberration, I point out that if they look at the May, June and July figures for 1993, they will see that there is a definite move downwards in the number of unemployed, and there is a trend upwards in the number of unemployed from August last year.

That is something that even some members of the Opposition might welcome in this State and might be prepared to acknowledge. I must acknowledge that this year—and I have always acknowledged the very good news and the trends, as well as acknowledging the things we need to do better; I am the first to do that—while the monthly labour force data is volatile and, while the total employment fell by 2 300, as I have indicated the continuing underlying trend continues to be a strengthening in the labour market with consistent growth in employment and falls in the unemployment rate.

I am delighted to be able to tell the House, with respect to the interjections (which I know I should not acknowledge)

what has happened regarding youth unemployment. Again, I will explain to the House how the statistics are collected (and I do this every month, month after month). I can inform the House that there has been a reduction in the number of unemployed young people in the 15 to 19-year-old age group by 1 100 down to 5 100. Now, that is far too high, and I am the first to acknowledge that, but in terms of our response to young people it certainly vindicates the Government's position in the Treasurer's announcement in the budget that we will increase the number of TAFE places by 1 000, we will increase—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, you don't want that. The Opposition does not want the number of TAFE places increased. I hope the record will show that, and show it very clearly, because I think there will be a lot of families in this community who would want to know that particular piece of information.

The increase in the number of TAFE places comes on top of the Premier's announcement that we will be looking at another 1 000 traineeships within the public sector and that we are prepared to fund a further 500 of the conservation core places.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, the Opposition does not like this.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order. It is not a matter of not liking it: the Minister is debating the question and she is again taking far too long to answer a simple question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Although this question seems to be taking a long time, it is actually the second shortest question that we have had so far today. But I would ask the Minister to wind up her remarks.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, the reason I am providing this information is that these public sector youth training positions have been incredibly successful. The Opposition does not like that. It does not really want youth to be employed in this State. What they want is for unemployment to increase and employment to decrease so that this State is brought to its knees. It is very interesting that we now have a proposal which will really help employment, when the honourable member opposite me—the member for Victoria—is now talking about moving to a complete user-pays system, including charging for crossing on the Goolwa ferry. That will be very interesting for the people of Hindmarsh Island when they hear about it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order.

The Hon. Dean Brown: It is your Party that has done that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader to order. I cannot hear the point of order that his Deputy wants to make.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister is again debating the question, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not accept the point of order, because I believe that it is in answer to the actual question that was asked, but I would ask the Minister to bring her remarks to a conclusion.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I just wanted to conclude, to reinforce what I said, by saying that in the period from August to August we have actually seen an increase of 2.1 per cent—by 9 800—and it

is very interesting that the unemployment rate over that period has dropped by 1.7 percentage points.

I conclude by saying that this is news for cautious optimism; it is not news for us to rush out and say that we have turned the corner with respect to the recession. But I believe it is time that even the Opposition started to try to engender some confidence into this State and started to be a little positive instead of knocking it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, you can keep on bullying. You are not going to get anywhere, Graham.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members are wasting their own time if they wish to use Question Time effectively.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services. Will he investigate the circumstances surrounding the death of a nine-month-old baby boy who had been suspected of being abused and whose family had been visited on seven previous occasions by officers of the Department of Family and Community Services; and can he assure this House that further cuts in funding for FACS will not jeopardise the ability of the department to respond to urgent cases such as this?

The Coroner's Court this morning released to me publicly available details concerning the death of a baby boy aged nine months, of Kurrulta Park, on 31 July this year. The cause of death is officially described as bronchial pneumonia associated with a fracture of the right radius and ulna. In his short lifespan the baby was visited seven times by FACS Department officers. Three days before he died the family was visited by a CAFS nurse who was refused admission by the boy's mother. The nurse called FACS, who failed to respond at the time when hospitalisation could possibly have saved the boy's life, and he died three days later. I am prepared to supply to the Minister the name of the boy and the name of the FACS office involved.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: If the honourable member raises an individual case and asks me to examine that, and is prepared to provide the name as he has said that he is, then clearly I will have that individual case examined. However, I would reject the assertion that was put as part of his initial question that there is some overall reduction to the Department of Family and Community Services budget which endangers individual children, because he then went on to link that general proposition with the individual case which he related to this House.

While I am certainly prepared, at the request of any member of this House, to investigate an individual case—and certainly one as serious as that to which the member for Hayward refers—I do not accept his generalised assertions as part of that question that there was any suggestion of a budget reduction providing that impetus. It is very unfortunate that he has chosen to politicise that individual case in this way. I wish that he had separated those two questions, because I would have been more than prepared to address the generalisation as a separate issue. However, certainly as part of an individual case I will take that matter forward and, according to the circumstances and what information I can

bring back to the House about the individual case, I will do that.

TOURISM AMBASSADOR

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Has the Minister of Tourism considered using anyone associated with the Adelaide Crows Football Club as a tourism ambassador for South Australia? I am aware that the Minister has appointed a range of high profile ambassadors for South Australia, including netball star Michelle Fielke, as I am reminded by the member for Stuart, and wine entrepreneur Sir James Hardy. Given the powerful national profile of the Crows through their on-field success and given their off-field public image as individuals, they would seem to have suitable attributes to be considered as tourism ambassadors.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his question, as I know he is a passionate supporter of the Crows, as are many other members of this House. I am delighted to be able to announce to the House that the Adelaide Crows coach, Graham Cornes, has accepted our invitation to join the team of South Australia's tourism ambassadors. Of course, Mr Cornes has coached the Crows for the past three years, bringing them into the AFL second semi-final for the first time this year following their win against Hawthorn at the MCG on Sunday. Certainly, the success of the Adelaide Crows has given Graham Cornes a high profile in this State and, of course, beyond as a champion of South Australia, as well as Aussie rules. As a former acclaimed player and coach, I hope Graham Cornes would have the support of everyone in this House to be a perfect choice as ambassador for South Australian tourism.

I think Graham Cornes is a perfect example of a 'can do' spirit which proves that South Australians can do anything when we are united behind a cause. Look at the Grand Prix and the submarine project. Where are the Crows' critics now? Where are all those whingers from three years ago? Instead of listening to them, Graham and his team got on with the job, and I am sure they will have the support of the entire South Australian population this weekend.

Of course, the economic impact of the Adelaide Crows on South Australia's tourism industry is significant. Thousands of people cross the border to attend Crows matches when they are held at home. Certainly they have helped make South Australia and Adelaide a very positive and major tourism focus and have brought national attention to Adelaide and South Australia. As their coach, Graham has earned great respect throughout the Australian sporting and general community and will be an invaluable asset in helping to sell South Australia as a tourist destination.

We have invited our various tourism ambassadors to take part in promotions of South Australia both interstate and abroad. Sir James Hardy was our first appointment. He has been an absolutely dedicated and committed tourism ambassador at a number of functions. Former New Zealand Prime Minister, David Lange, a passionate supporter of and visitor to this State, has also caused enormous controversy by pointing out the difference between an authentic holiday in South Australia and some of the crass and gloss in Queensland. Robyn Archer has agreed to be a tourism ambassador, as has the captain of the world champion Australian netball team, Michelle Fielke, along with the acclaimed gourmet chef Maggie Beer and Port Pirie's own Shakespearian television and motion picture actor Keith

Michell. So, Graham Cornes, good luck on Saturday; and it is great to have you on board.

MABO

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Why was the Premier's ministerial statement yesterday on the Mabo case completely silent on the issue of compensation? What assessment has the Government made of South Australia's liability for compensation should Mr Keating's latest Mabo proposals proceed? Will South Australia join New South Wales in insisting that the Commonwealth assume the major liability for any compensation? The proposals announced by the Prime Minister last week would require compensation for the extinguishment of all native title to be paid by the level of Government that granted the land to other parties.

What Mr Keating is proposing would make the South Australian Government liable for compensation for land grants and other decisions dating back to the foundation of South Australia which have extinguished native title in establishing freehold land, crown leases including pastoral leases, national parks and conservation parks, and land reserved under various indentures, and which would create a contingent liability for South Australia of many millions of dollars.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: At the initial Council of Australian Government meeting in Melbourne, I rejected the concept that the State should be liable for any compensation payments for the titles that were extinguished between 1975 and 1993. The Commonwealth Government's starting position at that meeting was that the bills should be shared. However, just prior to the collapse of those talks a day and a half later it changed its position and acknowledged that it would pick up all compensation. I see in the latest proposals it has now gone back on that and has returned to the ballgame of 50-50 sharing. I am just as much opposed to that now as I was then, and I have maintained that publicly. It is not a case of asking whether I will join John Fahey, because this is a position that we have had consistently since the Council of Australian Government meeting.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training advise whether any additional services are being provided for children with special needs by the Children's Services Office and, if so, could she outline what those additional services are?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, I certainly can indicate that to the honourable member, and I thank her for her question, support and interest in this very important area of the provision of services for children with special needs. The Children's Services Office is committed to equitable access and participation for children with special needs to the full range of early childhood services. The involvement of parents and other community members in the provision of these services is critical. I would like to acknowledge the work being done by individuals, community groups and associations in this area. Without the support and work of individuals and members of the community, the job of the Children's Services Office would be much more difficult.

Specialist staff, including speech pathologists, social workers, special educators and psychologists, are employed

in each region of the State to provide assessment and direct services to children and their families, and to support early childhood staff to respond appropriately to their needs. The Children's Services Office provides an integrated program which funds additional staff time in the pre-school to support children with moderate to severe disabilities.

It is interesting to note that there has been a 100 per cent increase in the number of children receiving this service that I have just outlined over the past 12 months from 207 to now 428 young children. I would like to indicate that the children's services budget for the clinical and remedial services for children with disabilities in the 1993-94 budget is \$1.96 million.

PRISONS, DRUGS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is to the Minister representing the Minister of Justice. Does he share the anxiety of former acting coordinator of home detention, Ms S.J. Wright, that increased drug abuse in custody is manifesting in 'escalating violence, standover tactics and in exacting sexual favours'; does he agree with Ms Wright's assessment that, through inflated drug prices in prisons, particular prisoners are 'in total control of others' lives and resources', and that this control appears to flow over to families who are in turn pressured to make good debts and often threatened with violence?

I have received a copy of a submission from Ms Wright to the Associate Director of Offender Services, Mr G. Vinall, and received by Mr Vinall on 27 August 1993, which makes these assertions and states that, if the Department of Correctional Services is to regain its credibility, it needs to develop a drug policy which is geared to reducing the availability of drugs in prisons. Ms Wright's submission states that prison staff are at a loss to know how to deal with the 'alarming rate of drug abuse in our institutions, on home detention and whilst under community supervision'.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer it to the Minister of Justice.

GARBAGE RECYCLING TRANSFER CENTRE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources. Further to my previous questions on the proposed recycling plant at Royal Park, can the Minister advise my constituents, as a matter of urgency:

1. What expertise does the proponent have in terms of operating a recycling plant?
 2. Does the proponent have sites at other locations in the metropolitan area and, if so, where are they located?
 3. Has the proponent of this recycling plant ever been denied a licence or licences on the basis or bases of operations on other sites and, if so, when, and what were those reasons?
 4. Is it a fact that there is no provision for the extraction of toxic solubles from the liquid waste from this plant?
- Residents in Royal Park, Hendon and Semaphore Park, and now West Lakes because of the waterway, are demanding answers to these serious issues which they feel will adversely affect their local communities and their environment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I share the member for Albert Park's concerns about this recycling plant. In representing his community, he has been a strong advocate, and I know that

he has expressed his concerns in the local environment as well as publicly through the local *Messenger* newspaper. There is quite a number of concerns about this proposal. I will take on notice the detailed questions that the honourable member has raised with me with regard to the proponent and various other aspects of the development that is proposed for this location and refer them to the Environment Protection Office for its considered and detailed response.

I will address the questions the honourable member has raised regarding this proposal, and I will refer the matter to my colleague the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and ensure that his officers are fully apprised of the proposal that is currently before the Woodville council and the Planning Commission. I will also take up the matter of whether or not the proposed site is the most appropriate location for a recycling plant of this sort, particularly in the western suburbs.

In wrapping up my response to the member for Albert Park, I must say that I share his concerns, and I am sure they are shared by my colleague the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. If a recycling establishment is to be appropriate, it must be environmentally acceptable. We cannot have establishments of this nature constructed in areas where they impede or reduce residential amenity or the amenity of the community as a whole, and we will ensure that that does not happen. I assure the member for Albert Park that we will give the matter our full attention and address his concerns, which I know are shared by hundreds of constituents in the Royal Park area, and that we will ensure that a comprehensive response is provided. If the proposed location is not appropriate, that advice will be conveyed to the relevant authorities.

FIREARMS

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Is the Minister of Emergency Services aware that the Government's recent legislative changes to the Firearms Act has made it illegal for collectors to hold gun displays and that the biannual Adelaide Gun and Militaria Show at the Wayville Showgrounds in October is now illegal? I have been told that under the provisions of the new Act it is illegal to display more than one identical firearm and to exhibit or sell away from a dealer's premises. This was pointed out to the Legislative Review Committee when it examined the new firearms regulations on 18 August.

Consequently, the Adelaide Gun Show, which is due to open, I am told, on 2 October and which traditionally attracts exhibitors from around Australia and employs a considerable number of people, will have to be cancelled. I am told that notices of cancellation are to be sent out this weekend in time for the 80 to 90 exhibitors to cancel their plans.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think that is a very misleading statement on behalf of the member for Eyre.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have carefully read—

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. Will the Minister please take his seat.

Mr LEWIS: As I understand it, recent rulings from the Chair—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable member wait until I recognise him. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: As I understand it, recent statements from the Chair about the use of the word 'misleading' where it applies to another member of this place are highly disorderly. I ask the Chair to rule that the Minister withdraw that statement.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not accept the point of order. The way I heard it—and I will check the record—was that the Minister was not referring to the honourable member but to the statement.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker; that is absolutely correct. That is what I said and what I intended to say. I invite those people who are involved in this propaganda exercise to contact the Registrar—that is, the Commissioner of Police—to get the accurate and correct information. The Registrar has made it quite clear that he will make certain arrangements that will allow for the licensing of various premises so that these events can take place. I am sure that the member for Eyre, if he wishes, can pass on that information to antique dealers, or the Registrar can supply that information directly to them.

In fact, I have been advised by the department that the Registrar has arranged for a briefing, in a forum environment, of the people who have raised those concerns. I am sure that they will discover that they can continue with their gun show. I hope that those people who appear to be using this as a propaganda exercise against the firearm regulations do not involve others who genuinely wish to undertake this show or display, as I am sure the majority of them do.

The regulations are clear about what is intended and their implementation. Their method of administration has been set out, and I am sure that the committee which dealt with it also had that information before it. I spoke to many of my colleagues on this side of the House, and I know that the Registrar's officers also briefed them to clarify the matter. So, I invite the member for Eyre to ask those people to make contact. If they cannot do that, I would be more than happy to assist in any way to convey that information.

COOBER PEDY MURDER

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Emergency Services advise the House of any progress in the police investigation of the murder of a tourist at Coober Pedy?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have just been advised by the Acting Commissioner of Police that two persons have been arrested in Coober Pedy in relation to the murder of the German tourist, Ann Neumann. I am advised further that the investigation is continuing and that the police are hopeful of discovering further information in regard to her whereabouts. They are fairly confident at this point that things are progressing positively. So, I am pleased to be able to make that announcement.

The Acting Commissioner will make that announcement, or has already announced it publicly, so I believe that the community has been kept informed of the comprehensive work that the police are undertaking. I wish to thank the Acting Commissioner and to congratulate the officers involved in this investigation, because I am sure that it has been one of their most difficult and frustrating experiences. I have spoken with some of them personally, and I know that it has been a difficult situation. The people of Coober Pedy have also been deeply involved, and I am sure they would

express their deep and enduring respect for the efforts of the police in relation to this investigation.

PRISONS, PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Justice. Does the Minister condone the kind of demeaning and pornographic literature circulating in our prison system which purports to give homosexual safe sex instruction to male and female prisoners, and does he agree that responsible messages on safe sex are debased and distorted by the words and illustrations contained in a comic called *Gaolwize* and other pamphlets now being introduced into our Correctional Services institutions?

I have received some of this literature from a concerned prison official who has tried to have the supply of material stopped. I can make it available to the Minister, but to read any into *Hansard* would be inappropriate given the offensive language used. The prison officer, who for obvious reasons does not disclose his name, feels that this literature, while claiming to carry an important message, does nothing more than encourage homosexual activity and drug taking in prisons and demeans the importance of the safe sex message and the men and women at whom it is aimed. The literature also appears to assume the ready availability of heroin and the normality of homosexual relationships in our prison institutions.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will refer that matter to the Minister of Justice.

BUSINESS LICENCE INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Business and Regional Development inform the House whether the Business Licence Information Centre opened in May this year is proving to be an effective use of State Government money?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his support for the Small Business Corporation. I know there was a great deal of cat-calling from members opposite when we announced the Business Licence Information Centre; obviously it was not seen as a worthwhile thing to do. But I am pleased to inform the honourable member that the Business Licence Information Centre is proving to be a most effective use of State Government money. In fact the centre, which represents a commitment to service and efficiency and which opened for business in May, has received just over 2 000 inquiries, generating requests for around 8 000 State and Commonwealth licences. About 75 per cent of these inquiries were telephone inquiries and 20 per cent walk-in, with a number of people also writing in. The four areas that have been the subject of the most inquiries have been small business relating to retailing, building, importing and secondhand dealing.

I have heard nothing but good comment for our one-stop shop, which has effectively streamlined the services we are able to offer to the South Australian small business community. A number of people have said over the years that it was vitally important that, rather than having to shop around town and go to various Government departments to try to find which permits and licences were necessary to establish and operate a small business, there needed to be a computerised one-stop shop. That has been done, with State and Commonwealth licences available instantly, and the

demand from the public and the response from small business has been superb.

GUERIN, Mr BRUCE

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Will the Premier confirm that the former head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Bruce Guerin, is to take a newly-created position at Flinders University, funded in part by the Government? Since September last year, Mr Guerin has enjoyed the title of Special Adviser to the Premier. I have been told that the present head of the Premier's Department, Dr Crawford, is determined to get rid of Mr Guerin, and Mr Guerin is, therefore, taking up a position at Flinders University. I am advised that the position is to establish a business degree in public sector management and that the State Government is proposing to contribute \$100 000 a year for five years to Mr Guerin's salary. I understand that his title is director elect of the Centre of Public Policy and Public Sector Reform. Can the Premier confirm that?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can confirm that appointment. There has been correspondence between Flinders University and the South Australian Government. I will put aside the comments made by the member for Mount Gambier—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—concerning the Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I certainly do not accept those comments. But many of the other details referred to in the member for Mount Gambier's question are correct.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

MOUND SPRINGS

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources. What is the Government doing to protect and increase the awareness of the conservation values of the Mound Springs in the Lake Eyre region?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am pleased to be able to indicate to the House some of the events which took place just yesterday further to support and reinforce the valuable asset that we enjoy in South Australia, namely, the Mound Springs of the Lake Eyre Basin region. Yesterday I had the great pleasure of joining with the creators of a video titled *Mound Springs* at a launch by the Conservation Council. It is a complete and very enjoyable video, which outlines the immense pleasure that the Mound Springs can bring to those who are able to see and enjoy the area. The Conservation Council and the film makers, Mr David Woodgate and Ms Erika Calder, have in my opinion made an important contribution to the education process by producing this video. I encourage all members who have the opportunity to see it to take their time, because it really does highlight what is there and a unique feature of the South Australian environment.

The Mound Springs have played a central role in providing an essential service to South Australia over thousands of years. Of course, originally our indigenous people depended on those springs for drinking water and their other needs. Of course, the springs have also provided water for grazing and for tourism, and some of our original explorers used the

Mound Springs as a base for their explorations throughout Australia, particularly central Australia and across the whole of Australia. I think John McDouall Stuart used it as a base for his explorations in 1861. The springs are very important in the sense that they provide a unique opportunity for us to see rare desert species in a location where we are supplied with regular fresh water because of the cracks in the earth's strata.

The overall video is a significant educational tool, and I hope that we can see it spread throughout our focus schools within South Australia and interstate as well. The State Government has brought those areas under the national parks management program, and that will further preserve and protect most of the area from additional pressures that occur around it. I congratulate the Conservation Council and particularly, of course, those people who have been part of it: Mr Colin Harris, from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, is the main narrator of the film, and he does an excellent job. I thank David Woodgate and Erika Calder for their work and contribution in bringing this important educational source to the South Australian community. I hope that we can see this further enhance not only our environment but our ecotourism development for the whole of South Australia.

AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Does the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety still hold the view he expressed in the foreword to the August edition of the Florey newsletter about the importance of buying Australian products? In that newsletter he quite rightly pointed out that every dollar spent on overseas products means money going out of Australia, making us a poorer country. He then urged everyone to look at the label before buying the product. If so, will he ask his colleague the Minister of Public Infrastructure why the new polyester, nylon and cotton coats supplied to E&WS workers carry the label 'Made in China?'

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Yes.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Today in Question Time I directed questions to my ministerial colleagues in relation to the proposed recycling plant at Royal Park. Clearly, from the evidence that my constituents and those people who have a deep interest and concern in this area have put before me, this plant, in our opinion, should not go ahead. I emphasise from the outset that I am not opposed to recycling: in fact, it is essential and critical to our community. However, this plant is not environmentally acceptable. Let me give an illustration to the House.

I am told that the site itself is not large enough. The water that will come from the wastes that are recycled in this plant—and members should bear in mind that they come out of household garbage bins—could contain waste from someone's shed. For example, people might go down to their shed and find an old tin of arsenic. Where will it go? Into the

rubbish bin. They might find old bottles of chlordane or dieldrin in the rubbish bin. If they use caustic soda, where do the containers go? Into the rubbish bin. If they use materials that clean out sinks, what happens to the empty containers? They go into the rubbish bin.

We talk about the use of pesticides and insecticides, many of which are harmful to the community, and those containers are also thrown into the rubbish bins. Where will they go? Under this proposal they will go into the recycling plant, be mixed up with other fluids which come from vegetation and so on and which will drip out onto the ground and be hosed down. Guess where that soluble material will go. It will go into a drain which, under the plan of the proponents' consultants, will end up in a drain that runs down the middle of the Old Port Road plantation and, in turn, into the West Lakes waterway.

Let me emphasise to the House that, as far as my constituents and I are concerned, the West Lakes waterway will not be the repository of waste material. For too long, as you would be well aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, problems have arisen in the West Lakes waterway development, which is held up as the best in the world after the recent awards in France and which will not be the repository of waste from many other parts of metropolitan Adelaide. That site and that proposal are badly thought through, not taking into account the millions of dollars that have been spent by my constituents in upgrading the suburbs in that area.

When people in the West Lakes area were apprised of the fact that their waterway might be polluted, there was a considerable amount of correspondence and, indeed, telephone calls directed to my office. I can give an assurance to my constituents that I will do everything possible legally to ensure that this plant does not go ahead.

That is the reason why I have asked more than 10 questions in this House; I have raised this matter time and again in the grievance debate since it was brought to my attention; and I have put out something like 6 000 newsletters on this matter—and more will go out after the response I received from the Minister today and my grievance debate contribution. This proposal is badly thought through; there is nothing to extract the toxic soluble waste from the material that could flow into the Port River drain. Again, I emphasise that the West Lakes waterway will not be the repository of toxic wastes from that site.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I wish to draw the attention of the House to the atrocious situation at West Beach where Barcoo Road is unmade. It services the Holdfast Bay Yacht Club and the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron headquarters. Barcoo Road was established about 30 years ago, at the same time as the Sea Rescue Squadron was established at that location. However, try as we may, it is extremely difficult to get any funding from the Government to seal this road. I received a letter dated 2 August from the Secretary of the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron, Ross Williams, who stated:

Once again I write to you behalf of the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron in relation to the construction and sealing of the infamous Barcoo Road. It is now 30 years or more since this track was put through and for 30 years nothing has been done.

