

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 7 October 1993

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

**PETROLEUM (PIPELINE LICENCES)
AMENDMENT BILL**

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Petroleum (Pipeline Licences) Act 1940. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

In May the Government announced a proposal to supply natural gas by pipeline to industries in the Riverland and Murray Bridge. It is proposed that the pipeline commence at Angaston from an offtake of the Moomba to Adelaide pipeline owned by the Pipelines Authority of South Australia (PASA). It will be mainly of 114 mm diameter and have a capacity of up to 5 terrajoules of natural gas per day.

Extensive public consultation has occurred with regard to the proposed route and design of the pipeline and the reaction has been generally favourable. A number of comments have been received which are being incorporated into the final design parameters.

This pipeline will initially supply gas to Berri and Murray Bridge and may be extended to Renmark and Loxton if the economics prove favourable. Gas supply will commence in late 1994 with up to ten industries connected by this time. The project meets the Government's objective of bringing forward important infrastructure projects.

The pipeline is to be constructed and operated by PASA but owned by the Gas Company and is an excellent example of the public and private sector working together to provide infrastructure which is vital for the future of regional South Australia.

The Petroleum Act 1940 provides for the licensing of petroleum pipelines. However this Act does not currently provide for the separate licensing of a pipeline which does not commence in the vicinity of a petroleum field.

The amendments provide that the proposed Riverland pipeline can be separately licensed to the Gas Company and allows for separate licensing of future necessary pipeline extensions where that is considered appropriate. It also provides that the Minister must consult with any pipeline licensee where there is a proposal for a new pipeline to connect into that licensee's existing facilities. Industry has been consulted during the drafting of the Bill and has indicated support.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s.80ca—Interpretation

This amendment clarifies that the pipeline licensing provisions extend to cases where a person causes a pipeline to be constructed or operated. Furthermore, a reference to a pipeline under Part IIB of the Act is to extend to a case involving part of a pipeline. New subsection (2)(b) clarifies what is meant by an 'extension' to a pipeline.

Clause 3: Substitution of s.80d

This clause will enable a licence to be granted in respect of a part of a pipeline. The application will be in the nature of an application to vary an existing licence, or a new application for a separate licence.

Clause 4: Amendment of s.80e—Mode of application for licence

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 80e of the Act to promote consistency between that section and the definition of 'pipeline' under section 80ca (as amended by this measure).

Clause 5: Amendment of s.80g—Factors relevant to the grant of a licence

This clause provides that where an application for a pipeline licence relates to part of a pipeline, the Minister must, in considering

the application, take into account the interests of any other licensee in respect of the pipeline.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 80m—Alteration of pipeline

This clause makes a consequential amendment by virtue of the proposal to move to a licensing system in respect of extensions to existing pipelines.

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

**STATE LOTTERIES (INSTANT LOTTERIES)
AMENDMENT BILL**

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Lotteries (Instant Lotteries) Act 1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Legal action was recently taken in New South Wales over the wording of an instant money ticket. The basis of the New South Wales case was that the use of the words 'match 3 numbers' could be taken to mean that a prize was payable if the ticket showed three pairs of numbers rather than three identical numbers.

Notwithstanding the fact that it has been commonly understood throughout the community that three identical numbers are required in order to win a prize, the New South Wales court found in favour of the player. The action succeeded on a technicality, even though the New South Wales wording was consistent with an international convention for the determination of winning tickets. The court indicated that the legislature could take action to protect the New South Wales Government against any consequences which might flow from the ruling.

The purpose of this amendment to the State Lotteries Act is to define quite clearly what constitutes a winning ticket in an instant lottery. The definition is consistent with what has always been intended by the Lotteries Commission and clearly understood by players.

It is necessary to apply this legislation retrospectively to protect the public revenue and the community from opportunistic claims. Several other State Governments have indicated their intention to introduce similar legislation.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement and application

This clause provides that the Bill will be taken to have come into operation on the day on which the State Lotteries Act 1966 came into operation. It also provides that the Bill applies to proceedings commenced before or after its introduction but does not affect any final judgment obtained in proceedings before that date.

Clause 3: Insertion of s.17A—Instant lottery tickets

The new section settles any potential confusion about the meaning of the words 'Match 3 and win', or the like, in instant lottery tickets. The section provides that the wording means that three of the same symbol must appear on the panel on the ticket for it to be a winning ticket (rather than three pairs of symbols as was held in relation to similar wording in *State Lotteries Office v Burgin* (NSW unreported)). The section also provides that statements in advertising or promotional material relating to an instant lottery will be taken to be of similar effect.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 6 October. Page 763.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I have said this before and I will say it again—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The Deputy Premier has a lot to answer for to the taxpayers of South Australia, because he is one of the main culprits who has turned the Budget Estimates into a farce. First of all, the budget itself was a very fraudulent document; it is a document that I do not believe will come out as presented to the Parliament. The whole document was a typical example of how the Public Service is running the State of South Australia. It is a typical example of how to confuse the taxpayers by creating all new departments, shuffling the chairs around on the deck of the sinking Titanic of the Government. More importantly, it is a document that set out to create confusion within the Public Service, because there are so many public servants in that middle administration level who are scared stiff about their futures at the present moment under the present Government, because, do not forget, about 3 600 jobs have been made redundant.

They were able to come up with a clever plan of reorganising super-departments and the whole structure of the Public Service and administration in this State so there is total confusion. You can ring some public departments today and even if you can get through to the Minister's staff nobody seems to know which department is where, or where some of the subsidiary departments or statutory authorities are located at the moment. So, there is this period of confusion. I saw it back in 1979 when there was a change of Government, and history has repeated itself; it is the greatest way for the Public Service to defend itself.

It is a typical Public Service bureaucracy gone mad, where you have a weak, wimpy Administration. Gone are the really strong Ministers that we have seen in the State over the past 30-odd years—Ministers who were able to command respect and control their departments. That has all gone: the Dunstan era wrecked all that.

The Hon. H. Allison: They can't even buy respect.

Mr BECKER: The member for Mount Gambier is quite right. So, because of this wimpy, weak leadership certain persons within the Public Service have had a field day. They have created the situation whereby this current Government is answerable to certain Public Service administrators, and they are the ones who are well and truly in control. When that happens there is danger; we have a situation where anything could occur.

It is almost as though the history of the State Bank is repeating itself: we have not learnt a thing. The warning signs were there in 1985 when I asked the first question as to why the State Bank of South Australia was lending \$50 million on a shopping centre in Geelong. The principle was there. If we had surplus finances in South Australia, why were we transferring those finances to another State? They were the warning signs. Over that period I asked about 22 questions. On many occasions I was told not to ask questions. On many occasions I was put down as destabilising the bank; that it could cause a run on the bank or a loss of confidence in the bank. But all the way through—and members of the Public Accounts Committee knew this—I kept expressing my concern that there was something wrong, that this place was heading for trouble.

Unfortunately, we know what the result was. I do not want to gloat about it. I feel terrible about it—to think that we have lost \$3 150 million, that the interest bill is mounting up year after year and that it could end up as much as \$4 000 million in losses, including the interest. There are all the lost opportunities and lost jobs. Day after day people come into my electorate office looking for affordable accommodation. We cannot offer it. We can only say, 'We will try to get you

on the priority list of the South Australian Housing Trust.' The Housing Trust can say, 'Well, there might be a seven, eight or nine year wait,' depending on what location these people want. So the whole situation has been an absolute disaster.

Mr Ferguson: What's your policy?

Mr BECKER: The member for Henley Beach asks what our policy is. My own personal policy is that a change of Government will save taxpayers millions of dollars. It will create confidence in this State, unheralded. There will be this new confidence in South Australia and the new opportunities will come forward where private enterprise will get the kick-start to create the jobs, which will create the wealth and which will create the benefits for the people who deserve them.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Well, for the benefit of the member for Henley Beach, my policy on housing is that I very strongly support and have always supported the South Australian Housing Trust. It is one of the greatest success stories in this State.

Mr Ferguson: Yes, but you will be out voted.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: You never know what I might get up to, because it is my desire that we not have a waiting list. Had we not lost this \$3 150 million, we could have built the accommodation that is required by the 42 000 people on the current waiting list, and I said that to Marcus Clark time after time. Why are we fooling around opening branches all over the world? Why did we have a branch in the Cayman Islands? How many staff were employed in the State Bank in the Cayman Islands? I got a stupid look from the executive staff of the State Bank when I asked that question. I got a stupid response, too. It was not until we asked further questions that we found out that the Cayman Islands branch of the State Bank was a post office box number. Of course, the Cayman Islands are a great tax haven; that is where all the crook money in the world is laundered and that is where all the drug money, criminal funds and the oil money is poured. No-one would have a clue what kind of money is transferred into and out of the Cayman Islands.

It is a tragedy to think that interest paid by the taxpayers of South Australia is now finding its way into criminal hands through some of these spurious organisations. If it is analysed fully, it is an absolute tragedy that this interest is being paid by the long-suffering taxpayers of South Australia while people are being denied affordable housing, beds in hospitals when they want them and the opportunity to obtain worthwhile employment. Let us worry not only about the people who are unemployed—such as the 20 per cent in parts of the new electorate of Peake—but also the people who are under employed. There are tens of thousands of people in South Australia who have a job of some kind, but it is not to their satisfaction. They are the people who are under employed. We are not using the talents of these people to the best advantage of the State's resources. That is a terrible waste of opportunity as far as South Australia is concerned. I cannot accept the way in which the Government has prepared and presented this budget or the way in which the Public Service has manipulated the Ministers into doing this.

We then come to the greatest farce of all time, because it was I who pushed David Tonkin, time after time, month after month, to establish the budget Estimates Committees for the Parliament. Let us not return to the ridiculous situation we had where members of Parliament would question Ministers day after day, night after night. When I first entered this

House we would be here until 3, 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning going through the budget line by line.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Davenport says, all members could participate, so that was one benefit, but the whole idea of having budget Estimates Committees was for members of Parliament, who were selected by their parliamentary Party or Caucus as its representatives, to examine the budget Estimates in greater detail, and it gave them access to the public servants. What has happened during the life of the Labor Governments in this State over the past 11 years is that the public servants have been cut out. The Deputy Premier is here—it could be seen that even some of his advisers were busting to give information. They had worked for weeks, days and nights preparing answers, information and explanations on various lines regarding their budget, but they were not given the opportunity to answer questions, because the Minister hogged the whole show and treated it in a very paranoid fashion. If someone asked a question, the response was, 'They're not entitled to that information so we won't give it; we'll skirt all around the issue and we just will not provide the information.'

That in itself is a reflection on Parliament. It is time that the taxpayers of South Australia were advised that this Government is not prepared to be accountable to the people. This Government makes statements to the effect that it believes in accountability and that it will do this and that, but when it comes to the real crunch there is no such thing as total and open accountability. This is where some Ministers sit on their public servant advisers. One Minister, in particular, takes very little advice from his advisers: that information has already been provided to members on this side of the House. It was a tragedy that questions were asked by members, be they of a technical or sensitive nature, and answered by Ministers who would not give their advisers an opportunity to respond.

If we are going to improve the budget Estimates Committees—and I hope that we have the opportunity to review that system within the next six months—my advice to the Government of the day would be that Ministers be virtually removed from the whole process; that members of Parliament be given the opportunity to ask questions directly of the public servants and not of the Minister. Until we can ask questions of the public servant who is responsible for a particular line or program, I do not think we will ever get true, open government. It is important that we have an informed Parliament; it is important that we have an informed Government membership; and it is important that we have an informed Opposition in this Parliament, as well as the public itself.

The only way that we can do that is to question the public servant rather than the Minister, because the Minister will act as a censor. The Minister will say, 'That is too sensitive: do not release that', or the Minister will axe out information, pass a note to one of his own colleagues and get a Dorothy Dix question that way. If there is any opportunity for a member of the Opposition to raise a point or to obtain information that may be beneficial to him, her or the electorate, you can bet your socks that the Minister of the day will ensure that that member of Parliament is not provided with the information. It is censorship at its worst; it is discrimination at its worst; and it destroys the whole basis of the budget estimates procedure.

That, in the Westminster parliamentary system, is an absolute shame. It is a disgrace to think that we do not have

a Government that is prepared to cooperate with the House in that respect. So, the Government stands condemned. It was a wonderful exercise and opportunity to be on the Estimates Committee of the Minister of Business and Regional Development (the member for Briggs). It seemed as though he wanted to be the expert on everything. Again he showed his prowess as a press secretary or former journalist, a former minder of the Premier and the Premier's Department in days gone by, in that no-one was allowed to query certain aspects of Government operation, particularly the Grand Prix.

I am a self-confessed petrol head—I love the Grand Prix, I love motor sport and I would do anything to support and encourage and keep the Grand Prix here. I want to make it the best in the world, and it has already won many awards and accolades. However, I cannot justify the huge expenditure that goes into operating and managing the Grand Prix, and I believe that we as members of Parliament have the right to ask the Minister and members of the Grand Prix Board questions that are being put to us by members of the public. Not everyone in South Australia will go along with the Grand Prix: there is always a certain percentage, whether it be 20 or 30 per cent, who are not happy with it.

We are entitled to know why certain costs are being maintained, why there is a continual loss with the Grand Prix and why we are not attracting the overseas visitors we should be attracting. What are we doing to promote this event worldwide? I do not know just how much we are doing because it seems very difficult to find out, since no-one is game to tell you very much. It is a shame when leaked reports of the Economic and Finance Committee are given to the media days before it is due to be tabled in the Parliament—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The honourable member says 'leaked report'. Members of the committee know that the report is to be tabled today, yet I read more information in the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* than I think we have discussed in the committee on some occasions, and I am getting a little tired of this. That, again, is a reflection on all the members of the committee. We read in the paper this morning that what we have been led to believe are two employees of the Grand Prix Board are having their salaries paid into a company. I do not know how you can pay someone \$165 000 for one of those positions on the Grand Prix Board: I am absolutely amazed at the very high level of the salary. But then we find out that that remuneration goes to a company, no doubt to minimise the taxation for that person; all we are doing is aiding and abetting tax dodges, and that is not on. I believe the Grand Prix can be improved; we can run it at a profit and it would be more beneficial to the State.

I liken the Grand Prix to the World Swimming Championships that were held in Perth in January 1991. That was a wonderful carnival and I believe the Western Australian Government lost about \$11 million. It had to build about four olympic-size swimming pools and improve and develop an existing pool, and after the World Swimming Championships it had to fill in a couple of those pools. The fact that contributed to such a huge loss was that 900 journalists and media representatives came in from all over the world to attend that event. That gives us some idea of the number of people who are involved, and when we are talking about 2 700 people coming to the Grand Prix from Europe and overseas, we want to know the number of people who are coming in as media representatives, pit crews, backup support and whatever. That is where the system seems to be falling down.

We have to do more. We have to be prepared to accept all these people who come in. It was amazing to sit in the grandstand at the World Swimming Championships where there was reserved seating for 900 media representatives—and they took more than one seat, I might add. We have to be looking at using this as a focal point to bring people in on package tours and then keep them here for much longer than they are staying.

That brings me to the whole point of tourism. I do not think we do anywhere near enough to promote South Australian or to encourage the right tourist development in this State. We have to have the international hotels, but we need to have them linked up with international airlines. If the Ramada Grand Hotel could not bring in part of a jumbo jet load a week, I would be surprised. I think we need to get onto the Holiday Inn groups: they are the type of tour operators we need to encourage to come here. We might have to give them tax benefits, we might have to give them some land on which to build their facilities, but if we can get them coming in—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: We do not need runway extensions: 767s will carry enough people. But we need to attract airlines willing to—

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): The honourable member who has just spoken indicated how frustrating it is to review the estimates. Estimates Committees could be a very productive time for not only the Government of the day but also the Opposition of the day, if only the Ministers were not on an ego trip to answer all the questions themselves. Some very competent officers attend on those days and there is a tremendous amount of preparation, as the former speaker has said, in making sure that they have at their fingertips the answers that may be required to questions from both sides of the Committees. However, the system falls down badly when Ministers want to make ministerial and political statements in every answer and when they will not allow their ministerial advisers to answer the questions.

So we had the farcical situation in two of the Estimates Committees of which I was a member when the Minister of Primary Industries, Mr Groom, got upset after he made a prepared opening statement because there was an off-the-cuff response. We had the farce where we sat there all day from 11 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night receiving a barrage of political diatribe and we asked very few questions. In fact, both sides suffered mortally because of inaction by that Minister.

Of course, we had the spectacle relating to questions about ETSA, when a certain report—from which I will quote in a moment—was quoted. The ministerial officers were not allowed to answer questions about that report and the Minister himself ducked and weaved through it and said that it was not relevant. However, he was saying that it was not relevant when this Government has tried to force through this Parliament the merger of the E&WS Department and ETSA on the pretext that it will be cost-efficient for the taxpayers of South Australia.

We on this side of the House have made very clear, and I have made very clear and very public, that, until both those organisations are efficiently run and until the restructuring that has gone in the past is finished, we should not even contemplate on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia putting those two entities together.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will back it up with a few facts and quote from something. In addition, there is ample opportunity, while that restructuring is going on, to combine some of the commercial duties and obligations of both ETSA and E&WS, such as the sending out of accounts and collection of money. All those things can be done at a grassroots level that would be beneficial to the taxpayers of South Australia.

This House would recall and should know that ETSA is being used as a cash cow by this Government; it rips about \$120 million out of the electricity consumers of South Australia to put into general revenue. Of course, that is a surcharge on their electricity bills and the Government claims that this restructuring has been going on.

I quoted from the Backhouse report, which says 'Change or perish' and which was written before the merger was announced and released to the Government after the merger had been announced. So it went on right through that period. In fact, in the executive summary, this report is absolutely damning of the inefficiencies that go on within ETSA—and reforms are necessary. In fact, it says that with the advent of a national grid ETSA will lose many of its customers to interstate suppliers of electricity if it does not become nationally competitive in its practices and efficiencies in this State. It also states that if we want to secure our major customers—that is, those customers who use over 10 megawatts—we will have to sign some contracts pretty quickly before the national grid is established, because under the national grid guidelines those people will have the power to negotiate as major users of power in South Australia with an electricity generator or supplier from another State, because it will all go into the national grid, as it does in many other countries.

This report states that, because ETSA's overheads are so far out of kilter and need so much reform, it costs \$350 per day per worker in annual operating costs before he or she drives out of the gate. It goes on to say that it would be very difficult for this division ever to compete with the private sector based on these figures. So those reforms must take place. In his reply, the Minister said that it was an old report, that it was commenced two years ago, that we should not take much notice of it and that when we put all these things together they will all be fixed. Unfortunately, this report went on to be very scathing about reforms that were put in place and had not happened. The report states:

In 1991, the ETSA board and senior management endorsed micro-restructuring recommendations for the CSS division that were intended to achieve the following:

It goes on to refer to greater emphasis on planning, utilisation of appropriate locations and streamlining of customer services.

This confidential report said:

However, our tentative approach and stop-start change program has meant that today, nearly two years later, we have not achieved a great deal of change. . . Our people at level 5, not yet appointed, are extremely disillusioned. They don't know their new roles or their lines of business.

It says that if the change does not happen the future of this division and other divisions in ETSA would have to be at risk on entering the national grid. The Minister's response to all this was that we will not go into the national grid unless everyone in South Australia is protected. To hell with the electricity consumers; to hell with our major users; and to hell with attracting more business to South Australia by affording them the cheapest electricity available through the national

grid. The Minister said, 'Let's go on muddling through and, when we have muddled through and if these changes eventually take place, only then will we go into the national grid.' That is an indictment on the Government for two reasons: first, that it has not been prepared to push through the reforms that are necessary in ETSA to lower our electricity tariffs in South Australia, and part of that of course is the sum of over \$100 million per annum that the Government sucks out of electricity consumers in South Australia into general revenue as a hidden tax; and secondly, it will not allow ETSA to go into that national grid, not on commercial reasons but because of lack of management by the Government.

So, it is paramount that we do not allow the joining together of E&WS and ETSA until these necessary reforms take place and we have cheaper electricity in this State which will allow people and business to be attracted to South Australia in order to create jobs. Here we are: we have record unemployment levels in this State and businesses are going interstate and overseas to New Zealand. According to the latest population figures it is very obvious that we have the lowest population growth in Australia, and people are leaving South Australia on a daily basis because there is no incentive to stay here. I am not going to say that is the reason why we should have an election—to give them incentive. However, the facts demonstrate it, and all the waffling that goes on from the other side trying to cover up the failures of the past will not get away from the basic fact: unless we provide an incentive for business in South Australia and unless our Government-run entities run efficiently in this State, we will not attract people or businesses; we will not retain businesses; and there will not be any jobs, as is shown quite clearly in our population growth, which is the lowest in Australia.

We also had the farce that occurred when we asked the Minister to tell us how much was budgeted in the SAFA budget for a contribution from the Electricity Trust of South Australia for the financial year ending 30 June 1994. He ducked and weaved around the question, we kept asking the question and finally he said that, as it had not been supplied in the past he would not supply it now, and that it was an outrageous question.

However, when I checked last year's budget I found that an amount of \$95 million was provided in the budget as an estimate of the payment from ETSA to SAFA for the financial year ended 30 June 1993. Then the Minister had the temerity to say, 'I do not know why the shadow Minister wants to know this, because it is only an estimate and it cannot be accurate.' This has gone on for years: the estimated profit of ETSA has been announced in the budget, together with the contribution that is going to be sucked out by the Government into SAFA.

What is the Minister trying to hide? An election is imminent. Why would he not want to declare the estimated profit of ETSA or the impediment on electricity consumers it will impose in the next 12 months? Why would he be hiding that? Is something going on in ETSA so that they cannot suck this contribution out in future years, or is he trying to make sure that this figure is hidden because it may have to be raised to maintain the SAFA 'alleged' profits—and I use that word advisedly—that go into general revenue. By not declaring it, it allows the Government once again to fudge the financial accounts in South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Not very open government, is it?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Not very open government. For the Minister to attempt to mislead that committee by saying that

he would not announce that figure because it had not been announced previously was a blatant attempt, in my opinion, to mislead that committee.

Primary industry in South Australia, on anyone's assessment, is at its lowest ebb since the last depression in 1932. People are being forced off their land in large numbers. According to people employed by the Government in counselling services, the greatest problem now is not more credit, not more help but just food on the tables.

When we have a State that is proudly agriculturally based and has been over many years and when our producers of wealth are in that situation and it is not recognised by a Government, it shows how much it cares for those people who are desperately trying to survive and to look after their families and about the provision of jobs for the people who are left in rural areas.

One of the problems that we always have on this side of the House is that when we have meetings with representatives of the banks they tell us that everything is under control; no-one is being forced off their land; people are being well looked after; and they intend, in the future, to make sure that they help contribute to South Australia's rural future.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That is the three card trick.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, and it has been going on for 10 years. I asked the State Bank Manager, Mr Ted Johnson, 'How many people are in trouble in South Australia?' He very proudly said, 'Look, we have 3 000 rural accounts in South Australia and we are very proud of them. In fact, in the bad bank we have only three accounts in South Australia in trouble. In the so-called good bank—I use that word advisedly—we have 26 people in trouble and nine of those may have to leave the land.' He did not say 'with dignity'. He said 'may have to leave the land'. We have been told this by that bank before. That is absolutely contrary to what those of us who look after rural electorates are being told. I went on to ask—and it is quite important for everyone to note the answer to this question—the manager of the State Bank, 'Does that mean that people who are getting letters from the State Bank saying "We will no longer honour your cheques; in other words, if you present a cheque, it will be dishonoured", are not in trouble?' The answer was devastating. He said, 'Of course they are not in trouble. All that means is that we would like to have a chat to them.'

So, all the business people in South Australia who deal with the State Bank and who have received those letters from the bank saying, 'Look, if you present your cheques we will dishonour them,' should not think they are in trouble, because the State Bank very publicly in the committee has stated that they are not in trouble. I want to give hope to all South Australians, whichever bank they are in. They should make a personal appointment to see Mr Johnson and say, 'You said you will dishonour our cheques. Here is your letter. Can we sit down and talk about it because you told the Estimates Committee that we are not in trouble?'

That is one of the problems. The Primary Industries Minister in South Australia has listened to the banks for the past few years and has not found out what is really happening in rural South Australia. The banks are saying there is no problem. It is about time the Primary Industries Minister went out and mixed with those people who are in desperate straits and who are having their cheques dishonoured, and see the anguish on their faces and the disruption that is being caused to those families. If he does so, he will be able to see that there is no food on the table in many of those households, and then he will be able to do something about it.

The Minister's rural counsellors are telling him that there is a lack of food on the tables of many farming families in South Australia. That is their biggest concern, not financial matters. Yet, all that the Minister could do in his opening statement in the Estimates Committee was to give us a very glossy, bright future for farming in South Australia. He said that it was wonderful and that the measures that he was putting in place would help South Australian farmers.

Last week the Minister attended a meeting at Lucindale, a supposedly high rainfall, wealthy area, and 300 people turned up. I asked the Minister to outline how much rural assistance he planned to give South Australians in the next 12 months and how much he had given in the past 12 months. The figure was \$70 million of help to rural South Australia, which produces the greatest part of the wealth of this State and provides what standard of living we have left. Compare that with some of the Government's disasters. It lost \$3 500 million in running a bank. That is the contempt that it has shown towards rural South Australia—\$3 500 million. There was the Scrimber operation in the South-East. The Government and the Minister managed a department that failed and lost \$70 million in one hit. That is as much as they are giving to rural people in their worst situation since the Great Depression. That shows the utter contempt of this Government for hard-working people who are trying to look after themselves and their families, employ people and contribute to the State's wealth. The sooner it can put its record in front of the people of South Australia, the sooner the people can judge.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): There are several subjects that I should like to address in response to the Estimates Committees. The first refers to the debt in the South Australian Housing Trust. The Minister and I spent considerable time during the Estimates Committees debating the debt and where the Housing Trust was going, but at no stage during the debate did the Minister define what the trust proposes to do about the debt. He spent most of his time trying to convince us that the asset base of the trust was substantial and that any corporation that had such an asset base would be pleased about it, and generally he talked up the viability of the trust.

It is a known fact that the trust has many assets—that has never been in question—but what a corporation would not want and what the trust should not have are the mounting liabilities and debt within that structure, particularly at a time when the Commonwealth is starting to reduce funding for State housing and State Governments are not in a position to fill the gap.

The debt in the South Australian Housing Trust is of real concern. The problem that we are experiencing now is a decline in construction numbers in the public sector and very few indentations being made into the waiting list. Despite 10 years of this Labor Government, we have seen the waiting list blowing out; there have been no impacts on the waiting list; people are waiting to get in; the number of people on subsidised rents is about 70 per cent; and there is a declining market in the public housing sector. Yet the Government spent most of the time in the Estimates Committee on the Housing Trust saying there was no problem. I happen to know that the board is worried sick about where the trust is going with the debt. If they do not do something about the debt, they will find very quickly that the Housing Trust will be in real trouble. I know that the Government of the day does not want it said in Estimates Committees or a debate

such as this that the Housing Trust's financial viability is at risk, because it is frightened it will flow down to the tenants and the tenants will feel some insecurity. The tenants need not feel insecure because it is not their problem: it is our problem. It is a problem that Government needs to do something to get on top of the debt.

The Auditor-General has been saying for several years that there is a problem in the administration of the Housing Trust and its finances. It has certainly been acknowledged that the present administration in the Housing Trust is starting to get on top of it, but the Auditor-General's Report went back a couple of years and referred to a lot of inaction as far as financing of the trust is concerned. It is a problem. The Auditor-General has pointed out very clearly in the report that the Housing Trust rent arrears are out of control, and he quoted a number of tenant debtors that is running into millions of dollars. He then points out that one of the problems that the Housing Trust has is that it cannot chase tenant debtors who are fly-by-nighters because, although the Department of Social Security knows where they have gone, that department is not allowed to tell the Housing Trust.

Mr Ferguson: What would you do about it?

Mr OSWALD: So, the Housing Trust, in carrying out its normal landlord role, is not permitted to chase the tenants who are fly-by-nighters. The honourable member interjected and asked what I would do about it. I would be on to the Minister in Canberra very smartly to see if we can get the legislation changed so the General Manager of the Housing Trust can chase some of his bad and doubtful debts of those who are genuine fly-by-nighters. We know for a fact that the majority of Housing Trust tenants are good, solid people who have every right to live in public housing. But we know that in both the public and private housing sector there are people who will fly by night and use and abuse the system for their own gain. I believe that the legislation has to be fixed up so that the General Manager of the trust can chase these bad and doubtful debts and do something about them.

It was interesting at Question Time yesterday, the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations had a Dorothy Dix question put to him by one of his colleagues, so that he could talk about the health of the private housing market. The private housing market is healthy because we have a very efficient private sector in this State which knows its business as far as building houses is concerned. He did not respond to interjections from me when I reminded him that in the public housing sector—

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Yes, interjections are out of order, but if they suit the Minister, the Minister is very happy to respond. I note that on this occasion the Minister refused to respond because he knew he was on very thin ice. He was on thin ice because, whilst the private housing market is buoyant, the public housing market, given the number of dwellings that are predicted again for this year, is down. I would have thought that at a time when we have this 40 000 odd on the waiting list, out of only 63 000 actual dwellings that we have in the public sector, we would be hearing by now after 10 years in Government some statements from the Minister of how they will address that waiting list, what they will do about it and what they will do about the new public housing starts.

We hear that, in cooperative housing, it is 'steady as she goes' as it was last year. We have not heard much about the new opportunities for housing with regard to religious organisations that want to get involved in housing. We have not heard whether they are tapping into other markets. We

have HomeStart sitting in the wings, and I have always supported HomeStart. HomeStart is no different, I suppose, from a lot of other housing lending organisations. It is running at commercial rates: indeed, for a short while this year it was running above the ordinary commercial rate. It is no wonder, under those circumstances, that HomeStart does not have too many people on its waiting list. I believe in HomeStart because I think it is useful to have such an organisation as a net to pick up those affected by any move into a higher interest rate regime.

Another subject I raised in the Estimates Committee was the Barossa Valley SDP, and in this regard I was not particularly happy with the Minister's response. Many anomalies are coming to light with the Barossa Valley SDP. None of us wants to see further subdivision and development on the floor of the Barossa Valley, but there are a lot of questions to be asked about the land and the properties that are owned around the rim of the valley. I gave an example of one farmer who owned a farm near Seppeltsfield made up of some 10 and 20-acre blocks.

The day before the Estimates Committee I sighted the actual valuations from the Valuer-General for three of those 10-acre blocks, which have been downgraded from \$56 000 to \$16 000. Any member who does a bit of quick mental arithmetic will understand what it is like if, having borrowed on a property you own, based on the valuation of that property, suddenly you find the property's valuation has gone down from \$56 000 to \$16 000. You will then have the bank manager knocking on your door telling you that you are overdrawn, or you may receive a letter telling you that credit is no longer available to you: your overdraft collapses and you are forced off the land. I do not think it was ever intended, through the Barossa Valley review, to force genuine farmers off their land. It would certainly not be my intention if I was the Minister in charge of this area to force farmers off the land. I believe the Government would be well advised to have a look at these issues.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: That is correct: not only force them off, but it ruins them, especially those who have reached an age when they would not have any opportunity to financially recover again. I believe that the matter has to be addressed rather urgently and I would like to see a quick response from the Government as to what it is going to do about these rural properties on the rim. I would also like to see produced far more accurate and consistent figures on the number of blocks in the Barossa Valley which can in fact take further development. When we analyse it, I think we will find that there are not as many blocks in the valley and along its rim which are capable of being redeveloped even if every farmer wanted to build a dwelling on every one of those properties.

I was alerted to the situation regarding Centennial Park Cemetery by some officers in the department. We all know that this cemetery has great potential for tourism as a heritage cemetery and, although it appears that up until the financial year before last moneys were being spent correctly on grave upgrading, over the past 12 months there has been a suggestion, which we could not get to the bottom of in the Estimates Committee, that a lot of that money might have been shifting sideways within the department or directed elsewhere and not used for the purpose for which it was budgeted. I hope when we address this matter next year we find that the money budgeted for the development of that cemetery is being used for its correct purposes. My colleagues and I hope the Government will also be addressing the question of the

people involved in administering the Centennial Park and West Terrace Cemeteries working together for the development of that cemetery.

The southern region sports complex was also raised as an issue. The Government is bending over backwards to assure people in the southern region that league football games will be played down there this coming year. From the response we received from the Government, it appears that paying for the grandstand is still a matter of negotiation. I think the Government should be making public what it intends doing about that grandstand. We are well aware of the \$600 000 negotiations taking place between SAFA and the Football League to build the clubrooms, but the grandstand is essential as part of the total complex. Certainly, through my Leader, the Hon. Dean Brown, we have committed ourselves to providing \$1.5 million to build that stand, and that is a firm commitment. As incoming sports Minister I intend to see that that project is carried out as quickly as possible.

In the Estimates Committees the Labor Party tried once again to claim the credit for telephone betting for bookmakers and the flow-on it has had. There is no question that telephone betting has been a success, and we are now seeing revenue from it starting to flow through to the three codes, but everybody in the industry knows that the Opposition had a Bill ready to go. Once again we have been able to drive racing policy for the Government over the past two years.

The Minister knew it was only a matter of time and that if he did not introduce his Bill for telephone betting I had one ready to run, and the Government would have been in the position of having to support it. We were very happy to support the Government's Bill as a matter of bipartisanship. The Minister and I have been able to work together in a bipartisan way on a lot of these subjects for the benefit of the racing industry, and at the end of the day the racing industry has benefited from that cooperation.

The matter involving 5AA radio station is still causing confusion out in the community because of the belief that was abroad that we had a specific date for 5AA to acquire the narrowcast licence. The fact that it has not yet happened is a matter of some disappointment to the people within 5AA. The radio industry generally still would like to know what is going on in 5AA and, as far as the narrowcast is concerned, whether it will be only for the country or for the country and city, and whether 5AA will get it and then go off and broadcast separately or retain its racing format.

We also need to know what would happen to 5AA if it dropped its racing format and ran on a narrowcast band. I understand that under the legislation 5AA cannot run on its own as a radio station without racing, because it is in contravention of possibly the TAB Act or another Act. There is a problem there, and the Government should spell out very clearly what is going on as far as 5AA is concerned, because many people in the racing community and I feel very strongly that racing must stay on air; it is successful interstate and we want to see this thing brought to a conclusion very quickly.

I raised a matter which the Government ducked, and I suppose it had some justification for doing so: I refer to the Fun, Sport and Action Program which has been implemented by Foundation SA. The Government said, 'It has nothing to do with us' and ducked it because at this stage it is possibly not getting off the ground as well as it could. The program, worth \$750 000, was implemented by Foundation SA, but Sport SA as a group representing sport in this State is concerned about its direction, its administration, the people who are on the board and what sports will be involved. With

\$750 000 involved, I think it is probably justified in asking a few questions, such as why someone involved in sport is not on the board directing where it will go.

The program is only in its infancy but I can telegraph that many sporting administrators are keeping a close watch on its progress. I would not like to see the Government using this program to say, 'We are doing something about sport in schools.' As everybody knows, we have a real problem about sports participation in schools and the growing reliance on sporting associations picking up where the teachers have left off.

As an agenda item associated with that, I referred to the Monaggetti report, which came out in Victoria. That report recommended that physical education and sport be reintroduced as a compulsory subject in all Victorian schools. It is a marvellous initiative to try to reverse a trend occurring in Victoria and in South Australia. The Minister said he was aware of it and that he understood it was a good report. I hope it will progress further than that. In fact, very shortly, I hope that we will see the Government pick up the Monaggetti report in South Australia and make sure it is implemented. In Victoria, it will be implemented over some three or four years, as it will take that time to have it fully up and running. However, it is a subject which is terribly important in South Australia. It is an opportunity to pick up a report from Victoria and implement it over here as well. They have done the research, and I gather from talking to sports administrators that it has some excellent material in it that we should be able to pick up. It does something about the problem of the Education Department stepping back from sport in schools, and it gives us an ideal opportunity to address a very real concern to us all, that is, this general decline in sport.

I spoke briefly and asked questions on employment in the racing industry. Everyone is aware that the racing industry is very much on its knees now. Just recently, the Government has made great play of injecting \$2 million into racing for stake money but, at the end of the day, of course, that is only \$2 million a year for two years. As sports Minister, in two years time I will have the problem of that money cutting out, and we will then be back where we were in 1993, with a dearth of stake money available. But it is right across the road. With regard to employment, the flow-on effect has been that people and breeders have walked out of the industry. TAFE has a marvellous school for training jockeys but, at the end of the day, will they be able to get a job with a trainer, because the trainers are going out of business? That is a real problem. We addressed it in Estimates Committees. In the last few weeks of this Government's existence, perhaps it can address some of those issues and set in train some new directions for racing so that we will not have this collapse of the racing industry in the galloping, trotting and greyhound codes.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): During the Estimates Committee hearings, I sat on four Estimates Committees. I sat on the Estimates Committee for the Attorney-General and Minister of Correctional Services and, regrettably, that Committee was characterised by much huff, puff and bluster but little in the way of fruitful answers. I sat on the Estimates Committee for the Minister of Emergency Services. That Committee was characterised by ducking, dodging, weaving and evading of answers, as well as long drawn out answers; in fact, it was probably one of the most disgraceful Estimates Committees I have ever sat on, with that Minister answering only six questions from the Opposition in the first 1½ hours.

If nothing else characterises a Minister who does not have the competence to administer his portfolio and answer questions before him, that aspect certainly does.

Following that, I sat on the Estimates Committee for State Services, and on that Committee we had a new Minister. I must say I was surprised by that Minister, because he does not have the greatest reputation in this State, but he actually answered questions and kept the proceedings moving. Following that, I sat on the remainder of the Estimates Committee covering State Systems and that Minister also—and I will say this while he is present in the Chamber—did answer the questions that were put before him. But I must also say that he fudged a good news announcement claiming that Southern Systems Corporation had been formed and that all would be well within Government with the information utility and information technology—which is far from the case, but I will come back to that later. Unfortunately, across the board, Estimates Committee processes this time, once again, were characterised by insufficient time for questioning, by many Ministers ducking for cover and, certainly, departments with plenty to hide.

I would like to look, in turn, at some examples in my contribution to this debate this morning. I refer, first, to the Correctional Services Estimates Committee. I put to that Committee drug statistics that are presently being faced by our prisons, statistics which I have put forward publicly many times and which, I am sure you would agree, Mr Speaker, are very alarming statistics. From 1982-83 to the most recent financial year drug fines in prison have increased by a staggering 1 889 per cent. Those points must be raised. It would be reasonable to expect that those problems would be addressed, but the Minister's response was absolutely staggering: he said that I had an obsession with the drug problem in our prisons. I simply pointed out to the Minister that it is not a matter of being obsessed but of the problem being fixed, because the fact remains that people come out of our prisons addicted to drugs.

Non-drug addicts often come out of our prison system as drug addicts and those who go in as drug addicts are able to continue their habit in prison, even if it involves hard drugs such as heroin, and they come out still addicted. I have visited half-way houses in this State which provide accommodation for prisoners on their release. Managers of those homes tell me that one of the greatest problems they face with people who are released from prison is getting them off drugs. That was pointed out in no uncertain terms in a confidential memorandum, which I revealed to the Committee, written by Ms J. Wright who, at that time, was the Acting Coordinator of Home Detention. She said, in part:

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.

The Minister responded by tabling a drug strategy that was put together by the department at the beginning of this year. I happen to know that that strategy was only put together after I repeatedly raised matters in this House. It was cobbled together in a hurry; it is inadequate, and it does not address the issues. This strategy fails to take into account research from, and measures that have been put into place in, other States and countries. It is a long way from solving the problem. Indeed, after the Estimates Committee, the Saturday blitz that was held at Yatala, during which a number of syringes and a bullet were found on visitors, proved that we have a problem with drugs and other material that should not be there getting into our prisons.

The Minister's response regarding this serious matter was far from satisfactory and one which I would have expected to be far more comprehensive. This Government has failed to implement in our prisons not only a drug strategy but a work strategy for prisoners to ensure that they are gainfully occupied and also that they are less likely to re-offend when they are released. In the Government's defence regarding the development of a strategy, it could argue that prisoners are not there for very long. I cited to the Attorney the example of a person who was sentenced to six years imprisonment for rape with a two-year non-parole period. Under the Government's reduced sentencing options, including the use of home detention, that person was released after eight months. So, we have the situation of a rapist being found guilty, being sentenced to six years imprisonment and being home again after eight months. I am sure, Sir, you would agree that that is absolutely no compensation to the rapist's victim, knowing that the perpetrator of that offence is again out in the community after eight months, which I argue is insufficient time for a person to be rehabilitated in the prison system if, in fact, that rehabilitation were available.

I then attended the Emergency Services Estimates Committee. There we had a Minister in trouble, one who took a long time to answer questions, and the answers he gave did not necessarily fully respond to the questions. I put to the Minister problems that he had with the Bureau of Emergency Services, and I challenged him to provide evidence to the Committee that would justify on a cost benefit basis the establishment of such a bureau.