The West Beach Trust was never able to find the money, but if the money spent in continuous grading over the years had been spent on forming and sealing it in the first place, then I would hasten to suggest that cost-wise we may even have been in front by now. So much for the past.

The road has now been designated a public road and has been taken over by the West Torrens council. It can only be described as an utter disgrace, and if it were controlled by private enterprise the council would undoubtedly order it to be upgraded.

The site is now no more than a pot-holed track alongside of which is a general rubbish dump, used by one and all, and is a favourite sport for the hoons who gather there to do their wheelies on and undo any grading which may have been carried out within 48 hours. It is also a regular dumping place for stolen vehicles to be stripped and sometimes burnt.

It is the only access to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron, a prime resource of the South Australian Police Department, and the Holdfast Bay Yacht Club, the oldest in the State. It also borders on one of Adelaide's leading caravan parks at West Beach. What a great impression it must make on our touring visitors.

With the \$11 million road grant given to the State this year, could you not once more apply to the State Government for funding for this project? The effect on the squadron fund raising of this dust and mud track and the expense of repairs to squadron and members' vehicles has been spelt out for years now. Surely it is time that we were heard.

Whilst drug users, alcoholics, single mums and no-hopers in general are pampered and allocated funds, those whose only wish is to serve their fellow man seem to continually get fobbed off. To my knowledge your council has never contributed one cent to the efforts of this organisation, even though it is within your council area. This organisation can lay claim to the saving of over 1 000 craft and some 3 000 people since its inception in 1960.

That letter, which puts it quite bluntly, was addressed to the City of West Torrens. The West Torrens council has replied to me following my representations over the years to try to get funding from the Local Roads Advisory Committee, Special Local Roads Program. The council states:

Council's submission for Barcoo Road was put in as part of the Western Adelaide Consultative Group comprising the Cities of West Torrens, Glenelg and Henley and Grange. Submissions made by this group did not receive funding from the Special Local Roads Program for 1992-93.

The Western Region of Councils, comprising the Cities of Port Adelaide and Woodville and the Towns of Thebarton and Hindmarsh did receive funding from the Special Local Roads Program 1992-93, for the upgrading of Valetta Road (Woodville Council) and Kapara Road (Port Adelaide Council).

With regard to submissions for funding from the Special Local Roads Program for this current year, that is 1993-94, the Secretary of the Local Roads Advisory Committee advised the Western Region of Councils that applications for funding would be received on a regional basis. An officer from the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville is handling the affairs of the Western Region of Councils and advice was given to the Local Roads Advisory Committee that individual councils would be making submissions for funding on their own.

The City of West Torrens was not notified that it should make a submission on its own with regard to the Special Local Roads Program for 1993-94. As a consequence and as coincidental as it may seem, Hawker Street and Valetta Road, both in the new amalgamated City of Hindmarsh and Woodville, did receive funding from the Special Local Roads Program for 1993-94.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I wish to raise a problem that one of my constituents faces, that is, the transport of his son to Urrbrae High School. My constituent has been tackling this problem for well over a year and finds it very difficult to find sufficient money or transport on a daily basis to get his son to school. My constituent lives some 7.4 kilometres from Two Wells and his son uses the Premier Roadlines bus to go to Adelaide and then from there he takes an STA bus through to Urrbrae.

The reason that my constituent's son wishes to go to Urrbrae is that he wants to train to be a veterinary surgeon. He is currently in year 9 and he commenced schooling at Urrbrae last year in year 8. Prior to that he had been going to the Mallala Primary School. He had the member for Light

take up his case last year. In fact, at that stage I was away briefly, so the member for Light took up the matter with the Minister.

In a letter to the Minister dated 4 May 1992, the member for Light detailed the various factors as they applied to my constituent in paying the weekly rate for his son's bus travel. At that stage the cost of the bus travel had gone from \$32 per month to \$51.80. In fact, my constituent indicates it now costs \$54 for 20 school days. Whilst Premier Roadlines say that that is a reduced cost and cannot be reduced any further, the reason why the fare was cheaper previously—namely, \$32—was that there had been a Government subsidy, which was removed.

My constituent was not content with the fact that the Minister replied on 26 June 1992 to say that there would not be any possibility of giving him additional reimbursement. He continued to pursue this matter and at the beginning of this year found that he was eligible for a travelling allowance. That is detailed under 'Distance criteria' in the schedule of travelling allowances, as follows:

A travelling allowance is payable to the parents, guardians and in some cases the student direct where the usual place of residence of the student is in South Australia and is five kilometres or more from the nearest Government school, or school bus service, provided by the Education Department.

My constituent therefore believes he fits into that position, as he is 7.4 kilometres away from the nearest bus. As a result of pointing that out to the appropriate authorities, my constituent now receives a quarterly reimbursement for travelling allowance but that has commenced only this year. He has come to me because he cannot understand why the Minister, in his answer to the member for Light last year, was not aware that my constituent would be eligible for that travelling allowance, and he has asked me to seek reimbursement for the travelling costs for 1992. I believe he has a very strong case to receive reimbursement because he sought to make application through members of Parliament last year. The matter was raised in correspondence to the Minister last May, and I am therefore asking the present Minister of Education to reconsider this matter and provide reimbursement for last year.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Members will recall that some two weeks ago in this place I raised the question of the Kesters Road/Main North Road intersection. I asked the Minister to give a report to the House on progress extending all along Main North Road, with that particular intersection being one of the most dangerous in my electorate. Indeed, a number of developments have taken place on Main North Road over the past two years. I understand that the Department of Road Transport is ultimately intent on providing a road with three lanes up and down from Pooraka through to Elizabeth and that considerable progress has been made on the northern end of Main North Road approaching Elizabeth.

The Kesters Road intersection at this stage has not been redeveloped and needs to be urgently looked at. There have been a number of accidents there, some of which have been very serious. Rarely a week goes by when an accident of one kind or another does not take place at that intersection. Unfortunately it has been the scene of much tragedy. My hope is that the Department of Road Transport, whilst continuing with the program of widening and making Main North Road the chief arterial road from the very northern end of the metropolitan area in Elizabeth through to the city

centre, will see the urgency of redeveloping the Main North Road and Kesters Road intersection without further delay.

There is no doubt that in that particular area the residents of Para Hills West, which is in my electorate, have a great deal of trouble safely accessing Main North Road—indeed, probably even less safely coming off the Main North Road when travelling from the city in a northerly direction and hoping to turn into Kesters Road to go home, to travel to some of the schools in that area or just to move around generally among shopping centres and for other purposes. At the moment the intersection has no safety barriers, unlike many of the other intersections in the area, and much of what I have had to say in this place over the past few years about the Warrendi Road/Main North Road intersection (which, indeed, was determined to be a black spot some three years ago and received black spot funding) now applies farther along at the Kesters Road/Main North Road intersection.

It is interesting to see that work on the Montague Road/Main North Road intersection is progressing very well: in fact, I understand it is now six months ahead of schedule. Bearing in mind the Commonwealth money that has been poured into the Montague Road extension which has, in fact, necessitated a new intersection at Pooraka for Montague Road/Main North Road, I hope that as soon as that work is complete funds can be found from either a Commonwealth or State source to rectify the problems involving the Kesters Road/Main North Road intersection. It is also my hope that, with the provision of three lanes north and south along the Main North Road, safe intersections will be provided at all of the points—Kesters, Maxwell, Research, Montague and Main North Roads—and that at those entrances traffic will be able to move on and off Main North Road much more safely than is currently possible. It is a very delicate issue for those constituents who come in to see me to tell me about the terrible accidents taking place there now. It is my hope that the Department of Road Transport will take these comments on board and provide a report urgently indicating that we will have action on the matter in the near future.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I wish to draw to the attention of the House a matter which arose during the course of comments being made on the 5AN Conlon show this morning. I refer to a debate, albeit in fairly short order without much opportunity to put a case and defend any remarks made by the other side, between the Hon. Diana Laidlaw and the Hon. Barbara Wiese, the Minister of Transport Development in another place. During the course of that exchange the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, quite properly, drew attention to the figures which are included in the budget papers that have just been published by the Government showing that patronage of State Transport Authority services fell by a further 3.7 million passenger journeys during the last financial year and that a further decline on that figure is predicted for this current financial year, 1993-94. We need to recognise that patronage is now at its lowest level since full bus and train services became available in this State over 60 years ago in the 1930s.

The other point that needs to be made is that gross receipts from fares are estimated to be about \$44.7 million, and that means that the South Australian taxpayer will subsidise to a record level—a whopping \$176.4 million—the operations of the STA. That is nearly half a million dollars a day or, according to my arithmetic, about \$20 000 an hour. It is incredible that a State Government can continue to do that. The argument offered in answer to this by the Hon. Barbara Wiese was, 'Oh, that's all right, so what? Last year there

were 3.7 million fewer STA passenger journeys, and this year we have some improvement: there is going to be only a further 800 000 fewer journeys.'

The only conclusion one can draw from that is that she does not understand that what she is talking about is a further reduction on a record low. She must think that there is some virtue in going backwards more slowly. That is what she tried to sell to the people of South Australia. I think it is about time Government Ministers realised that they are not part of the solution but part of the problem. They need to stand aside and allow the people of South Australia to say who will become the Government in this State for the next four years. An election is due—in fact, it is high time.

Unfortunately for the Minister, this morning she made the same 'Freudian slip' as the Minister in this place during the course of a reply in Question Time today. I refer to the Minister's calling on the Hon. Diana Laidlaw to say what she, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, will do when she becomes Minister. The Freudian slip is that the Hon. Barbara Wiese, as Minister of Transport Development, does not expect to be a Minister for much longer. She knows on her own assessment, and by her own admission in that inquiry, that the Labor Government will not be re-elected whenever the election is held. That is a fair assessment on her part of her prospects and that of her Party, and more the reason why they should stand aside. The Premier should advise the Governor forthwith. With the botch that the Premier has made of the budget, along with the incompetent assistance he has had from the Treasurer, it is time they stood aside and allowed someone to bring in a budget that will do something for this State.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In the few minutes I have available to me I would like to speak on a very important subject which impacts on our everyday life and on everything we do. I refer, of course, to literacy. I have a definition of 'literacy', as follows:

Literacy is the ability to read and use written information and to write appropriately in a range of contexts. (It also involves the integration of listening, speaking, and critical thinking with reading and writing and includes the cultural knowledge which enables a speaker, writer or reader to recognise and use language appropriate to different situations.)

As everybody would realise, we have a multicultural society. In saying that I also include our indigenous people, the Aborigines.

There is a difference between literacy generally and the special needs of people from non-English speaking backgrounds, because English is their second language. Whilst they may be entirely literate in their first language, they need special help to become literate in English. It is a very complex subject. I know that my colleague, the member for Henley Beach, has a keen interest in this area. He was very interested in this area as a member of the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice because of the relationship between young offenders and the fact that they were not learning at school.

There has been a lot of talk about literacy standards declining, but my information is that there is no evidence to support that. However, having said that, the greatest number of students at risk of developing such problems are in the low socioeconomic areas. In reality, that gap has widened between those at risk and those who are successful. I say categorically that nowhere is that more obvious than in the young Aborigines of Australia. The gap in literacy standards between young Aboriginal students and their white counterparts is something like five years. I know that a number of

national studies have had similar results, indicating that literacy standards are not falling but that in the lower socioeconomic groups they are certainly increasing.

I was very pleased to hear, in answer to a question asked of the Minister recently, that the Government has many programs which identify those at risk. Those programs address the different needs of a range of people, from children in kindergartens to mature age factory workers. In fact, that is where we have to work, because whilst the children are learning at school they do need that help in the home situation which very often they do not receive because of the lack of literacy in the parents of some of those children, particularly those at the lower end of the scale.

Students at risk can include those who move from school to school (and here again we will find that a lot of those will be Aboriginal students); students who are frequently absent from school (and the reason they are absent, by and large, is that they do not feel that they are able to learn because they need some special assistance); students whose home literacy is different from their school literacy (and I have just spoken briefly about those children); students with behavioural problems; and students with intellectual or physical disabilities.

I know that a key plank of the national curriculum profiles in English was to set national literacy standards and therefore facilitate national collection of data on standards. We really do need to set those national standards. South Australia has actually been very good in that regard and is leading the way by having attainment levels in literacy in primary schools, and the Minister has assured me that she will be pushing for those attainment levels at the national level. The Federal and State Governments have dozens of different programs in literacy and language areas, starting at early childhood and going right through to retraining programs for mature age students.

But we really need to be targeting students at the local levels and finding out what the particular problem areas are. For example, in my own area we need a lot more programs targeted at young Aboriginal students and their parents so that we can overcome many of the difficulties currently facing them, because if we do not have a good building plank with good literacy and numeracy skills the chances of being able to get out of that low socio-economic background are very limited indeed. So, it is a vital part of any decisions that we make in this Parliament and in the national Parliament.

COMMUNITY WELFARE (CHILDREN) AMENDMENT BILL 1993

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Community Welfare Act 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: 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.

This Bill amends the Community Welfare Act 1972.

The necessity for this Bill arises from the passing of the Young Offenders Act 1993 and the Youth Court Act 1993 earlier this year, and the Children's Protection Bill which was recently introduced.

The main purpose of the Bill is to delete the administrative provisions in the Community Welfare Act for children to be placed under the guardianship of the Minister, the provisions which set out the Minister's responsibilities in regard to the interstate transfer of children under guardianship, and the powers of the Director-General for the care and protection of children under the guardianship of the Minister. These provisions are no longer required. All such provisions relating to the care and protection of children are dealt with under the Children's Protection Bill 1993.

The provisions for the establishment of regional and local child protection panels are also repealed. These panels were established in 1972 at a time when there were few notifications of child abuse and limited community and agency awareness and cooperation in dealing with child protection matters. The system contemplated by the Children's Protection Bill provides alternative mechanisms for accountability and interagency response to the problem of child abuse.

Notification of suspected child abuse, offences against children, medical examination and treatment of children and the temporary care of children in hospital are also provisions to be repealed and dealt with under the Children's Protection Bill.

Community Welfare forums are abolished. A Division has been inserted to ensure that the Minister and the Department consult with relevant organisations in providing services to the community. Members of the public and organisations will be encouraged to make comments and recommendations to the Department about services. The Minister will ensure that procedures are in place for the Department to deal with client complaints.

Principles for dealing with children, to ensure that all action is taken in the best interests of the child, are provided in the Children's Protection Bill 1993. Consequently, the principles for dealing with children under the Community Welfare Act are no longer required and are proposed for repeal.

The provisions relating to the establishment of facilities for children and for foster care have been recast to bring them into line with current language, programs, procedures and practice. The inclusion of two new sections ensures that a licensed foster care agency undertakes regular assessment of foster parents and has authority to assess a foster parent for financial or other assistance. The Chief Executive Officer may delegate powers to a licensed foster care agency.

Opportunity has been taken to delete, insert and amend clauses in the Community Welfare Act 1972 to bring it into line with the objects, definitions, provisions and terminology of the legislation recently passed and the Children's Protection Bill. The Bill also brings the Act into modern drafting language. These changes will ensure that legislation is consistent and complementary when the Acts are brought into force.

References to the Department for Community Welfare have been replaced with Department for Family and Community Services, the Director General replaced with Chief Executive Officer, 'shall' a word not used in modern drafting has been replaced by 'must', 'will' or 'should'. Language has also been amended to make it non-gender specific.

Transitional provisions are dealt with in Schedule 1. Guardianship orders made under the Community Welfare Act will run their term but there is provision to cancel an order or appeal against a refusal to cancel. The same powers and duties apply to the Minister and the Chief Executive Officer in respect to children subject to guardianship orders as apply under the Children's Protection Bill.

Schedule 2 revises penalties under the Act.

In summary the Community Welfare (Children) Amendment Bill does not make substantive change to the Community Welfare Act 1972 but brings it up to date with legislative reform relating to children, families and community services.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for the Act to come into force by proclamation.

Clause 3: Substitution of s. 1

This clause substitutes the short title of the Act.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 6—Interpretation

This clause deletes and inserts various definitions. It should be noted that Schedule 3 of the Bill also includes various amendments (of a statute revision nature) to the definitions.

Clause 5: Further amendment of s. 6—Interpretation

This clause adds a 'catch all' provision that picks up references to the old Director-General terminology in other Acts and statutory instruments.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 8—Delegation
This clause substitutes references to the 'Deputy Director-General' with references to the 'Executive Director, Operations'.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 10—Objectives of the Minister and the Department

This clause brings the objectives of the Minister and the department with regard to ethnic and racial groups into line with the terminology of the Children's Protection Bill.

Clause 8: Substitution of Division V of Part II

This clause revises the provision of the Act relating to consultation by the Minister. It is intended to abolish community welfare consumer forums under the Act and instead to require generally that the Minister and the department consult with relevant organisations. Furthermore, members of the public will be encouraged to make comments and recommendations to the department. The Minister will also be required to ensure that appropriate procedures are in place to allow complaints against the department to be considered and, if appropriate, acted upon.

Clause 9: Substitution of Division II of Part III

This clause recasts section 23 of the principal Act so that the 'Community Welfare Grants Fund' will become the fund for the Family and Community Development Program and the 'Community Welfare Residential Care and Supports Grants Fund' will become the fund for the Early Intervention and Substitute Care Program.

Clause 10: Amendment of heading

This clause is a consequential amendment.

Clause 11: Repeal of s. 25—Persons dealing with children must observe certain principles

This clause repeals the section that sets out certain principles for dealing with children under Part IV. This is no longer necessary as Part IV is now only comprised of administrative provisions.

Clause 12: Repeal of Subdivision 1 of Division II of Part IV

This clause repeals those provisions providing for placing children under the Minister's guardianship by executive decision. This will no longer be allowed.

Clause 13: Substitution of Subdivision

This clause revises subdivision 2 of division II of Part IV of the principal Act. This subdivision relates to the establishment of facilities for children, including homes for the care of children. It is proposed to recast the provision so that the Minister will establish facilities and programs for the care of children.

Clause 14: Substitution of s. 40

This clause re-states the purposes of foster care, emphasising that foster care is only for where a child cannot remain within the child's own family.

Clause 15: Substitution of s. 41

This clause re-enacts section 41 in up-to-date language and provides a Division 6 fine for a person who acts as a foster parent without first being approved as a foster parent by the department.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 42—Application for approval as foster parents

This clause relates to the assessment of the suitability of persons to be foster parents under section 42 of the principal Act. It is proposed to refer specifically to the need for the Chief Executive Officer to be satisfied that a proposed foster parent is a fit and proper person to provide foster care.

Clause 17: Insertion of s. 43a

This clause inserts a new provision into the principal Act to require the Chief Executive Officer to undertake regular assessments of a person's role as a foster parent, and to provide on-going support and guidance to the foster parent.

Clause 18: Repeal of s. 44—Duty of Director-General in relation to foster children

This clause repeals section 44 which is now redundant in view of the review provisions under the Children's Protection Bill.

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 45—Powers of entry

This clause is consequential upon clause 32 of the Bill, which inserts a general offence of hindering departmental employees.

Clause 20: Amendment of s. 46—Cancellation of approval

This clause relates to the ability of the Chief Executive Officer to cancel the approval of a person as a foster parent under section 46. The grounds upon which the Chief Executive Officer may act will be expanded to include that the person would no longer qualify for approval as a foster parent, or that other proper cause exists for the cancellation of approval.

Clause 21: Substitution of s. 47

This clause revises section 47 of the principal Act. This provision relates to the information that a foster parent must furnish to the Chief Executive Officer. The provision will require a foster parent

to advise the Chief Executive Officer if the foster parent changes address, if another person comes to reside with the foster parent, or if a person residing with the foster parent is charged with an offence (other than a trifling offence).

Clause 22: Insertion of ss. 50a and 50b

This clause inserts two new sections. New section 50a will require a licensed foster care agency to undertake regular assessments of a foster parent's role as a foster parent and to assess any requirement of a foster parent for financial or other assistance. New section 50b empowers the Chief Executive Officer to delegate his or her powers relating to foster parents to a licensed foster care agency.

Clause 23: Amendment of s. 51—Children's residential facilities

This clause re-enacts a part of section 51 in up-to-date language and provides a Division 6 fine for a person who maintains a children's residential facility without a licence. More emphasis is placed on the question of the suitability of a person to run such a facility.

Clause 24: Substitution of ss. 54 and 55

This clause recasts section 54 of the principal Act using modern terminology, but makes no substantive changes to the section other than the insertion of a division 7 fine for breach of the section.

Section 55 of the principal Act is re-enacted in revised form. This section requires that a person who has a licence to conduct a children's residential facilities must enter into a written agreement with a guardian of the child before a child under the age of 15 years takes up residence in the facility. Where a child is of or above the age of 15 years, the licensee must, where practicable, consult with the guardians of the child and be satisfied that the child has consented to be cared for in the facility. However, these requirements will not apply in relation to a child under the guardianship of the Minister or the Chief Executive Officer, or of whom the Minister has custody.

Clause 25: Repeal of s. 73—Interpretation

This clause repeals section 73 which will no longer be required in view of the proposed amendments to or repeal of the various sections comprised in this Division.

Clause 26: Substitution of ss. 74 and 75

This clause re-casts section 74 in up-to-date language. It provides for granting financial assistance to persons providing 'substitute' care for a child. Section 75 is repealed as the question of unlawful absence from training centres is now covered by the Young Offenders Act, and the powers under this section relating to children in care are now in the Children's Protection Bill.

Clause 27: Amendment of s. 76—Unlawful taking of child

This clause makes amendments consequential upon the repeal of section 73.

Clause 28: Substitution of s. 77 and 78

This clause re-casts section 77 and makes it clear that an authorised officer from the department can request a person to leave the grounds premises of a training centre or other facility where a child is being detained (pursuant to the Young Offenders Act) or a children's residential facility established by the Minister. The Chief Executive Officer may also forbid communication between a particular person and a child detained or residing in any such premises. Section 78 is repealed as it is now redundant.

Clause 29: Substitution of s. 80

Section 80 is re-cast in simpler terms and in up-to-date language.

Clause 30: Repeal of ss. 81 to 83

This clause repeals sections 81 to 83. Sections 81 and 82 are now covered by the Children's Protection Bill. Section 83, which forbids selling prescribed substances or articles to children under 16, is now redundant in view of the Tobacco Products Control Act and the Controlled Substances Act.

Clause 31 Repeal of s. 85—Director-General may in certain circumstances consent to medical or dental treatment of child in detention or placed under his control by order of the Children's Court
This clause repeals section 85 which deals with consent to medical treatment of certain children. This matter is covered by the Children's Protection Bill and, as far as children in detention are concerned, the ordinary laws as to consent will apply.

Clause 32: Repeal of Division III of Part IV

This clause repeals the provisions that provide for the establishment of regional and local child protection panels, the notification of suspected cases of child abuse, offences of maltreating children and the medical examination and temporary custody of abused children. All these matters are now dealt with in the Children's Protection Bill, with the exception of child protection panels—this system is brought to an end.

Clause 33: Insertion of new ss. 236a and 236b

This clause inserts two new sections in the Act. One deals with the offence of hindering persons exercising powers under the Act. The

other creates an offence of impersonating a departmental employee with statutory powers.

Clause 34: Amendment of s. 251—Regulations

This clause tidies up the regulation-making power. Heads of power are deleted either because they are now redundant or because the matters they refer to are handled administratively.

Clause 35: Repeal of s. 252—Offences

This clause repeals section 252, which was a general offence provision. All offences under the Act will now have penalties appearing at the foot of the relevant sections, and all offences are summary offences by virtue of their penalty levels.

Clause 36: Revision of penalties and statute revision amendments

This clause refers to the revision of penalties that is to be found in Schedule 2, and to the miscellaneous statute revision amendments in Schedule 3.

Schedule 1: Transitional Provisions

This schedule deals with several necessary transitional matters. Clause 2 keeps guardianship orders that were made by the Minister under the repealed provisions alive. These orders will be permitted to run their term. Clause 3 preserves the right to apply for cancellation of guardianship orders and rights of appeal against a refusal to cancel. Clause 4 requires the Minister to continue to review such orders annually. Clause 5 makes it clear that the Minister and the Chief Executive Officer have, in respect of children subject to such guardianship orders, the same powers and duties as they have in relationship to children put under the Minister's guardianship pursuant to the Children's Protection Bill. Clause 6 allows the 96 hour detention of a child in hospital to run its course where the detention commenced prior to this Act coming into operation.

Schedule 2 revises the penalties under the Act, converting them to divisional penalties and, where appropriate, increasing the levels to levels more in line with current penalties.

Schedule 3 makes the usual non-substantive statute revision amendments, e.g., converting the Act to gender-neutral language.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES REPEAL AND AMENDMENT (CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS) BILL

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make certain repeals and amendments relating to restructuring of the juvenile justice and children's protection systems in this State; to enact transitional provisions; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: 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.

This Bill amends various Acts affected by the enactment of the Young Offenders Act, 1993, the Youth Court Act, 1993 and the passage of the Children's Protection Bill, 1993. It contains provisions to ensure that matters will not be disrupted by the repeal of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979 and the enactment of the new legislation.

The new Young Offenders Act, 1993 does not, as did the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979, spell out young offenders' rights to bail, nor are the Youth Court's sentencing powers fully spelt out. The provisions of the Bail Act, 1985 and the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act, 1988 now apply to young offenders. In the case of the Bail Act a minor amendment is needed to ensure that the new Youth Court is a bail authority.

More far reaching amendments are needed to modify some provisions of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act. For example some references to imprisonment need to be amended to read as references to detention, references to bonds need to be read as references to an order under section 26 of the Young Offenders Act, 1993, references to probation need to be read as references to the youth against whom the order is made. The Act also needs to be amended to take cognisance of the fact that orders to which it refers will now also be made by the Youth Court and that it is the Chief Executive Officer

of the Department of Family and Community Services who has responsibility in relation to young offenders and not the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Correctional Services. Warrants of commitment will not be issued by the Youth Court and the concepts of community service under the Young Offenders Act differ somewhat from that under the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act. These differences are also catered for in the amendments.

The Bill also contains the transitional provisions necessitated by the repeal of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act and the creation of the new Youth Court and a totally new regime for dealing with young offenders and children in need of protection.

The regime adopted in the transitional provisions is to allow all proceedings for offences to be started or continued under the new regime, even though the alleged offence was committed before the new legislation came into operation. It may be, for example, that a young offender has an appearance before an Aid Panel outstanding at the time the new legislation comes into operation and this will need to be dealt with.

The amendments recognise that a young offender may be subject to more severe penalties under the new legislation so it is provided that, where the offence was committed before the new legislation comes into operation, a young offender cannot be subject to a more severe penalty than he or she could have received under the old legislation.

Because the enforcement of bonds of the Children's Court differs from that under the new legislation their enforcement is to continue in accordance with the old legislation. This is to ensure that young offenders already in the system are not disadvantaged by being subject to the new regime. Equally with other orders of the Children's Court. The release of young offenders in detention, for example, will continue to be governed by the old legislation.

Provision is made to allow matters that are part heard at the time of the commencement of the new legislation to continue to be heard even though the judicial officer is not a member of the new court.

Provision is also made with respect to the continuance of part heard in need of care proceedings.

PART 1 PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title
Clause 2: Commencement
Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause includes definitions aimed at simplifying the expression of the transitional provisions.

PART 2 REPEAL OF CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT 1979

Clause 4: Repeal of Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979

PART 3 AMENDMENT OF BAIL ACT 1985

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 13—Procedure on arrest
The amendments require a youth who is arrested and refused police bail to be brought before the Youth Court rather than a justice as is the case with an adult.

PART 4 AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT 1988

Clause 6: Interpretation of Part
This is a machinery provision for references to the principal Act in this Part.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation
The definition of 'court' is amended so that the Act applies to the Youth Court.

The definition of 'appropriate officer' is amended so that it includes the Registrar of the Youth Court.
Definitions of 'youth' and 'Youth Court' are added.

Clause 8: Substitution of s. 21
Section 21 provides that the provisions relating to sentences of indeterminate duration do not apply to a child unless the child is sentenced as an adult. The terminology used in the section is updated to comply with that used in the Young Offenders Act 1993.

Clause 9: Substitution of heading to Part V

Clause 10: Insertion of s. 44A—Application of Part to youths
Part V relating to bonds is modified so that it applies to orders made against youths under section 26 of the Young Offenders Act 1993. This gives the Youth Court power to suspend a sentence of detention or to discharge without sentencing on condition that the youth enters into an undertaking. It imposes a limit of 3 years on the term of an undertaking. It enables the Court to require a youth to pay a sum of

money in the event of breach of an undertaking and to require that obligation to be guaranteed. It also provides for variation or discharge of an undertaking.

Clause 11: Insertion of s. 59AA—Application of Division to youths

This clause modifies the provisions relating to enforcement of bonds for the purposes of their application to an order under section 26 of the Young Offenders Act 1993 requiring a youth to enter an undertaking. The terminology used in relation to adults is modified to make it applicable to youths.

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 61—Imprisonment or detention in default of payment

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 61a—Driver's licence disqualification for default

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 67—Application to work off pecuniary sums by community service

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 69—Amount in default is reduced by imprisonment or detention served

These amendments modify the provisions relating to enforcement of pecuniary sums for the purposes of their application to an order for payment of a pecuniary sum made against a youth. The provisions in the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act are subject to sections 23(5) and (6) of the Young Offenders Act. The terminology used in relation to adults is modified to make it applicable to youths. The Youth Court is given power to make an order for detention of a youth for non-payment of a fine equivalent to a warrant of commitment against an adult. A youth is given the opportunity to apply to work off a fine by community service under the Young Offenders Act similarly to that given to an adult.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 71—Community service orders may be enforced by imprisonment or detention

This amendment modifies the provision relating to enforcement of community service orders for the purposes of its application to an order for community service made against a youth. The terminology used in relation to adults is modified to make it applicable to youths. The Youth Court is given power to make an order for detention of a youth for breach of an order equivalent to a warrant of commitment against an adult.

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 71a—Other non-pecuniary orders may be enforced by imprisonment or detention

This amendment modifies the provision relating to enforcement of an order that requires a person to do something other than community service or payment of a pecuniary sum for the purposes of its application to such an order made against a youth. The terminology used in relation to adults is modified to make it applicable to youths. The Youth Court is given power to make an order for detention of a youth for breach of an order equivalent to a warrant of commitment against an adult.

PART 5

TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

Clause 18: Transitional provisions—Youth Court
The non-judicial staff of the Children's Court are transferred to the Youth Court.

Clause 19: Transitional provisions—proceedings for offences
Proceedings for an offence in the Children's Court may be continued in the Youth Court but the penalty that may be imposed must be no more severe than could properly have been imposed by the Children's Court. The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act will continue to apply to orders and bonds in force under that Act on the commencement of the new scheme.

Clause 20: Transitional provisions—in need of care proceedings
A family care meeting need not be held prior to taking proceedings under the new Children's Protection Act if a conference was held under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act within the last month. The Children's Court, in completing part-heard 'in need of care' proceedings, must make only those orders that the Youth Court is empowered to make under the Children's Protection Act. Orders made under Part III remain in force and may be varied or revoked by the Youth Court. A care and control (residential) order will be taken to be an order granting custody of the child to the Minister. A child being held in temporary custody under section 19 of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act may continue to be so held in accordance with that section (i.e. until the next working day).

Clause 21: Interpretation of Acts and instruments
References to the Children's Court are to be interpreted as references to the Youth Court. References to an officer of the Children's Court are to be interpreted as references to the corresponding officer of the Youth Court.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION (MEDICARE PRINCIPLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to enshrine the Medicare Principles and Commitments in State legislation. Honourable members will recall that the Premier and the Prime Minister signed South Australia's new Medicare Agreement in February of this year, guaranteeing funding to South Australia's public hospitals for the next five years.

The Commonwealth Medicare Agreements Act 1992 and the individual Medicare Agreements require States to adopt the Medicare Principles and Commitments by enacting legislation complementary to the Commonwealth Act by 1 January 1994, or to have made reasonable efforts to do so. The Government is pleased to respond with the introduction of this Bill.

Hospital Medicare is based on three fundamental principles—

Principle 1: Choice of services—eligible persons must be given the choice to receive public hospital services free of charge as public patients.

Principle 2: Universality of services—access to public hospital services is to be on the basis of clinical need.

Principle 3: Equity in service provision—to the maximum practicable extent, a State will ensure the provision of public hospital services equitably to all eligible persons, regardless of their geographical location.

The Bill incorporates these principles as guidelines which must govern the provision of public hospital services by the State and the South Australian Health Commission as an instrumentality of the State. It is acknowledged that, while the principles focus on the provision of public hospital services to eligible persons, they operate in an environment where eligible people have the right to choose private health care, in public and private hospitals, supported by private health insurance.

Both levels of Government have an interest and a duty to maintain public hospital services and to ensure that public patients get the most comprehensive and fairest health service possible. An essential element is the provision of information to public patients. This is reflected in Commitment One, which requires the joint Commonwealth and State development of a Public Patients' Hospital Charter. Work is well advanced in developing such a Charter for South Australia, which will spell out the hospital services a public patient can reasonably expect to receive. A discussion paper on a complaints body will be released shortly.

Commitment Two encompasses efficiency, effectiveness and quality in public hospital service delivery. It includes a commitment to quality improvement, outcome measurement, management efficiency and effort to integrate the delivery of hospital and other community services. These are already priority areas in South Australia. The recently released booking list policy, which will lead to long-term and widespread reform of the management of public hospital booking lists and better services for patients; the management reviews of some of the major public hospitals and the resultant efficiencies which are being identified, are examples of initiatives which will ensure that South Australia continues to provide its patients with some of the best health services in the country.

South Australia stands to gain up to \$22 million under the Medicare Agreement, depending on population growth and the level of public patient activity. The 1993-94 Budget contains tangible evidence of the benefits already beginning to flow to South Australia as a result of the signing of the Agreement.

Medicare has become an integral component of public policy in Australia. Since its introduction in February 1984, Medicare has been very successful in keeping expenditure on health at a level that Australians can afford without compromising the fundamental

principles which underpin it. Medicare is one of the most affordable and fairest health systems in the world.

This legislation articulates the concepts of choice, equity and access. It demonstrates that both levels of Government are committed to excellence in health care.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Insertion of section 4

Clause 2 inserts section 4 into the Act. It provides that the State and the Commission (as an instrumentality of the State) must, in carrying out their duties under this Act, do so in accordance with the following principles:

- Eligible persons must be given the choice to receive public hospital services free of charge as public patients.
- Access to public hospital services is to be on the basis of clinical need.
- To the maximum practicable extent, a State will ensure the provision of public hospital services equitably to all eligible persons, regardless of their geographical location.

It also provides that the State and the Commission (as an instrumentality of the State) must give effect to the following commitments:

- The Commonwealth and a State must make available information on the public hospital services eligible persons can expect to receive as public patients.
- The Commonwealth and the States are committed to making improvements in the efficiency, effectiveness and the quality of hospital service delivery.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS (ARRANGEMENTS WITH COMMONWEALTH) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the balance of 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 1 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 Publications Act, 1974 has been amended to empower the Chief Censor to classify videos and publications on behalf of South Australia and to collect fees in respect of that service.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 3: Insertion of s. 10A—Arrangements with Commonwealth with respect to classification

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

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 13—Classification of publications

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 14—Publications deemed to have been classified or to be unclassified in certain cases

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 15—Review

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 17—Notice

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 18—Offences

The current Act provides that if a publication is classified under a corresponding law it will be deemed to have been classified by the Board. The Bill removes this mechanism for automatic classification under a corresponding law and instead provides for classification by the Commonwealth pursuant to the above mentioned arrangement. The amendments in clauses 4 to 8 remove all references to corresponding laws, substitute references to the arrangement where appropriate and make other consequential alterations.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 22—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 Board.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.
(Continued from page 687.)

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

I wish to refer to some of the findings in the Auditor-General's Report, and I commence with the following statement:

Over 70 years the prudent financial management dissipated.

Those are the Auditor-General's words, which have a very chilly echo. They mirror Peter Duncan's assessment of *State of Denial*, where he said:

Our past achievements have been virtually wiped out in just one decade.

With the Auditor-General's Report, this Government can no longer deny the consequences of its failure. I continue to quote the Auditor-General's Report, as follows:

... a marked deterioration in this State's financial position; a severe financial handicap. The public sector is now subject to financial pressures that would not have otherwise occurred.

These are further sentiments expressed by the Auditor-General which will follow this Government to its political grave. They are Labor legacies which could and should have been avoided. If the former State Bank directors and senior executives are guilty of negligence, this Government is doubly guilty of neglecting the interests of all South Australians. The Auditor-General issues this challenge in his report:

The task ahead is to manage the consequences of having diverted a significant portion of the State's financial resources to the rescue of the State Bank rather than having those resources available for the further development of the State's economy.

It is clear that Labor is not up to meeting this challenge. Labor's inaction and incompetence have already created a major financial disaster, but the Government has learnt

nothing from it. Ministers have continued to sit on their hands doing nothing to ensure that further disasters are not just around the corner. It is clear from other financial failures identified in the Auditor-General's Report that under Labor we have another financial tidal wave waiting to engulf all of South Australia.

Labor has no remedy for the mess that it has created. It desperately clings to the hope that no more storms will erupt before that State election and that South Australians will not see the further clouds on the horizon following that tidal wave. The fact is that Labor has not put South Australia's financial house in order, as it claims to have done. We are not strong enough to absorb more financial pressures without the action that this Government continually ducks. The budget is built on quicksand with revenue that will not be available in future years.

It is now clear that the full cost of the State Bank disaster will exceed \$4 billion. By the end of this financial year, the full indemnity of \$3 150 million is likely to have been paid. During 1993-94 we will add a further \$210 million to the \$447 million interest already paid on those borrowings. The bill will total \$3 807 million by June next year. With further interest on the borrowings in future years, the financial bill will vastly exceed \$4 000 million, even without a fifth bail-out. It is clear that the Auditor-General does not share the Government's confidence on this score, because he has reported as follows:

As the assets under GAMD management are impaired and their improved performance or otherwise in many instances are influenced by prevailing economic and property market conditions, the long-term bottom line performance of GAMD cannot be predicted with certainty.

So much for the Treasurer's claim that he has no information to suggest that a further bail-out is possible. Even the valuations of the Government's own properties are still being marked down very significantly. If the Treasurer cared to read the Auditor-General's Report, he would find, for instance, that Government commercial properties managed by the Department of Housing and Construction were devalued by more than \$30 million last financial year.

The Auditor-General's Report puts a timely focus on the financial burdens now spread right across South Australia by this Government's financial incompetence. There are other financial time bombs ticking away slowly, such as rapidly escalating unfunded liabilities which now exceed \$5 000 million and the vulnerability of the budget to a rise in interest rates or a further lowering of this State's credit rating. This Government would prefer South Australians to ignore these issues. Just before an election, it does not want to be confronted with the full cost of its own failures. This financial year the budget provides \$684 million for further interest payments on borrowings incurred by this Government. This will bring interest payments on our State debt since 1989, paid from the budget, to a staggering \$2 920 million. Most of this interest is being paid on borrowings required to bail out the Government's mistakes, not to provide new services to South Australians.

The Auditor-General's Report points us in the direction of more victims of Labor's appalling legacies. We find from this report that the Housing Trust waiting list has risen yet again. It now exceeds 43 000, compared with 24 000 when this Government came to office in 1982. We also discover from this report that the trust has rental arrears of \$10.9 million, up \$2.5 million in just the past 12 months—further evidence of the financial pressures now on all South

Australians. In education, the report points to a further reduction in teacher numbers, which have now fallen by 310 since 1990. In our hospitals, the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth continue to shed staff, particularly nurses, while administrative costs rise, and admissions rise as well.

Increased public transport costs have forced thousands of commuters to find alternative means of transport, congesting our roads and making them less safe. Public transport patronage continues to plummet, as highlighted by the shadow Minister of Transport this morning on radio. All public servants remain under increasing pressure to do more but with less. As the Auditor-General observes in his report:

Since around the time it became apparent that the Government's guarantee would be invoked, senior public servants have been deflected from their principal duties of managing important Government activities in order to pursue a rescue and salvage operation related to the bank.

To address the budgetary problems caused by the disaster, the public sector is now subject to financial pressures that would not have otherwise occurred. It is little wonder that last year public servants lodged more than 600 workers compensation claims for stress. That shows the sort of pressure they are under, because it is double the number five years ago.

The Auditor-General has given advice on action required to ensure much greater financial accountability, so that a disaster like the State Bank can never happen again. He refers to the role of the Parliament and the capital advances made to the bank which allowed it to grow so rapidly and fail so spectacularly. He states:

Parliament was not called upon to advance money to the bank by way of a grant or loan.

This was a denial by the Government of an important provision in the State Bank Act which gave that role to the Parliament. The Auditor-General states:

The parliamentary appropriation processes do provide a potentially vigorous and searching environment for the assessment of such representation and/or proposals.

In other words, the Auditor-General is saying that this Parliament should have had a role in making loans or appropriations to the State Bank, but this Government denied that, even though the State Bank Act provides for it to occur. I have already committed the next Liberal Government to giving this Parliament a much more influential role in ensuring the finances of this State do not run off the rails. The Auditor-General also states:

Users of public sector financial information cannot be satisfied that they have available all relevant information in a transparent and understandable form.

He refers to his own experience of having to refer to a number of sources to gain an understanding of the whole of Government's financial activity and states:

It is of some concern. It is necessary to consider such an array of different information sources to understand the public sector financial position.

This fact alone suggests a need for improvement. This cannot be taken as anything but a serious indictment of this Government's failure to keep up with developments in the Government's financial reporting. Around Australia, South Australia is treated as a joke by the other States and Territories. It is becoming increasingly embarrassing to hear from time to time the complaints about how South Australia has dragged its feet in meeting nationally consistent criteria for financial reporting. Treasury officials in other States simply cannot understand why this Government has learnt so little from its own mistakes.

This Government has wasted the whole parliamentary term in improving financial reporting and accountability. The State Bank disaster was staring Labor in the face at the 1989 election. That tidal wave hit South Australia soon afterwards. The Auditor-General's Report makes it clear that this Government has done nothing to avoid a repeat of that disaster. After the State Bank disaster, it was reasonable to assume that one thing the Government would have done was to identify all other financial guarantees and ensure that they were fully protected. However, it even fails here, as we heard the Premier admit today during Question Time. The Auditor-General reveals that in 1991-92 Treasury was informed that an accurate and complete picture of the totality of the Government's guarantees was not available.

In his latest report, the Auditor-General was forced to reveal that this is still the case: he said, 'We still do not have a complete picture.' That was acknowledged today by the Premier who said that, after two years, even the Premier, the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, and the Auditor-General, despite repeated requests of the Ministers, cannot get a full and complete picture of guarantees given by this Government using the taxpayers' money.

Mr Becker: That is incompetent and a disgrace.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That is a disgrace. To think that even the Premier is so ineffectual in his own Party, amongst his own Ministers and around his own Cabinet table that he cannot get a complete picture of financial guarantees given by this Government. I have just been out on the steps of Parliament House and the news media cannot believe that after two years this Government cannot get its act in order, even after the State Bank disaster. I ask a question of the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services: Minister have you been able to answer the question about guarantees given in your area?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Holloway): Order! Interjections are out of order. I ask the Leader to address the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It appears that the Minister cannot answer.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is quite clear that this Minister and all the other Ministers cannot answer, because their own Premier this afternoon acknowledged that he has not been able to get the information that he has been seeking for more than two years about what guarantees have been supplied by the Government. The Auditor-General's Report goes on to say:

Further to guarantees provided by specific legislation, Ministers in certain circumstances, with the approval of Cabinet, have given guarantees. It is not currently clear that all guarantees of this type have been reported to Treasury for central recording.

As I said, that is a disgrace. These guarantees are given using taxpayers' money. As the taxpayers discovered to their great cost, when these guarantees are called upon, as in the case of the State Bank, this can cost them very dearly indeed. With the State Bank alone, those guarantees have cost more than \$3 000 million. Yet, here we have another mob of Ministers who are so negligent and so careless that they cannot tell the taxpayers how many financial guarantees have been given in their name. Such negligence by a company would land its directors and executives in deep trouble, and they would certainly get the sack, but this Government does not care what it does with the taxpayers' money.

The Auditor-General makes these points about guarantees in bold type in his report demonstrating the seriousness that he attaches to this matter. Such neglect of financial responsibility by this Government is a disgrace. It has become typical of the Labor Government over the past 11 years. Mr MacPherson and his predecessor, Mr Sheridan, as Auditors-General issued a number of warnings to this Government in their annual reports about the need to improve financial management and reporting. Usually, those warnings were ignored.

There have been references for years in successive reports by the Auditor-General to the need to establish accrual accounting. The development of an asset register by departments and agencies, a critical first step in this process, was delayed for more than three years despite those requests. The present Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, prior to his becoming a Minister, was an advocate of the need to establish a register. In fact, I recall the current Minister of Health, Family and Community Services (the member for Elizabeth) making the point prior to 1982 about the need for a register of Government assets across the whole of Government.

The Hon. M.J. Evans: I was not in Parliament.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I know. You made the statements outside Parliament. I recall this, because the Minister happened to work in the Public Buildings Department. He put forward a strong case to his Minister for the need for a register of assets. He had a very good Minister, too, because that Minister became the first Minister of Public Works to set out to establish a register of assets in South Australia. After 11 years of government, we find that this Labor Government has still failed to put that register together. It is unbelievable that this Government has been so negligent. Although the present Minister of Health, Family and Community Services has been sitting around that same Cabinet table enjoying the spoils for more than 12 months now-

The Hon. M.J. Evans: No, less than 12 months.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is about 12 months, plus or minus a day or two, but he has been sitting around the Cabinet table enjoying the spoils—the white car, the big salary and everything else—and still he has not been able to achieve, or to encourage the other Ministers to come up with, a register of assets to the disappointment and financial exposure of the South Australian taxpayers.

I return to the accrual accounting system. Full accrual accounting remains a long way off, because this Government has dithered and delayed the implementation of important recommendations of the Auditor-General. In his latest report, Mr MacPherson has made a number of important recommendations about public sector financial management, which a Liberal Government will take up as a matter of urgency. In particular, his latest report will be an important input to the Audit Commission which a Liberal Government will have established and up and running before Christmas this year, knowing that the election is due on 27 November. We fully accept his advice about public sector reform that 'proper management of the changes is critical to ensure achievement of the planned reforms and benefits and to demonstrate accountability'.

With the budget that is now before this Parliament, this Government has proved that it is incapable of this task. It sets targets then consistently fails to meet them. There are other illustrations in the report of the Auditor-General of the Government's financial failure to act on previous advice and

warnings. For example, in the area of workers compensation for public sector employees, claims for the last financial year totalled \$50 million. They have continued to escalate under this Government, increasing four-fold over the past 10 years: there has been a four-fold increase in workers compensation claims over a 10-year period under Labor. That is the sort of abuse and mismanagement that has been going on. It is obvious that this Government is imposing upon the private sector a standard of worker safety which it is not prepared to adopt for its own Government employees and for itself.