I asked for something that would establish as fact that, by creating this new department with a new level of management, we would finish up with a greater operational police presence, a more effective Police Force and a more effective delivery of emergency services, including fire, ambulance and rescue; something that would prove that that would occur. The Minister could not come up with that proof, and when he found himself in a corner his response was quite amazing. He flipped past the whole problem to the Premier. He said, 'It is not my fault; the Premier makes the decision.'

I think it is worth sharing the Minister's quote with the House. He said:

The Premier makes these decisions; the Premier is responsible for the operation of the Public Service. Those decisions are made in consultation with Ministers. The Premier makes the ultimate decision and has the final responsibility.

I walked away from that Estimates Committee convinced that the present Minister of Emergency Services has serious doubts about the formation of a Department of Emergency Services and about the creation of many of the new so-called super ministries. Some of the other responses were also quite amazing. I pointed out to the Committee that I had it on good authority that the new department was to have a management support group of 15 managerial staff; of those 15, five are to be EL2 positions, one (a Mr Lewcock) to be paid at the EL3 position, and a budget of \$2 million was being sought.

I am aware that the new CEO of the bureau approached all the departments asking for money and staff and, on the first pass, was advised that that was not possible, they had had their funding slashed and their staffing was down. On a further approach I am now aware that the CEO has gained some of that staffing and a number of people have been seconded to the Department of Emergency Services—including, surprisingly, an officer from the Department of Correctional Services, which is not part of the bureau. I understand that 15 staff are still being sought; a \$2 million

budget is still being sought; and the bureau is to be accommodated on the tenth floor of the Finlayson's building—yet another impost on the taxpayer.

Looking at staffing, the Minister came up with a surprising statement when I put to him that the budget figures demonstrated that there had been a cut of 49 general police officers. The Minister's response was:

Apparently this is a technical process that has been followed. In fact, there is no reduction in staff, I am advised. It is actually the way in which the method of recording under the human resources management system is operated. There is apparently a faster recording mechanism. The old manual systems of personnel practices 20 years ago were very slow. The new system now provides a much faster record of where people are, so there is a better and more accurate picture of the structure and staff numbers. This is what I am advised by the officers.

That is a surprising answer, but is the Minister saying that they have had absolutely no control over the Police Force before, did not know where they were, how many police they had, how many staff they had and, therefore, they have now found that they have 49 fewer than they thought they had in the first place, or is he trying to use this new computer system as an excuse? Is he saying that the new computer system did not work in the first place? Certainly, the human resources management system to which he is referring has been the subject of audit concern over a number of years. I have asked the Minister to bring me back details of where those 49 staff have gone and where the difficulties were with the system that could cause that sort of discrepancy. I am still waiting patiently.

That answer is probably not surprising for, when questioned again about the benefits expected from the bureau, the Minister came up with some amazing statements, which included in part:

I think we will see some benefits. . . perhaps outside private organisations could be potential beneficiaries as well. . . We might be able to reap rewards. . . we may be able to reap benefits. . . We may well find that. . . there could be benefits flowing from. . . However, in general, those sorts of benefits can flow. . .

That is from a series of about 12 sentences. In other words, the Minister has absolutely no idea whether or not a bureau of emergency services will work. His answer was nothing short of absolute waffle. It gave no satisfaction to the Opposition or, I should think, to Government members of the Committee (or, indeed, to his officers) that he knows what he is doing. This new department is simply showing a new management structure, 15 staff and \$2 million of taxpayers' money. The member for Albert Park may well yawn: perhaps he does not care what happens to emergency services—

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, Sir, is it against Standing Orders for me to yawn in the Parliament? I was not even listening to the clown opposite!

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

Mr MATTHEW: The fact remains that this department was heralded as part of the new Government restructure, one of the new areas that was going to save the taxpayer money, and it is not. To date, only two emergency services bureaus have been created in this country: one in Tasmania, which was scrapped; and one in Queensland, which at the moment is undergoing investigation, and the head of the bureau has been sacked. That particular bureau has lost \$44.5 million of the taxpayers' money through the Queensland ambulance service alone.

This Government has chosen a path of demonstrated failure by Labor Governments in Tasmania and Queensland

and is duplicating that path of failure in South Australia, and that is not satisfactory. The Minister ducked, dodged, weaved and provided a lot of waffly answers about a number of other subjects, but I will leave that at this stage as I turn to some of the other matters that were placed before the Committee.

I refer to State Systems. It was an interesting period during the Estimates when the Minister announced the formation of Southern Systems Corporation—and, I might add, it was not a very well kept secret. It was well known in the industry that the Minister was going to make an announcement, but it was interesting the way the announcement occurred. The Minister's staff were desperately trying to cobble together an announcement for Estimates because they knew that the Information Utility was going to be raised as a problem during the Estimates Committee. It would have to be; after all, it is one of the Government's great failures.

In order to make the announcement the Minister needed a board, so there was a last minute ring around of potential board members to cobble together a board for this organisation. Those people were very surprised at the way it was done, at the way they received the phone calls and at the haste at which it was done, and it soon became obvious through the industry that this was occurring because the Minister needed some sort of good news announcement to try to buffer himself from the Estimates process.

During the course of that Estimates Committee I quoted from an article in an Australian computer magazine, *Pacific Computer Weekly*. That magazine is well read within the computer industry, and the article focused on the Information Utility, and I will quote from it because it is a very important article. It stated, in part:

The big lie is that the IU is still alive and well, with the only change being that the Government holds all equity instead of sharing it with the private industry. It is a lie perpetuated by Government facing electoral defeat within six months and public servants concerned about their cushions in the event of change of Government.

The article further states:

Government makes up about half the IT buying power in South Australia. The proportion is higher the larger the computer system becomes. Any business man or woman who called the Government a liar on the issue would not even get the crumbs let alone a piece of the IT pie, but behind the scenes there is open contempt for the South Australian Government's attempt to manipulate the IT business in a big way.

The Minister dismissed that article entitled 'The Big Lie Remains Unchallenged' and launched an attack on the journalist who wrote it. Interestingly, since the announcement of Southern Systems, last week alone I was approached by five representatives of major computer companies based in Australia. I met with four of those people last week, and two of them brought in the article that I just quoted and said, 'Have you read this?' I then gave them the extract from *Hansard* and they said, 'Well, that article is spot on; that is exactly how the information industry feels about this Government; that is exactly how we feel. The journalist is right but, if we say it publicly, the Government will strike us off any contract chances with Government.'

The Hon. M.D. Rann: What a wank.

Mr MATTHEW: Well, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Minister interjects 'What a wank'. I do not particularly approve of that language, but the fact remains that what has now occurred through the formation of Southern Systems is that the total risk of the Information Utility venture (which so far has proved to be a failure) is now to be borne by the South Australian taxpayer, because the Government has been unable

to gain the confidence of the information technology industry and to bring in a partner. That spells loud warning bells.

I was also a member of the State Services Estimates Committee. Once again, with State Services we have seen some very alarming signs. We have seen the usual losses by State Clothing and, in fact, in the past financial year the corporation lost \$85 000, bringing the total loss of taxpayers' money to \$1.508 million in eight years. State Print exceeded its previous record: last year it lost \$3.3 million of taxpayers' money and it has the proud record of losing \$5.2 million of taxpayers' money in three years.

It is interesting to see where some of that money is going. The South Australian Government is undertaking printing work for other Australian State Governments, and it is losing money on that printing work. In fact, I recently met with the Minister responsible for administrative services in New South Wales, who put to me that printing work done by South Australian State Print for New South Wales is so low in cost that it undercuts all the printers in that State and could not possibly be done on a profitable basis. Another New South Wales Minister said to me on another occasion, 'We are quite happy for State Print to keep printing for us because its helps to redress some of the *per capita* funding imbalance that some New South Wales residents believe we have.' In other words, the South Australian taxpayer is funding printing for the New South Wales Government. I do not find that acceptable at all. Is it any wonder that State Print has lost so much public money—\$5.2 million in just three years?

We also found that the Central Linen Service cannot count its stock. It claims that it has \$5.931 million worth of stock, but it does not really know because it does not know how to count it. The Auditor-General had some serious concerns about that in his latest report and, in fact, in his previous report. His audit was subject to that particular stock count being qualified.

Then, of course, we saw that State Fleet is using a computer system that was designed for complex heavy vehicle repairs to manage its fleet. The interesting thing is that it does not have one complex heavy vehicle in the whole State Fleet and now it is pouring more money into that computer system to try to get it right. That is one of the many disgraces of the failure of some of the State Services organisations.

In short, it was a disappointing Estimates Committee session and it highlighted a Government on its knees. The sooner we rocket through this budget and take away the last excuse for the Government not to go to the polls, the better.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I am pleased to be able to participate in this Appropriation Bill debate and to respond—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I listened to you, and that was hard enough, so you can just continue on with your sending out of material for the forthcoming election.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.H. Hemmings): May I suggest to the member for Heysen and members opposite that we let the honourable member proceed with his contribution and that he ignore the interjections and make his contribution through the Chair?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: With much pleasure, Mr Acting Speaker. I have noticed that there has been quite a considerable amount of comment from both sides of the House regarding the Estimates Committee procedures. I would like to take this opportunity to express some concern.

I believe that overall the Estimates Committees are a very worthwhile exercise. However, it concerns me that an enormous amount of resources go into the preparation of material that may or may not be required. I would suggest that probably about 80 per cent of the material that is put forward for the use of a Minister is not used. It is of concern to me also that we find that some Ministers—but not all of them—bring in people who may be required to assist them in answering questions. I suggest, again, that 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the time the majority of those people are not required either. Why can we not have a situation where, if the Minister could not answer a question, he takes it on notice? I do not see any need for bringing in 20 or 25 advisers.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I know we did. I certainly did not bring in 25 people to sit behind me in case they were needed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would suggest that it is quite unnecessary to have all these advisers in Estimates Committees. The Minister could have his or her CEO and Deputy, and if either of those people or the Minister cannot answer the questions they could be put on notice. I, and the majority of members on this side of the House, would much prefer that to the waffling that goes on by the majority of Ministers trying to answer questions when they do not have a clue about what they are talking about. They seem to be almost frightened to provide the opportunity for senior officers to answer the questions. If we are to make the most of these Estimates Committees, we should do away with the Ministers altogether during the process and just leave it to the senior officers.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: You never know: we might do it when we get back here in a couple of months. Estimates Committees would be much more successful if the Ministers kept out of it. They have every other day of the year to sit in this place. The Ministers could keep out of the Estimates Committees and we could question the senior officers about matters. They will not be able to answer a question relating to policy but those questions can be put on notice.

I was a member of three Estimates Committees, the first relating to Environment and Natural Resources, and that title has changed three times in the last six months—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: —as the member for Albert Park would know. Six months ago it was the Department of Environment and Planning, then it became the Department of Environment and Land Management and now it is the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. I hate to think what it is going to be called in a couple of weeks. I am looking forward to some certainty with a change of Government when we will all know what is happening as far as those departments are concerned, and we certainly will not throw away hundreds of thousands of dollars that must result from these changes to departmental names just for the sake of change or to make it a bit more difficult for the Opposition to try to work out what is happening as far as budgetary issues are concerned.

The Estimates Committee that looked at Environment and Natural Resources was an absolute disaster. The Minister waffled away. I hate to think how the Minister feels when he reads his own speeches in *Hansard*.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I cannot speak for the Minister at the table, but I hate to think what the member for Unley, the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, thinks. I bet you that he does not even read it: he would be too worried to read it. He waffled away and three questions were asked in a hour, and we wonder why the system is not working properly. The Minister of Public Infrastructure was not quite as bad but nearly as bad. However, I must commend the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, as he handled the situation very well. We got a lot of information and got through a lot of questions, and I very much appreciated the way in which that Minister handled his responsibility at that time. Let us look at some of the information that we obtained during the Estimates Committee on Health, Family and Community Services.

The first thing we learnt was that the Government is spending some \$534 000 on reorganisation of the department's central office when there is so much need in the community at the present time. Mr Acting Speaker, you would know in the electorate that I think you still represent—

Mr Hamilton: He wasn't here.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: We all know he was not here. There was some concern. I remember reading in the media something about your being away, and nobody could really find out where you were.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is totally inappropriate for me to be reflecting on you and your position in the Chair at this stage.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I would suggest to the member for Heysen that he heeds his own advice and does not make any reflections on the Chair, because he may find that the Chair could then possibly vacate the Chair and put his name on the list. The member for Heysen is aware that I can put the boot in a lot better than he can.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If we are having threats we will see what the rest of the day brings forward. Returning to the Department for Family and Community Services, \$534 000 is being spent on reorganising the head office when there is so much need in the community. More cases of child abuse need to be dealt with; there is more pressure on the non-government agencies—on the voluntary sectors, such as the Salvation Army, St Vincent De Paul, the Central Mission and Anglican Welfare. Every one of those voluntary organisations is up against the wall trying to serve the community.

Here we have a situation where the dear old Government, through DFACS, is spending \$534 000 to reorganise its office. On top of that we find that it has spent \$9 531 flying seven senior officers of the department around South Australia. The hire of the plane amounted to \$4 700, and over \$3 000 was spent on accommodation and \$1 814 for meals, totalling \$9 531.

The interesting thing is that the Minister tells us that this was to provide the opportunity for the CEO and the senior officers to visit regional areas and talk to the people. I have no problem with that. The problem I have is that, as I understand it, and certainly the Minister did not deny it at the time, many of those people in far away places of the State were in Adelaide a few weeks before attending a meeting of regional officers at a venue near the Patawalonga. They got together and talked about all of the things that they talked about later over breakfast, lunch and dinner at a cost of \$1 814 for meals.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Each?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Blimey! I know that things are bad. However, it does not matter, Mr Acting Speaker. Again, we have a situation where there is so much need in the department, and the taxpayers of this State are paying \$9 500 to fly these people around the State. Let us see who they were: the department's CEO; the deputy CEO; the Executive Director; the Director, the Manager of Aboriginal Advocacy; the Industrial Relations Officer; the staff counsellor; and administrative support. You wonder how many people were left in the department to do anything during that week with all of those senior people flying around the North of the State talking to everybody else. I wonder how we survived with the CEO, the deputy and all those senior officers flying around.

I also asked the Minister how many people from the Department for Family and Community Services were on leave without pay. This appeared to cause a few problems. There was something about confidentiality and it not being appropriate to be told who these people were. I asked who they were, how long each had been on leave without pay, why, and which of them had been offered voluntary separation packages and why. There was no response to that; I was told that the matter would be taken on notice. I have got the responses from the Minister—I understand all the rest are there although I have not yet had time to check them—but there is no information in regard to this matter. If there are confidential or other reasons why they are not able publicly to say who these people are, why they are on leave, and so on, I would appreciate it if the Minister would make that advice available to me. If we look at *Hansard*, I think we will find he said he would do that. Again, I remind the Minister of the question that I asked and indicate that I am still seeking that information and look forward to receiving it at a later stage.

I then went on to talk about the \$2 million which had been promised as part of a program to rehabilitate gambling addicts. I feel strongly about this matter. A number of promises have been made in this place about assisting compulsive gambling addicts. The former Premier, the member for Ross Smith (Hon. J.C. Bannon), made a couple of promises about what he was going to do to help these people, but nothing eventuated.

When this place regrettably decided that we were to introduce poker machines into this State, we were told that a \$2 million program would be provided to assist gamblers who could not help themselves. Then we learnt that this money would be made available only if the need could be shown by non-government agencies. That is ridiculous. We have enough evidence now. I suggest that members should talk to the Central Mission, the Salvation Army and all those non-government agencies which are dealing with people who have needs and find out about the problem of compulsive gambling.

It sickens me, driving under one of the bridges over the Grand Prix track up Dequetteville Terrace into Adelaide, to see a massive sign which says something along the lines, 'One-arm bandits at casino 28 October'. I presume that is something to look forward to! Yet we find there is no guarantee of this \$2 million being made available, and no information has been provided as to how that money will be spent in helping people who cannot help themselves. It is a bit late now, because, as a result of the regrettable decision that has been taken in this place, those machines are in.

I asked about the aged health strategy for older South Australians, about which we have been hearing for a decade. The Minister told me that significant work was under way and it was expected to be completed about March of next

year. I can recall asking that question three or four times in recent years, but we are no closer to that strategy being brought down.

I asked about the uncertainty of funding for non-government agencies such as DOME (Don't Overlook Mature Employees). A total of 648 people were returned to the work force in 1992-93 as a result of the magnificent work of that organisation. They do not even know whether they will continue to be funded. There is a tremendous amount of uncertainty in the public with regard to the new structure that will take in community services. We do not know what it will be called or what it will contain. I have received representation from organisations such as CAMHS and others that are told that they will be included in this new structure but are not being given any opportunity to have their say.

I was staggered that the Minister was unable to define homelessness as far as young people were concerned. This is the department that is responsible for programs for funding homeless young people. He was not even able to define homelessness. So we go on. I will run out of time and I will have to come back to a number of these subjects on a later occasion. I could spend hours talking about the lack of responses that I received from the environment portfolio. We spent about the first 30 minutes talking about recycling, not that there is very much recycling in South Australia at the present time. I was able to bring to the attention of the committee and to the Minister in particular the problems that are being caused because of a total lack of a coordination program in this State regarding recycling, and a total lack of input from the Government in providing incentive for industries to grow up to be able to use recycled products.

None of that is happening, yet again in this place, in answer to a question that I asked, the Minister continues to blame local government because we do not have recycling. If anyone is to be blamed, the blame must rest fairly and squarely on this Government, this Minister and previous Environment Ministers under this Government. I look forward to coming back with a number of issues that have come out of those Estimate Committees, but I agree with members on this side of the House: the sooner this Government is thrown out and we get a Government with certainty and a new direction, the better for all South Australians. The additional information I will be able to provide to the House regarding the lack of information coming out of estimates will prove that point.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): It is nice to see you back in the Chamber, Mr Acting Speaker. We sincerely hope that your visit, which attracted so much attention, was fruitful and productive. I am sure that the member for Hartley is enjoying your presence back in the Chamber. We look forward to your contributions because I understand he took particular interest in your travel arrangements. We are looking forward to your participating again, particularly in relation to that matter.

Obviously this debate is the last opportunity that this Government will have to involve itself with the financial affairs of this State. For the past 11 years it has had the authority to direct the Public Service and control the Parliament, so we should briefly reflect upon where we stand today. What has happened? When this Government took office, it did so in the expectation of growth and promises. We would have an investment fund, we would end unemployment and all sorts of great things would flow for South Australia. You and I know, Mr Acting Speaker, that none of that has occurred. What is the situation today? What large,

ongoing constructive development projects have taken place that will create permanent employment for the people of this State? Little or nothing. It has been a Government that has pandered to minority eccentric interest groups at the expense of the long-term good of the community.

We had a promise that there would be no new taxes. We have certainly had taxes and we have certainly had charges. The budget should be the vehicle to create confidence. It should be a document which encourages investment, assists in job creation and gives hope to the young people of the future. The greatest asset we have in this State is our young people, the next generation of citizens. What we have to do is create opportunities so that they can play their part and their role in this community. In my judgment it is deplorable that up to 30 per cent of young people are without a job and without the opportunity to get a job. They are at wits end to know what to do because the overwhelming majority of them are desperate to obtain gainful employment.

At the other end of the spectrum we have people in their 40s and 50s who have lost their job and have no prospect of ever working again. We now have many people in that situation. What are we going to do? There is only one thing to do: open up this State to business, create opportunities, and encourage and assist those industries who can quickly respond, and they are the agricultural sector, the tourist industry and the mining industry. We have to short circuit development arrangements. I refer to the tourist industry and one has only to look at what is taking place in the Northern Territory, with the tremendous influx of tourists at Alice Springs and Darwin and throughout the Territory. A tremendous number of jobs have been created there. That is what has to take place here.

We have the environment that overseas people want to visit. They are not so much interested in the cities; they want to look at the broad open spaces, for example, Wilpena, Arkaroola, Coober Pedy, the Flinders Ranges, Kangaroo Island, the Barossa Valley and all such areas. We have to create opportunities, improve the infrastructure, and get these people moving. We have to cooperate with the Northern Territory and get tourists to come into South Australia and arrange for them to go out through Darwin so they will see part of central Australia. They are the sort of things which wealthy overseas tourists want to look at. We have the facilities. We have to encourage them to come here and spend their money. This will provide opportunities and hope for young people.