Despite repeated warnings in annual reports of the Auditor-General, this matter is still ignored in the latest figures. Illustrating his continuing concern, the Auditor-General has revealed that his office audited practices in the Health Commission. It is most appropriate that the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services is here to find out what the Auditor-General had to say about his area of Government.

The Hon. M.J. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, it is a disgrace. I would not have sat there as a Minister smiling if the Auditor-General came up with this finding on me. Let us find out what the Auditor-General had to say. He found:

A need for improvement in management information encompassing preparation of timely, relevant and accurate information, both financial and statistical.

Clearly, he is saying, Minister, that, first, you have been supplying the Auditor-General through your Health Commission—

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, the honourable member is referring to me as 'you' and not by the correct title.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I ask the Leader to address the Minister by his title. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I realise that the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services is very sensitive, because obviously he has been supplying false, incorrect, untimely or irrelevant information to the Auditor-General on both financial and statistical matters. That is clearly what the Auditor-General is accusing the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services and his Health Commission of, and it is about time the Minister stood up and recounted to the House exactly why he has done this. Why has he supplied incorrect and false information to the Auditor-General?

Another area of consistent concern to the Auditor-General is the introduction of Government computing systems. The evidence continues to be that millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money has been wasted. This latest report reveals that the Justice Information System has been completed at a cost of \$59 million. This represents a blow-out in the cost of \$19 million, in constant dollar terms, on that cost estimate originally put down in just 1989. It is a similar story in the courts with its new computer system, which has just been completed at a cost of \$22 million, even though the original estimate was \$14 million.

I turn to the great disaster just to our west, the ASER project. When the Government announced its commitment to this project in 1983, it said that its maximum financial obligation to the Convention Centre and car park would be \$1.25 million a year—\$1.25 million in the first year—and this could be expected to be significantly reduced from \$1.25 million in subsequent years. Allowing for inflation, this would have amounted to a total subsidy of about \$10 million over the past seven years. Instead, the total Government subsidy has been not \$10 million but rather \$35 million—350

per cent higher than that estimated by the Government and told to this House. There was a further escalation last financial year of more than \$900 000 in the total subsidy of \$7.57 million in just the one year. That is how disastrous this Labor Government is in its financial management.

A similar picture is beginning to emerge with the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. The operating loss in the first full financial year has been \$466 000, after the loss in the opening year, which was less than a full year, of \$201 000. The Minister of Tourism will equate these statements with the knocking of that project, as he always does any time anyone happens to criticise that Minister. He is the great fabricator, as we all know. He wants South Australians to live in a make-believe world where they can have such facilities as the Adelaide Convention Centre or the Adelaide Entertainment Centre without having to pay for them. Of course, it was that same Minister who stood in this House and, with the most colourful language, attacked the Liberal Party for ever criticising the State Bank of South Australia or Marcus Clark.

He was the great defender and, if ever there was a message to that Minister, the Minister of Business and Regional Development, it is the three royal commission reports and the two Auditor-General's reports. It highlights the extent to which that Minister is just a fake. He fabricates his stories and he is prepared to stand up in this House and say whatever comes into his head which he thinks is politically astute, regardless of whether it is true.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That's right; he never lets the truth get in the way of a great story, particularly a new story for him.

Mr Such: He is a great pretender.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He is a great fabricator and a great pretender. I stress that this Government, when it came to the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, again failed to consider the impact on the bottom line. It does not put into place the financial reporting and other accountability mechanisms necessary to prevent the waste of taxpayers' money. This abdication of responsibility by Labor is what is now costing South Australians so dearly. It is the very antithesis of the approach recommended by the Auditor-General in his report tabled yesterday. His report is a timely reminder that, unless South Australia moves quickly—much more quickly than this Government has ever done in initiating financial reforms—we will run into another major financial tidal wave. Only a Liberal Government can be trusted to take the action necessary to avert that further disaster and rebuild the finances of this State through honest, open and accountable Government—something that the Labor Party just does not understand.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I refer to two issues: the Government workers compensation fund and the accounting procedures as they relate to the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. When we look at the Auditor-General's Report in relation to workers compensation, in essence we read the same comments that were put before this House some four years ago. The Auditor-General at that time said that there was a need to have a look at the fraud potential within Government. According to this report, an audit indicated a need for the permanent appointment of a fraud prevention officer—some four years after the Auditor-General reported the necessity for such an appointment. That does not suggest in any way that there is any more significant fraud in the public sector than in the private sector, but what it does

suggest is that the Government has not bothered to take any notice of the Auditor-General's recommendation.

In the select committee of which I was a member, fraud in the workers compensation area in both public and private sectors was a major issue. I am staggered that, some 12 months after that report was been tabled in this House, we now find again that the Government is considering the appointment of a permanent fraud prevention officer. The Auditor-General's Report shows again, for the fourth year in a row, a worsening trend in the cost of workers compensation as it relates to the Government sector. The Auditor-General states:

The estimated liability of workers compensation claims as at 30 June 1993 was \$110 million compared to \$98 million at 30 June 1992.

That is an increase in the liability in 12 months of \$12 million. This Government in the private sector is demanding a fully funded scheme, yet in the public sector we are again accruing massive future liabilities with no cash, with no investment, to back it up. So again we have Governments putting off the evil day of reckoning; funds should be invested to cover these estimated liabilities.

The Auditor-General's Report indicates an increase in the payment of claims from \$46 million in 1992 to \$50 million in 1993. In essence, we have had a claims payment increase of \$13.5 million over the past three years—from \$36.5 million in 1989-90 to \$50 million in 1992, and a \$4 million increase between 1992 and 1993.

This trend of massive increase in claim payments in the Government sector was an issue brought before this House by the Auditor-General four years ago. Every single year since then there has been a continual increase but no attempt at all has been made to examine what is causing the problem.

One of the major areas investigated by the workers compensation select committee was the role of management advisers, particularly in the matter of stress claims. I recall that two doctors—one was Professor Doctor McFarlane, Professor of Psychiatry at the Adelaide University, and the other was in charge of mental health at the Health Commission, but I cannot remember his name—gave evidence to the select committee that the personnel management of stress claims was a major concern, along with the methods the Government was using to treat those claims. One of the doctors told that committee that he had advised the Government that it should be looking at better management schemes and that, if it did that, it would significantly reduce stress claims.

That brings us to page 159 of the Auditor-General's Report, which states that in the five years since 1989 the number of stress claims has increased by 50 per cent, from 404 in 1989 to 601 in 1993, and there was an increase in 1992-93 of some 60 claims. One would think that a Minister who got that advice—and the Minister of Labour got it as Chairman of the select committee—would go back to his department, and to the Government generally, and say, 'We need to take notice of what the doctors have told us in the select committee and implement management schemes that will reduce these stress claims.'

I point out an interesting omission this year: we no longer have the cost per claim mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report. I suspect that the \$18 000 cost per stress claim last year has been exceeded this year, otherwise it would be in here. It seems quite incredible that a most important issue—the actual cost of all the claims listed—has been omitted this year, and I suspect, as I have said, that there has been a massive increase in the cost of those claims. That is an issue

that we will take up in the Estimates Committees, and hopefully we will get an answer.

The Hon. M.J. Evans interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: There is no question of that at all. What I am suggesting is that the information from the Department of Labour, or in this instance from the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Fund, has not been as comprehensive as it has been in previous years. I think that is a pity, because those sorts of cost comparisons are very important.

It is interesting to note that the number of claims heralded by the Education Department is some three times more than the number involving its nearest rival. I recognise, of course, that there are significantly more employees in the Education Department, but there has been an increase of \$4 million in the amount paid out this year by the department. I suspect that there has been a significant increase in stress claims as well in that department.

Again, the Correctional Services Department rates second, the E&WS third and the Department of Road Transport fourth. It is interesting to note a \$1 million increase in claims in the road transport area, which is quite an amazing increase in the light of the information, covering the previous three years, set out in the Auditor-General's Report. The Government places tremendous emphasis on the need for control to be exercised in relation to compensation in the private sector, and I support that attitude, but it is real pity that it does not follow through with the same argument in relation to the public sector.

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

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I wish to use this opportunity to refer to some comments made by the member for Hayward during an earlier debate in this House. He referred to my action with the assistance of the Labor candidate for Mitchell, Mr Paul Acfield, in successfully intervening to have some classrooms remain at the Tonsley Park Primary School.

The member for Hayward made the allegation that, as a result of the successful intervention of myself and Mr Acfield in retaining the drop-in centre at Tonsley Park, another school missed out. The member for Hayward went on to say:

What the member for Mitchell may not know is that the school that missed out was Marion Primary School. . . He deprived the people in Marion Primary School of a relocatable classroom, which is badly needed. That school is overcrowded; it is filled to capacity; and those people are suffering serious educational disadvantages from overcrowding in their school, because there is a drop-in centre at Tonsley.

I remind the member for Hayward that I spoke on this matter in a grievance debate on 31 March (page 2767 of *Hansard*), and if he reads that debate he will know what it was all about. That was some six months ago and it seems that the honourable member has only just caught up with the issue.

The matter was raised because there were proposals to remove two separate transportable buildings from Tonsley Park Primary School. One building was a double unit and there was a single classroom nearby. The single classroom had been used as a Nunga room to improve the understanding of Aboriginal studies, as there is a considerable number of Aboriginal students attending that school. The other double building at the school was used for a parent drop-in centre, as acknowledged by the honourable member. However, it was also used as an art room and for other purposes at the school.

As a result of my intervention and that of Paul Acfield, the candidate for Mitchell, a compromise was reached whereby the double unit remained. I should point out that that particular building is some 30 years old and considerable structural modifications had been undertaken. Indeed, the wall between the classroom and the outer veranda was removed. Anyone who knows the old-style prefabricated buildings that exist in some of our schools would understand what that would involve. It would have presented some difficulties and, therefore, additional cost to remove that building because of those structural modifications. I pointed all that out at the time.

However, the important point I want to make is that, of course, before seeking the Minister's support to retain that classroom at Tonsley Park Primary School, I made inquiries as to why it was to be moved and where it was to be moved. Indeed, it was Marion Primary School where the classroom was to go. As a result of my representations to the Minister I am well aware that another classroom is to be moved to that school at the end of this term and will be available, I understand, for the fourth term this year. So, Marion Primary School will be receiving its much needed classroom.

I did indeed think through this matter very carefully, because the Tonsley Park Primary School is the closest school to the Marion Primary School. One of the reasons why parents at the Tonsley Park Primary School were so keen to retain this classroom was not only that of its benefits to the educational and social programs at that school but also its importance, so the parents believed, in maintaining the very existence of the school.

I pointed out in my speech earlier this year that the plans to remove the classrooms had fuelled rumours within the Mitchell Park area that the school was about to close. Of course, one of the reasons why those rumours had been circulating is that adjacent to the Tonsley Park Primary School is the site of the proposed Tonsley interchange. Because of some uncertainty about that particular project, a lot of rumours have been circulating in the area.

I believe that the removal of that classroom would have further removed confidence in the school and could very well have led to the closure of the school. What would have happened if that had occurred? Of course, the students would have to go to another school, and the nearest school is Marion Primary School, so it would have further exacerbated the overcrowding problem at that school. I did think through very carefully the action that I took and I believe that the outcome that will be in place within a few weeks at the end of this school term will be that Marion Primary School will get its much needed buildings, the Tonsley Primary School will retain its buildings, and that will further strengthen confidence in the school to ensure that it continues to be viable. I believe that is the best possible outcome for the residents in that area. They will retain both schools and have adequate space at them. So, I certainly make no apology for the action that I took in conjunction with the Labor candidate for Mitchell, Paul Acfield.

I think it is most important that the viability of the Tonsley Park School be maintained, and it was certainly necessary that the double classroom remain at that site. The member for Hayward went on to say how these schools were indeed not in the electorate that I will be representing after the next election, the electorate of Elder. It is true that Tonsley Park Primary School is to be in the new Mitchell electorate, not the Elder electorate, and indeed the Marion Primary School is there as well.

As long as I am a member in this place I will do my best to represent all electors, whether they be in the current electorate I represent or the future electorate. I believe that the actions I have taken are in the interests of the residents of the south-western suburbs, including those who live within my electorate. I make no apology whatsoever for the action I have taken, and I believe that when the facts are known the people of the south-western suburbs, whether they be in the future electorate of Elder or the future electorate of Mitchell, will support the action I have taken with the help of the candidate for Mitchell, Mr Paul Acfield.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I recently had the pleasure of seeing the film *Jurassic Park*, which is technically brilliant and as we know was created by Spielberg. It has a rating which suggests that parents should exercise some guidance before their children see it. As I said, it is technically brilliant but it is likely to frighten children, particularly young ones. The reason I mention it today is that I want to draw some parallels between the creatures in *Jurassic Park* and some of the creatures that constitute the Government of this State. There are some similarities and there are some differences.

In *Jurassic Park*, and this is one of the fundamental differences, we have extinct creatures coming back to life and what we have opposite in this Government is live creatures, live dinosaurs, who are about to become extinct. So, there is quite an opposite arrangement in terms of *Jurassic Park* and the creatures that constitute this Government.

There are many similarities in terms of those dinosaurs of *Jurassic Park* and the dinosaurs that constitute this Government. This Government has acted like dinosaurs tearing people to bits, that is, in terms of the economy. The way it has behaved is quite inappropriate. It is out of its depth and, like dinosaurs, out of its time and no longer relevant. In fact, yesterday watching some of the dinosaurs on the front bench, I thought they seemed to be particularly nervous and jumpy, and I hope that ready supplies of Valium and Serepax are on hand as they get twitchy closer to the big event. We saw, for example, and I want to come back to this in a minute, Arnosaurus throw his books on the desk; an example of pressure. We saw another dinosaur, Lenesauros, talk very fast for a long time, and then we saw Rannosauros in frenetic activity complete the unusual behaviour by that trio. We have also had a new breed of dinosaur, the budget, which I will call Tackysaurus. It appears to be harmless, but in fact is very much a flesh eater, as are the other dinosaurs on the front bench. We can expect more unusual behaviour from them as we get closer to the time when they go through their four year ritual of display and nervousness.

One of the differences with *Jurassic Park* and the dinosaurs that we have here in Government is that in *Jurassic Park* the dinosaurs broke out to devour the people, but in South Australia the people want to get in to devour the dinosaurs that sit on the front bench, so we have the complete opposite. There are many similarities and I have indicated some earlier. Let us have a further look at some of the dinosaurs that constitute the Government. I would like to highlight three of them in particular.

The first is Arnosaurus. This particular dinosaur is able to change appearance by altering hair styles and profile. He consumes dollars at an alarming rate; is very fond of deficits and wild promises; and is one dinosaur that you should approach with great care particularly in the lead up to the courting ritual which is due any time now at the end of the four year period. Arnosaurus is prone to chest thumping and

other strange activities, as we saw yesterday, and has been known to engage in carnivorous activity. For example, he devoured Bannosaurus some time earlier. Unfortunately for him, Bannosaurus is now close to extinction because his special diet of greenbacks ran low during 1988-1991 AD. There are still some relics left of the time in which Bannosaurus roamed this State and there are relics in King William Street; some tall buildings and other remains and relics. But Bannosaurus has now become very unpopular and we are not likely to see much more of him as he heads for extinction.

Now we come to Lenosaurus. This is a very colourful bird-like creature: she is hyperactive, an incessant chatterer and has been known to talk other dinosaurs to death. That is a very powerful weapon, since Lenosaurus is incredibly territorial and always has her eye on other's territory and especially territory held by Arnosaurus.

We come then to a very strange creature indeed that I mentioned earlier, Rannosaurus, who was displaced by the Kiwi bird and flew to *Terra Australis* to get away from that creature across the Tasman. Rannosaurus has a particular liking for petrol, benzene and ethanol. It seems to give Rannosaurus somewhat of a turn on and he is very prone to events involving motor cars and the fumes that are generated by them. He likes to display himself and is often used by Arnosaurus to bait other creatures. So, it is one of his characteristics that he is able to be used by Arnosaurus to try to attack other creatures that are in any way close to their domain.

Rannosaurus fabricates very large nests all over the place. He is very territorial and he also has his eye on the territory currently under the control of Arnosaurus. There is quite a bit of potential for conflict between these dinosaurs, and I do not have time to go into all the characteristics and the characters who constitute this Government, but many of them are suffering from very serious diseases which are likely to end up with them becoming extinct.

Some of the diseases include high unemployment, engaging in the use of very complicated phrases like 'horizontal fiscal equalisation', and talking about social justice and other very strange terms which suggest that, because they have not been able to deliver, these dinosaurs are headed for extinction. *Jurassic Park* was a figment of the imagination, created by Steven Spielberg. Sadly, the dinosaurs that constitute this Government are a reality. Like *Jurassic Park*, it is not always as it may appear. At times these dinosaurs may appear to be harmless, but in reality they are very dangerous, as we have seen in terms of what they have done to the economy of this State. Not even Steven Spielberg would be capable of presenting these dinosaurs (Arnosaurus and his pack) in a favourable light. Accordingly, I have come to the conclusion that these dinosaurs, unlike the ones in *Jurassic Park*, are well and truly headed for extinction.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I would like to raise two matters, the first being the absolute confusion that now reigns regarding the administration of firearms laws in this State. Currently, people are not only confused but unable to comply with the new laws because of the lack of forms and the failure of the Government properly to consider the way in which it would administer them. I have been told that people who legally purchased firearms before the due date, 1 September 1993, have been unable to comply because there are not enough forms at some police stations. There is the grave likelihood

that the bi annual gun show will be cancelled because of this bureaucratic humbug and nonsense.

I would like to cite the response that the Legislative Review Committee had from the Minister, the Hon. Mr Mayes. I suggested that the committee write to the Minister requesting that he delay the implementation of these regulations until all the pitfalls had been removed and some commonsense applied. In his letter dated 25 August 1993, the Minister replied to the Chairman, as follows:

I refer to your letter concerning Firearms Act regulations which come into effect on 1 September 1993 and advise that I do not support a delay in the commencement date.

The current regulations expire on 31 August 1993 and the new Act is proclaimed to come into effect on 1 September 1993. I am advised that a deferral will require Parliament to pass legislation. . . and I do not agree with that—

As far as the evidence presented by Mr Hudson I would refer to the evidence presented by the Police Department. Furthermore, I have been advised by the Commissioner of Police that a comprehensive public awareness campaign is about to commence. I attach a copy of the draft press release and an information sheet which will be forwarded with all renewal notices. The 'Before you Shoot' booklet has been modified to take into account the changes and will be available from all police stations.

I have had people in droves contacting me and complaining that the forms are not available and that, technically, they are breaking the law. People do not know whether they can use their semi-automatic weapons with magazines holding more than five bullets. Confusion is reigning high. The Minister was made aware of this. Evidence to the Legislative Review Committee made quite clear that confusion and chaos would reign, law abiding citizens would be penalised, and the shooting fraternity would be unduly hassled and put to great inconvenience for no real purpose. The Minister and those in the Police Department who are pushing this line should read the article in *The City Messenger* of 8 September which states:

The Blade has claimed Adelaide's last seven murder victims. Knives crime worry. Knives have become the forgotten—but lethal—weapons of the violent side to Adelaide society. While the public focus has been on guns with new SA firearms laws passed last week, the last seven Adelaide murders, including four this year, have all seen the victims die at the blade of a knife.

It gives a list of the unfortunate victims. Pocket knives, sheath knives, long blade knives and even pairs of handcuffs are all openly for sale from city department stores. The article goes on to give quite a lengthy explanation of how these knives are available to the public and how they have been used for criminal activity.

It is a great pity that this Minister and his colleagues have not applied a little commonsense. They have not taken into account what law-abiding, sensible people have put to the Government in relation to firearms control. All the shooting fraternity wanted was to be treated fairly and reasonably. The Minister has been less than courteous; he has not been reasonable and he will pay the price—let there be no bones about that. He will pay the price because of his attitude and because of the attitude of those who are advising him. Incorrect information has been given out from police stations, but that is not the fault of the police officers. People do not know where they are going.

It is up to the Minister to amend these regulations and the Act, as he was advised to do some time ago. He has taken no notice, because he has a blinkered vision in relation to firearms. It is unfortunate. I am looking forward to a change of Government, because we will modify these regulations so that commonsense applies. Why should people have to renew their licence every three years? If you are a law-abiding

citizen and you get a licence, that should be it. Why should you have to have a permit to buy long arms? What a lot of nonsense. Why should there be all the nonsense about buying ammunition? A few days before these laws came into effect, I think it was Chief Superintendent Brown on radio who accepted that this would not stop criminals. A senior police officer admitted on radio that these laws would not stop criminals. If they have cash in their hands, unfortunately they can obtain firearms.

The answer to the problem is heavy penalties and gaol sentences for people who use firearms in the commission of an offence. Seize the firearms: no problem at all. All law-abiding gun owners support that, but this hassling red tape and nonsense is an absolute fiasco and it will rest fairly and squarely on the head of the Minister. I look forward to telling the firearms fraternity exactly who is to blame.

The second matter I wish to refer to is another saga which has gone on for longer than *Blue Hills* and concerns the shack sites at Blanche Harbor, Port Augusta. At the last State election the Liberal Party said, 'We will freehold the shacks in South Australia to give shack owners a fair go.' In the past few days, in a desperate panic move to try to retrieve some of their lost ground, the Minister did a back flip and sent a letter to His Worship, the Mayor of Port Augusta, setting out the conditions. Let me say from the outset that the Liberal Party will freehold those shacks when in Government. No matter what the Minister says now, he will not be there to put his policy into effect. We believe people have rights, whether they are above the high water mark or wherever they are. They took over those shack sites in good faith, so they should be treated in good faith. The letter states:

1. freeholding for sites above 2.96m AHD, where the lessee indicates in writing by 31 October 1993, agreement to meet freeholding costs (estimated to be \$10-12 000). . . He cannot tell them how much. When in Government the Liberal Party will give people as much time as they want to the department—not this 'maybe \$10 000, maybe \$12 000' approach. I believe that these valuations are right at the top end of the market; and, further, they should be given a considerable period—a few years—to meet those costs, because how will a lot of those people be able to raise that money? The letter continues:

. . . accepting full responsibility for erosion and flooding damage, disclaimer of liability against the Crown. . .

2. forty year non-renewable, transferable miscellaneous lease to issue to the existing lessee for sites above 2.96m AHD, where the lessee cannot meet all of the requirements listed in figure 1 above. The lessee must indicate in writing by 31 October 1993 acceptance of full responsibility for erosion and flooding. . .

Why should those people not have freehold title? There is no reason. It is just that there are a few odd bods in the Department of Environment and Land Management. The reason people have not had these sites freehold before is that the Government has been weak, and there has been weak and ineffective representation. That is the only reason why they do not have title. Even blind Freddy knows that they should have had it. The letter goes on:

3. forty year non-renewable, transferable miscellaneous lease to issue to the existing lessee for sites below 2.96m. . .

What is so magical about 2.96 metres? They are entitled to a freehold title, too, and under a Liberal Government, if they so desire, they will have it. Make no mistake about that—and they will have it within six months of us coming to Government, if they desire, because this nonsense has gone on for far too long. The letter continues:

4. forty year non-renewable miscellaneous lease to issue to existing lessee for sites below 2.96m AHD, where the lessee cannot

meet the necessary requirements for waste disposal as set by the SA Health Commission. . .

5. for sites unable to be freeholded, lessees will be required to remove improvements at their cost on lease termination.

I would think that when the overwhelming majority of those people have finished with those sites they will want them for their families. They are entitled to keep them for their families throughout the State. Anyone who thinks about it knows that those shack owners will not go freely or willingly; they are entitled to have a secure title so they can improve the sites. They are good recreational facilities. These people have done nothing wrong, and when in Government the Liberal Party will ensure that their expectations are met. Do not take any notice of what this Government has said; it has had 10 years and done nothing. Give us six months and we will fix the problem, because not only here but elsewhere in the State we believe people should have the most secure title possible over their land—not this socialistic attitude from people who do not think they should have a title to it anyway.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I received a letter today from the South Australian Fishing Industry Council Incorporated, as follows:

Dear Sir,

Under instructions from the SAFIC Executive Committee, I am writing to inform you that this committee takes great exception to remarks made by you in Parliament (*Hansard* April 29) concerning a member, Mr Maurice Corigliano.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: You wait. It continues:

Your remarks that Mr Corigliano has ambitions to 'dominate the fishery and to own all the licences' is insulting but scarcely deserving of comment considering that it is not legally possible.

Mr Gunn: That's correct.

Mr QUIRKE: I agree with the member for Eyre. It is certainly the case that Mr Corigliano does wish to dominate the gulf. The letter further states:

Your reference to our member making 'sure that \$3.4 million of taxpayers' money that has been frozen in terms of interest rates for the past six years will never be used for any community purpose' is as ludicrous as it is defamatory. It is well known that Mr Corigliano is a third generation fisherman, has been a pioneer of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery and has worked tirelessly to ensure that the very thing of which you accuse him, will not happen.

He has campaigned vigorously for Government action to save the fishery from its present disastrous state for the past 15 years but to no avail and now that it is facing extinction this man stands to lose everything—

I understand, Mr Acting Speaker, not quite everything—

Your uninformed and cruel remarks do you little credit and do even less to improve what has become a crisis situation for all those involved.

Yours sincerely,

Graham Gribble

Well, if they did not like those remarks, they will like the remarks that I make in the next eight minutes even less.

Let me relay to the House my involvement in this area. I had the pleasure of chairing the Select Committee into the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery. I well remember the night when the then Minister of Fisheries called me down to his office to ask me whether I would serve on the select committee. I told the Minister that I would be pleased to, and I asked him who was going to be the Chair. He looked at me perplexed, and he said, 'Why, you are, of course.' I had never been on a select committee before so I thought this was wonderful. On the way back to the lift his adviser said to me, 'We couldn't think of anyone who would take the threats, the death threats, the phone calls, the visits and all the other hassles as well as you.' I must say that I got into the lift with

half a smile on my face, and I wondered what was going to come of it.

In the next six to eight months evidence was presented to us from all sides. Mr Deputy Speaker, as a member of that committee you would agree that the evidence was inconclusive, and from many quarters it was just plain terrible. There is no doubt that the Department of Fisheries did not do a very good job, and we made that clear in the report.

There is no doubt that the fishermen wore their self-interest on their sleeve. There is also no doubt that their employing of certain people did not help the case, although I must say that the biologist Kesteven, whom they brought before us was very good. In fact, he was so good that he contradicted some of their case. However, if I had to single out any professional group for giving us the worst and most contradictory case, the slackest evidence, lacking in detail, with no home work, it was SAFIC. I have not said that in the House before, but I thought it was the sloppiest evidence that was presented to us. I really wondered where those people were coming from and why they did not have some full-time advice, so I asked the Minister. I found out that they were Government funded. They are funded off the licence. I must say that I was shocked and horrified by that, and I have already suggested to the Minister how he can achieve some economies in that department.

I return to Mr Corigliano. In my office, as the report came down, Mr Corigliano and others agreed to a whole range of what could only be described as a raft of proposals which would bring the whole lot together. We were going down the road of self-management, but the 11 fishermen had to have a ballot conducted by the Electoral Commission to pick their representative. Now they tell us that they want more self-management. We also sent the Hon. Ted Chapman down there as Chairman. I believe he is a fair and reasonable person, and I am proud to say he is a friend of mine. I must say that I had something to do with that. But they do not like him either. He found, as I did, that it is very difficult to understand Mr Corigliano, because Mr Corigliano has an agenda. The trouble is it is not the same agenda every day.

Within 24 hours of the report coming down, Mr Corigliano was on the radio denouncing all the things that he said, when he was in my office, he was pleased to have. The arrangement did not last long at all. Eventually legislation was introduced into this place and it was passed, and it went to another place. That legislation was to regularise a whole range of things and provide for self-management in the gulf, setting up the team that was to look after the new gulf when it opens later this year. It was also going to enshrine in legislation the very generous components of the package that was negotiated during the select committee.

A lot of public money went into a buy-out of those fishing boats. I will also say, and I stand by it, that I am not big on buy-outs, because I think inevitably they always run into trouble, particularly when people with little goodwill walk away from the arrangements, and I refer to Mr Corigliano, supported by this SAFIC crowd.

Let me describe exactly what happened. The bill was over \$4 million, and the interest was accumulating at better than 15 per cent every day. Our committee placed a freeze on that until the fishermen could go fishing again. We froze their licences until they could go fishing again, and we tied the payment of the debt to the licence so the Government could be guaranteed that it would retrieve the capital when they went fishing. Did they like those arrangements? They were ecstatic about them when they came down. However, when

it came closer to paying the bill, which the community in South Australia is reasonably entitled to expect them to pay back, they started lobbying members of the Legislative Council. They even came to lobby me last week.

I said, 'If I were the Minister, I would wipe out all the advantages you received from the committee and give you what you want. You do not want the legislation to go through. You can have the bill and the six years of interest, and you will all be \$2 million worse off. In fact, by now it may even be up to about \$3 million. You want to go around lobbying, you want all the good stuff, but you do not want to take any of the rest.' I received this letter today, and I must thank SAFIC for providing me with a good vehicle on which to express some of my concerns. At the end of the day millions of dollars have been lost—money that could have been used to paint schools out there in any one of our 47 electorates. The money could have been used to employ teachers, provide computers and a whole pile of other things instead of a greedy bunch who do not know when they are well off.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I wish to continue to document my concerns in respect of the crisis that has developed at the Modbury Hospital over the past year and which I believe will continue into next year. The crisis at Modbury has developed some very dangerous symptoms, and I refer to an internal memorandum that was sent to the outpatients department of Modbury by the Medical Administrator on 29 April 1993. That memorandum states:

As a cost saving initiative, I would like to request that all medical staff provide outpatient department patients with private pharmacy prescriptions rather than hospital prescriptions. Please note that patients are not disadvantaged by this as the hospital pharmacy charges \$13 for each drug prescribed, \$2.60 for health care card holders. This is exactly the same as the charge by private pharmacies for pharmaceutical benefits scheme items. In order to make this easier, I have organised for a supply of private prescription pads with Modbury Hospital's name on it to be distributed throughout the outpatient department.

The Health Minister and the State Labor Government have been at it again, cutting corners with hospital instructions to reduce the cost to the Arnold Administration. However, the request that medical staff at Modbury Hospital provide outpatients with private pharmacy prescriptions rather than hospital prescriptions was a deliberate attempt to evade financial and legal responsibilities. The instruction that was issued on 29 April had only just come to the attention of the Health Insurance Commission, which considered the decision to use private prescriptions for hospital purposes to be a breach of the Medicare agreement.

The State Government is obliged to provide emergency pharmaceuticals to outpatients, and any attempt to circumvent that obligation can be construed as a deliberate act to acquire extra Federal funds. If that institution was a private enterprise, the charge that could be levied as a result of that action would be fraudulent intent. The practice of using private prescription pads, stamped with the name of a public hospital and outpatient department, shows just how far this Government will go in respect of what amounts to double dipping. Cost saving initiatives are one thing, but to resort to that kind of sleight of hand chicanery to skimp on paying relatively few dollars indicates how bankrupt the Labor Government's principles have become.

The Health Insurance Commission sent one of its officers to Modbury to advise health administrators of the breach of the Medicare agreement. Memorandums were also to be sent to all hospitals in South Australia clearly stating how the use of private pharmacy prescriptions in this exclusive manner

in public hospitals is not acceptable. There was also some concern that Modbury was not the only public hospital which had resorted to such a practice, because of the Government's determination to slash health expenditure, regardless of the consequences. Medical administrators would not have taken such a course of action without official encouragement which calls into question the role of Health Minister Evans and the Arnold Cabinet.

This matter was considered serious enough for the Federal office of the Health Insurance Commission to be advised of what had happened in South Australia in case a nationwide investigation was needed. The Health Commission in this State was asked to report on this matter, but at this time I am still unaware of any such report. Further ramifications of the crisis at Modbury are outlined in a letter that I received recently from an orthopaedic surgeon, Dr. Robert Atkinson, who has given me permission to read it into *Hansard*. The letter is addressed to the Medical Director of Modbury Hospital and states:

Dear Sir,

I think it is time that I put into writing the appalling circumstances regarding the management of the orthopaedic consultants at Modbury Hospital. In good faith we dropped 25 per cent of our salaries at the beginning of the year without changing our work pattern to get a fourth orthopaedic surgeon. This was on the understanding that there would be 12 orthopaedic sessions: three orthopaedic surgeons at four sessions or four orthopaedic surgeons at three sessions. Now we are back to three orthopaedic surgeons, but the number of sessions per surgeon remains at three each, and there seems to be endless bickering in regard to this.

I would, first, like to make the point that the premise that we are only able to be paid for the time that we spend actually at Modbury is a fallacy. We spend a large amount of time doing work which is in the public interest at Modbury Hospital, and I estimate that this amount of work is greater than four sessions or 14 hours a week. There is work done in preparation for surgical cases as well as teaching and presentations by all of us. There is a large amount of work done in regard to the Australian Orthopaedic Board of Studies, resulting in the final success of achieving recognition for an orthopaedic trainee registrar at Modbury Hospital in 1994 for the first time.

I would like to emphasise that this is public work and, in fact, by training registrars we are producing competition for our private practices. On pure economic terms, we are subsidising the time we spend at Modbury Hospital as the average cost of maintaining an orthopaedic practice exceeds the hourly sessional rate in the public sector. Community service and not economics is the reason we go to Modbury Hospital and, in some orthopaedic and other surgical circles, this is seen as foolish support for an inefficient system.

The principle involved with our argument with you is quite significant and has certainly undermined our attitude to Modbury Hospital. In the past we have not pursued minor callback allowances and really used the callback for major cases. In the future, however, we will follow the exact rule, and any callback, no matter how minor, will be documented. We spend time considering and using the most cost effective implants and instrumentation at Modbury Hospital with due regard to public funds. A large amount of highly expensive equipment is often brought in to be used on public cases.

I would say that we are the most productive practitioners in the hospital with more highly technical work done per surgeon than anybody else resulting in overall cost savings from reduced length of stay. For you to undermine us and basically punish us for our performance and generosity I find to be extraordinarily strange management. I am uncertain as to where this attitude comes from, but it needs to be eradicated from the hospital if you are going to have anybody of note working in the hospital.

This leads me to my final point, in that, unless this can be satisfactorily resolved, our accreditation for a trainee registrar may be withdrawn and I really cannot see an effective orthopaedic service remaining. It may be that this is what you wish.

At this point, I am resolved to contact both the Minister of Health and shadow Minister of Health to see if I can get some sense to bear on this most extraordinary attitude. For our State to progress, it requires a change of attitude and support for those who put in and perform, and that does not mean putting in hours and time, as it is

quite obvious that plenty of people put in time with no performance. The end result is what counts, and in that area the orthopaedic surgeons at Modbury Hospital are streets ahead of anybody else.

Dr Atkinson completes his letter to the Medical Director of Modbury with the following comment:

Under socialism and before their demise, the Russians said, 'They pretend to pay us and we pretend to work.' Thank you for your consideration.

I cannot recall the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services standing in this place and announcing that medical practitioners had taken the stance of cutting their own salary without reducing their services to assist the budget predicaments of this Government. Hiding the truth quite obviously is a symptom of this Labor Government, and it is the only achievement that can be attributed to it.

The nature of the crisis at Modbury Hospital is that, unless the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services reinvestigates and reviews the budget within the infrastructure at Modbury, the system, which has been a very proud one and which has serviced the area of Tea Tree Gully and beyond for many years, is in danger of collapse. The options that have been looked at—the cuts to service areas within Modbury—as I have said before, are totally unacceptable. It is not good enough that these people are being ignored; they are being denied service after service.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The Auditor-General's Report, as is always expected, has provided us with some valuable information, even though it was 24 hours late in being tabled in this Parliament. On page 2 of his report under the heading 'Independent Audit Report', the Auditor-General states:

The expression of an opinion on an organisation's annual financial statement by an independent professional auditor adds credibility to those statements and ensures that the necessary level of financial accountability has been exercised. In accordance with professional standards I issue an independent audit report on each set of annual financial statements which I am required to audit. The opinion expressed in that report is usually unqualified, but where good reason exists a qualified opinion is expressed. In extreme cases it may be necessary to decline to express an opinion. In all cases when a qualified opinion (or no opinion) is given full reasons are stated in the independent audit report issued.

For the financial year ended 30 June 1993 qualified opinions were expressed on the financial statements of the following public authorities: Department of Housing and Construction; Department of Primary Industries (Woods and Forests Division); and State Services Department. I have been concerned to note that the independent audit report issued by me is not always presented accurately or always attached to the financial statements of some public authorities in their annual reports produced in accordance with the requirements of the Government Management and Employment Act 1985. When such errors and omissions have been detected I have written to the Chief Executive Officer of the public authority concerned.

I hope that the Premier and the Treasurer take particular note of that statement by the Auditor-General and act strongly to reprimand the chief executive officers who overlook quoting the comments of the Auditor-General so that we can be assured that these errors will not occur again. One can only become suspicious when an Auditor-General must report in these terms to the Parliament on the actions and activities of some of our Government departments. It is a terrible reflection on those departments for not carrying out the Auditor-General's instructions. If we had been given greater resources for the Economic and Finance Committee or for the parliamentary committee structure in general, those departments could have been closely examined, as they should be.

On pages 37 and 38 of volume I of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1993, special mention is

made of the contingent liabilities of the State. This area has concerned me for many years, as in terms of the number of guarantees given by the Government, various authorities and, of course, the Industries Development Committee, there has never appeared to be a standard form of accountability of the total value of such guarantees. There never has appeared to be a standard form of accountability of the total value of such guarantees. On page 37 of his report, the Auditor-General says:

In 1991-92, audit reported to Treasury that an accurate and complete picture of the totality of the Treasurer's guarantees and indemnities was not available. The importance of this information lies in the need for an awareness of potential commitments and to ensure that there is in place an appropriate management strategy in respect of such commitments. The position is all the more relevant having regard to the experience of the losses of the State Bank and SGIC. The State's financial position would be tested if faced with a further financial crisis period.

He goes on to say:

The liabilities of major financial institutions as set out in the table hereunder make up by far the greater part of liabilities that are subject to guarantee. In recognition of this fact, Treasury has prepared a table identifying the liabilities to external parties subject to guarantee and the assets available to meet such guarantees at 30 June 1993.

On the top of page 38, the Auditor-General sets out, under the notation that the figures are unaudited, the following information: the State Bank of South Australia reported group liabilities subject to guarantee, \$15 007; liabilities to other public sector entities, \$315 million; liabilities to external parties subject to guarantee, \$14 692 million; and the group assets available to meet reported liabilities, \$14 093 million; and indemnity under the deed of amendment and acknowledgments, \$2 048 million, \$1 713 million, \$335 million and \$1 964 million, under those respective headings. The figures for the State Government Insurance Commission reported group liabilities subject to guarantee are \$1 807 million, \$98 million and \$1 079 million, and the group asset available is \$1 831 million.

The figures relating to the South Australian Government Financing Authority, under those respective headings, are \$27 215 million, \$6 443 million, \$20 772 million and \$11 296 million; and the Local Government Financing Authority, \$747 million, \$332 million, \$415 million and \$748 million, totalling reported group liabilities subject to guarantee at \$46 824 million. Liabilities to other public sector entities amount to \$8 901 million; liabilities to external parties subjected to guarantee, \$37 923 million; and group assets available to meet the reported liabilities, \$29 932 million.

What this all adds up to is that the table shows an excess of liability over assets of some \$8 000 million, which is representative of the net indebtedness of the Government. In other words, in theory the State could owe or be insolvent to the tune of \$8 000 million, and it is frightening to think that the State has committed \$46.8 billion worth of guarantees with something like \$29.9 billion worth of assets. We are in real trouble. We are in the well-known ditch as far as the finances of this State is concerned.

This situation must be turned around. The only thing we can do is immediately apply to the Federal Government to have the State Bank brought under the Banking Act. If we do that, we can lift \$14 billion out of these guarantees immediately. I believe that is what is behind the attitude of the Federal Government. It must be concerned that the States are committing themselves with these horrendous guarantees to prop up activities of statutory authorities and Government trading enterprise departments to such a degree that there is

no way the States will ever meet these commitments. So, in the interests of everybody concerned and particularly of this State, we should apply to have the State Bank put under the Federal Banking Act. That would relieve the State of some \$14 000 million commitment in guarantee. It will not affect the bank—as a matter of fact it would strengthen the bank. It would have no impact on the State except to bring us back into a far more solvent situation, and it would no doubt have some impact on our credit rating.

I hope, again, that the Treasurer, the Premier and the Government look closely at the statements made by the Auditor-General, and act quickly to assess the amount and the value of all the guarantees. We could be up for \$50 billion, because nobody knows how many guarantees are outstanding as per each ministerial department, and that is because nobody has yet submitted a final list.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): One of the most tragic aspects of the State Bank fiasco is that this Government is seeking, on the one hand, to escape just retribution and, on the other, to discover where the blame lies. We have lost sight of just what the State Bank situation embodies. The State Bank is not just a business: it is, or was, part of the history of South Australia's growth and its maturing development. The saddest part of the outcome of a decade of mismanagement of what was a real asset to the entire community is that that history is being destroyed. We have effectively lost 70 years of frugal financial management of constructive build-up of South Australia.

Mr Becker: It's a lifetime!

Mr VENNING: More than a lifetime. I have in my possession a pamphlet which is a treasured Venning family keepsake. It tells of the occasions, almost 75 years ago—75 years ago to the day, next Monday—when an illustrated address was presented to my great-grandfather, Mr W.J. Venning, in recognition of his more than 40 years service to the citizens of this State and especially to the farming sector. It was signed by many of the prominent citizens of the day, as well as by more than 130 of his farming neighbours in the Crystal Brook and general Mid-North regions. Among the many projects of the day in which my great-grandfather was a prominent figure were the Farmers Mutual Association (forerunner to the South Australian Farmers Federation), water conservation, liberalised land laws and, not least, State banking. In fact, it was said that he was the person who initiated the first State Bank in South Australia in the early 1880-90s.

At a dinner in Adelaide on 13 September 1918, at which he was presented with an address bearing the signatures of literally hundreds of South Australians, he told, in his reply to the presentation, of how he had come to perceive the need for a State bank, what he believed a State bank should be and what it should do. His reply is reproduced word for word in this little pamphlet, which I am happy to furnish to members—in fact I will submit a copy to the library. I would like to share it with members. I quote from page 8, under the heading 'State banking', as follows:

In the year 1886 I moved in the Farmers' Association annual meeting a motion in favour of the adoption of State banking to help the industries of the country to bridge over the several monetary difficulties of the people as they arose. The motion being agreed to, it then became a line in the policy of the association. Finding much ignorance of this question existed, I convened meetings on my own account, and talked to and with the people about State banking.

pointing out the terrible charges moneylenders imposed upon the borrowers, and argued that if a State bank were in existence the terrible costs in obtaining loans could be avoided. The idea soon took root, and many people agreed that something should be done to help all people over the monetary difficulties arising through dry and adverse seasons as they arose.

Members must realise that this was in 1886. The booklet continues:

Having this in view, I advocated in the many meetings I convened and addressed that the State Bank should consist of three departments: viz., issue, deposit, mortgage.

Issue. Dr Ross, a member of the New South Wales Parliament, was favourable for a State Bank in New South Wales, so I wrote him. In his reply he suggested that the Government should dedicate one million acres of land as a land bank reserve, and issue notes upon it. This letter can be seen in the *Advertiser* of either July or August of 1886. This, coupled with the credit system discussed in McLeod's *Elements of Banking*, formed the basis of my ideas of dedicating certain Crown lands as land bank reserves. It was argued that if we may coin the funds into money we may just as well coin the land into money. In meetings I attended I advocated the dedication of £5 million worth of land as bank security against notes and deposits and the loans the mortgage department might make.

Deposits. No doubt, if a measure had been agreed to, as advocated, for a State Bank, and had authorised the dedication of £5 million worth of Crown lands for its present and future security, it would have induced many frugal people to deposit their surplus money in the bank and, as Gilbert points out in his treatise on banking, the system of deposit accounts is a very great stimulus to the habits of industry, economy and frugality of the people. The whole surplus capital of the individual is thus rendered productive, and is advantageous to the country by augmenting the amount of national capital, and by increasing the demand for labour as a result of giving facilities to trade and commerce, and of removing the temptations of frugal people to engage in hazardous speculations and foreign investments.

Under a system of State banking, backed up by the Crown lands of the State, the frugal workman gains immediate interest and security for his savings, whilst the savings are immediately employed through the bank in putting a further portion of labour into motion. Is there not an advantage to the public from the gathering of those small capitals together, and then sending them forth into channels of trade, so as to promote the commerce, manufactures, and agriculture of the country? This is a great encouragement to the frugal temperate man to save money.

Mortgage. When advocating State banking, I had no doubt in my mind that a fair system of mortgaging securities for loans could be adopted applicable to the wants and conditions of the people. Such an institution could offer to all classes of our people who were borrowers of money at much less cost than before. To foster the idea, a State Bank booth was arranged on the North-Western Agricultural Society's showgrounds, Crystal Brook, and on show day a number of people signed petitions or papers setting forth the desirability of a State Bank. At the Adelaide show in the following week we employed one to take charge of the petitions, and to secure signatures. The subject caught on, as indicated by the late Hon. J.W. Downer's remarks on Mr Caldwell's motion for a State Bank (see *Hansard*, 22 September 1886). He said:

However much some of us may feel disposed to pooh-pooh and speak indifferently of the popular feeling on this subject, I think it is quite impossible for us to shut our eyes to the fact that there is a great deal of agitation on the matter now before the House.

After this problem of State banking got into the air, and the Hon. Alfred Catt, after wisely making inquiries in America and other parts of the world, submitted to the House a motion in favour of a State Bank. A Bill followed and the present State Bank resulted. This bank dealt with only one department of the State Bank I advocated, viz., the mortgage branch. The matter had been so well ventilated that the public were prepared to accept the Hon. A. Catt's motion in the House as a first instalment. I heartily joined in recognising the great value of the Hon. A. Catt's efforts in bringing his Bill before the House and securing its adoption. The great success of the State Bank as it exists today indicates in an unmistakable way the ability and forethought of the gentleman who had charge of the Bill. Our industries still require that financial solidity that a sound system of general State banking would give, and to this end I advocate the dedication of the Crown and repurchased lands of the State, and the

issue of a currency free of interest payments. This would solidly support the repatriation proposals in favour of our returned soldiers.

My last words: we do not want a banking institution that will save industrious frugality from hazardous speculation—a sort of reservoir and security for the temperate people's savings. In this philosophy there are no tears, no sighs, no groans, no regrets, but a stout heart and laughter to the last. But in the philosophy of joint stock commercial speculative banking there have been tears, sighs, groans, and regrets, broken hearts, and sorrow. We do hope that Legislatures of Australia will so mould its monetary affairs that the earnings and savings of the industrious workmen may be put to profitable account and his money be safeguarded against loss, and thus make Australia great and free, the home of light and liberty, the glory of the southern sea.