The agricultural sector and the mining industry have laid the foundation for this country and this State. We have the most efficient and reliable producers in the world in South Australia and Australia. This Government has not even been able to come to its senses and exempt the stamp duty so that these people can transfer their farming properties to their families and then be eligible to receive social security benefits and allow the farms to continue. Surely a very simple matter such as this can be legislated without any impediment whatsoever. People should be able to transfer their financial arrangements from one bank or financial institution to another without any penalty. What purpose or what role does the Government have in putting its hand in their pocket? In my judgment, none whatsoever. It is just another grab for revenue so that unnecessary bureaucratic organisations can continue to expand and get in people's way.

Why is it, of recent times, that literally no money has been spent on public infrastructure? In the days of the Playford Government power lines and water mains were constructed

across South Australia. What has happened? Try to get a water main extended or try to improve the water schemes at Hawker and Quorn—two very important tourist areas—or try to get water extended west of Ceduna. It is not a great request of those communities in asking for a reliable water supply. You would think they were trying to shift the Crown jewels from London! Nothing has happened and nothing, unfortunately, will happen while this Government fails to recognise that there is an urgent need to provide these facilities.

There has been considerable debate about what should take place in relation to the excessively high levels of debt within rural South Australia. The Government does not appear to know, or perhaps it is aware of the situation but does not want to address it. All sorts of propositions have been put forward. The most important thing is that we get confidence back into the rural industry. We must give the financial institutions the confidence to continue to lend to and support people, and we must be able to assist those in extreme difficulties. I found interesting a letter that was given to me last Friday night when I addressed a meeting of concerned citizens at Smoky Bay. One of those people had taken the trouble to write to the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, Mr Crean, as follows:

Let me first assure you that the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936 has been amended to allow banks to claim a deduction when only a portion of a bad debt is written off. Under the previous legislation, banks were not entitled to a deduction for bad debts unless the entire debt was written off, although in practice the Tax Office did allow such deductions in certain circumstances. This change puts beyond doubt the application of the present law in relation to partial write-offs.

In addition, under the new arrangements, creditors will be able to claim deductions for losses incurred in debt for equity swaps under debt restructuring arrangements on or after 27 February 1992. These changes were introduced to encourage banks to allow businesses to trade out of financial difficulties rather than foreclosing on bad debts. It is a little early for the Government to ascertain the impact of this change in the taxation treatment of partial debt write-offs and equity swaps on bank lending practices. The Government made this amendment to clarify the taxation treatment of bad debts. However, the Government cannot, of course, access the commercial merits of individual cases. Decisions by individual creditors on whether to use this provision or seek to recover outstanding loans is a matter for their commercial judgment.

Yours sincerely, Simon Crean.

I thought it important to put that letter on the public record so that there could be no misunderstanding in relation to the taxation laws as they affect people facing difficulties.

The other matter I wanted to refer to as we approach the next State election involves Dr George Crowe, who stood at the last Federal election as an Independent but who turned out to be about as independent as the secretary of the Labor Party in South Australia, because in actual fact he was the second ALP candidate—a vote for Crowe was a vote for the Labor Party. This gentleman is now putting himself forward as the Democrat candidate for Giles, I understand, and I am wondering whether he will be assisted again by Mr Herb Kemmel, the architect of the skulduggery and a well-known extreme left wing Labor Party supporter, with some questions hanging over him, who I now understand has attached himself to the land care group on Yorke Peninsula. I wonder whether they will be used as part of his Labor Party activities, but that is another matter.

We want to know whether at the forthcoming election Dr Crowe will be a vehicle to channel the limited votes he gets—from those dissatisfied Labor voters who vote for him—back to the Deputy Premier. We want to know—the people in these areas want to know—where he stands. He represents an

anti-mining Party, and he will attempt to represent Roxby Downs. Will he tell the people at Roxby Downs that really he is an agent of the Labor Party? Where does he stand? Even though few people would have understood it until the very last moment, a vote for Crowe at the last election was a vote for the Labor Party. No. 10 on the ballot paper was one ahead of the Liberal candidate, and therefore it was a vote for the Labor Party. It cost in excess of 2 000 votes. People who thought they were voting against the Labor Party and who did not want to vote for the Liberal Party were not told that their vote would end up having the same weight as that for the No. 1 Labor candidate, Mr Piltz.

We are entitled to know, because the activities in which Dr Crowe engaged were far from honest, in my view. He has talked about all sorts of things and about how credible he is, but at the end of the day the trick that was played there was a quite devious and scurrilous one designed to do harm to the Liberal Party. Will he pull the same stunt in the State election in the seat of Giles? We are entitled to know, and that is why I have raised the matter today, so that it gives him plenty of time to come forward, explain his activities at the Federal election (which he has not done) and put on the public record where he stands.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Eyre that this is the Appropriation debate. It is very wide-ranging, and a lot of leeway is given in this matter, but the Chair is having some difficulty in linking up the honourable member's comments, and I would ask him to link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr GUNN: I am not surprised, Mr Speaker, that you have brought that to my attention. However, I have finished that section, and I have achieved my objective. I wish now to stay strictly within your ruling, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member wantonly and deliberately breaching the Standing Orders of this House?

Mr GUNN: Certainly not: it was just a passing reference. I would not, in any way, want to flout your ruling, Mr Speaker. It was purely a passing reference. I wish now to refer to other difficulties being experienced in my electorate which were not addressed in this Estimates Committee or by the budget itself. For example, there are no long-term plans to develop the port of Thevenard, which will become economically very important in the future. If the grain industry in the upper Eyre Peninsula is to remain viable, it cannot continue to carry excessive freight rate demands. Therefore, if the shipping arrangements change, changes must be made to allow those people to get their products onto the world markets, without being disadvantaged. Some improvements have to be made to the port of Thevenard. When the matter was raised on my behalf by the member for Chaffey, the answer was, to put it mildly, disappointing.

With regard to the other matter to which I now refer, nothing happened after months and months of procrastination in relation to amendments to the Meat Hygiene Authority Act. Where are we today? We have had three deputations: one to the Minister (now Premier) and two to Minister Groom. We have had the member for Stuart claiming credit when she did not even know anything about it.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Well, she wrote a letter to one of the butchers claiming to have done so much work on it—one letter. The matter had been going for 18 months before then.

Mr Ferguson: You're uncharitable!

Mr GUNN: Of course I am uncharitable, but I am just stating a fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: Let me say that, no matter what is said in this House today, the doomsday clock is ticking and, the moment there is a change of Government, by administrative decision the problems will be resolved, and the butchers will be able to get on with providing a good service to people in their community without all the humbug and nonsense that is taking place.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member can make all the suggestions about me she likes. She was not game to come forward and say what she wanted. I am very happy to face the electors Saturday. There are a few nervous nellys on the other side of the House not looking forward to the barrier going down. But when this budget goes through this House today—the last impediment to the election—we will be able to count the days; we know exactly how long it will take.

Mr Ferguson: Maybe you'll put out some policies.

Mr GUNN: This Government had all the policies, and the policy it has inflicted upon the people of this State is no hope, no future, financial mismanagement and the roting of the financial system. Each Government member has a \$130 million debt; that is their share of the State Bank debt. They have a fine record to carry out to their electorates! Let them go out and justify that to all the people of South Australia when vital public utilities are being run down or urgently required facilities are getting knocked back. I will give another example in my electorate.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Do you support the Arid Zones Conservation Park?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I certainly do not support the world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre Basin. If the Minister does, he would want to lock up the whole of the northern part of South Australia so that there is no development and no hope.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: What's he talking about?

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. Interjections are out of order.

Mr GUNN: Of course, we support—

The SPEAKER: Order! The persistence of the honourable member is out of order, and he will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr GUNN: Of course the Liberal Party supports the Arid Zones Conservation Park; it has done for years. When the matter was first brought to my attention many years ago when the Government was seeking support, I immediately responded by saying that it had my total support, because I believe this project is important to all South Australians—and my Leader made that very clear. Let me now refer to child care facilities in this State. Some constituents of mine wrote to the Minister responsible seeking the establishment of a child care service at Coober Pedy. They spoke at length with Ministers when the Cabinet visited Coober Pedy, but the response they received from the Minister responsible is as follows:

With regard to the demand for child care services, I am informed that under the current national child care strategy Coober Pedy has not been identified as a high need area in the first round of allocations. It will, however, be reconsidered in the 1994-95 planning phase.

Family day care places can be made available immediately, but this is dependent upon the recruitment of suitable care providers. The attached report from the Children's Services Office summarises the current [situation]. . .

As at this date, nothing has happened. Anyone who appreciates the situation would understand that there is a need because of the depressed economic conditions in that area which have not been helped by the Federal Government which has increased costs to the mining industry. As in many parts of this State, unfortunately, both parents have to work; therefore, no suitable child care arrangements can be made. It has been put strongly to me by my constituents that a child care facility should be built on or in close proximity to the school site. I sincerely hope that there are sufficient funds available. Just a fraction of the State Bank money would have been—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Why does Dean Brown not support enterprise zones?

Mr GUNN: Dean Brown does support enterprise zones.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): It is appropriate at this time to make some comments about the operations of the Estimates Committees. I express my concern and regret at the degrading of the effectiveness of the Estimates Committees over the past decade. I stated when the Estimates Committees were set up that they were an attempt to give greater opportunity to the Parliament and to every individual member who chose to be party to them to seek information from the Ministers, and to give the Ministers the opportunity to bring their senior advisers to the House so that the exchange of information could be as direct as possible.

Regrettably, what has happened is that there has been a lack of willingness by members on both sides of the House to make the Committees work effectively. If we had been able to make them work effectively I am sure they would have been much better than the Committee as a whole arrangement that we had before 1980 when I think they were first introduced. I am concerned about that, because I think that ever member has indicated disgust, despair or disappointment with the operations of the Committees. We are all attempting to find a different arrangement which the House can look at to make sure that the examination of the budget is more effective.

It has been mentioned in the House that in one case one of the Ministers was able to answer only three questions in the first hour. That is just not appropriate. If it was a question that required that sort of statement there are other ways of getting information across. Quite clearly, it was abuse of the privilege of that position and something that was not designed for the proper examination of the Committee. A full day for each Minister was an appropriate thing to do at the time. It was believed that we would be able to elicit from Ministers that exchange of information that could be on the public record, that could help not just the members of Parliament but South Australians understand the Government machinery.

Having said that, it is difficult for me even to put forward a recommended change. I would like to think that the original proposal in 1980 is probably the most effective one, but it requires the will of every member of Parliament to see that that takes place and it is not to be seen as a means of grandstanding or, in some cases, covering up. I appreciate that we are in the lead up to an election period: they will be the last Estimates Committees before an election and, quite often, in that sort of environment, committees of any kind seem to be somewhat distorted. Be that as it may, it was difficult to get a clear direction out of the Government and out of the Ministers.

We do lack vision: the Parliament has not been able to give the vision we really want. I was driving around my electorate last week attending various functions, and I looked at the peninsula and, just for a moment, tried to think whether Eyre Peninsula would ever have been developed had we had in the 1920s a Government of the same attitude, frame of mind and lack of vision that is in place now. There would never have been a railway line built; there would never have been a Todd pipeline built; there would never have been a power supply put through; and there would never have been any sort of road infrastructure go through. It would all have been hampered by native vegetation, planning approvals and the whole thing. It would never have got off the ground.

We have in that area, basically, the grain bowl of South Australia. Quite often we are producing 50 per cent of the State's grain on that one peninsula. We take our hammerings through droughts, mice plagues, locust plagues and other adversities but, overall, the contribution of that area to the financial coffers of this State is enormous and far beyond the average contribution of other parts of the State. And it is primary production, be it on the land or in the sea. It is a renewable resource: it is a farming activity and it is one that, if looked after well, will continue to contribute to the coffers of this State and the nation for a long time to come.

If it is not looked after and if it is abused and considered a minority sector of the community because less than 6 per cent of the population is actually involved in primary production, obviously the ability to earn income will go. That will deteriorate the farther one goes down the track. The visions of the 1920s have been hampered. I am sure that this and any future Government must redirect its visions to realise that, if we want that ongoing contribution to the coffers and to the development and support of the State, it must give fair consideration to those areas. With that, and as part of that ongoing support, must come the provision of basic infrastructure and basic services. We are always at risk. I heard the Australian Democrats on the radio this morning talking about a cutback in medical services. I am not sure how serious that was or whether it was a bit of political grandstanding. It may well be at risk; I do not know. We are fighting every inch of the way. The same goes for schools. Every citizen of the State, regardless of whether they live in the inner metropolitan area or in the outer areas of the State, is equal and at least has some fundamental right to the basic facilities enjoyed by every other citizen.

The Committees also looked at some of the problems that are confronting the State, including the State Bank issue. Earlier today we heard the member for Victoria explain to the House what the General Manager of the State Bank said about the number of farmers in difficulty in South Australia. We know that what was said is not right. The Minister of Primary Industries set up a working party after the rain and storm damage that occurred at harvest time. A member of the working party, a public servant, asked whether it was true that farmers were advanced carry-on finance on the condition that they signed a declaration that their property would be placed on the market by the following September or whenever. A State Bank officer stood up and denied that that was the case.

I have seen many such letters, and probably every member who represents a rural area would have seen similar letters. It is common practice amongst the banking institutions to put pressure on farmers by advancing carry-on finance to enable them to put their crop in on condition that the property is put on the market and sold, which is even worse than just putting the property on the market, because to have a forced sale and

to accept any price—not just a realistic value, but to accept any price—does an enormous amount of damage to South Australia. It causes damage because it artificially deflates land values and it therefore puts at risk every other primary producer who has any sorts of borrowings at all. It lowers the asset value and, therefore, with the increasing debt level the percentage of equity to asset shifts over.

I would like to use this opportunity to quote an example which explains what I am talking about. About four years ago a farmer in my electorate got into financial difficulty. He had three boys and a fairly large area of land on central Eyre Peninsula which was not highly productive country but was usually fairly reliable. The advice at that time from banks, from Governments and financial institutions was: get big or get out; buy the land because the prices will never come down, and all the rest. Because he had three boys and the neighbouring property came on the market, he did just that: he bought it.

He had an asset value at that time of about \$1.3 million and, with his borrowings for this new farm (for which he had to borrow every dollar), he had a debt of about \$900 000. That was still an acceptable debt to asset ratio at that time. Within a matter of two years, of course, land values came down, commodity prices dropped and it soon became apparent that the debt equalled the asset and the bank started to put the pressure on. The person concerned had a fair amount of large equipment. He sold off some of that equipment where he was able to, and he sold a small parcel of land. He reduced the debt to \$340 000, which was an enormous effort in a two-year period. Then the bank wanted to move in on him and it wanted to force the sale.

I heard of this and, having been involved in the case a little earlier, together with a couple of other people we arranged for the Premier and the Minister of Primary Industries to meet that farmer on the roadside when the Premier visited Eyre Peninsula. Of course, this caused some concern to the bank. However, the bank did back off, and it allowed that farmer to continue. Believe it or not, that farmer now has a tax problem. He was given that opportunity, which the bank was going to deny him at that time. After reducing his debt level to one-third of what it was, the bank was then going to move in and foreclose on him. Thanks to the intervention of the Premier and the Minister at that time, that farmer is still farming, and farming quite well. As he said to me the other day, he now has a tax problem mainly because of provisional tax requirements.

We are seeing a lack of forward thinking by the banks. More particularly, in my view, unless the banks recognise that they have a responsibility to keep the good farmers on the land, we are going to see a brain drain from the farming community; we are going to see a lowering of the farming 'intelligence bank'; and that will have adverse effects on the long-term productivity of the State.

We are seeing a lessening in pest plant control measures. Banks are putting pressure on farmers such that farmers are not carrying out the required noxious weed eradication that they are supposed to. As everyone in this House would know, to miss one year of seeding of noxious weeds puts the farm back seven years, because at one seeding, with the hard and the soft seed of any plant, seven years of germination occurs down the track. So, it is important.

I have challenged some of the banks—where they have put lines through the pest plant control measures, where they have taken that out of a farmer's budget—that by doing that they are becoming farm managers and therefore must carry

the responsibilities and obligations under the laws of this Parliament and this State. The moment they get into that sort of thing they have to carry the obligation for it.

When I went public on that, on two occasions banks came back to me and said that they realised that they had overstepped the mark in relation to that issue. As simple and as small as it might be in the overall farm budget, nevertheless it is a very important measure. There is an obligation on behalf of the bank and the farmer to ensure that the requirements of the State and its laws are met.

I have talked about some things that I did not originally set out to talk about, but in talking about the budget I refer to the Year of the Family, which I raised before in this House some two months or six weeks ago. I have done that on a number of occasions, believing that this State should have and should recognise the Year of the Family. It is an issue that has concerned me greatly. I have objected to many of the laws that have been passed in this State because they are anti-family and they do not work for it. The member for Heysen, I think it was, just a few moments ago spoke about seeing signs in town indicating that poker machines will be introduced at the end of October. That is another anti-family measure.

Mr Ferguson: It started on that side of the House.

Mr BLACKER: I do not care on which side of the House it started—it is anti-family. It should be borne in mind that more and more Government expenditure has to go into the social welfare area to try to correct the anti-family legislation that this State and the Commonwealth have passed in recent years. My concern about the budget is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLACKER: I raised this matter in the House quite some time before the budget was handed down. There was an opportunity for the Premier of the day and the Minister responsible to at least make some small allocation and accord some recognition to Year of the Family, which occurs at Federal level next year. But no, we received no intimation that this State Government is prepared to acknowledge the Year of the Family in the way in which it should, and the way in which many members of Parliament if not most members of Parliament believe it should be acknowledged. Whether it was a simple oversight, I do not know. I find it hard to believe that, in a budget of the size we are talking about, just a few hundred thousand dollars could not have been put aside for this once-in-a-decade recognition of the family. All Government departments would be coordinated with a simple request: 'Please make a special effort during the year to have something that will signify the Year of the Family; please put something on your information material that will assist in promoting the Year of the Family; please do something to help our kids and our families.'

Every member of Parliament would have experienced the situation where, many times a day, destitute families who do not know which way to turn attend their offices on many issues. When they do get to the office of the member of Parliament, quite often it is so far down the track that it is very difficult to assist them. I know that all members of Parliament, regardless of their political persuasion, do their level best to help those people. I am not being at all critical of anyone. The system has grown upon us where we have had a series of pieces of legislation which has basically been anti-family, and we are now suffering the consequences of those issues and finding that more of our individual time and departmental time is spent trying to help those people who are

caught up in that sort of mess—in trying to resolve their problems.

However, it is not all bleak. On a slightly more positive side, there has been a change of attitude for many people who, knowing full well that the farming industry is down and in some cases various fishing industries have turned around, have looked to an alternative enterprise issue. On a visit to the Yallunda Flat Show last Monday, I saw that the Show Society showed vision; it set aside a hall and named the day 'An Alternative Enterprise Day'. Those people came up with a series of small local alternative enterprises, such as the farming of ostrich, emu, deer, elk, alpaca, oysters, yabbies, abalone, tuna, snapper and lobster, which are all aquaculture or farming oriented and which have been commenced in the past three or four years. With the provision and the ability to foster some of those new industries, it may be that some of those people involved in those industries will get a start. We must get the Government red tape off their backs because some of it is absolutely unreal. We must remove the barriers that have been placed before some of those people and, provided they are operating within the laws and there is no health or quarantine risk to anyone else, we should give them every opportunity to get their businesses going, and in turn they may well assist this State to get back on its feet.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): I appreciated being involved in the Estimates Committees, a procedure which is a very good facility of the Parliament. I want to congratulate those who had the foresight to implement it. I note the suggestions made yesterday by my colleague the member for Kavel in relation to the Senate Estimates Committees: it would be a marvellous idea if the time restraint was taken away so that we could speak out on all these lines rather than be gagged, as we have been in some of these Committees. Generally, the Committees were very constructive.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Very much so. The prepared statements in reply to Dorothy Dix questions were regrettable. I am concerned about the allocation and level of funding for the Department of Primary Industries, and in particular in relation to agriculture. Despite the Minister's protestations—and he has been doing a lot of waffling lately—about misreading the figures (and he basically implied that I was a dill), it is irrefutable that agricultural services have suffered and in the coming year will suffer many hefty cuts. I had a heated exchange with the Minister and without a doubt the figures are very hard to define. I do not deny the need for economies but what we see here is the continuation of a pattern of using the agriculture sector as an easy target for cuts in funds. The formation of a super department has, on the Minister's own admission, made it difficult to make direct comparisons. If I had a suspicious nature I might even be led to think that the figures were deliberately clouded. This House has a right to know what the Government is planning. It should not be up to an individual member to have to go over every figure with a magnifying glass to try to wiggle out the information, if indeed the information is even there. However I work out any of the figures, it is quite clear that the Government intends to continue the process of starving the agriculture sector of resources.

The Minister denied my suggestion that staff morale was low in this department. I still assert that the manner in which this department has, over the years, been cut and cut again

has left a legacy of disaffection that pervades the whole department from the highest to the lowest level.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is it not a tradition of this Parliament that speeches should not be written by or for the speaker?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order about who writes speeches. Again, I warn the honourable member, in the friendliest manner from the Chair, about frivolous points of order. He well knows there is no Standing Order relating to who may write speeches. There is a custom whereby members do not read speeches, but that is a different point of order altogether.

Mr VENNING: I take great exception to that. If the honourable member had the courage to read through the Estimates Committees proceedings, he would work out what was said. I am repeating much of what was said there, and it was all *ad lib*, as in Question Time.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You should be on the front bench.

Mr VENNING: I take great exception to a terse comment such as that, because it is a reflection on me that I am not able to write down matters that affect my industry. As the honourable member well knows, I know what is going on in my industry and I do not need anybody to write speeches. I hire a person in my office—and that is well known—to assist me with press releases and general research, but I prepare my own speeches. I will admit that my material is printed on computer so that I am able to have access to it over the years, because it is good to be able to refer back. I am very upset about that allegation from the member for Napier. I am thankful that his days in this House are numbered.

The Department of Primary Industries in South Australia has been the lowest funded department in Australia for many years. What we are seeing is further cuts. South Australia—and I do not need to look up any of these facts because they are well known—is the State in Australia that relies most on its agriculture. I tried to be positive during the Estimates Committees and I gave the Minister credit, because during the past three years agriculture in this State has lifted its head and is really making big gains. This industry alone can lift South Australia out of its demise, but to see this cut in our department from the lowest to even lower is staggering. I do not know how the Minister could even consider it. Money should be put back in rather than further cuts being made.

We have lost a lot of staff in the Department of Primary Industries via TSPs and voluntary separation packages. The department has lost its former CEO, Dr Radcliffe; it has lost its 2IC; it has lost five key people in critical positions; and it has lost some of the most famous and dedicated scientists. I asked the Minister, 'When will the next lot of TSPs be offered and to whom?' To his credit he did not know so he took the question on notice. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Employment Agents Registration,
Mutual Recognition (South Australia),
State Bank of South Australia (Investigator's Records and Preparation for Restructuring) Amendment,
Supply (No. 2),

Tobacco Products Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Corporation of Port Lincoln—By-law—No. 26—Bathing and Controlling the Foreshore
District Council of Paringa—By-law—No. 33—Lock 5 Marina

SEATON NORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 431 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to provide part of the former Seaton North Primary School campus for a children's playground, was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

LAFFERS TRIANGLE

A petition signed by 653 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to support the retention of the land bounded by Sturt Creek and Sturt and Marion Roads, known as Laffers Triangle, as open space, was presented by Mr Holloway.

Petition received.

FOCUS 2000

A petition signed by 61 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the current ownership and funding of the *Focus 2000* newspaper for South Australian Housing Trust tenants, was presented by Mrs Hutchison.

Petition received.

STATE BANK

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of State Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: During the Estimates Committee debate on Wednesday 23 September this year, the member for Bright asked me a number of questions relating to the tender awarded to State Supply to supply stationery to the State Bank. The honourable member claimed, and I quote from *Hansard*:

The tender awarded to State Supply for the stationery supplied to the State Bank bore a strong similarity to a bid lodged at an earlier time by a major Adelaide-based wholesaler.

Furthermore, the member for Bright claimed that it had been alleged to him that somehow State Supply had obtained a copy of a tender lodged by a competitor. The member for Bright was quoted in the *Advertiser* the following day as saying after the Estimates hearing that he had received strong evidence to support his claims.

Given the seriousness of these allegations, I gave my assurance that I would contact the Commissioner of Police to have this matter investigated immediately. I can now report to the House the findings of the Anti-Corruption Branch, and I read an edited extract of the Anti-Corruption Branch's final report, as follows:

The initial allegation was that the tender from State Supply replicated another tender. An examination of the tender documents clearly indicates this is not the case. Inquiries also indicate that the

State Supply tender was submitted a day before the named tender. This would indicate that it was impossible for State Supply to have access through State Bank to the tender document from the other organisation prior to their submission.

Based on the available material, I find no evidence to support the allegation there was any collusion in the submission of tender documents by any parties in relation to the outsourcing of stationery for the State Bank of South Australia in 1992. As such, I find this issue is refuted.

These inquiries have clearly indicated there is no evidence of collusion or other criminal activities in the tender process. Examination of the documents indicates the process was conducted within accepted commercial guidelines.

This report, which was signed by the Commissioner of Police, highlights that, once again, the member for Bright has got it wrong. Police investigations into these spurious allegations are a waste of time, effort and money.

The member for Bright claimed that he had received strong evidence to support his claims, yet once again the honourable member's allegations were found to have absolutely no basis or substance. In the past, when the member for Bright has made one of these allegations, I have asked him to provide the police or myself with some evidence. The honourable member has never provided any evidence of substance or accuracy. Yet the media and the public continue to accept at face value the misinformation put forward by the member for Bright, supposedly in the interests of the electorate. This repeated misinformation not only damages the honourable member's reputation further but, more importantly, it brings the reputations of another two South Australian employers and their employees into disrepute. I call on the member for Bright to apologise to all those individuals and organisations slandered by his accusations and allegations.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the eighth report of the Committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I bring up the eighth report of the Economic and Finance Committee on the inquiry into executive structures and salaries in the South Australian public sector.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. If the House cannot hear the honourable member speaking, we will not know what is being tabled. The honourable member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE: I move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR REMUNERATION

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Why has the Government failed to take action to preclude unacceptable practices in public sector remuneration, which are described in the Economic and Finance Committee report just tabled as

being disgraceful, totally inappropriate and leaving a great deal to be desired?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, it was pretty widely circulated last week by the Chairman—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will direct his question through the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As long ago as 1988, the Government received advice from Treasury that salaries paid to State Bank executives should be made public to ensure greater accountability to the Parliament and the taxpayers. The Government rejected that advice on the grounds that it would—and I quote the former Premier—‘create more problems than it would solve’.

The former Public Accounts Committee made a similar recommendation three years ago in September 1990, and 11 months ago the Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee warned publicly that ‘there is evidence of some very haphazard and questionable practices being used by some statutory authorities to fix large salary packages.’ The committee’s report today shows that the Government has repeatedly ignored warnings and allowed disgraceful and totally inappropriate practices to continue even now.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The first point to be made is that this report has just been tabled in this Parliament and, now that this has happened, it will, of course, be considered by the Government. The second point I want to make is that the Leader, as he did yesterday, is quoting from statements that were made in 1988 and 1990. He has failed to quote the fact that this year’s and last year’s State Bank annual reports have followed a different practice to that of previous years in that they reveal details of the remuneration of senior executives of the State Bank, something that I would have thought he would be pleased about. That is something that is now happening that did not happen before. In a sense, I guess that is an outcome of previous comments and recommendations that have been made.

I only have the press reports to go on with respect to the report that has just been tabled in Parliament, and I have no idea of the extent of their accuracy; the *Advertiser’s* track record in respect of accuracy is not notably good, so I will want to read the report myself. The third point that I want to make is that, as I read the report, it appears to make some references to those people directly within the public sector more or less by way of actually detailing how much they earn in their salary package. The main criticisms seems to be targeted at those who work for public trading enterprises. Those recommendations will have to be taken into account seriously, and I have no problem with that.

At the end of the day the real issue that will have to be taken into account in a special way is that these public trading enterprises operate in the private trading environment. The real question then must be whether or not they are to be put at a disadvantage with private competitors. I do not think that would be a reasonable situation. I certainly accept that it would not be reasonable for them to be in a favoured position in the business environment over private trading enterprises. They should not have any favoured treatment in terms of the salaries and packages that their senior executives earn, because there is no justification for that. However, if on the other hand a constraint is to be put upon them so that their senior executives cannot be paid on a reasonably comparable level with reasonably comparable institutions in the private sector, that would mean that effectively there would be a brain drain from those public trading enterprises into other

companies that would limit the capacity of those companies to compete effectively.

So, we will look at this report very closely indeed. In my view, there is no justification for excessive packages that do not, in a sense, match what is taking place in the private sector. However, I make the point yet again that the Leader has chosen not to acknowledge what has been done in the past 12 months in this regard. He would do himself and his credibility due cause by paying tribute to the work that has already been done in this area.

MOUSE PLAGUE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Primary Industries say what degree of success has been achieved in controlling the mouse plague in South Australia, and will he give any estimates of the total cost involved if these are available at this time? This is an important question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am surprised at that reaction, because this is a most serious matter as far as the rural community is concerned. The strychnine baiting program ended on 30 September and the farmers had 14 days after that to apply the strychnine. The reason for that, of course, is that they cannot take the risk of harvested grain being mixed with baited grain. I do have final figures in relation to the estimate of damage and other matters associated with the campaign, and it has been an enormous success. Without the use of strychnine and, if it had been allowed to continue unchecked, the mouse plague would have caused losses of the order of \$150 million to our crops and, if the mice numbers had moved into the outer metropolitan area, like the northern Adelaide plains, or further into the South-East, damage for example to our floriculture industry (which is worth \$270 million to South Australia) would have been enormous, not to mention the horticultural losses as well. So it has been an enormous success.

Mice numbers have been reduced by 95 per cent. A total of 350 000 hectares were baited throughout South Australia. As I said, 95 per cent of the mice numbers have been knocked out. We have effectively saved, through the use of strychnine, something like \$100 million in crop losses that would have otherwise occurred—not to mention the potential flow-on effects. There were 73 State Government employees involved in the campaign and 47 employees from the Animal and Plant Control Commission.

Unlike South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales still have enormous problems. Victoria only a matter of two weeks ago authorised the use of ground baiting with strychnine. They had aerial baited, but they have only just authorised the use of ground baiting, and as a result Victoria is now reporting mice numbers in explosion proportions, and they have great difficulties in controlling the mice plague at this part of the year coming into harvest time. We advised Victoria that it should not delay in relation to this matter. That is an example of where you can test what we did against what other States have done, and Victoria has a great problem because it took an extra month before it authorised the use of aerial baiting with strychnine and it has only just authorised ground baiting. So, Victoria is in great difficulties.

In New South Wales, which did not use strychnine at all, they are now reporting mice numbers in plague proportions. They are also reporting an upsurge in mice numbers, but in South Australia the mice numbers have been reduced by 95

per cent, and we have saved the rural community in South Australia something like \$100 million. At the commencement of the campaign the estimated damage to South Australia's crops was between \$20 million and \$30 million. The final estimate is something like \$40 million, but that is likely to be revised downwards as a result of farmers being able to resow as a result of the use of strychnine and achieving a better than expected harvest.

So, while they are the final figures, they need to be put in that context: they may yet be revised downwards. I was at the Paskeville field day on Yorke Peninsula last week and farmers from Yorke Peninsula were telling me—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Minister to draw his response to a close.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The farmers from Yorke Peninsula were very emotional about the fact that their crops had been saved, they were able to resow and they will have an income as a result of the Government's use of strychnine in South Australia. Finally, I want to congratulate primary producers across the State for their cooperation, because it is only as a result of their cooperative effort that we have been able to put down the mice plague in South Australia. The cooperative effort involved primary producers, people from my own office and of course private companies as well as the district councils. There are still some scattered problems, but they are being monitored and treated by other means. However, the situation is completely under control. It has been an enormously successful campaign, and we only have to look at what is happening in Victoria and New South Wales to see how effective our campaign was.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now becoming repetitive, and he will resume his seat.

PUBLIC SECTOR REMUNERATION

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

Will the Deputy Premier accept responsibility for the executive remuneration practices of the SGIC, which the Economic and Finance Committee has described as disgraceful, inappropriate and unacceptable and, if not, who is responsible? The committee is critical of the level of executive remuneration in the SGIC given the commission's poor financial performance in recent years and packages that allow executives to minimise their tax obligations.

Both these issues were raised in the Government Management Board report on the SGIC, which the Government received in August 1991, more than two years ago. That report revealed that SGIC executive remuneration was provided by 'a combination of base salary, motor vehicles, car parking, superannuation, credit card balances, fees of one type or another, travel expenses and home loans'. As a result of that report, the Government gave itself significant additional powers to control the operations of the SGIC, but these remuneration practices have continued to flourish.

Over the past two years the number of SGIC executives being paid more than \$100 000 a year has also increased from 9 to 12. The Economic and Finance Committee has expressed concern that the commission is not applying performance criteria in determining remuneration.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As with the Premier, I have not seen this report. I have noted with interest—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—some press reports in recent days of speculation on the report. I understand that the press speculation is reasonably accurate. So, assuming that that is the case, I can only say that I have absolutely no difficulty with what appear to be the recommendations of the report.

The practices that have been described are, of course, common practice in the private sector and entirely in line with the Liberal Party's policy of individual contracts, freely negotiated between the employer and the employee. As I understand it, that is the Liberal Party policy and that is what has been occurring in the SGIC and the State Bank. I cannot quite see how the Opposition can complain with any sincerity about the practice; it is its policy, but it is not mine and it is not this Government's. The fact that the SGIC and the State Bank have been operating in the same way that the private sector has been—completely in line with Liberal Party policy—I believe is unsustainable. I also believe that anyone who goes to work for a public sector enterprise has to understand that there may be some penalty attached to that. Probably the first penalty is a lack of privacy, and I support that completely. One has to accept that if one works in the public sector. All members of Parliament do and I believe that everyone who works for the SGIC and the State Bank has to accept that there will not be, cannot be and ought not to be any confidentiality as regards their salary packages.

There is a real down side to that, because it is a competitive market out there, and it is the market that members opposite laud and praise on a daily basis. There is no doubt that for a number of executives in the city the remuneration package will be the final determinant of where they work. If the State Bank and the SGIC cannot compete, they will not get the best employees. It is as simple as that. I believe that that is something that we must accept, because private sector practices—common and everyday practices—are not acceptable in the public sector and certainly are not acceptable to this Government.

The problem to some extent will be self-correcting from 1 April next year. There will be no financial benefit to employees to negotiate those kinds of contracts. It will cost them as much in fringe benefits tax as will getting the whole of the package in cash, so to a great extent the problem will work itself out. Nevertheless, contracts are still in place, and again I point out—although I do not want to be repetitious—that they were negotiated in the market place completely in line with private sector practice and completely in line with Liberal Party policy practice.

Both the SGIC and the bank know my views on this: they are very much aware of them. Both organisations report to Parliament through their annual reports, which list the number of executives in certain brackets, and any additional details that have to be given about those packages will be given to Parliament quite openly. Everybody knows the rules. I can say in answer to the Deputy Leader that, if the reports of the Economic and Finance Committee are correct, I have no difficulty with them, this Government has no difficulty with them and any action that needs to be taken—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was taken two years ago. That is why they are in the annual report. I have just gone through that for you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Any further action that needs to be taken will be taken.

GARBAGE RECYCLING TRANSFER CENTRE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources advise the House of any concerns expressed by the Environment Protection Office in regard to the proposed north-western waste recycling transfer facility at Royal Park? Mr Frank De Masi of Johnson Street Royal Park lives in close proximity to this proposed development, as do many of my constituents, and has expressed great concern to me about potential noise and dust pollution from the proposed facility which is planned for an area containing very considerable residential development. I understand that the Environment Protection Office may well share some of these concerns and in fact has communicated such concerns to the Planning Commission, hence my question.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Albert Park has raised this issue previously in the House and has obviously kept his constituents in touch with his concerns about the proposed development. I know that the honourable member supports strongly the establishment of the recycling depots: his concerns are that they should be environmentally acceptable and placed in the appropriate location. The honourable member is correct in saying that the EPO does have a number of concerns with this development, and has expressed those concerns, correctly (as the honourable member said), to the Planning Commission. The submission that has been made as part of the range of submissions received by the commission is currently being considered. The EPO's primary concern relates to the potential for excess noise and dust that could be emitted from the generator of the proposed facility.

I am sure that members will appreciate that the site is zoned light industrial and, by definition, a light industrial area is one that does not add or create any appreciable noise, smoke, smell or dust in the immediate area or any other nuisance to so cause any loss of amenity to those people in that area. As the honourable member has said, there are people living in a residential environment very close to the site. A minute of the EPO regarding this development states:

Recycling depots have been a cause of complaint to the Environment Protection Office regarding noise, odour and dust and these issues are not adequately addressed in the planning application report. Typical noise sources are shredders, compactor, movement of heavy vehicles etc. The report proposes that the operation will be contained within purpose-built buildings, there is, however, no assessment of the likely emissions of noise, odour etc. from these buildings. Unless the buildings are designed and constructed as to contain high levels of noise they may not be effective in preventing the emission of excessive noise. The proponent claims that noise from the site will comply with the requirements of the Noise Control Act. This Act is intended for the resolution of existing noise conflicts and is not a standard by which new development should be judged.

This office recommends that noise from new development should not significantly add to the existing noise environment. In particular, noise from the development should not exceed the existing ambient level of noise by more than 5dB.

I think the honourable member has correctly raised this issue here and in doing so has very adequately and efficiently represented his constituents. I commend him for that and hope that we can see these matters resolved very efficiently by the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC SECTOR RENUMERATION

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Does the Deputy Premier intend to take any action against the Managing Director of SGIC, Mr Jones, for approving an executive remuneration

package with a cash component of only 40 per cent after Mr Jones had told the Economic and Finance Committee on 7 April 1993 that the commission would apply a policy requiring executives to take at least 50 per cent of their remuneration in cash? In the report tabled today, the committee found that five out of a total of 17 executives employed by SGIC and its subsidiaries received less than 50 per cent of their total remuneration package as a base salary, and a further three received less than 60 per cent. If superannuation, which we all know is a standard, is included in the committee's calculation, the number of executives receiving less than 50 per cent of their total remuneration package as a base salary rises to eight out of 17.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I said earlier, I have not seen the report. The member for Bragg has an advantage over me.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He appears to have a copy in front of him. I do not; nobody has given me one.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have no intention of asking for one right now. These things have to be studied in detail.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will say that the report will be studied very quickly. If any action is to be taken with respect to anybody, Mr Jones or anybody else, of course it will be taken, and it will be taken very speedily indeed. However, as with all these things raised by members opposite, there are usually two sides to the story. I will wait to hear the other side of the story and, if necessary, I will be happy to bring the other side of the story back to the Parliament, but I do not believe in hanging anybody before a trial.

SMOKING POLICY

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister representing the Minister of Transport Development explain why the Office of Transport Policy and Planning allows smoking in nine-seater taxi buses that rank to pick up individuals from hotels and sporting venues when the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board prohibits smoking in licensed cabs?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will get a report from the Minister of Transport Development for the honourable member.

STATE BANK

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): How does the Premier justify the use of almost \$4.8 million of taxpayers' money to make severance payments to State Bank executives since February 1991? The report of the Economic and Finance Committee tabled today shows that, since the bank collapsed and the Government took control through its indemnity arrangements, severance payments totalling \$4.798 million have been made to 39 executives. These payouts are in addition to payments for outstanding annual and long service leave and average more than \$123 000 per executive. The committee has described these severance payments as excessive to those executives whose performance has been criticised by the Royal Commissioner and the Auditor-General and who have been labelled 'bastards' by the Deputy Premier when he complained about their role in the downfall of the former Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again, this refers to a report that will have to be studied in detail—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—when I have a copy of it, and my officers and those of the Deputy Premier will certainly do that. I point out that this matter related to a downsizing situation within the bank. We now have the good bank, as it is called, making real profits, unlike the illusory ones it was making before.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel has asked the question.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Just bear with me. We now have a situation where the bank is making very real profits.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Why is it making very real profits—because it has got back to the basics of banking that it should be on about. It has got back to targeting the markets that it does particularly well at. It frankly did not need the size—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—of the employment structure or the capital structure that it had previously. It simply no longer needed that. There was a choice available to the new management and new board of the bank that they simply could have decided to keep all the extra people whom the bank was contractually obliged to employ, because they were part of the employment of the former bank, and somehow just put them aside in offices where they would not actually do anything because they would be surplus to requirements. If that had been the case, the bank would not have been able to achieve its current rate of return: it would have had to be paying those salaries needlessly, because frankly those employees would have been in excess of the requirements of the bank.

So, the actual decision to downsize, I would have thought, was one that we would support in this place. I would have thought that was one decision that was acknowledged as being a wise one on behalf of the new board, the new management, of the bank.

When it comes to downsizing arrangements, you then have to examine what are the requirements to do that downsizing. The simple fact is that many of these employees who work for the bank had contractual employment arrangements with the bank, and you simply do not decide that you will tear up those arrangements and say, 'Tough luck'. If you do that, and if that is what members opposite are recommending the bank should have done, quite understandably those people who had had their contracts torn up without due recompense would have gone to their nearest lawyer and taken legal action. They would have had a reasonable case: indeed, it is likely that they would have had an overwhelming chance of succeeding. It is true that nothing is ever certain. They might not have succeeded, but since there would be an overwhelming chance they would have succeeded, the bank would have faced legal costs in fighting these cases in the court which, again, would have been an unnecessary drain on its real profitability when there were other procedures that could have been followed.