When I read the sentiments of my great-grandfather, I am proud to call myself a conservative, in the truest sense of the word. I offer a copy of the booklet to any member. It is a responsible Liberal Government that this State needs to restore the values of William Venning and those like him to our commerce and to our community.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I can assure members that I will not keep the House for very long as another debate is about to commence. However, I would like to bring to the attention of members an issue that arose at a meeting I attended at Morphettville Racecourse on Sunday 4 April 1993. I spoke very briefly on this matter in a grievance debate previously and said that I would complete my remarks later.

The public open forum that was held at Morphettville Racecourse at the ABCOS sale yards was the first time we have seen the three racing codes come together to try to get some action from this Government in relation to the perilous state of the racing industry and to see whether they could trigger some activity to address the decline of the profitability of the three codes. They want to get the Government to face up to the fact that the racing industry in this State is dying. If something is not done about the industry in the next few months, we will see it falling over at a greater rate.

The meeting was attended by owners, breeders, trainers, punters and media—in fact, anyone who had any connection with the racing codes. As background, according to the ACIL report, racing is the third largest industry in the State, but it is an industry in which we are seeing employment opportunities declining by the day. There is no doubt that the racing industry is dying and needs Government assistance.

We heard claims at that meeting that trainers were finding that they had to put off staff, and we heard of other quite serious situations. For the benefit of members I intend to summarise some of the notes I took on that occasion so that they are on the public record and so that the Government can start to address the issues. I will name names, because it was a public meeting and everyone who addressed it identified themselves beforehand.

Gallops trainer, Leon MacDonald, maintained that South Australia was now the Cinderella State of mainland racing, with prize money in Western Australia recently getting a boost of \$9 million and Queensland country racing getting \$3 million. Trainers such as Bart Cummings, John Hawkes and David Balfour were setting up stables interstate and overseas, while Lindsay Park had moved its breeding operations to New South Wales. The recent yearling sales had shown that very few horses were purchased by local trainers, simply because they no longer had the owners.

We heard that trainers were also being adversely affected because they were covered by Federal awards for their stable hands, while their WorkCover premiums were higher than those in any other State. We also heard that the TAFE system

did a good job of training potential strappers but that now there were no jobs for them.

Ross Sugars advised that he has been involved in harness racing for 20 years, including being 12 times the leading driver, but his earnings were only equal to the basic wage. Training 25 horses as well would mean a far more viable existence. However, he was now down to 12 or 15 horses, but had had as few as 9 or 10 horses. Instead of three full-time workers, he now had only one part-time employee. Only one of his owners from 10 years ago still has horses with him. Every year his costs were going up 10 to 15 per cent, but stake money had remained static during that period. Another racehorse owner, Bob Cowper, said that the economics of racing now means that, unless you win a race in a city every month or two, owners are charities for the benefit of everyone else. Therefore, there was no encouragement for anyone to become an owner and go to the yearling sales and purchase a horse.

Greyhound trainer, Blair Cross, stated that races in Sydney and Melbourne were worth \$1 600 to the winner, with many in Adelaide worth only \$500. Bookmaker John Gray said that, whereas Adelaide dog races once used to be 70 per cent of the stakes of Sydney races, they were now down to around the 15 per cent mark. He complained that there were too many betting outlets, such as PubTAB, and punters had lost interest in going to the track. He claimed that the turnover of some of the betting venues was so small they should be shut down. He believed the introduction of poker machines would only accentuate the problems. A racehorse owner pointed out that maidens in Brisbane could race for \$13 000, whereas the prize money for class six horses in Adelaide is down to the \$10 000 mark.

Greyhound identity Eric Mather said he had been in the industry for 13 years and, even though he won 22 races the year before last, the next three months could see him exit from greyhound racing. Norm Mumford said he had been standing pacing stallions for the past 29 years and, despite his claim of having the best horse of its year, he had never been worse off. He pointed out that his son, instead of being at the meeting we attended, had gone grape picking for \$90 a day. Thirty dollars of that money would go on paying a fine for nominating the wrong driver at Kadina. Mumford called for a three per cent deduction from TAB turnover.

Leading trotting trainer for the past three years, John Justice, said his number of horses in work had declined from 50 down to 28, and his workers had dropped from five down to two. It was more difficult to get owners, and he was finding times very tough. John Sanderick, a greyhound owner of 20 dogs, said he was having more dogs trained and raced in New South Wales because of the prizemoney. Harness racing trainer, Ron Vincent, said he was only surviving on the earnings of his wife. He mentioned that it cost him \$78 to take a horse to Port Pirie. Third placing returned \$80. He had used up all his life-savings and predicted that he would be out of the game by the end of the year.

That is a summary of some of the speeches that were made by various people in the industry who went to the microphone. I think the message running through all of this is that the racing industry is in dire straits and, unless the Government does something about it, we will see the third largest employer in this State, an industry which the State has thrived on for many years, collapsing around the Government's ears.

Motion carried

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

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Wednesday 6 October, in accordance with the timetables as follow:

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Tuesday 14 September at 11.00 a.m.

Premier, Minister of Economic Development, Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs

Legislative Council
House of Assembly
Joint Parliamentary Services
State Governor's Establishment
Premier and Cabinet
Premier and Minister of Economic Development—Other Payments

Office Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs

Wednesday 15 September at 11.00 a.m.

Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister of Mineral Resources

Treasury
Deputy Premier and Treasurer—Other Payments

Mines and Energy

Thursday 16 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, Minister of Recreation and Sport

Housing and Urban Development
South Australian Housing Trust
Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations—Other Payments

Friday 17 September at 9.30 a.m.

Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, Minister for the Aged

South Australian Health Commission
Department for Family and Community Services

Tuesday 21 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Minister of Emergency Services, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs

Environment and Land Management
Minister of Environment and Land Management—Other payments

Police

Minister of Emergency Services—Other Payments

Auditor-General's

State Aboriginal Affairs

Wednesday 22 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Public Infrastructure

Minister of Public Infrastructure—Other Payments

Thursday 23 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Business and Regional Development, Minister of Tourism

South Australian Tourism Commission
Office of Business and Regional Development
Economic Development Authority
Minister of Tourism—Other payments
Minister of Business and Regional Development—Other Payments
State Services (Program 5 only)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Tuesday 14 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Justice, Attorney-General, Minister of Public Sector Reform, Minister for Crime Prevention, Minister of Correctional Services

Attorney-General's
Courts Administration Authority

Electoral

Correctional Services

Attorney-General and Minister for Crime Prevention—Other Payments

Office of Public Sector Reform

Wednesday 15 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, Minister of Consumer Affairs, Minister for the Status of Women

Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage

Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and Minister for the Status of Women—Other Payments

Public and Consumer Affairs

Minister of Consumer Affairs—Other Payments

Thursday 16 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Transport Development

Road Transport

State Transport Authority

Marine and Harbors

Office of Transport Policy and Planning

Tuesday 21 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Education, Employment and Training

Children's Services Office

Education

Employment and Technical and Further Education

Minister of Education, Employment and Training—Other Payments

Wednesday 22 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety, Minister of State Services

Labour

Housing and Construction

State Services (except Program 5)

Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety—Other Payments

Thursday 23 September at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Primary Industries, Minister Assisting the Premier on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs

Primary Industries

South Australian research and Development Institute

Motion carried.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I

move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed consisting of Messrs Brindal, Brown, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison and Messrs Lewis and Quirke.

Motion carried.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I

move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs Atkinson, S.J. Baker, Bannon, De Laine, McKee, Matthew and Meier.

Motion carried.

AUDITOR- GENERAL'S REPORT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that the Auditor-General has forwarded an erratum to the annual report 1992-93 tabled yesterday, as follows:

On page 90 of the report, under the heading 'Revenue', reference is made to sales of electricity by megawatt-hours. The sentence should read 'Sales of electricity increased by 313 000 megawatt-hours'.

Copies of the erratum will be distributed to all members.

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (PREPARATION FOR RESTRUCTURING) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 10 (clause 1)—Before 'preparation' insert 'investigator's records and'.

No. 2. Page 1, line 15 (clause 2)—Leave out 'this' and insert 'subject to subsection (2), this'.

No. 3. Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 15 insert new subclause as follows:

'(2) Section 2A of this Act will come into operation on the day on which this Act is assented to by the Governor.'

No. 4. Page 1—After line 15 insert new clause as follows:

Insertion of s.25A

2A. The following section is inserted after section 25 of the principal Act.

Custody and use of investigator's records

25A. (1) In this section—

'authorised person' has the same meaning as in section 25;

'investigation' means an investigation under section 25 conducted either before or after the enactment of this section;

'investigator' means the person by whom an investigation is or was conducted;

'investigator's record', in relation to an investigation, means—

(a) evidentiary material produced voluntarily or under compulsion to the investigator or an authorised person in the course, or for the purposes, of the investigation; or

(b) any record of evidence or submissions made for the purposes of the investigation; or

(c) any record (including an expert's report) made or prepared by, or on behalf or at the request of, the investigator or an authorised person for the purposes of the investigation;

'prosecuting authority' means—

(a) the Director of Public Prosecutions of the State or the Commonwealth; or

(b) the Australian Securities Commission; or

(c) any other authority of the State, another State or a Territory of the Commonwealth, or the Commonwealth that undertakes responsibility for the prosecution of offences.

(2) Subject to this section, at the conclusion of an investigation, the Attorney-General is entitled to the custody and control of all the investigator's records to the exclusion of the rights of any other person.

(3) Despite subsection (2), the investigator retains a right of access to and may make copies of the investigator's records.

(4) If a person would, but for subsection (2), have been entitled to possession of a record at the conclusion of the investigation, the record is to be delivered to the person as soon as the Attorney-General is satisfied that there is no need to retain the record for the purpose of any civil or criminal proceedings.

(5) If an obligation arose, or an undertaking was given, that a particular record or particular information gained in the course of the investigation be kept confidential, the following provisions apply:

(a) the obligation or undertaking is binding on the Attorney-General;

(b) the obligation or undertaking does not prevent disclosure of the record or information to—

(i) the Crown, its officers or its legal advisers; or

(ii) a prosecuting authority;

(c) if such a disclosure is made, the obligation or undertaking becomes binding on the person to whom the disclosure is made.

(6) No objection may be taken to the use of an investigator's record or information gained in the course of an investigation for the purposes of, or as evidence in, civil or criminal proceedings merely because of disclosure of the record or information to—

(a) the Crown, its officers or its legal advisers; or

(b) a prosecuting authority.

(7) No civil or criminal liability arises from disclosure of an investigator's record or information gained in the course of an investigation to—

(a) the Crown, its officers or its legal advisers; or

(b) a prosecuting authority.

(8) This section does not affect the operation of section 34(3) of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987 (relating to the admissibility in criminal proceedings of answers to questions put by an investigator or authorised person) as applied by section 25(7) of this Act.

(9) This section—

(a) applies both within and outside the State; and

(b) applies outside the State to the full extent of the extra-territorial legislative capacity of the Parliament; and

(c) is to be regarded as part of the substantive law of the State.'

No. 5 Page 3 (clause 3)—After line 20 insert new subclause as follows:

- ‘(3a) The Treasurer may issue—
 (a) to a person who is engaged on the authorised project; or
 (b) to a prospective purchaser or an agent of a prospective purchaser authorised by the Treasurer to have access to information under subsection (3), a certificate identifying the person as such and any person may be refused access to information to which access is sought under subsection (3) unless the person first produces that certificate for the inspection of an appropriate officer of the bank or subsidiary of the bank.’

No. 6 Page 4, line 19 (clause 3)—After ‘certified’ insert ‘in the absence of proof to the contrary’.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council’s amendments be agreed to.

The amendments received considerable airing in the other place and attracted unanimous support. On this occasion that is good enough for me. I urge the Committee to accept the amendments.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Opposition has some extreme reservations about the way in which the law is being changed in the fashion indicated in the amendments. It is useful to report that, in the time between when the amendments first arrived in this place and the debate we are having today, an injunction has been issued by the auditors against the availability of records gleaned through the State Bank Royal Commission, and particularly the Auditor-General’s investigations. This injunction was granted against the opposition of the Government because the auditors were able to satisfy the court, at least on an interim basis, that the Auditor-General gave some undertaking of confidentiality to the auditors. That puts a further light on the matter.

We are entering into a very difficult area here. We do not have an explanation on the record as to the Government’s intentions either in this House or in another place as to why these amendments are being moved. They are very wide amendments which place all the records from the Auditor-General’s investigations into the hands of the Attorney-General. The debate in another place certainly revolved around discussions with the Crown Solicitor with respect to the need for this legislation. It was a late entry into the Parliament and it has the potential of having unwanted consequences, because normally when we consider these things in a hurry we get them wrong.

We understand that the Auditor-General gave some undertaking of confidentiality in order to have the auditors comply with his request for information. We also believe that this voluntary cooperation was made on that basis and therefore the records that are held by the Auditor-General are indeed a result of voluntary cooperation and may have gone far further than if the Auditor-General had applied his powers, which he was entitled to do. We recognise that royal commission reports, investigations and transcripts as a right belong to the Government, and we believe that there has been a conflict in this area. We believe that the enactment of this law may create some problems, particularly for auditors and other people. However, we understand the need to expedite the matter.

I would have preferred this issue to lay on the table until we had had sufficient time to examine all the angles and understand exactly what is being done here because it does have the potential to cause difficulty for those affected. I make the point strongly that this Parliament must deal with matters on their merits, and I do not believe that this has had

the appropriate time span to enable us to approach all parties. We are relying on legal advice which, in most cases, has been adequate but in some cases has been found wanting in the past.

I do not find the current situation very satisfactory. The Opposition will comply with the Government’s wishes to ensure that the records that have been collected are available for use in restructuring of the bank. However, other material has come to light in those investigations which should remain the province of the Government and should not be made available to any other person.

I believe it is important that the context of this issue be clearly understood. It is depriving people of their rights, but it is important that we expedite the matter to allow the bank to get on with its restructuring process. I have extreme reservations about the way in which this is being handled and about this set of amendments, which should have been properly constituted in the original Bill.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the Deputy Leader for his gracious support.

Motion carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. C. J. Sumner), the Minister of Transport Development (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage (Hon. Anne Levy) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1 Page 1, lines 6 to 10—Long Title—Leave out the Long Title and insert new Long Title as follows:

An Act to enable the recognition of regulatory standards throughout Australia regarding goods and occupations, and for that purpose, to adopt the Mutual Recognition Act 1992 of the Commonwealth (and any amendments made to it before this Act commences) as a law of the State.’

No. 2 Page 1, lines 20 to 29 (clause 3)—Leave out the definition of ‘participating jurisdiction’.

No. 3 Page 2, lines 1 to 3 (clause 3)—Leave out subclause (2).

No. 4 Page 2, lines 8 to 17 (clause 4)—Leave out subclauses (2), (3) and (4) and insert new subclause as follows:

‘(2) The adoption under this Act has effect for a period commencing on the day on which this Act commences (but not so as to give effect to any adopted provision before that provision commences under section 2 of the Commonwealth Act) and ending on the fifth anniversary of—

(a) the day fixed under section 2 of the Commonwealth Act; or

(b) if more than one day is fixed under that section—the earlier or earliest of those days.’

No. 5 Page 2, lines 18 to 33 (clause 5)—Leave out the clause.

No. 6 Page 2, lines 33 to 35 (clause 6)—Leave out the clause.

No. 7 Page 3, lines 4 to 11 (clause 8)—Leave out the clause.

No. 8 Page 3—After line 11 insert new clause as follows:

‘Expiry of Act

9. This Act expires at the end of the period for which the Commonwealth Act is adopted under section 4.’

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council’s amendments be agreed to.

The amendments were discussed thoroughly in another place and consensus was arrived at. Great minds have laboured

long on this and I am not disposed to argue with those great minds, so I urge the Committee to accept the amendments.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Obviously, the Opposition is very pleased with the amendments made in another place. This Bill does not pass all rights over to the Commonwealth; it means that this State does have a say in its future. The Bill came before us on two previous occasions and this will be its final disposition. We believed that the Bill contained some fundamental flaws. We did not believe it was the right of this Parliament to pass our rights off to the Commonwealth, and indeed that has been modified in the amendments that we see before us.

So, whilst we do have some reservations (which have been debated fully) about what may occur under mutual recogni-

tion, as the Deputy Premier has pointed out, we do believe that these amendments make it quite clear as to how far we will cooperate in extending mutual recognition. We have reached a fine balance. The amendments before us are consistent with those that have been successfully moved in Victoria. We also believe that a similar stance will be taken in Western Australia when that Government considers the Bill. So at least three States will be of common mind on this subject, and for that we are grateful. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 6 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 7 September 1993

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

2. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. Did the Engineering and Water Supply Department pay to Treasury in a single year the payment of \$17.9 million and if not, how much was paid?

2. What other payments were made by the department to extinguish short term borrowings by 29 June 1993?

3. What amount was borrowed by the department to fund these payments to the Treasury and to extinguish short term borrowings?

4. What borrowings has the department made in July 1993?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. The planned debt repayment of \$17.9 million contained within the budget for 1992-93 was not paid. The principal reason for this was the decrease in water sales of some \$25.2 million arising from the unseasonable climatic conditions prevailing throughout the year.

2. A short term borrowing facility of \$5 million was utilised by the department at various times throughout the year. Details of short term borrowings were as follows:

Date Borrowed	Date Repaid
15 October 1992	15 January 1993
15 January 1993	15 April 1993
15 April 1993	29 June 1993

The short term facility was extinguished on 29 June 1993. No other short term borrowings were outstanding at year end.

3. The short term borrowings were extinguished as sufficient working capital became available to the department.

4. No borrowings were made by the department in July 1993.

3. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. Why did it take from 1984 to 1992-93 for the Engineering and Water Supply Department to settle a claim of \$0.9 million in respect of flooding in Gawler Place?

2. Did the amount paid include interest and, if so, what was the principal, the interest rate and the amount?

3. Apart from the amount paid to settle the claim what other costs were incurred by the department?

4. Did the department receive legal advice and if so, from what source and at what cost?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. The incident occurred 14 June 1984. A claim was not received until 30 October 1986. The issues were of a complicated nature and concerned liability and costs relating to required upgrading to the building by the Adelaide City Council. The matter of liability was initially disputed by the department based on extensive testing. The matter was forwarded to the Crown Solicitors Office to act on behalf of the Minister. As part of the legal process, large delays were experienced with correspondence from the legal representative of the Plaintiff to the Crown Solicitors Office. A Supreme Court Hearing on 25 January 1993 was held to determine if the department was liable for costs associated with fire service upgrading of the building. As a result a negotiated settlement was reached.

2. Amount Claimed—30 October 1986	\$801 577.02
Negotiated Payout (Principal)	\$491 559.18
Interest Payable	\$307 224.49
(simple interest 6.25 yrs @ 10%)	
TOTAL PAYOUT	\$798 783.67

3. The Department incurred costs associated with testing, consulting engineers and property consultancy of approximately \$20 000.

Legal costs associated with this matter resulted in costs of approximately \$25 000.

4. The department received legal advice from the Crown Solicitors Office. No costs have been incurred by the Department for this service.

4. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What is the Engineering and Water Supply Department's policy on claims for flooding and damage from burst or leaking pipes and mains?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Engineering and Water Supply Department currently has responsibility for approximately 24 000 kilometres of water mains and 6 900 kilometres of sewer mains within the State of South Australia. With such a large infrastructure it is impossible to eliminate all risks associated with such systems.

The department's policy regarding damage resulting from floodings and burst or leaking pipes is based on Crown Solicitor opinion and legal precedent in relation to such events. The department will deny liability unless it can be shown that the Minister, his servants or his agents had been negligent.

If the department is found to be negligent in the performance of its duty and damages result, the department would pay reasonable compensation.

In some instances the department may not consider itself liable but may consider an ex-gratia payment based on the principle of 'social justice'.

5. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. How many claims against the Engineering and Water Supply Department for flooding and damage from burst or leaking pipes and mains are outstanding from each financial year?

2. What is the estimated total of these claims and what provision was made for them in the accounts at 30 June 1993?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Engineering and Water Supply Department receives numerous claims every year for reimbursement of costs for damage caused by sewer floodings and burst or leaking pipes. These claims are generally from insurance companies who have paid out claims to policy holders. Liability in almost all cases is denied by the Department.

There were seven claims outstanding as of 30 June 1993. In six of the seven cases liability has been denied. In the Gawler Place claim some liability has been accepted and the matter was settled in July 1993.

No liability has been accepted for the damage to the De Corso property at Gorge Road Newton, however the Chief Executive has agreed to an ex-gratia payment for reasonable losses accruing to the owner beyond that covered by household insurance.

2. Since 30 June 1993 the claim for damages at Gawler Place was settled for \$798 783.67. A provision of \$1 000 000 had been allocated with an additional amount of \$100 000 for costs.

A claim has yet to be received from the De Corso event, however provision has been set aside to cover a reasonable claim.

Provisions have not been set aside for the events which the Department has not accepted liability. To date such claims amount to \$2 130.

6. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. How many residential properties incurred additional water charges;

2. What percentage of all residential properties incurred additional water charges;

3. What percentage of all residential water rates is derived from additional water charges;

4. How much in total was charged in additional water charges on residential properties; and

5. How much in total was charged for water rates and additional water charges on residential properties?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

- \$305 710.
- 66 per cent.
- 38 per cent.
- \$36 315 677.
- \$95 105 195.

LEADED PETROL

7. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. Was South Australia represented at the meeting in Canberra held during the week commencing Monday 27 July 1993 on lead in petrol and, if so, what was this State's submission on the phasing out of leaded petrol?

2. Was a national phase out timetable adopted?

3. Did the meeting consider a position paper that canvassed financial incentives to change consumer behaviour to reduce the demand for leaded petrol and in particular, were an increase in the excise on leaded petrol or the introduction of a tax on the lead additive considered?

4. Would the introduction of financial incentives increase the cost of leaded petrol?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The answers are as follows:

1. South Australia was represented at the meeting on lead in petrol held in Canberra on 29 July 1993 by myself and an officer of the Department of Environment and Land Management's Environment Protection Office. This Government's submission to the meeting was that the hazard to the community, particularly to young children, posed by lead in petrol is serious and requires urgent action.

Current information on blood levels and associated lead-in-air concentrations is needed to ascertain the extent of community exposure and to monitor the effect of intervention programs. This needs to be obtained through selective surveys funded jointly by government, industry and health organisations.

South Australia supported the phase out of lead in petrol as quickly as possible within technical and economic constraints. The demand placed on the operators of the Port Stanvac refinery to reduce lead in super petrol to 0.3 grams/Litre (g/L) by the end of 1994 was re-iterated on the basis that the octane level of that petrol could be dropped from 97 to 96.

Octane number is a measure of the energy rating of petrol, based on the fuel value of 100 per cent iso-octane being 100; iso-octane is a common component of petrol.

The South Australian Government strongly urged a renewed joint government, industry and motor association campaign to promote use of ULP in pre-1986 cars which can satisfactorily use that fuel.

2. The representatives of neither government nor industry were able to adopt a formal, binding national agreement at that meeting due to the nature of the forum. Nevertheless, a national phase out timetable was agreed in principle for formal adoption by each of the State and Commonwealth Governments through the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council protocols.

Resolutions of the meeting included:

- there was agreement that petrol sourced from Victoria and New South Wales move to 0.2 g/L at 96 RON by the end of 1994 and that other States move to 0.3 g/L at 96 RON by 1994 and aim to get to 0.2 g/L by 1995 provided that octane demand can be significantly reduced. It is encouraging to see that oil companies have given a commitment to move towards 0.2 g/L by the end of 1995. A total phase-out should be achieved as soon as practical.
- The impact of a reduction of the RON rating below 97 be further assessed between now and 1994.