So, they followed the arrangement of making severance payments to these people who were no longer necessary in the new organisation, and that is not unique to the State Bank. I can assure the honourable member, who I would have

thought would know better, that this is a common situation that applies in many organisations that have gone through downsizing arrangements in the private sector. They have to make severance payments. Those severance payments are made up in fairly standard sorts of ways, looking at fairly standard sorts of features, and that is what has happened in the case of the State Bank.

SOUTHERN RIGHT HOME

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. What involvement, if any, has the South Australian Government in the Seaford energy efficient display home project known as Southern Right Home, and what expectations does the Minister have for it?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this very exciting project, of which the State Government is a proud sponsor. The South Australian Housing Trust has provided assistance towards the construction of the house with an interest free loan of \$43 000. This will be repaid when the project is wound up and the home sold, which is anticipated to be in December 1994. I understand that the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the Office of Energy Planning and the Energy Information Centre have also provided assistance in one form or another to promote energy aspects of this important project.

The Southern Right Home is a joint initiative of the A.V. Jennings corporation, the Noarlunga council and the State Government. Its aim is to demonstrate how new ideas in house design and construction, energy efficiency, domestic security and safety, and environment sensitivity can be brought together in everyday, affordable family housing situations. The Southern Right Home is currently being constructed at Clearwater Crescent, Noarlunga. I understand it is now at the lock-up stage and currently having various appliances installed and landscaping work done in preparation for its official opening in mid-November.

It will be open to the public as a display home to provide ideas and advice on all aspects of housing from house design and siting to safety and security, as well as providing practical hints on how to save on domestic energy consumption. The Southern Right Home is very much a first in the way it brings together into a single display concept the full range of new ideas and directions in housing. It combines design ideas such as house siting, passive heating and cooling, and natural lighting, with safety features such as non-slip floor surfaces, safety glass and a range of fire protection measures. It promotes environmental features such as the use of waffle pads in the foundations made from recycled plastics, as well as products which minimise energy consumption, such as aerated building blocks, roof ventilations and internal heat control zoning.

All this is done with price in mind. The ideas promoted in the Southern Right Home are ideas which we can all afford. I would suggest they are ideas which will make our own homes safer places in which to live, whilst looking after the environment. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate A.V. Jennings and the various officers of the State Government and Noarlunga council who have been involved in bringing together this important initiative, and I certainly look forward to viewing it myself in the near future.

PUBLIC SECTOR REMUNERATION

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): My question is directed to the Premier. Why is the Government still failing to ensure full disclosure of information about public sector executive remuneration? In September 1990, the former Public Accounts Committee recommended the public disclosure of remuneration of executives employed within the public sector. Today, more than three years later, at pages 61 and in sequence, the Economic and Finance Committee has reported that full disclosure is still not being required of all statutory authorities. I ask this question in light of the continuing requests that were made to the Economic and Finance Committee during compilation of that report for continuing secrecy and also in light of the answer to the second question today by the Deputy Premier, who claims that he supports full disclosure of public salaries.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Since the release of that report in 1990, there in fact have been moves for more disclosure than was previously the case, and I reported on that earlier this afternoon. So, there is more disclosure now of public sector salaries—certainly with respect to statutory authorities and public trading enterprises—than was the case at the time of that report in 1990. We now have this report (and I now physically have this report; it has just been put before me) and it will be, as has been said a number of times today, considered very seriously indeed. The very principle of disclosure, as the Deputy Premier said a few moments ago, is certainly supported, and the question is that it should be supported to the maximum reasonable extent. What then has to be determined is whether there are any reasonable limits that might have to be considered. But we will not comment on that until we have had a chance to consider this report and make considered decisions on that matter.

FIREARMS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Emergency Services indicate to the House whether he has any intention to request the Commissioner of Police to review the administration of firearms control following the introduction of the new regulations under the amended Firearms Act? I have been approached by a number of constituents who, whilst expressing strong support for the changes to the legislation for firearms control (and, in fact, one of them said that it was brilliant), have expressed concern that the system of administration for these controls carried out by the Police Department has not been sufficiently streamlined to take into account the requirements of the new legislation.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: A number of people have approached me regarding the administration of this matter, involving the forms to be completed and the requirements to be observed by applicants for licences, including renewals. I will ask the Registrar to look at streamlining the administration system. As the system settles down, we will obviously see some hiccups in it and, given what the honourable member and other members (namely, the members for Mitchell and Henley Beach) have said, I will be happy to take up this matter with the Registrar.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Will the Premier say why his Government is so incompetent that it cannot even identify how many statutory authorities exist in South Australia?

What confidence can taxpayers have that their money is not being wasted when the Parliament does not even know who is spending it? On page 18 of its report today, the Economic and Finance Committee has revealed that it was unable to obtain a comprehensive list of the statutory authorities and that the Office of Public Sector Reform was still compiling such a list. More than three years ago, in a report (to which other members have referred) issued in September 1990 on Government accountability, the former Public Accounts Committee made a similar criticism, revealing that it may not have been able to identify all statutory authorities for which the Government is responsible.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The overwhelming majority of statutory authorities have been not only named but agreed upon. What remains, however, as a question that requires further examination depends on whether certain bodies come under the definition of 'statutory authorities'.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, the member for Murray-Mallee waves the report around and quotes a page number. Again, I draw attention to the fact that I have only just received this report. I will have it investigated, and I will come back with some further comments on these matters.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That's a weak response.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If the member for Heysen wishes, I will just spend my time reading this right now rather than answering questions. As this report has been delivered to me only today, it is appropriate that I give it due and proper consideration rather than take into account some—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will look at this report in its entirety and find out what the full recommendations are—not take them out of context—and bring back some detailed responses to those recommendations; and, indeed, one of those responses will deal with the matter raised by the member for Murray-Mallee.

WINE TAX

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Business and Regional Development inform the House of the purpose of next week's visit by ACTU Secretary, Bill Kelty, who is Chairperson of the Federal Government's Regional Development Task Force? I understand that Bill Kelty will be meeting with the Minister to discuss the State Government's submission to the Federal Government's Regional Development Task Force, including the impact of the Federal budget on South Australia's wine industry.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I certainly will be happy to answer this question about this important meeting with Mr Kelty and his task force. On Monday, State Cabinet will be meeting with Mr Kelty to discuss the State Government's submission to the Federal Government's Regional Development Task Force, which was announced earlier this year by the Prime Minister, Mr Keating. The submission will cover a number of specific areas, the details of which will be released early next week. In this State there has been broad restructuring in a number of industries vital to South Australia's economic and job growth, including industries such as the automotive industry and the textile, clothing and footwear sector. There is no doubt that during the recession many of these industries were hit hard by a number of

changes to industry policy by the Federal Government, of course, particularly by tariff adjustments. A number of those industries responded well, especially in the case of the automotive industry, which is performing spectacularly well in terms of exports—both the major manufacturers and the car components industries.

While the State Government supports restructuring, which enables companies to become more world competitive, there must be real and continued assistance from the Commonwealth to aid the process because, obviously, that restructuring process has hit some States with a heavy manufacturing sector disproportionately hard, and certainly this matter will be raised with Mr Kelty on Monday. There will also be discussions about the importance of the airport upgrading and the MFP to the overall development of South Australia as a region.

In addition, the Federal budget decision to increase the tax on wine has, of course, had an enormous impact on the South Australian wine industry and grape growers. The Premier has already made the Government's position quite clear to Prime Minister Paul Keating and to Treasurer John Dawkins. We do not support the rise in taxation on wine, particularly at a time when the industry is strengthening its export performance and the nation's economy in general; indeed, particularly on the eve of a major campaign by the industry to reach \$1 billion in export sales per year by the year 2000.

I wrote to Bill Kelty suggesting that there be specific discussions on the wine industry and the wine tax issue and I asked him to meet with industry leaders. I will speak personally with Mr Kelty about the potentially devastating impact of the wine tax on South Australia's regional economies and about ways in which the task force can assist our position. One of the members of the task force is Margaret Lehmann of Peter Lehmann Wines, and she has already held meetings in South Australia on a number of issues, and I have met with Steven Howard, one of Mr Kelty's deputies. I believe that Mr Kelty's visit is something that we as a State must take advantage of in order to represent the interests of not just the wine industry but also our automotive and TCF sectors.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): How does the Premier equate his prediction that house construction on the Gillman site will begin this year with the comment made by the MFP's Chief Executive Officer, Mr Ross Kennan, in an ABC interview with Susan Mitchell on 28 September that the first activity of 'any factual form' will not be until 1997; and can he now give any clear timetable on when urban development in the form of housing will actually start on the Gillman site?

In the Estimates Committee's proceedings of 14 September, the Premier was questioned about earlier statements that he made concerning the construction of houses on the Gillman site this year. In reply to one question he said:

I refer to a statement I made on the construction of these houses commencing by the end of the year. Every estimation is that that will continue to be the case.

In reply to the next question he said:

That is quite right. The start of construction on those 70 houses is scheduled before the end of the year.

In the Susan Mitchell interview of 28 September Mr Ross Kennan was asked what sort of time frame the MFP was planning for the development of Gillman. He replied:

You're looking probably at the first activity on the Gillman site in terms of any... any actual form in the 1997 sort of time frame. So it's a long way away.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I challenge the member for Hayward to do some more homework on this matter. I suggest that he check the speech that I made on the day on which the Federal election was announced, as that was the day on which the comment was made about these 70 plus houses being built and that construction would start by the end of the year. I ask him to compare again the statements I made in the Estimates Committee, and that he look carefully at the genesis of these houses as part of the MFP, where they are to be built, because he will find that there is no contradiction between the comments made by Ross Kennan and me on the construction of houses under the MFP banner. He will find that I said that construction will start towards the end of this year. If there is any slippage in that, it will be a matter of months and not years as the honourable member implies. I leave the honourable member with the challenge to do that homework, because he will find that he has the wrong end of this question and that he has missed the point.

ABORIGINAL STUDENTS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training indicate any initiatives that are being taken to support the language development of Aboriginal students in this International Year of the World's Indigenous People?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for her continuing interest in her constituents and for representing the interests of Aboriginal students in South Australia. The department provides additional staffing, equating to about 100 Aboriginal education workers and 42 Aboriginal education resource teachers, to schools with large numbers of Aboriginal students. Part of their role is to assist the language and literacy development of students and to improve attendance levels of Aboriginal students at schools throughout the State.

The Aboriginal Education Unit has also developed two major teacher training and development programs entitled 'English Language Acquisition' and 'Teaching Aboriginal Students'. Over 200 teachers are currently involved in these programs in South Australia. English as a second language teaching methodologies have been implemented as a successful strategy for English literacy development in remote Anangu schools. Literacy levels and attendance for Aboriginal students generally remain much lower than those of the wider student population, and considerable effort is currently under way to more accurately quantify the attainment and attendance levels of Aboriginal students in the key learning period between reception and year 10 and, of course, within our SACE program in years 11 and 12.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Premier. What is the total annual cost to taxpayers of the appointment of Mr Ron Dent as Communications Director for the MFP, and how does the Premier justify this cost when the MFP already has a Public Affairs Manager on a remuneration package of almost \$90 000 a year; a Senior Marketing Adviser, who earns more than \$60 000 a year; and a Media Liaison Officer on more than \$50 000 a year? What possible benefit are taxpayers getting from this spending when the

Chief Executive Officer, Mr Kennan, admitted in a television interview last week that the MFP has yet to even develop a vision which it can communicate?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again, we have very selective quoting of things here—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is quite a disreputable way of approaching the question. I would have thought that the member for Goyder was above that sort of selective quoting, of taking something out of context—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I certainly do have an answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Meier interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I take it that this means that the member for Goyder quite clearly is indicating that he does not support the MFP and all that is involved in that project as, I take it, do many members opposite. I suppose that is as good as we can do in terms of trying to get policies out of the Opposition: to find out what they do not happen to agree with and say that that is one of their policies. I would very much like to know what the Opposition's policy on the MFP is—that would be quite interesting—before the voices start interjecting in various forms, because I know that members on that side of the House have a very divided set of opinions on the matter. The member for Goyder has asked a series of questions about the employment of Mr Ron Dent. I will take those questions on notice and bring back a response.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Do members want a Question Time or an across-the-Chamber debate? The member for Walsh.

INTERNATIONAL SUBSCRIBER DIALLING

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety say which members of the House of Assembly have an ISD bar on their electorate office telephones and which do not, and why, and whether the member for Hayward has access to this facility? It appears that some electorate office telephones may not have ISD access for overseas telephone calls, and most telephones at Parliament House do not. However, the Leader of the Opposition's telephone is one of a minority that are unrestricted. Furthermore, operator connected overseas telephone calls are possible through both electorate office telephones and Parliament House telephones.

I see your quizzical expression, Mr Speaker. By way of further explanation, this became a matter of public interest recently for reasons outlined in the *City Messenger* of 29 September by Alex Kennedy, who stated:

MP Mark Brindal deservedly got done like a dinner for his cynical announcement about having a world expo at Gillman in the year 2000. Just maybe he was being serious, although that does stretch the most non-cynical imagination. However, when confronted by the fact that the year 2000 world expo was already arranged, his answer gets the prize for cynic of the week.

Poverty-stricken on an MP's salary, Brindal said on radio that he did not have ISD access (at work) to ring overseas to check. In other words, he was not willing to pay for such a call from his own phone.

He was only willing to check on the feasibility of a multi-million dollar project supposedly for the taxpayers' benefit if the phone call came free. Hope he gets a Telecard from Father Christmas.

Mr Lewis: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The arrangements and configurations that members of Parliament have on their telephones in their electoral offices are their business. I have no idea what they have, and I would not expect the department to have any idea. I know that there are arrangements about the number of telephone calls that they can make. I might point out that in my own case, when I became a member of Parliament and found there was an ISD bar on my telephone, I had it removed. All you do is pick up the telephone book, look in the inquiry section, ring Telecom and the arrangement is made. If the member for Hayward had some difficulties in that area, he could have contacted me and I would have given him the assistance I give any member who contacts me in relation to these matters.

CONCERT TICKETS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): How does the Minister of Emergency Services justify the use of departmental resources and money to circulate by fax to his departments a request to be compensated for tickets to a concert he was unable to attend? Was he eventually able to sell the tickets and, if so, the House would be anxious to know whether he was able to recoup the full cost of the tickets? Sir, with your concurrence and by leave of the House I will explain.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! 'Question' has been called. Members can do so at any time; that is their prerogative. However, we have had one each side and I would suggest, for the conduct of the House, that we leave it alone from now on. It is totally up to members, but I suggest that may be the wise course to take. The Minister of Emergency Services.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have no idea what the honourable member is talking about, but I will privately accept the information that she might have available, and I will be happy to investigate the matter.

BARTON ROAD

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport Development. When will the Minister of Transport Development fulfil her obligation under the Road Traffic Act to clear the Adelaide City Council's unlawful closure of Barton Road, North Adelaide? When will the Minister take control of the Road Transport Department and the State Transport Authority for the purpose of allowing the safe two-way flow of private vehicles along Barton Road, North Adelaide?

On 13 July I was told by the Government:

I refer to your letter of 28 April 1993 concerning the issuing of infringement notices to motorists driving through the bus lane at Barton Road, North Adelaide. The Commissioner of Police advises that the legal position is currently under discussion between the Police Department and the Adelaide City Council. Until discussions are complete no infringements will be issued for disobeying the 'Buses only' sign. Advice on the result will be sent to you in due course.

Yesterday at 11.25 a.m. a Mrs Zaworski of Para Hills was issued with a traffic infringement notice for \$112 for exercising her right as a motorist to drive on a public road, to wit, Barton Road, North Adelaide. On 1 December 1992, the Minister of Transport Development wrote to me to assure me that bus operators had been told by their depot manager not to block the exit and entrance to Barton Road for the

purpose of denying access to Barton Road to private motorists, yet each working day private motorists are denied access to Barton Road by some bus operators blocking the exit and entrance to that road.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will take up the matter with my colleague the Minister of Transport Development in another place.

SCHOOL SPORTS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Why is the Government continuing to ban interstate competition for primary schools when at least 11 competitive sports have continued with it or recommended it? Does he agree that such a ban is therefore discriminatory of those students, teachers and parents who want to participate? In view of the forthcoming Olympic Games in the year 2000, does he agree that such a ban will place our young students at an unfair disadvantage compared with students from other States who are not denied the opportunity to compete at interstate level at an early age?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: At the recent Sports Ministers Council meeting there was unanimous agreement that we should establish across Australia a policy for junior sport, and I think that is long overdue. It is a timely document and it provides—and, as I said, there was general agreement for it—that there should be national sporting competitions for primary school aged students, but they should occur only where those national sporting organisations sponsor the competition and see that as appropriate.

It is generally recognised that in some fields of sporting endeavour, for example, gymnastics, national competition is appropriate, but it should be under the auspices of the national sporting organisations concerned. That has been the position in South Australia for a long time. The honourable member is advancing that those States where the education authorities provide very substantial sums of money not for the young athletes themselves but for teachers to be paid to leave their schools, their class rooms—and in this State I think the amount is equivalent to about one-third of a million dollars each year—should be directed away from sporting programs which encourage greater participation of young people in sport. In fact, it is directed to very few students and to teachers who will participate in so-called national competitions organised between education authorities, not by the national sporting organisations. It is seen that the money in those circumstances is better directed into areas of, say, sporting camps for very talented young people in our community. For example, the South Australian National Football League was involved in a very successful talent camp for young boys who have the talent to progress in that sporting field.

The number of States that are now actually supporting that competition, given that not all States could participate through their school structures, is diminishing and it is seen as much more desirable that national sporting organisations conduct these national competitions under their own auspices, and indeed that the scarce resources that we have at State level are directed into areas like national sporting camps, talent identification and the broader participation of young people in sporting activities. We all know that far too few young people participate in organised sporting activities and that the drop-out rate, particularly for girls, during the secondary school years is unacceptable in this country. We need to make sure that we allocate the resources that we have

in a way that will advantage the maximum number of young people, particularly during their school-age years. I suggest that this misdirection of resources to very few young people at primary school age is contrary to what has now been declared as a national objective in this area of youth sporting policy.

TRAINING PROFILE

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training outline the benefits to South Australia of the new State training profile?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Today I had great pleasure in launching the 1994 State training profile, which provides a blueprint for the development of the State's vocational, education and training system. Not only does it provide a blueprint but it is important to recognise that the State training profile has been developed as a result of consultations between industry, commerce, private enterprise and the community-based training providers as well as the department.

South Australia is now expected to get an extra \$5.3 million in special funding for training in 1994. The overriding priority for South Australia is to regain prosperity by creating a competitive edge in traded goods and services. It is interesting to note that the profile indicates that the greatest growth areas for training in 1994 will be in the services and hospitality fields, with a projected growth from 1992 to 1994 of something like 15 per cent. Increased training will be provided in the areas of food processing, hospitality, travel, tourism and recreation.

It is important that we understand where we are and where we are going. This training profile is something that will work with industry, with training providers and with the department to ensure that we match the economic development strategy with the ability to train young people particularly who are flexible, who are highly trained and who, through their training, can attract new investments and new industries to South Australia.

STATE BANK

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MATTHEW: During the ministerial statement to the House prior to Question Time today, the Minister of State Services misrepresented me over a \$4 million State Bank contract given to State Supply. The Minister said:

The member for Bright was quoted in the *Advertiser* the following day as saying after the Estimates hearing that he had received strong evidence to support his claims.

I did not make any such statement to the *Advertiser* and I advised the Anti-Corruption Branch of the Police Force of this fact. The Minister said:

The member for Bright claimed that he had received strong evidence to support his claims, yet once again the honourable member's allegations were found to have absolutely no basis or substance.

I did not make any such statement. Further, the Minister said:

In the past, when the member for Bright has made one of these allegations, I have asked him to provide the police or myself with some evidence. The honourable member has never provided any evidence of substance or accuracy.

I have made statements to the police in the past; I have provided the police with evidence; and I have provided the police with potential witnesses. I am sure that the Minister is aware—if I am assuming correctly, the statement he is making is about an allegation concerning drugs in prison—that there is presently an officer before the court charged with dealing in \$10 000 worth of heroin. The Minister further said:

Police investigations into these spurious allegations is a waste of time, effort and money.

I did not ask the Minister to call in the anti-corruption branch: he did so of his own volition. If money was wasted, the Minister is to blame. The Minister asked me to apologise: on the contrary, it is the Minister who should be apologising.