3. Part of the discussions at the Canberra meeting included reference to financial incentives to change consumer behaviour in favour of using ULP instead of leaded petrol.

The importance of a price differential was emphasised by many participants. The economic and equity implications were noted. The importance of an incentive element in a total package and the fact that the cost of manufacture of leaded fuel was now greater than that of unleaded was recognised. Price differentials of between 2¢ and 5¢ per litre were canvassed. While the community groups, Victoria and some industry groups strongly urged the case for price differentials, some State and Territory Governments, including South Australia, emphasised their opposition.

Not only would it discriminate against the owners of older cars which cannot use ULP and who also tend to be those who can least afford that burden, it may have other detrimental affects. Such a price difference may tempt inappropriate use of ULP in cars which cannot use it, with the possibility of causing engine damage and increased exhaust emissions.

Introduction of a tax on the lead additive was also considered and that has a philosophical advantage of being directed at the pollutant of concern. Further research into the overall effectiveness of such a strategy will be undertaken by the Commonwealth government, as well as the suitability of replacing lead compounds with other fuel additives. Known alternatives have associated environmental and health disadvantages, which must be evaluated completely before they can be encouraged.

The education program launched this year is still in its early stages and the full effects are still to be realised. Education and discussions with industry to reduce the lead levels in petrol are the key areas where South Australia is putting its effort.

4. A price differential between ULP and leaded petrol does not necessarily have to increase the cost of the latter but a decrease in the cost of ULP was also proposed at the Canberra meeting.

However, the latter strategy does not necessarily encourage the community to minimise its total use of a non-renewable energy

source. It also could increase other pollutants in the atmosphere through more fuel being used.

8. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. What percentage of leaded petrol was sold in South Australia in each of the years 1989-90 to 1992-93 and what percentages are anticipated for 1993-94 and 1994-95?

2. What action has the Government taken to hasten the phasing out of leaded petrol?

3. Has the Government revised its policy since the National Health and Medical Research Council lowered the target for blood lead level of Australian children?

4. What is the target level and has this State adopted it?

5. What were the sales of leaded petrol in each of the years 1989-90 to 1992-93 and what sales are anticipated in 1993-94 and 1994-95?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The percentage of leaded petrol sold in South Australia was 79 per cent in 1989-90; 74 per cent in 1990-91; 69 per cent in 1991-92; and 65 per cent in 1992-93. The forecast figures for 1993-94 and 1994-95 are 50 per cent and 45 per cent respectively.

These figures were obtained from the Australian Institute of Petroleum and the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

2. The phase-out of leaded petrol is a function of not only the replacement of older cars which cannot use unleaded petrol (ULP) by new cars but also the use of ULP in pre-1986 cars which can run on that fuel. All petrol engined cars made after February 1986 are designed to use only unleaded petrol.

This Government began promoting the use of ULP wherever possible in 1985 by conducting a prolonged publicity campaign and providing fact sheets on use of ULP to the public.

The Unleaded Petrol Act, 1985 required all sales outlets of petrol to provide ULP as well as Super (leaded) petrol. Although more expensive to produce, ULP was required by law to be sold at no greater price than super petrol. This initiative penalised neither those who could not afford to replace their pre 1986 cars, nor those who were able to use ULP in their older cars and chose to do so on environmental grounds.

More recently this Government, through the Office of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA), has supported the World Environment Day launch of the joint Commonwealth EPA and Australian Institute of Petroleum campaign to encourage use of ULP in appropriate pre 1986 cars. Lists of vehicles capable of using ULP were distributed to service stations throughout the State.

The Government has also acted to reduce lead in leaded petrol. The Office of the EPA has been negotiating with Mobil for the past twelve months on this issue. It has now been agreed that super petrol produced at Port Stanvac Refinery will contain not more than 0.4 g/litre of lead by December 1994 following installation of an additional \$11 million plant and with possible reduction of the octane rating the lead content will be reduced to 0.3 g/litre in that time.

3. The Government was aware that the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) was revising its policy on lead and began to examine ways of reducing community lead exposure even before the NHMRC decision was made.

In that respect, the Government has not needed to revise its policy in the light of the new NHMRC goal for lead in blood.

4. Although NHMRC has recommended a goal for lead in blood, no timeframe will be proposed until the overall community effects, including social and economic effects have been assessed. It has been general practice to adopt NHMRC recommendations in South Australia.

The recommendation issued on 2 June 1993 is summarised below.

GOAL

To achieve for all Australians a blood lead level of below 10 ug/dL (micrograms/decilitre). There is particular urgency in reaching this level in children aged 1-4 years because of the adverse effects of lead exposure on intellectual development.

TARGET

Council acknowledged that achievement of this goal would be facilitated through the establishment of target dates. These are to be set by Council at its 116th Session (November 1993) after consideration of the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology Report 'Reviving Australian Guidelines for Lead—An Assessment of Impacts (Final Report)'.

5. The sales of leaded petrol for the years 1989-90 to 1992-93 and the forecast sales for 1993-94 and 1994-95 are tabulated below,

as supplied by the Australian Institute of Petroleum. The forecast figures are from the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics, based on maximum use of unleaded petrol by the pre 1986 fleet and average new vehicle replacement rates.

YEAR	LEADED PETROL (Megalitres)
1989-90	1176
1990-91	1075
1991-92	976
1992-93	932
1993-94	752
1994-95	681

9. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

- Are tests conducted on the level of lead in soil and, if so—
 - what determines the areas to be tested; and
 - what country and metropolitan sites have been tested during 1993 and what was the range of readings in each area?
- What is regarded as the safe level of contamination, when was this level established and is it being reconsidered in view of the National Health and Medical Research Council's decision to lower the target for blood lead level in children?
- What action is taken if a reading exceeds the safe level?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I suggest the following reply:

- Tests of the level of lead in soil would usually be undertaken in order to evaluate the risk to human health or to the environment posed by the presence of the lead as a result of past or present land use (eg battery manufacture or breaking).

In October 1990 the Minister for Environment and Planning authorised the distribution of Planning Practice Circular 17 (Land Contamination) which requires planning authorities to consider the past uses of property for which they are assessing development applications. Where the previous use of a site indicates any potentially contaminating activity, the Council or State planners are advised to seek a comment from the EPO prior to further consideration of the application.

In July 1991 the Minister for Environment and Planning produced an Advisory Circular on Contaminated Land which required government agencies contemplating the purchase or sale of property to consider the past use of the site and the potential for contamination to have occurred on the property, prior to the transaction proceeding.

Where the site history indicates that potentially contaminating activities have been undertaken on the property, the agencies are advised to apply for an approval from the Office of the EPA for the transaction to proceed. The EPA liaises with the South Australian Health Commission and the Engineering and Water Supply Department regarding the likely risk to human health and to surface and groundwater resources respectively.

Both circulars can result in testing of a site for the presence of the particular elements and chemicals indicated by the site history. Lead has been found to be a common contaminant of property in South Australia due to past smelting operations in this State and its relatively widespread industrial use. The results of site assessments undertaken in accordance with the Minister's Advisory Circular and Planning Practice Circular No 17 are forwarded to the EPA for assessment.

Due to the limited resources available to provide a detailed breakdown of the limited information held by the EPA, only an overview of the distribution of sites tested for lead is available. Generally, contamination of sites is caused by industrial activity, waste disposal and certain other commercial activities such as scrapyards. Consequently, former industrial sites in locations such as Brompton, Bowden and Port Adelaide have revealed high levels of lead following site assessment.

The levels of lead have ranged from a few parts per million to very high levels of the order of thousands of parts per millions that may result from the sampling of a 'hot spot', eg where there is a number of lead battery casings.

2. The concept of 'investigation' or 'trigger' level has been developed by the South Australian Health Commission in conjunction with the National Health and Medical Research Council (NH&MRC) and the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC) to facilitate the assessment of contaminated sites. An investigation level is the concentration of a contaminant above which further appropriate investigation and evaluation will be required. Site specific evaluation of the available data and proposed land uses will be required to determine whether single, occasional or typical values in excess of the investigation will

prompt further investigation. This approach is in accordance with the National Guidelines for the Assessment and Management of Contaminated Sites published by ANZECC and NH&MRC in January 1992.

Levels slightly in excess of the investigation levels do not imply unacceptability or levels likely to pose a significant health risk. Once the further investigations are completed, a site specific health risk assessment will be required to determine the presence of health risk and, if present, its nature and degree.

The level of contamination at which some remediation of a site is considered necessary in order to protect human health or the environment is the 'response level' and is based on the a site-specific assessment and therefore varies from site to site.

The concept of a 'safe level' of contamination fails to take into account the conditions and uses of each site (such as the exposure conditions and the biological availability of the particular form of lead) and so a blanket approach has not been adopted in this State.

The relationship between blood lead levels and soil lead levels is complex and is presently under extensive investigation in South Australia and elsewhere in view of the recent changes to the NH&MRC blood lead guidelines.

3. In circumstances where the level of lead in soil on a site exceeds the investigation level (presently 300 parts per million), then the following matters may be taken into account in deciding whether remediation of the site is necessary:

- proposed land use;
- potential child occupancy;
- potential environmental effects such as leaching into groundwater;
- single or multiple contaminants;
- depth of contamination;
- level and distribution of contamination;
- bioavailability of the contaminants;
- toxicological assessment of the contaminants;
- physical chemistry properties of the contaminants;
- state of the site surface, eg paved, grassed or exposed;
- potential exposure pathways; and
- uncertainties with the sampling methodology and toxicological assessment.

When investigation of a lead affected site warrants a response, remediation of the site to reduce the risk to health and/or the environment is undertaken. The Port Pirie Remediation Program is an example of the process and has been recognised both nationally and internationally for the scale and expertise involved and also for the development of management guidelines and procedures.

10. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

- What determines the sites selected for tests of total suspended particulate lead?
- What tests were made in 1992-93 and what were the ranges of each site?
- What is regarded as a safe level and is the safe level in South Australia the same or lower than the National Health and Medical Research Council's goal and if not, why not?
- Will the safe level be revised in view of the National Health and Medical Research Council's decision to lower the target for blood lead level in children?
- What action is taken if a reading exceeds the safe level?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. The principal source of lead in air in major cities is lead from petrol, thus local lead levels are closely related to traffic density.

Total suspended particulate lead levels are monitored primarily near arterial roads with high to medium traffic densities. Two sites well away from major roads are monitored to represent more general community exposure.

2. Seven sites were monitored on a continuous basis in 1992 by the Office of the Environment Protection Authority, namely:

- Thebarton Primary School site, near the intersection of South Road and Henley Beach Road;
- Parkside Primary School site, near the intersection of Young Street and Glen Osmond Road;
- Dulux site, Commercial Road, Port Adelaide;
- Wilderness School site along Northcote Terrace, Medindie;
- Road Safety Centre site, along Port Road, Adelaide; and
- Hampstead Centre site off Folland Avenue, Northfield.

The sampling method involves collection of a sample over 24 hours every six days to obtain a representative, unbiased result.

Lead levels are tabulated for 1992. These are expressed as three month running means in micrograms per cubic metre, as required by the internationally adopted protocol.

Monitoring Site	Range
Thebarton	1.13- 1.98
Parkside	0.44- 1.54
Port Adelaide	0.69- 1.06
Medindie	0.43- 0.99
RSC, Port Road	0.43- 0.83
Hampstead Centre	0.10- 0.34
Kensington Gardens	0.11- 0.26

3. South Australia has adopted the National Health and Medical Research Council goal for atmospheric lead, which is 1.5 micrograms per cubic metre, averaged over a three month calendar period. The results show that only one site frequently exceeds this goal and that is the site of highest traffic density.

4. The goal will be revised once the National Health and Medical Research Council has recommended a new goal for atmospheric lead. Pending that recommendation, the criterion used in South Australia will remain at the current level.

5. The NHMRC recommends goals which should be aimed for, rather than specifying safe levels of pollutants in the atmosphere. The key issue is the level of lead in blood rather than the indirect health measure of lead in air.

Through the introduction of unleaded petrol in 1985, the average air lead concentration has dropped by 28% since 1988 and will continue to decrease as unleaded petrol becomes the predominant petrol used.

Only two metropolitan sites recorded lead levels in excess of the MHMRC goal in 1992 compared with eight in 1988. Of those two sites, only one site regularly records levels above the goal and that site is less than ten metres from an intersection with extremely high traffic density.

The requirement for a reduction of lead added to super petrol from 0.65 grams/litre to 0.3 grams/litre by December 1994 will ensure that the concentration of lead in air will continue to drop as quickly as is practically achievable.

FACS FUNDING

11. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What distinction is made between funding for emergency relief and financial counselling within the Department of Family and Community Services and given that there is a distinction between the two services and the demand for financial counselling in the non-Government sector, why is there not commensurate funding for non-Government financial counselling services?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS:

The distinction between funding for emergency relief and financial counselling is that:

- funding for Emergency Relief in the non-Government sector is provided by the Commonwealth Department of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Services;
- F.A.C.S. does not provide funding for Emergency Relief through its Family and Community Development Program;
- funding for financial counselling in the non-Government sector is provided by the State and Commonwealth Governments;
- the allocation for financial counselling for 1993 from the Family and Community Development Program is \$111 890 for the four direct services and \$25 650 for policy development and training;

The following issues are being addressed regarding future funding for financial counselling in the non-Government sector:

- coordination of Commonwealth and State/Territory Financial Counselling Services is currently being examined by the Income Security Sub-Committee of Social Welfare Administrators;
- F.A.C.S. proposes to develop a plan to promote a range of responses to people in poverty as part of its Anti-Poverty funding policy;
- financial counselling services are seen as a vital component of the range of services for people in poverty;
- it is intended to involve the non-government sector extensively in the development of the plan.

TAB

28. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What is the reason for the increase from \$76 000 in 1990-91 to \$101 000 in 1991-92 in directors' fees of the SA Totalizer Agency Board and who approved the increase and when?

2. Who are the directors of the TAB and associated boards and what remuneration is paid to each?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:

1. There was no increase in SA TAB Directors' fees from 1990-91 to 1991-92. SA TAB Directors' fees for both 1990-91 and 1991-92 were \$40 000.

The amounts referred to in the question relate to the consolidated amounts which reflect both SA TAB and Festival City Broadcasters Limited Directors' Fees.

2. Directors of TAB as at 30 June, 1993 and remuneration:

Mr B Cousins (from 16/3/93)	\$12 356 pa
Mr C S Hayes	\$ 9 969 pa
Dr R C Morton	\$ 7 845 pa
Hon J D Corcoran	\$ 7 845 pa
Mr M G Pickhaver (from 20/5/93)	\$ 7 845 pa
Ms C S Costello (from 24/6/93)	\$ 7 845 pa

Directors of Festival City Broadcasters Limited as at 30 June, 1993 and remuneration:

Mr T A Sheridan	\$12 000 pa
Mr R W Lloyd	\$ 9 500 pa
Mr P R Shergold	\$ 7 000 pa
Hon J D Corcoran	\$ 7 000 pa
Dr R C Morton	\$ 7 000 pa
Mr C S Hayes	\$ 7 000 pa
Mr B Cousins	\$ 7 000 pa

NATIVE TREES

36. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What research has been undertaken by Government agencies into the type and number of Australian native trees in the Adelaide Hills, including such districts as Strathalbyn and Finnis and what were the findings?

2. Are any of the trees diseased and, if so, to what extent and what action can be taken to save them?

3. Has the salt level risen thereby affecting the trees?

4. What new plantings of Australian native trees have been or will be undertaken in the Hills area during this and subsequent years and, if none, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. There have been two major botanical studies conducted by the Government in the Mount Lofty Ranges. The first, which was published in 1981, examined the main blocks of remnant vegetation in the central and north-eastern parts of the Ranges.

The second study, in 1986, involved an intensive survey of the native vegetation from the southern tip of the Fleurieu Peninsula to Lyndoch in the north. The area surveyed included the Strathalbyn and Finnis districts.

These surveys have provided a detailed description of the types of plants found in the various blocks of remnant vegetation in the region, including the species of trees, and a map has been produced to show the distribution of the different vegetation types.

Since the 1986 study, information has continued to be collected on the vegetation by the Department of Environment and Land Management from inspectors of applications for clearance or for protecting areas under Heritage Agreements.

2. Native trees may suffer from a variety of diseases caused by viral, bacterial or fungal infections. Many also suffer from attack by insects, such as borers, or sap-suckers which attack the leaves.

At the present time there are some areas of the Mount Lofty Ranges, including the Strathalbyn and Finnis districts, where a large proportion of the foliage of many trees has died. This condition is brought about by a small insect, commonly known as 'lerps'. These insects are mainly affecting species such as River red gums, Blue gums and Pink gums.

While these insects are always present on trees, outbreaks of very high populations do occur from time to time. It is only in times of these outbreaks that widespread damage to individual trees is noticed. These outbreaks usually last one autumn-winter period with regrowth of new leaves in the following spring. There may be a small outbreak the following year and in some instances trees will not recover.

Chemical control of lerp populations is not feasible on any large scale. Individual trees can be protected by either surface spray or through trunk implantations of systemic insecticide.

3. 1989 figures produced by the State Dryland Salinity Coordinating Committee showed that approximately 2 500 ha of land in the Adelaide Hills is affected by salinity. Some tree deaths may be attributed to rising salinity levels.

Work is currently being undertaken by CSIRO, the Department of Engineering and Water Supply and the Department of Primary Industries, South Australia to address this problem.

The National Landcare Program, announced on 22 August has a component to address the issue of dryland salinity in the Adelaide Hills and a number of local land-care groups are actively addressing the problem through revegetation programs.

4. A number of Government agencies as well as non-government groups and individuals are involved in planting native trees in the Adelaide Hills.

Through the Government's Rural Tree Planting Program some half a million trees have been planted this year. This tree planting program will be continued in future years.

As well as tree planting, the Government is involved in the direct seeding of native species. Through this method a variety of local native shrub and tree species are used to establish areas of valuable wildlife habitat.

On a State scale the Government, through the Natural Resources Council, is developing a State Revegetation Strategy to enable coordination of the considerable tree planting effort that is occurring State-wide.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE

38. Mr BECKER:

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle, registered VQK-427 attending to at the Erindale Shopping Centre, Kensington on Monday 19 July 1993 at 10.30 a.m.?

2. Who was the female passenger in the motor vehicle?

3. Why did the driver continue to try and enter the carpark through the wrong entrance, thereby causing traffic problems to other motorists using the carpark?

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

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

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. For the purchase of lunches for a group of officers attending firearm training at Stonyfell Pistol Range.

2. Female member of the Police Force attending the training session.

3. The male driver was unfamiliar with the shopping centre and upon entering found that it was an exit road only. Due to the problems in reversing into moving traffic, he decided to continue and park the car.

4. The South Australian Police Department, Traffic Operations Group at Holden Hill.

5. The motor vehicle was being used in the normal course of duty by members of the South Australia Police Department.

LOBBY GROUP FUNDING

40-52. Mr BECKER asked—the Premier; Deputy Premier; Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations representing the Attorney-General; Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations; Minister of Business and Regional Development representing the Minister of Transport Development; Minister of Environment and Natural Resources; Minister of Education, Employment and Training; Minister of Public Infrastructure; Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety; Minister of Environment and Land Management representing the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage; Minister of Business and Regional Development; Minister of Health, Family and Community Services; Minister of Primary Industries:

1. Which political lobby groups receive funding from the Minister or departments or agencies under the Minister's control to pursue their activities of presentation and representation to the Government?

2. How many political lobby groups not receiving Government funding are registered with each department or agency under the Minister's portfolio?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:

1. The term political lobby group is one that cannot easily be defined (for example it could cover a wide range of community groups that receive grants from the Government) and the effort involved in answering the honourable member's question cannot be justified.

2. If the honourable member would care to be more specific as to the types of groups he is interested in then it may be possible to answer the question.

SCHOOL GRANTS

53. Mr BECKER:

1. How many applications for 'Back to School Grants' were sought by the following schools and what was the amount in each case—

- Camden Primary School;
- Henley Beach Primary School;
- Netley Primary School;
- Plympton High School;
- West Beach Primary School;
- Flinders Park Primary School;
- Kidman Park Primary School;
- Kilmara Junior School;
- Lockleys North Primary School;
- Lockleys Primary School;
- Salesian College;
- Thebarton Senior College;
- Torrensville Primary School; and
- Underdale High School?

2. Which schools were granted assistance and how much was granted in each case?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Applications for 'Back to School Grants' were not sought from schools. The funds were allocated on the basis of percentage of School Card holders moderated by the condition of school assets and any recent or proposed major expenditure on asset upgrading.

Of the list of 14 schools provided by Mr Becker two are private schools (Kilmara Junior School, Salesian College) which were ineligible for grants under the program.

Of the remaining 12 schools, Torrensville Primary School received a grant of \$30 000.

KINDERGARTEN FRAUD

55. Mr BECKER:

1. How many instances of fraud by kindergarten treasurers were detected in the year ended 30 June 1993, at which kindergartens and for how much in each case and how do these instances compare with those in the years ended 30 June 1991 and 1992?

2. What action has been taken by the Children's Services Office and when to reduce the incidence of fraud?

3. How much has been recovered and what Police action was taken in each case?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

1. One incidence of fraud was detected in the year ending June 1993 at the Ballara Park Kindergarten. The suspected fraud was \$11 700. Two cases were reported in the year ending June 1992 at Woodville Gardens and Lantana Kindergarten. The suspected fraud was \$2 463 and \$700 respectively. One case was reported in the year ending June 1991 at Settlers Farm Kindergarten. The suspected fraud was \$660.

2. The Children's Services Office produced an information booklet in 1988 'An Introduction to Kindergarten Accounting'. This booklet advises the Incorporated Management Committees who control Preschool operating funds how to set up a proper bookkeeping system. It contains details of Bank Reconciliations, Treasurers Reports to Management Committees and End of Year Financial Reports to the CSO. The booklet has been updated and reissued to centres a number of times. Sound accounting practices, if adhered to, will minimise fraud risk.

The CSO has required audited financial statements within three months of the end of each calendar year. This procedure has in some cases led to the detection of fraud.

The CSO has conducted numerous financial training workshops for Preschool Centre Directors and Honorary Treasurers. In April

1993 as a result of the Ballara Park case, a memo was sent to every kindergarten listing 15 procedures a Management Committee should follow in order to prevent fraud. This memo also advised steps to take if fraud is suspected.

3. To date approximately \$12 400 has been recovered. In all cases the Police were advised by the respective Management Committee. The Police make a decision, on the evidence available, whether to instigate court proceedings.

With respect to the above cases the CSO is advised that:

Ballara Park—still in the hands of the Police.

Woodville Gardens—still with the Police, no action to date.

Lantana—no action taken.

Settlers Farm—matter went to court but case not proven beyond reasonable doubt.

PACIFIC

56. Mr BECKER:

1. How many persons were invited by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to the opening of the musical 'South Pacific', how much was paid in airfares and accommodation in respect of each guest and why were persons from interstate invited?

2. What class of airfare was offered and by whom?

3. Why was Mr Alan Bond of Perth invited and what contribution can he make to the success of the production?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. 460 invitations were issued to the opening night of 'South Pacific' in Adelaide. Those invited included representatives of the Government, the Opposition, the media, arts industry and staff. A number of people were invited from interstate and overseas to attend the opening night. Airfares and accommodation for the opening night were provided for four people who were all journalists from interstate. The total amount paid in respect of their airfares was \$1 752. Journalists were invited from interstate to help promote the show which, following the Adelaide season, tours to Brisbane, Perth, Melbourne and Sydney. Also invited from interstate were representatives from the Victorian Arts Centre, Perth Theatre Trust, Queensland Performing Arts Trust and the Victorian State Opera. These people were invited because these organisations are involved in presenting 'South Pacific' at their risk in Melbourne, Perth, Brisbane and Sydney. The people from these organisations paid for their own airfares and accommodation.