INTERNATIONAL SUBSCRIBER DIALLING

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BRINDAL: In a question today the member for Walsh asked about ISD use in connection with my electorate office and quoted an article from Mrs Kennedy and a statement I am purported to have made on the radio. I acknowledge that I made the statement. I received a copy of the press release which the Premier put out on this matter and in which he said that I should have made a simple phone call.

When I discussed this matter—recollecting that I had asked for an ISD ban on my office phone and finding that there had been one on that phone because I had attempted to use line 1—my personal assistant told me that in fact there was no ISD ban on our second line. I then proceeded to take the Premier's advice and make a simple phone call. I rang 013 at 9 a.m. and I was told that they would have to ring Paris for the number and I was kept waiting for 10 minutes. They then got back to me and said that all the lines to Paris were engaged. At 9.25 a.m. they rang back to say that the lines were still engaged. At 10.5 a.m. they gave me the phone number.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I then tried 12 times during the day to ring Paris on the Premier's advice and it was not until 9.20 that evening that I finally got through. Unfortunately, in Paris they speak French and my French is not very good. So when I spoke to the girl I did get her to understand—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now starting to stray from a direct personal explanation.

Mr BRINDAL: I will be brief. When I finally got on to the people, I was told—as I had been told in the beginning—that this was an international group that handled things on a Government-to-Government level and that basically I had no authority as a member of this Parliament to speak to them, nor would they speak to me because it was entirely inappropriate. Having followed the Premier's good advice, I was well and truly told off for doing it and ended up having to ring Canberra the next day. So I think that members in this House would be well advised not to listen to the Premier when he gives gratuitous advice.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Natural Resources): I want to make a brief comment about the comment of the member for Hayward yesterday in regard to his appearance in the matter between ex-councillor Hudson and me. I have never seen a more uncomfortable delivery, if I might say so, from any member of Parliament on any occasion than the honourable member's attempt to explain his appearance in the court when the decision was handed down by Mr Justice Mohr.

The honourable member then went on to plead that he had no involvement at all. I am afraid that I am not convinced and I am sure that very few, if any, of my colleagues are convinced. I am sure that the electorate will not be convinced either, because the honourable member has a history. Unley is a small place and I have a network of friends who keep me informed of what is happening. On many occasions the member for Hayward has been seen in the company of ex-councillor Hudson after meetings of council and in collaboration with him.

Any explanation he has offered in this place and the attempt yesterday to explain away his involvement give me no comfort at all and do not encourage me to think that there has not been some involvement by him or the Liberal Party in this whole exercise. If that is the case, that is fairly shameful. The matter is between an ex-councillor of the Corporation of the City of Unley and me and does not involve the Liberal Party or any functionary or apparatchik of the Liberal Party. By his own admission yesterday the honourable member indicted himself.

I want to turn my attention to one other matter in relation to the activities of the member for Hayward. I refer in particular to women's rights in relation to abortion. It has been brought to my attention by one of my friends who is involved in the Right to Life organisation that the member for Hayward has disappeared—he has vanished from the scene; he has not bobbed up on this issue for a number of months. The organisation is very concerned about his failure to support it. In fact, the members of the organisation feel that he has ratted on them.

I refer to a variety of statements that have been made and comments in the newspapers over the years since the private member's Bill was brought before this House in October 1990. I will quote from some of those newspaper articles in relation to the honourable member's attitudes on this issue. An article in the *Advertiser* of 18 October 1990 states:

Brindal's Bill threatens more—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Don't you get into it; just be warned. The article states:

Brindal's Bill threatens more than existing laws on abortion. It is seen by women's rights lobbyists as an attempt to turn back the clock. It gives new life to fierce and largely discarded arguments about the rights of the unborn and it challenges political rites that have become cosily entrenched over many years. . . Brindal describes himself as 'pro-life'. He is also pro-choice, but does not believe the woman's choice necessarily takes precedence over the unborn child's right to live.

An article in the *Messenger* of 14 November 1990 states:

Then there's Mark Brindal with what most women in the Liberal Party have christened the bigoted Brindal Bill against free-standing abortion clinics. For a bachelor, he's mighty worried about women's health, but perhaps he should have talked to more women first. The votes he'll have lost in the long term with those headlines wouldn't bear counting.

I think that Alex Kennedy was the author of that article. The *Advertiser* of 28 December 1990 refers to members of the

South Australian Medical Women's Society being concerned about all health issues affecting women and children, and it is very important to draw members' attention to this article. A letter from one of my constituents, Dr Ireland, the Honorary Secretary of the South Australian Medical Women's Society, states:

The implications of the changes to laws regarding abortion proposed by Mark Brindal's private member's Bill are worrying. The immediate effect of this Bill, if passed, would be to restrict the choices available to women seeking termination of pregnancies. Some might then be forced to resort to unsafe backyard abortionists, with resulting damage to their health.

I think that is a very pertinent and relevant comment. I refer to the Messenger Press of 17 April 1991, which states:

How can we, the public and the media, judge what is behind such campaigns by politicians? The Brindal Bill remains, since the last State election, probably the best case study. Brindal, new at the election, says he's not pro-life, so since he was very, very raw to the Chamber when he introduced the Bill—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Heysen.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have warned the member for Heysen for deliberately and continually interjecting. He is warned.

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

I will finish off what the Minister was just talking about concerning his defamation case with Mr Hudson and answer the scandalous claim that he made in this Parliament—which he has not made outside because he would be sued if he did: the Liberal Party has not been involved in any way whatsoever in that case against the Minister. It is yet another lie from the Labor Party, and they come quickly at present from a Government that is desperate to save its own neck.

I want to talk about the Economic and Finance Committee report, which refers to the abuse of salaries of executives within the SGIC, the State Bank and other organisations and the fact that this Labor Government for the past five years has done absolutely nothing to stop that abuse. Look at the warnings that were given in 1988 over the fact that they should immediately come out and disclose what the salary packages were within the State Bank and their refusal to do so. Why did the former Premier refuse to do so? Because he said it would cause more problems for the Government. They were acutely embarrassed by even 1988 as to the abuse and the disgraceful practices being carried on within the Government. Yet, this bunch of Ministers who let the State down over the State Bank sat there on their hands once again and did absolutely nothing. They have learnt nothing from the State Bank whatsoever. Despite repeated warnings, even in recent years and even with the present Premier, they have done nothing to stop the abuse that has been going on.

Let us look at the evidence: in 1988 a warning was given by Treasury to the former Premier that the salary packages should be disclosed publicly, and the Premier turned down that warning; three years ago in September 1990 the Public Accounts Committee, which was the forerunner of the Economic and Finance Committee that has brought down the report today, gave a warning to this House that there should be full disclosure of those executive salaries. And again the members of the Labor Government of South Australia sat on their hands and did absolutely nothing. And while they sat there doing nothing we, the taxpayers, have been paying.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Notwithstanding the Leader's concern for his backbench, he should not be speaking facing them: he should

be directing his remarks through the Chair and not turning his back on you.

The SPEAKER: As all members know, comments and remarks must be directed through the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The only defence that we could get out of the Premier and Deputy Premier this afternoon is that the same practices are going on in the private sector. The facts are that they are not going on in the private sector. There has been gross abuse of high salaries and the packages put up by the statutory authorities under this Labor Government. Let us look at examples of excessive salaries in the State Bank and SGIC and compare them with a private company. The State Bank has 78 people on a salary of \$100 000 or more—78 people. SGIC, which for the last two years has recorded a very substantial loss that we, the taxpayers of South Australia, have had to pick up, has 17 executives on salaries of more than \$100 000. Yet, if we take an international company that has been extremely successful such as BTR Nylex, one of the great success stories of Australian industry, we see that it has a mere 16 executives on salaries of more than \$100 000. But we have the failed and crumbling State Bank of South Australia with 78 and SGIC with 17. There has been gross abuse, and this Government has known about that and has failed to take any action whatsoever.

Eleven months ago in the paper the Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee warned Arnold—so the headline says—to do something about the pays in the bank and the abuse of these salary packages. What has occurred in the past 11 months? Absolutely nothing. We, the taxpayers, are once again the victims of an absolute abuse of power and responsibility by the Cabinet of this Labor Government—the discredited bunch that will be thrown out at the next State election, as they quite rightly deserve to be.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I would like to address the topic of enterprise zones, and in doing so I would like to congratulate the Minister of Business and Regional Development on this initiative, which has been a very important one for South Australia. It would appear that members opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, do not agree with that. I have been working steadily with a committee in Port Augusta which was set up specifically to prepare a submission to present to the Minister with regard to an enterprise zone for that area. Considerable work has been done, and the participants on that enterprise zone committee were from all areas of the community, not least the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Port Augusta City Council and the various departments such as ETSA, AN, the Department of Road Transport and the E&WS. It has been a very productive committee, and at this stage we are very close to having a submission ready to go to the Minister.

During the Estimates Committee I asked the Minister whether it would be possible for other enterprise zones to be established, mainly because I knew that our submission was almost ready to go to the Minister. It was interesting to see an article in the local paper which quoted the member for Eyre, Mr Graham Gunn, and which stated:

... the move was typical of the Labor Government's past practices of running with Liberal Party initiatives.

That statement astounded me. It continued:

... the Labor Government had proved in the past few years it did not have ideas of its own.

I would suggest that the member for Eyre should be speaking to his Leader, because his Leader did not support enterprise zones and, in fact, in a speech delivered in this House on 28 April 1993 (*Hansard*, page 3158) the Leader said:

I have said that the proposals in the Economic Statement are superficial. The enterprise zones will do little for the unemployed in Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Mount Gambier, the Riverland and other regional centres.

So if the member for Eyre had taken the trouble to talk to his Leader, he would have found that his Leader does not support enterprise zones. In another article in the *Port Pirie Recorder* the Leader of the Opposition was quoted as saying:

The proposed tax benefits for new business [under the enterprise zone system] have no credibility whatsoever.

So it is rather amazing that the current member for Eyre has made such a statement in the local paper, the *Transcontinental*, because it is pretty obvious that the member for Eyre does not speak factually; he does not do his homework; and obviously he does not even talk to the Leader of the Opposition to find out what the Opposition's policies are on this. If anybody is hanging on the coat tails of anybody else, I would say that it is members opposite who have no idea of what their policies are in the lead-up to an election. They are hanging on the coat tails of the policies of the current Labor Government. If they do not smarten up their act, they will be going to the next election with not one policy in view, and nobody in South Australia could support people who go to an election with no policies and who actually try to take the policies of the current Government. The member for Morphett is a prime case in point. He had to plagiarise everything that came out of the 2020 Vision statement—

Members interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON:—and members opposite can laugh as much as they like, but it shows that there is no depth on that side; there is no initiative, and there is no light and flair. There is nothing there for the people of South Australia to even look at as an alternative in Government. The Liberal candidate for the electorate of Eyre has no idea what his policies are, so he ad libs and, in doing so, actually overrides what the Leader of the Opposition has said about enterprise zones.

Members interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: The honourable member opposite says that all the policies are there. They must be invisible policies, because nobody in South Australia has seen them. It is amazing.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): A friend of mine is in trouble with the union and has written to me providing some details, so the member for Morphett said in a very brief letter to me the other day. I thought it would be worthwhile to read to the House the comments of this small businessman who is again being abused by the union movement. The letter states:

Please find enclosed copy of log of claims—

which I will get to shortly—

served on us yesterday from CFMEU union. Firstly we are not members of that union. We belong to FIME union. However, we are forever being harassed by the CFMEU and quite frankly somebody should know and be made aware of the power these unions have. It makes one wonder who is running the country.

Three years ago this union tried to blackban us from the McDonalds site at Darlington. The builder was so fearful for his life, he rang and told us, 'Look, I can't let you go ahead with the works because they are going to blackban me', and he stated he had feared

for his life. We told this builder there was no way we would back out of their contract and they were stuck with us as their contractors. We took the case to court. Our union and the Employers Federation represented us and the judge ruled in our favour forbidding CFMEU from coming near us for three years, which is now almost up. It is our opinion that something should be done to stop this sort of thing happening. The small businessman does not stand a chance. Instead of being applauded for employing people we get knocked down each time. We sincerely hope you can look at this log of claims and bring it up in Parliament. . .

We all know what a log of claims is about: its purpose is to try to create a dispute. But, when you look at some of these logs of claims, it really shows how out of touch with the real world the union movement is. It starts off by stating:

Preference of employment shall be given to financial members of the respondent union, and every employee shall be required to become and remain a financial member of the union.

What a farce, when only 30 per cent of the private sector now choose to be in a union. If we make it preferential, we will probably get it down to 20 per cent. Here we have a union still pushing this old fashioned preference demand in its log of claims.

It provides for a minimum wage of \$2 000 per week, and it is graded at the halfway mark, with level 9 getting 120 per cent of that, or \$2 400 per week. Ordinary hours shall be no longer than 30 hours. Do they not want to work at all? They just want to get paid for doing nothing. Each employee shall be allowed not less than 2.5 and not more than four hours meal break for every single ordinary day worked. That is rather interesting: when will they do some work? All overtime shall be paid at two and a half times the normal rate; holiday and Sunday work shall be triple time. This is the sort of nonsense put forward by the unions in the early 1900s.

I thought we were talking about enterprise bargaining and about the 40 per cent of kids in our community who cannot get a job. This particular company 10 years ago employed 20 people. It did jobs for the casino and our major banks. Today it employs four people, all of whom are contractors, and we ask ourselves why! This sort of nonsense cannot help but encourage small business to get smaller and make sure that it gets out of the union's clutches. I notice this particular claim is signed by Mr Sharkey: I wonder whether it is 'sharkey' by nature as well as by name in this whole exercise.

This sort of nonsense is one reason why we need to get rid of the current industrial relations system and make sure that we have a system that recognises reasonableness and the fact that the employers and employees can sit down and negotiate from a reasonable beginning, namely, their award base, instead of being harassed by people from a Federal union who never bother with negotiating. Why would we get this sort of nonsense? It is because of this archaic system that we have.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Members would recall that some time ago there was the closure of the Seaton North Primary School, which had been subsumed by the Seaton High School. The residents in that area argued, quite properly, for the provisioning of play equipment on that site. The existing equipment at the time was defective and unsafe, and I took it upon myself, following proper advice, to ensure that that equipment was dismantled and removed, because many young children, often accompanied by adults, came to play on that equipment. That site is located adjacent to my property at 32 Raymond Avenue.

I took it upon myself to argue with the Minister, behind the scenes and in the House, for the restoration of that equipment because I believe it is incumbent upon the Government and the Education Department, given the fact that they would profit considerably from the sale of land some time in the future, to provide moneys not only for upgrading Seaton High School but also for this playground equipment. A local resident, Mrs Westbrook, who lives in my street and has been well known to me over many years, approached me about this matter some time ago, and members may recall a petition from 431 residents of South Australia presented to the House today requesting that the House urge the Government to provide part of the former Seaton North Primary School campus for a children's playground. I must acknowledge the tremendous amount of work and footslogging done by Mrs Westbrook, who obtained all those signatures herself. She was very diligent in her approach to this matter, walking every street in Seaton from South Parade right through to Raymond Avenue. She put in a considerable amount of time and effort.

I am delighted to advise the House that at 11.30 a.m. today I received at my electorate office a letter from Mr L.J. Phillips, Assistant Director of School Building Services, stating:

Dear Kevin,

Further to our discussions and meetings regarding the reinstatement of the playground from the former Seaton North Primary School, I wish to confirm the details of our negotiations and the final agreement reached at the on-site meeting on 1 October 1993 with you, Mr John Dyer, Mayor of City of Hindmarsh and Woodville, and Mr Barry Heath, Community Services Officer, City of Hindmarsh and Woodville.

The proposed replacement playground will be located adjacent to your property and fronting Raymond Avenue. The agreement reached was as follows:

1. The Education Department within the Department of Education, Employment and Training (South Australia) will provide the land at no cost to the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville. The Education Department within DEET (SA) will cover any transfer fees/costs.

2. The materials from the former Seaton North Primary School playground, which are currently stored at the former West Lakes High School site, will be given free of charge to the city of Hindmarsh and Woodville for reuse in the new playground. These materials have a value in the order of \$5 000 to \$7 000.

3. A cash grant of \$5 000 will also be provided to assist with the development of the playground. Thank you for your interest you have demonstrated in this project. I have certainly valued the support and cooperation you have so readily offered. The local community is indeed fortunate to have your genuine concern and commitment in ensuring that the playground facility was reinstated following the closure of the Seaton North Primary School.

Much of the credit, as I indicated, goes to Mrs Westbrook. I have been a great supporter of this proposal. I thank the Minister, her officers, the Woodville council Mayor and its officers for their cooperation, and I look forward to the erection of this playground equipment in the near future.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I wish to address two issues today—that is, if I have the time. The first issue refers to a fax that was received by the Metropolitan Fire Service on 29 March 1993. The fax was from the Minister of Emergency Services' office and was intended for the perusal of as many people as possible within that department. The message itself is highlighted by the title 'Tickets for sale.' It goes on to say that the tickets for sale are for the Billy Ray Cyrus concert being held on Thursday 15 April 1993 at 8 p.m. at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. If these tickets are sold, the contact is back to the Minister's office, and the telephone

number is supplied. The explanation given on the fax is as follows:

Kym Mayes bought tickets for the concert but is now not able to attend due to interstate travel plans. We would be very interested to hear from anyone who would like to buy the tickets.

The question must be asked: how can the Minister justify the use of departmental resources and money to circulate, by fax, to his departments a request that appears to be asking for compensation for tickets to a concert that for another reason he was unable to attend? Therefore, our curiosity would want us then to ask: was the Minister, in fact, eventually able to sell them? If so (and I am quite sure that we would all be very anxious to know), was the Minister able to recoup the full cost of those tickets? It must be extremely hard to work on a ministerial salary, but I am quite sure that we feel sympathy towards the Minister in his hour of need.

However, by sending this fax through the Metropolitan Fire Service, it curiously stretched through different departmental areas. In fact, the departmental people themselves were really trying to be quite helpful to the Minister and made sure that the majority of the departmental areas received this fax to try to assist the Minister recoup the expense obviously expended on the tickets. The memo itself went from the Chief Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Service to the Deputy Chief Officer; to the ACO, Operational Support; to the ACO, Support Services—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: We just hope that there were no fires at this point because obviously people in that department were too busy trying to carry out a ministerial request to attend to business of the day. Then again, when a Minister makes a request, I guess most people would attempt to comply. From the ACO, Support Services it went to the ACO, Operations; to the Senior Staff Officer; and to the Director of Finance, Administration. That was a good place to send this fax. Who better than the Director of Finance Administration? Although the Director of Finance Administration may have been able to assist with a request for finances for the tickets, I hope that he was also a supporter of Billy Ray Cyrus because, otherwise, I guess they would all have been saying in there, 'Oh, my achy-breaky heart.'

The memo went on to state that Mr Kym Mayes had bought these tickets and because of his interstate travel plans could not attend. The memo records all those aforementioned officers who had been contacted, asking whether they would like to contact the Minister's office. However, it is very disappointing because, from the stamp on this fax that lists all the departments, it appears that the only person who did not have an opportunity to comply with this request was the industrial officer; for some reason he has been left off the list.

Mr Such: Perhaps he was a Madonna fan.

Mrs KOTZ: The member for Fisher said that perhaps he was a Madonna fan instead of a Billy Ray Cyrus fan.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: Yes, most definitely. It was sent in relation to Billy Ray Cyrus.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 780.)

Mr VENNING (Custance): The Department of Primary Industries, the former Department of Agriculture, has lost some key personnel in this State, including the previous Director-General (Dr John Radcliffe), the Deputy Director (Geoff Thomas), and many others right down through the ranks of the old department. It has lost some of its expertise and top advisers and years of experience that cannot be replaced overnight. The list is awesome, and the experience loss is very regrettable.

The Minister claimed that the departure of these people has opened up some marvellous opportunities for younger officers. That is a lot of rubbish—total rubbish. He is trying to defend the indefensible. In many, if not most, of those cases the posts these people have left are not being filled. I know of some instances where officers have come to work and found the position above them vacant and had to telephone the person at home to find out where that person was and the project that person was doing after he had left. That is how swift some of this was. There has been no follow-up in many cases, and these things have been done in great haste.

The marvellous opportunities the Minister talks about consist, in many cases, of existing staff doing the jobs of departed senior people without any recognition at all. I know that many of these people who have left are indispensable, and the department will need to get their services back via consultancies and other means. The Minister claims that morale is not low. Frankly, I would query how he would know. From where I sit, from where I go and from where I work, the contrary is absolutely the case. In my long acquaintance with this department I have found that most of the people—certainly those in the country regions—are driven by the desire to do their best for their clients. They are a very dedicated band of people.