2. Economy airfares were provided to the four interstate journalists and were paid for by the production of 'South Pacific'.

3. Mr Alan Bond came as the guest of Ms Diana Bliss, a Sydney theatrical producer. Ms Bliss was invited by the Gordon/Frost organisation who are the co-producers of 'South Pacific' with the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. Mr Bond was not invited in his own right.

57. Mr BECKER:

1. Who underwrote and arranged the estimated \$2 500 000 to finance the revival of 'South Pacific'?

2. How much has been contributed by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to stage this production and from what source did it come?

3. How many personnel are employed in staging the production and how many are from overseas and South Australia?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. The finance for the production of 'South Pacific' was arranged by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. Contributions have been made by the Queensland Performing Arts Trust, Perth Theatre Trust, Victorian Arts Centre, Victorian State Opera, Gordon/Frost Organisation and a number of private investors.

2. The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust's contribution to the staging of 'South Pacific' was \$557 000 which was funded from the Trust's working capital reserves.

3. The employment provided by the show can be divided into three components.

Firstly, there were approximately 50 people employed in the construction of the set for 'South Pacific'. The sets were manufactured by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust at its workshops at Dry Creek.

Secondly, there is a permanent company of fifty people that tour with the show. This is made up of actors, production administration, stage management, touring technical crew and principal musicians. Three of these people are from overseas.

Thirdly, in each city seventy seven others are employed. These

are four children, ten child supernumeries, fourteen adult supernumeries, thirty stage hands and nineteen musicians. All of these are Australians.

BEACH EROSION AT WEST BEACH

58. Mr BECKER:

1. What action does the Government propose to take with respect to beach erosion at the front of the West Beach Surf Life Saving Clubrooms and when will such works be completed?

2. What action has been taken in the past 12 months to remedy this problem and at what cost?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. I have been advised by the Coastal Management Branch of the Department of Environment and Land Management that beach erosion at the front of the West Beach Surf Life Saving Clubrooms is not likely to result in severe damage to the existing rock protection. The beach levels are low in the area at present as a result of the rough weather but they are expected to recover during calmer periods later in the year.

However, there are parts of the revetment between the Club rooms and West Beach Trust which have slumped and will require repair. The Coast Protection Board has programmed this work for the 1993-94 financial year.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

59. Mr BECKER:

1. Will the Government use, in the alpha-numero registration of motor vehicle number plates, a code for each Government department to enable the vehicle to be easily identified and the use of the vehicle understood if used outside normal office hours and if not, why not?

2. What would be the cost of implementing such a scheme over the normal two and a half years or 40 000 kilometre life of the vehicles?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:

1. There are approximately 20 000 vehicles registered under the present system of distinguishing government owned vehicles with blue-on-white number plates.

It would be possible for Government agencies to be issued a specific series of registration numbers that identify the organisation to which the vehicle has been allocated. However, the community could not readily identify the user department.

There would be some administrative costs and physical effort required to re-allocate registration numbers and attach new registration number plates to the existing fleet. The cost of replacement number plates is \$19 per vehicle and the cost of amending each vehicle record is \$17. Based on the current fleet of 20 000 vehicles the cost is estimated to be \$720 000.

State Fleet currently leases 2 500 vehicles to various agencies. The registration number of these vehicles would not accurately reflect the identity of the agency that has the use of the vehicle unless the plates were changed each time the vehicle was leased out. Such an arrangement would be costly, difficult to administer and impractical, both for the Department of Road Transport and State Fleet.

2. A phased approach of allocating a specific series of registration numbers to new vehicles as they are introduced to the government fleet could be introduced at no additional cost. Government number plates are currently made in advance and held in stock for issue. This would no longer be practical because of the extensive series of plates required. Plates would need to be manufactured after a number had been allocated to a vehicle. Some delays in the issue of plates to new vehicles may result.

Several Government Departments use windscreen decals to identify their sedans and station wagons. A similar system if adopted by all Government agencies who hold vehicles permanently or on long-term lease would be more meaningful to the casual observer than a series of registration numbers allocated for the use of individual agencies.

However, some agencies, particularly in the health and welfare areas may object to windscreen decals because of the need for privacy of their clientele. In addition, the 300 vehicles in the State Fleet short-term hire category are used by many agencies for ad hoc purposes and it would be impracticable to place a decal on the window of these vehicles.

ETSA

60. Mr BECKER:

1. Why is an advertisement appearing on television promoting the Electricity Trust of South Australia when the Trust has no competitors?
2. What were the total and breakdown costs of preparing, writing, recording and screening television advertising to ETSA for each of the years ended 30 June 1990 to 1992?
3. How much has been spent on ETSA television advertising in the year 1992-93?
4. Is advertising to be continued and, if so, what is the schedule?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. The television commercials aired since June 1993 are not promoting the Electricity Trust of South Australia. They are promoting the use of energy efficient electrical appliances and technologies.

This promotion is achieved by using the creative device of demonstrating the use of energy efficient processes by SA Industry (in particular the hospitality and manufacturing industry) and translating this to the audience experience.

ETSA is obliged to identify itself as the promoter of these concepts—hence the small identification at the end of the commercial, together with the phrase 'Electricity: Energy for Tomorrow'. This states that it is the product electricity, and by inference, the energy efficient applications of electricity, that is being promoted.

As for competition, ETSA is indeed the major (though not sole) retailer of electricity in this state but is not the sole energy supplier. ETSA operates in the 'energy market'.

ETSA's customers use electrical processes to achieve end results—motive power, heating, cooking, hot water production, lighting etc. If they can achieve the same end result with another fuel (with which they are more familiar, or, believe to be cheaper) they may seek to use that alternative energy fuel. Therefore, there are substitutes for ETSA's major product. As a consequence, ETSA is in a competitive market.

When this substitute is not as energy efficient or as cheap to operate as the equivalent electrical process which delivers the same or better end-benefits, then ETSA believes it has an obligation to make the community aware of this situation, with the most impact and in the most cost effective way.

2. A summary of costs for both television commercial production and media presentation is as follows:

(Please note, it has not been possible to separate the production costs into its individual components—preparing, writing and recording)

Year	Media	Production	Total
1989-90	\$179 435	\$ 31 648	\$ 211 083
1990-91	\$358 424	\$476 135	\$ 834 559
1991-92	\$697 620	\$431 768	\$1 129 388

3. In the last financial year the following has been spent on television advertising in relation to production and media purchase:

Year	Media	Production	Total
1992-93	\$159 550	\$403 814	\$563 364

4. In relation to the expenditure for 1993-94, the changes arising from the ETSA/EWS merger make it difficult to be exact. However, based on ETSA plans developed for 1993-94, the television advertising scheduled for the year is for promotion of energy efficient heating/cooling (in the form of reverse cycle air-conditioning) and commercial/domestic cooking. This will be achieved by using existing commercials.

Anticipated expenditure for 1993-94 television advertising is:

Year	Media	Production	Total
1993-94	\$150 000	\$100 000	\$250 000

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

62. Mr BECKER:

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQG-367 attending to whilst it was parked in Sandwyh Street, Wentworth, NSW, on Saturday 10 July 1993 at approximately 4.30 p.m.?

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

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

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The replies are as follows:

1. The vehicle concerned transported three clients of the Intellectual Disability Services Council to Wentworth, New South

Wales on a supported holiday from 10 July 1993 to 11 July 1993 inclusive. The clients had multiple disabilities and two IDSC officers accompanied them to provide for their personal care and support needs.

2. The vehicle concerned is registered to the Intellectual Disability Services Council Inc. (IDSC).

3. The vehicle was being used in accordance with Government regulations.

REGISTRAR OF MOTOR VEHICLES

64. Mr BECKER:

1. How many different pamphlets were distributed to clients of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles in the past 12 months?

2. Which companies or organisations used this service and what was the total amount of income received from each?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:

1. During the financial year ended 30 June 1993, 15 different pamphlets were distributed with registration renewal notices.

2. The companies using the advertising insert service were:

- Windscreens O'Brien
- Jarvis Ford
- Bob Moran Motors
- JM Insurance
- Ford Australia
- GIO Australia
- United Holden
- United Isuzu
- Yamaha Motor Cycles
- Brian Phillis Motors

Total income received by the Department of Road Transport from these companies was \$248 335.76. For reasons of commercial confidentiality it is not possible to indicate the income received by the Department from each company.

ADVERTISING LEAFLET

65. Mr BECKER:

1. Why was it necessary to include with motor vehicle registration renewal notices, a 'flier' from the Department of Road Transport entitled 'Yes, it's another insert'.

2. How many were printed?

3. Who designed and wrote it?

4. Why was it printed on only 50% recycled paper and what was the cost of printing, production, design, writing, etc.?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:

1. The insertion of advertising leaflets with registration renewal notices was introduced by the Department of Road Transport to assist in offsetting the ever increasing costs to the road user and the State generally. The funds raised by this scheme are used in the construction and maintenance of roads and for road safety purposes.

Shortly after the scheme was introduced, the department received a small number of complaints from the public. In the majority of cases, callers were satisfied when the benefits of the scheme had been explained to them. The department then decided to include an explanatory 'flier' with future renewal notices, in order to highlight the benefits provided by the scheme.

2. A total of 1 400 000 'fliers' were printed, which were designed by Revolutions Advertising and Marketing, with the text provided by the department.

3. On the use of 50 per cent recycled paper, I should first point out, that there are basically two main categories of paper—offset and coated. Coated paper, which was the paper used in the production of the 'flier', provides for better print and colour resolution and quicker drying times. On a print run of this size, the drying time of the ink is a critical factor in determining the machine running time. The greater the machine running time, the greater the cost. Although 100 per cent recycled paper would have been the preferred option, there are no recycled coated papers with greater than 50 per cent recycled content. Offset paper, which may have 100 per cent recycled content, is generally used as photocopy or letterhead paper. The use of offset paper, with a longer ink drying time, would have increased machine running time and provided an inferior quality product, at a greater cost than coated paper.

4. The production and design costs of the 'flier' totalled \$440, whilst the printing and delivery came to \$12 000. This represents an expenditure of less than one cent (0.89¢) for each 'flier'.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE**66. Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle, registered VQL-726 attending to whilst the car was parked in the private carpark situated behind 207 Sturt Road, Seacombe Gardens on Wednesday 14 July 1993 between the hours of 12.30 p.m. and 2.00 p.m. approximately?

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

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

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. The vehicle in question is registered to ETSA and was driven by one of ETSA's employees whose base of employment is at ETSA's St Marys Service Centre, 33 Ayliffes Road, St Marys.

2. ETSA's employee recalls parking the ETSA vehicle in the carpark at the rear of 207 Seacombe Road, Seacombe Gardens, prior to 12.30 p.m. on 14 July 1993. He was inspecting public lighting facilities in the immediate area and because this involved walking some distance from the vehicle, he believed the car-park provided more security than parking in the street.

3. The vehicle concerned was being used for legitimate ETSA purposes and no action in relation to this matter is contemplated.

SPEED CAMERAS**67. Mr BECKER:**

1. What studies have been undertaken into financial hardship caused to motorists by the fines resulting from photographic detection devices (speed cameras) and, if none, why not?

2. Will the Government consider the alternative community service order scheme for those unable to pay cash for such fines and, if not, why not?

3. Are the Police aware of any particular group of motorists affected by financial hardship and in particular, family groups, and if so, what assistance is available to such motorists?

4. How many persons in the past year failed to pay expiation notice fines resulting from detection by speed cameras?

5. What is the amount outstanding in speed camera fines for the past year and how does this amount compare with the previous year?

6. How many speeding motor vehicles were detected by speed cameras in the past year?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. The South Australian Police Department has not undertaken studies into financial hardship caused to motorists by the fines resulting from photographic detection devices (speed cameras). Such is not considered the responsibility of the South Australian Police.

2. Legislation currently allows for a community service order to be issued by the Court. A system of allowing community service to be served without the matter going to court, in addition to other matters, is presently before Cabinet.

3. The South Australian Police Department is not aware of specific sociological research regarding any particular group of motorists affected by financial hardship but section 65 of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act, 1988 is available to persons who are unable to pay fines due to financial hardship and other reasons. This provision is administered by the Courts Administrative Authority.

4. While the Commissioner's Annual Report has not yet been released and final substantiated figures are not available, 19 580 expiation notices for speeding were forwarded for prosecution where alleged offenders chose not to take advantage of the expiation system. Of those 19 580 offences, there were 16 586 convictions and 2 994 were either dismissed or withdrawn.

5. The current amount outstanding in fines resulting from the 16 586 convictions in 1992-93 and how this compares with the previous year is not known by the Police Department and would need to be obtained from the Courts Administrative Authority.

6. 207 480 offences were assessed for notice of issue.

OUTER HARBOR TERMINAL**70. Mr BECKER:**

1. How many overseas tourist ships have called at Outer Harbour Terminal and used the facilities in each of the past two years and how many passengers embarked or disembarked during the period?

2. What investigations have been undertaken in the past two years for alternative uses of the main terminal building at Outer Harbor?

3. What was the total cost of the terminal building and maintenance and repairs since erection and what is the current valuation of the premises?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:

1. Two cruise vessels (Achille Lauro and Royal Viking Sun) called at the Outer Harbor Terminal in 1991-92 and two (Maxim Gorkiy and Europa) called in 1992-93.

In these cases the terminal use was limited simply to custom's clearance at arrival and departure.

In all cases passengers on board at arrival disembarked for day tours and all re-embarked for ship departure on the same day.

It is understood that approximately 1 660 passengers were on board these vessels.

2. In 1992 DMH reviewed the use of the terminal over the previous ten years and, given the very limited use, a decision was taken to pursue alternative uses at the appropriate time. It is expected that Registrations of Interest for use of the Terminal will be sought from the community when the Transport Hub Project is further advanced.

3. The total cost of the terminal building (commissioned in 1973) was \$2.0 million. Details of maintenance and repair costs since that time are not readily available. However, \$31 000 was incurred for maintenance in 1991-92 and \$16 000 in 1992-93.

A current valuation is not available but is being sought to facilitate determination of rental for leasing options.

COOBER PEDY POLICE STATION

75. **Mr GUNN:** What stage have plans reached for the construction of the new Police station at Coober Pedy; when is it anticipated work will commence and what is the anticipated cost?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Planning for the proposed Coober Pedy complex has proceeded to the detailed design stage, with formal documentation of the construction project to commence shortly. It is anticipated that siteworks will commence in February 1994 and construction will be completed in December 1994. The total estimated cost of construction is \$2.980 million.

PORT AUGUSTA POLICE STATION

76. **Mr GUNN:** What stage have plans reached for the construction of the new Police station at Port Augusta; when is it anticipated work will commence and what is the anticipated cost?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Planning for the proposed Port Augusta complex has reached the stage of initial design and drawings. Planning and final design work is proceeding on the basis that the Police complex will be constructed on a portion of the former Education Department site on Flinders Terrace. It is anticipated that siteworks will commence in March 1994 and construction will be completed in July 1995. The total estimated cost of construction is \$5.4 million.

LITTER**80. Mr BECKER:**

1. Have KESAB, local government and other appropriate bodies reported to the Government an increase in the number of liquid paper board milk containers littering streets, beaches and in particular the River Torrens and Patawalonga and, if so, to what extent?

2. What education program will be introduced to stop such littering?

3. Will the Government introduce a 5¢ deposit on such milk cartons and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. No reports of an increase in the littering of liquid paperboard cartons have been received. However, Government and groups like KESAB have been concerned for some time of the percentage that this type of container represents of total litter in this State. KESAB and industry have in the past instigated public awareness campaigns. The awareness campaigns have been targeted at males between 17 and 26. This sector of the community has been found to cause the most littering of these containers. Results have not indicated a change in behaviour. For this reason, I have advised industry that additional steps should be taken to address flavoured milk.

Figures supplied by KESAB from surveys undertaken in February, May, August and November 92 have shown that these

containers represent an average of 7.3 per cent of total litter and 63.9 per cent of beverage related litter. These figures are by item count.

2. KESAB have advised that they have a program of ongoing activities which will be continued during the financial year which in part target liquidpaper board containers. Some of these activities are, on screen advertising in cinemas, Roadside litter clean-ups in conjunction with Correctional Services Department, their Waste Wise Van and the Royal Adelaide Show.

3. The Beverage Container Unit of the Office of the Environment Protection Authority has been conducting an appraisal of the Soft Sector (non-alcoholic) of the beverage industry which includes these products and containers. It is anticipated that a position paper detailing the options available will be presented for Government to consider by the end of September.

SEALING OF ROADS

83. **Mr GUNN:** How much does the Department of Road Transport intend allocating for the sealing of the following roads:

- (a) Roxby Downs to Andamooka;
- (b) Quorn to Hawker; and
- (c) Port Kenny to Pygery?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:

(a) Ongoing sealing of the Roxby Downs to Andamooka road is to be undertaken as funds permit until the full length of the road is sealed. \$250 000 has been allocated towards this work in the 1993-94 financial year.

(b) Final sealing of the Quorn to Hawker road was completed in 1984. The road is considered to be in fair condition.

(c) The Port Kenny to Pygery Road is a local road under the control and care of the District Councils of Le Hunte and Elliston. The State Government does not provide funds for the construction or maintenance of local roads. Any questions regarding current plans for the road should be directed to the relevant Councils.

BREACHES OF SPEED LIMIT

84. **Mr GUNN:** Is it the aim of the Police Force to issue as many notices for breaches of the speed limit as possible and are speed cameras located to maximise revenue or what other criteria are used?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is not the aim of the police force to issue as many notices for breaches of the speed limit as possible.

It is the aim to use traffic speed analyser devices as a tool, to create a perception in the minds of drivers who speed in excess of the legal limit, that they will be detected. The objective is to reduce the speed of traffic to within the legal limits, thereby reducing the frequency and severity of road accidents and resultant injuries.

Deployment of speed cameras is based on the following criteria:

- Black spots
- Complaints of speeding
- High speed/high volume locations
- Locations unsafe to work conventional radar.

As the vast majority of speed detection deployment is based on the 'black spot' criteria, the system is clearly weighted toward accident reduction and not revenue raising.

85. **Mr GUNN:** Who determines where speed cameras are located, how many are currently operating in South Australia and how often are they checked for accuracy?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Speed cameras are deployed by the Traffic Intelligence Centre according to a computerised system based on speed weighted vehicle collisions. These locations are overridden on occasions by operational police in order to treat roads that are the subject of speeding complaints, or to treat roads perceived to have a speeding problem and thus an accident potential.

There are 12 speed cameras that are the property of the Police Department, two of these are kept as spares. The speed cameras are checked for accuracy before and after every operating session.

GRANTS

89. **Mr VENNING:**

1. How many individuals or organisations have been awarded agribusiness innovation grants for which applications closed on 17 February 1993?

2. Who were the recipients of any such grants?

3. How much of the \$5 million fund has been allocated, will the remainder be allocated and, if so, when?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM:

1. I have approved the allocation of monies to six applicants from this fund:

2. Mr David Blessing

K.I. Trading Co

Primary Industries South Australia (Fisheries), matching an Industry contribution

Mr Ben McNamara

Galloway Yabbie Farm

South Australian Farmers Federation—Wool Trade Mission.

3. A total of \$225 000 has been approved for funding to the six applicants. The remaining funds will be allocated under the current RIADF call, for which advertisements appeared in the media in early August. The closing date for applications for this call will be 31 August 1993.

RESERVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

90. **Mr VENNING:** Has a farming sector representative on the Reserves Advisory Committee been removed from the Committee and has the vacancy been filled by a person with close links with the wilderness movement and, if so, will the Minister explain the reasons for this shift in the make-up of the Committee's representation?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The membership make-up of the Reserves Advisory Committee is not specified in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. There is thus no requirement for a specific representative from any sector of the community. The Committee's term of membership expired on 30 March 1993. One of the members, Mrs A. Gilfillan, a farmer from the Mid-North, indicated that she did not wish to be reappointed. Whilst the Committee's statutory membership was five persons an *ex officio* member was appointed in 1991 to assist with the Committee's heavy workload.

The Reserves Advisory Committee may be considerably revamped as a result of the current review into the national park system. The Government, as an interim measure, decided to reappoint the existing members who wished to continue to serve on the Committee for a further 12 month period pending the review's outcome. With the retirement of one member it was decided to appoint the *ex officio* member as a permanent member, bringing the Committee into line with the Act's membership provisions. The *ex officio* member is also responsible for the administration of the Wilderness Protection Act 1992. There are close linkages between this Act and the management of national parks. A Reserves Advisory Committee member with an understanding of both Acts is considered highly desirable, particularly as the first proposed proclaimed wilderness areas, all of which are in existing parks, are currently on exhibition for public comment.

GOOLWA BARRAGE

91. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:**

1. What tests have been carried out in the body of water up stream from the Goolwa Barrage since January 1992 to determine levels of:

- (i) nitrogen;
- (ii) phosphorus;
- (iii) salinity; and
- (iv) heavy metals?

2. How often has monitoring occurred in this time for each category?

3. How are the results expressed, what is the range in the results and the target level?

4. Have tests been carried out:

(a) on insect larvae to detect morphological abnormalities and what have been the results of these tests; and

(b) to determine the presence of toxins from algal blooms and, if so, which, if any toxins have been detected?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. Lake Alexandrina is the most significant body of water upstream from the Goolwa Barrage.

Regular monitoring of nitrogen, phosphorus, salinity and heavy metals are conducted at Milang which is the major water offtake in Lake Alexandrina.

2. Monitoring of all forms of nitrogen, phosphorus and heavy metals is conducted monthly.

Salinity is monitored weekly.

3. All results are expressed in milligrams per litre.

The range of results from 1 January 1992 from Milang are shown in the following table:

There are no target levels specifically for water quality in lake Alexandrina. However, guideline values for environmental waters are contained in Australian Water Quality Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Waters, published by the Australian & New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council. These cover protection of aquatic ecosystems, recreational water quality and aesthetics, raw water for drinking water supply, agricultural water use and industrial water use. There are also guideline values for recreational use of water in the Australian Guidelines for Recreational Use of Water 1990, published by the National Health and Medical Research Council. In addition, there are drinking water quality guidelines in the Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality in Australia 1987, published by the National Health and Research Council/Australian Water Resources Council.

MILANG LAKE ALEXANDRINA

Parameter	Range (mg/L)	
Phosphorus (soluble)	0.005	0.038
Phosphorus (total)	0.049	0.265
Nitrate—N	<0.01	0.03
Nitrite—N	<0.01	0.01
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	0.50	2.18

Ammonia—N	0.005	0.100
Salinity	200	550
Aluminium	0.67	15.8
Arsenic (Inorganic)	0.001	0.008
Cadmium	<0.0002	0.0016
Chromium	<0.005	0.022
Copper	<0.005	0.014
Iron	0.56	8.02
Lead	0.001	0.018
Manganese	0.013	0.14
Mercury	<0.0001	0.0002
Selenium	all samples	<0.001
Zinc	<0.005	0.061

< = less than

4. (a) No tests have been carried out on insect larvae from Lake Alexandrina to detect morphological abnormalities.

(b) Testing for the presence of cyanobacterial toxins in algal blooms has been regularly conducted on samples collected from Lake Alexandrina since 1990.

No toxic blooms of *Nodularia spumigena* have occurred in Lake Alexandrina since January 1992. The hepatotoxin Nodularin was identified in the majority of samples collected from earlier blooms (1990 and 1991).