So, what happens when you increase their load and reduce their support? Largely, they take up the slack and get on with the job and do their damndest to see that their clients (the farmers) get the services and advice they want and certainly need. I never hear people such as Trevor Dillan and Tom Yateman—people who are known to me; people on the front line of the department—complain; they are totally loyal to the department. These people and hundreds like them are being totally worked to death, with not a complaint out of them. Such loyalty this Government does not deserve.

I attended the Hart field day a few weeks ago. I was upset that the Minister was not there, because it was a fantastic success, and I congratulate all those who were involved. It was very much a cooperative affair between the department and the farmers, with the department doing a great job. I did not see much of the new SARDI, although I know it was present. None of these people seemed to complain much, so of course the Minister is likely to think that morale is OK, but if one asks in the regions whether the work is being done one will get a different picture. I wonder how morale is in the Pest Eradication Unit, given that it has lost its very experienced and able Chief and it is facing one of the worst locust plagues ever with reduced permanent resources. We are facing the worst prospects ever from a locust plague, and the locusts have already reached the Barossa Valley and the Mid North. We do not have to track them down from the arid zones, because they are already here. What was the Government's response? It allowed the expert and coordinator to leave the department. It is an absolutely ridiculous state of affairs. I wonder how the Government could let this happen.

What is morale like amongst the staff of research stations that are to be closed down or amongst those who would like to get out but who have not been targeted? The Minister says, 'We have been able to effect these changes and reorganise the department without any overall loss of service.' With respect, that is utter garbage. Even if that were true—and it is not—it would be a reflection on the dedication of those officers who are left to carry the can. We cannot keep loading more and more onto those who are left; that would be chaotic. No matter how you cut it, the fact remains that the department is the lowest funded of its type in Australia. No-one refutes the figures. Our Department of Primary Industries is the lowest funded organisation of its type in Australia, and this is in a State that has the greatest reliance on agriculture. It does not add up; it is a total contradiction and it is totally insane.

Much of the burden is being borne by the ancillary services of the department, such as the Advisory Board of Agriculture and, as I have said, the board members now carry a lot of the can; the South Australian Rural Advisory Council, of which I was privileged to be a member and which was set up by the present Treasurer; the Women's Agricultural Bureau; and Rural Youth. Again, the Government picks the easy targets. These targets are very easy to pick because there are no votes in it for the Government.

During the Estimates Committees I intimated that I was extremely upset about the RIAFD fund. With a lot of fanfare the Minister announced that \$5 million would be offered. We heard about this on the media and we read about it in the rural press, but what actually happened? One would think that it would all be gone in the first week, but we heard nothing. I put out a notice congratulating the Minister and encouraging my constituents to have a go at this fund. However, two or three weeks later some of my constituents rang me to say that they had been knocked back. I presumed that the fund was fully subscribed and that these people did not get onto the huge queue, but the facts of the matter are that only \$225 000 of the \$5 million was expended to six applicants, one of which was the department itself and another the South Australian Farmers Federation, so only four private applicants gained access to that \$5 million fund. I think this is another shabby deal, with the Minister making huge headlines and not delivering. Over the past couple of weeks, time and again, the Minister has fudged and waffled on the radio in lawyer speak to cover up the facts. The facts are that the Minister does not deliver what he says, and that makes me very cross.

As I have said, we have lost much because of TSPs. I asked the Minister to tell the Committee when and to whom the next batch of TSPs was to be offered by the Department of Primary Industries. He took that question on notice. I thought that according to etiquette and good manners I would have that answer by now, but I do not. Obviously, the Minister does not know the answer or, if he does, he does not want to tell me or the Committee.

During Question Time today, the Minister mentioned the mice plague. The use of strychnine in agricultural areas has saved millions of dollars, but why was it not done more quickly. If it had been done two or three weeks earlier we would have saved much more and, if the subsidising of the bait had been done a month earlier, instead of a 95 per cent success rate it would have been 99 per cent. My constituents are cross because they were able to buy the poison, commonly known as Dynamice, in 2 kilogram containers, but now the Minister directs that it must be purchased in 5 kilogram containers with the so-called reason being to deter small landowners from buying it because it would be too expensive.

That is a lot of rubbish because they are still buying it. They are buying a 5 kilogram container and decanting it into all sorts of small containers to share the cost with their friends. That is the worst scenario because this deadly poison is being put into unmarked containers. At least in a 2 kilogram container it was adequately labelled and the poison was safely marked and one knew where it was. So, I ask the Minister to review that decision urgently.

Again, yesterday morning the Minister mentioned rural counselling. Funding for rural counsellors is not guaranteed. The Minister waffled on saying that it is, but it is definitely not. I would be the first to hope that one day we will no longer need rural counsellors, but during this year and the next we certainly will, and these people—several of whom I know personally—should not be impeded. They do a fantastic job, way beyond the call of duty, and they are being hamstrung by not having guaranteed funding. I implore the Minister: rather than waffling on the radio and using lawyer speak, put down the facts so that there will be guaranteed funding for rural counsellors. I note that tomorrow night there will be an annual meeting of yet another rural counselling service in the northern region, and I wish that new service well.

Whenever possible, I try to be positive about the Minister. He has done several things of which I approve, particularly the decentralisation of the department. He has done a good job with that, putting several areas into the region. I applaud particularly the field crop decision in Clare. In spite of these difficult times and the 4 per cent increase in costs every year, this year and last year we increased production by between 2 and 3 per cent. I give the Minister a share of that accolade. However, over the past two or three weeks, in particular, he has completely lost the plot. The Estimates Committee became a time to waffle. I am disgusted that the Minister, who obviously has some ability, has lost the plot, because I think he has been left out in the cold now that the member for Elizabeth has left him on his own. He is getting very lonely, and I think he has lost his desire to continue. That upsets me very much.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Yes, I think he is the Pied Piper. Peter Pan has left him and he is now on his own. It looks as though the member for Elizabeth has a larger goal. I saw him sitting in the Premier's chair today, and he looked very comfortable. I also noted that the member for Briggs (Hon Mike Rann) looked very uncomfortable. It is distressing for him to see that opportunity fading away. Irrespective of that, I ask the Minister of Primary Industries to announce the name of the new General Manager of Field Crops. I wonder why that announcement has been delayed. I thought that it would have been made by now so that planning can continue.

In conclusion, the rural community is very concerned about the Medicare agreement and the bed/patient ratio. If any issue totally defies logic, it is this one. Country hospitals and hospitals right across this State are penalised \$405 per day if their ratio of private beds to public beds gets out of kilter. If these hospitals have too many private patients, they suffer a penalty of \$405 a day. So what is happening in small country hospitals? If you seek admission to a small country hospital you are told, 'Sorry, we have our quota of private patients; you cannot come in here as a private patient.' Most hospitals in country regions face huge penalties if the Government wishes to pursue it.

What sort of a policy is that? Why did the Minister sign that document? The Minister of Health, Family and

Community Services signed that Federal Government document. It is a ridiculous situation, and everybody out there is absolutely rotable about it. The Minister should never have signed it. It is a travesty of justice and it is certainly not fair play. I do not know how the Government can justify anything like that.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I apologise in advance to the gentle readers of *Hansard* because, while they follow this debate, they will notice a distinct difference between my address and the address of the member for Culance who just preceded me. Unfortunately, I do not come from a rich family and I have not had the opportunity of engaging the sort of assistance that the member for Culance has engaged, and the professionalism that appears in his speech (for which he has been assisted, I understand, by a professional journalist) will not appear in the speech that follows. I apologise for the fact that it will not seem the same to those readers who are perusing this part of *Hansard*.

I consider the member for Culance to be a friend of mine. Ever since he came into this Parliament he has shown a tinge of friendliness. We have exchanges elsewhere, outside the Chamber, which are quite pleasant. We share a joke and from time to time he has shown me how to push a bowls ball down the bowling green. However, this is probably the worst speech that I have ever heard the member for Culance put up in this establishment.

One of the advantages of this debate is that it gives those opposite the opportunity to lay down a blueprint in respect of what they would do if they were in power. What did we get from the member for Culance? The same old carping criticism and the negativism that continually flows from all of those people on the other side, line after line. We are waiting with bated breath to hear the agricultural policy of those opposite. My understanding is that we are very close to an election, and I would have thought that those opposite would be proud, being a rural Party, to produce their rural policy. In fact, I believe that the Party opposite has its roots in the rural areas and, by and large, the vast majority of those people who have represented it from time to time come from rural areas. I would have thought that they would take the opportunity to produce a policy which they would then be able to take to their constituents and say, 'This is what we are going to do for you: not only is this what we will do for you but this is how we will pay for it.'

Members opposite do not realise that the quality of the answers to the questions that they raise depends upon the quality of the questions. It is a shame to see the member for Culance leaving the Chamber, but I will continue. The quality of the questions in the speech of the member for Culance was appalling. The member for Flinders and the member for Culance were, in a sense, critical of the Government's efforts so far—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I will come to the Leader of the Opposition as time proceeds, and perhaps we will be able to discuss this sensibly, although I have never been able to get a sensible interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps one day if I stay in this Parliament long enough I will get a sensible interjection from the Leader of the Opposition which I can answer. It is a question again of the quality of the questions.

I have a great deal of respect for the member for Flinders, because I believe that of all the members who sit opposite the quality of his speeches far outshine any one of the speeches that I have heard from other members opposite, but he did stray when he said that he thought Eyre Peninsula was not being supported by this Government. I had the privilege of being Chairman of the Select Committee on Rural Finance, together with other Government members, and we examined the financial situations of many people in the rural sector. I am totally sympathetic to the position in which many of these people find themselves, and I am scathing in my criticism of the way the banks and other financial institutions in many instances handled the early stages of the rural crisis and how they failed to support people in the rural area.

One has only to look at the budget figures for this year to realise that the State Government, admittedly with some Federal assistance, is supporting the rural industry in this State to the tune of \$70 million, which is an increase over last year of \$40 million, and that includes an extra \$21 million for those people who could gather, under exceptional circumstances, the sorts of grants that were being handed out under that category. There was an additional amount for loans from \$6 million last year to \$25 million this year.

This State in this financial year is supporting an additional rural debt of \$740 million and is supporting a total rural debt of \$1.4 billion. A lot of this is taxpayers' money, and it comes from the taxpayers in the metropolitan area, because more people in the metropolitan area pay tax. Many people in the rural area do not pay tax and have not paid income tax for many years: they are being supported by the rest of the State and by the rest of the Commonwealth as far as rural assistance is concerned. I am not saying that they do not deserve to get it—I do not want anybody to put words in my mouth. However, I get somewhat annoyed when I hear the bleating from the other side. I single out the member for Custance in particular, who took the whole of his 20 minutes to grizzle about what a bad deal the rural sector of our State is getting. This year we as taxpayers have supported the rural industries to the extent of \$70 million.

I come from an industrial area where there are many small businesses. Those businesses employ people; they manufacture things for motor cars; but they get very little from the State Government in assistance. In my humble opinion, those people deserve as much support as people in the rural industries are getting. When my constituents were put off from General Motors-Holden's—and there have been thousands of them—how much assistance did they get from the State Government? They got nothing whatsoever. The same cannot be said for those people in the rural industries. Rural industries get support and those people who have to leave the their farms get support. The last time I checked the figures—and I do not have them here—I found that the system is worth something like \$60 000. I stand to be corrected; it might be \$50 000.

Mr Blacker: It is \$42 000, I think.

Mr FERGUSON: I stand corrected. Those people in my electorate who have been taken out of their businesses, who have not been able to get support—and I do not want to embarrass them by naming here, but I can name them privately—and who have come to my office for assistance have got absolutely nothing from the State.

All the time we get this barrage from the other side. People in the agricultural areas say, 'The State is not doing enough.' It appears to me that the more the State provides for those people, the more complaints come our way. This year

the State, with the assistance of the Commonwealth, has provided an additional \$40 million. It is not as though this Government has walked away from the rural community. During the time that I have been in Parliament, which is now 11 years, this Government has continued to support the rural industries, even though in the majority of cases those have never voted for us or rarely vote for us. That fact has been cast aside and over the years we have poured millions and millions of dollars into the agricultural industries.

I do not take away the fact that the rural sector has had a rough time. I know that commodity prices, over which they have no control, dropped dramatically. I also know that interest rates, over which they have no control, increased substantially. I know that the management of the banks, about which they can do very little, was extremely rough on them, particularly at the beginning of the rural crisis. I do not think they are doing too badly now, but in the first instance the banks were very hard on them. I do not forgive the banks for what they did to the farmers at the start of the rural crisis.

However, what do we hear? Because we are coming up to an election, people feel that they must get up in this place, they must go out to their own electorates, they must reach their rural newspapers and say, 'The State Government has sold you out.' We know that that is untrue and that the figures do not bear out what they are saying, because we are giving more in rural assistance than we have ever given in our history.

What small business in your electorate of Semaphore, Sir, would not welcome with open arms the subsidised interest rates which the farmer gets but which they cannot get? I get sick and tired of hearing from time to time of the rural sector versus the industrial sector. It is not true to say that the rural sector is providing most of our exports: the majority of our exports from South Australia are being provided by the manufacturing industry. One only has to get hold of the ABS figures to see that.

When I go out to the country towns—and I have been to a lot of country towns as Chairman of the committee on rural finance—I find that when I talk to the farmers face-to-face they will concede that the situation that I have put before the House is true. However, it appears that something happens when one of these farmers becomes a representative of a rural area. They feel they must get up in this place and tell a story that is far from the truth. But I will leave that aside at the moment because I have only five minutes left.

I would like to come back to the carping that has occurred on the other side of the House in relation to the conduct of the Estimates Committees. I cannot understand it.

Mr Such interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Fisher appears to want to crack a joke at my expense. His behaviour was typical of how the Estimates Committees have been wrongly exploited by members of the Opposition. The honourable member came in here and read a statement. He had the opportunity to probe, to ask questions, to find out what was in the budget and to come back with conclusions, but what did he do? He came in here and read to the Committee a four-page prepared statement about what he thought about education and how poorly it was going. It was one of the most badly put together statements I have ever come across. He could hardly wait to get out on the steps of Parliament House to stand before the television cameras and try to get the matter aired on the electronic media.

He was one of those about whom the member for Flinders was talking earlier—one of those on the Opposition side who

were exploiting the reason why these Committees were set up in the first place. I totally agree with the member for Flinders: there are faults on both sides. There is need for change.

After every Estimates Committees proceedings I can remember for past four or five years I have been putting to the Opposition that it is time for change in relation to these Committees. The member for Fisher had trouble with the member for Hayward. At one time he had to tell the member for Hayward that he was lead speaker for the Opposition. He had to tell him to butt out because the honourable member was trying to steal his thunder. That is a ridiculous example of team work on the part of members opposite.

I agree with the member for Kavel that it is time we changed the formula of the Estimates Committees. I invite members of the Opposition to get together with members of the Government to hammer out an agreement to change the formula by which these Committees are conducted. I believe that it is possible and that it is something we can do. I have not had the time to speak about industrial relations, as I had hoped to do. However, I hope that the time has come for a change in these procedures.

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

When this budget was introduced five weeks ago, it was full of holes and I think we all understand that. Now after the Estimates Committees its credibility has been completely blown apart. It is a totally dishonest document, which has come from an increasingly desperate Government. It is a budget with which the Government planned to revive its fortunes in the electorate. All it has done is to bury Labor deeper in a mire of public distrust, disenchantment and disgrace which now engulfs this entire Labor Government. This budget was in fact Labor's revival number 5. The member for Ross Smith, the former Premier, produced the Arthur D. Little report in July last year as Labor's first attempt at revival. This was the event planned to turn attention away from Labor's disasters and to look at the State's long-term future, but it did not work. Because it failed, the former Premier had to go.

In came Labor's revival number 2—the election of the present Premier. He promised a new era and a new direction for South Australia. A month later we had revival number 3—the coalition Government. With it the Premier promised a new era of political stability. We find that one of the so-called independent members of the coalition has suddenly rushed off and joined the Government for political expediency. For eight years he refused to join the Government because the Labor party was split with divisions, with factions and with a preselection procedure which did not incorporate any local people. For eight years he refused to join the bunch, but now, with no change in the Labor Party whatsoever and for pure political expediency he rushes back and joins the colleagues. Why? Because he wants the Federal seat of Bonython. We all know that.

In April this year we had revival number 4—the so-called economic statement. That also has failed to rebuild any confidence whatsoever in the economy in South Australia. Labor revival number 5, this budget, was accompanied by a cosy fireside chat from our Premier. But this also has clearly failed, so the Premier is again in a revivalist mood. Labor's revival number 6 has come in the form of television advertising and a Clayton's election campaign. But this is just like all the others. It too will fail. You cannot change history with an advertising campaign. When is the Premier going to realise

that South Australia will not recover until the Labor Government goes? South Australians have a Premier who wants them to believe in miracles. He wants them to believe that the Labor party commenced government only with his appointment to the highest political office that this State can offer. His advertising pleads with them to ignore the State Bank disaster and the other financial debacles of this same Labor Government—the lost jobs, the lost population and the lost investment opportunities. The Premier wants South Australians to pretend that the State Bank disaster never occurred. He wants them to ignore the \$3 150 million debt hanging around the necks of all South Australians as a result of the biggest financial disaster in the history of Government in Australia.

He also hopes that they will not realise that he was a senior Minister of the Cabinet who sat in on all the key decisions and deliberations over the last 11 years. He and the other Ministers appointed the boards of the State Bank and the SGIC. The Premier wants South Australians to forget and forgive, yet he refuses even to apologise to South Australians for what he has inflicted upon them. He wants South Australians to believe that he is a good economic manager. This is as credible as saying that Tim Marcus Clark was a brilliant banker.

The Premier's current television advertising ignores the fact that, while he was the senior industry minister in Cabinet, our State's manufacturing sector collapsed and we lost 20 000 manufacturing jobs during that period. He wants South Australians to forget that when Labor came to office 11 years ago our share of national employment was 26 000 jobs more than we have at present. His advertising boasts about exports as well as jobs. In fact, if South Australia had retained the share of national export earnings we had when this Labor Government came to office, the annual value of South Australia's exports now would be \$250 million higher than it currently is.

With such a legacy of economic and financial failure, all the Premier has left is to attempt to mislead the people of South Australia. In this, he is no better whatsoever than his predecessor, the member for Ross Smith. I have news for the Premier. The people of South Australia have news for the Premier. The Premier is not believed. He is just one member of a Labor Government which has destroyed the economy of this State, lost our money and lost our jobs. South Australians want revenge and they will get revenge at the next election. Labor's grubby attempt to bury its past and to cling to office deserves the outraged contempt it is now getting from South Australians. They will not be fooled by the underground campaign now being waged by the Premier's mates at the Trades and Labor Council. They will stop at nothing to prevent a Liberal Government in South Australia. There is no lie they will not tell, no fear they will not spread. We are about to hear as many lies from the Trades and Labor Council about the industrial relations policy of the Liberal Party as we got from this Labor Government about the State Bank while it was collapsing.

Labor will never learn its lesson: Labor cheats; Labor misleads; Labor misrepresents; and Labor tells lies. Labor is a failure and a fraud. Labor would rather destroy South Australia's future than have the decency to let the people decide now who should govern them for the next four years. While Labor Ministers stay in office to allow the superannuation cash register to tick up thousands more dollars for them they are, at the same time, deliberately leaving increasingly serious problems for the next Liberal Government.

For the past two years Labor has dithered and delayed in finalising enterprise agreement arrangements with the Public Service. Now, on the eve of an election, it is attempting to bribe public servants with an open-ended deal not allowed for in this budget. The Government has been told that the claims by the Teachers Institute alone will cost an additional \$42 million a year. But this Government does not care. It has never cared about protecting the interests of South Australians, particularly as taxpayers. The Government's debt reduction strategy is in shambles. The targeted separation package program is not meeting its own targets. For example, during the Estimates Committees the Liberal Party established that in SACON 787 targeted separation packages were offered but only 48 were accepted. Nor is the Government genuinely expecting SACON to meet that target. The budget program allows for a reduction of only 67 positions within SACON, but they offered 787 TSPs.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department failed by 85 positions to achieve its job reduction target last financial year. In the Department of Marine and Harbors only one-third of the TSPs offered have been taken up. In the Health Commission, for which the Minister here has responsibility, the take-up rate is only a little bit better. When the 1992-93 budget was introduced the Government said 942 full-time equivalent positions would be abolished during the last financial year. In his economic statement in April the Premier added another 1 500 full-time equivalents to that target for the 1992-93 financial year.

However, the number of positions actually reduced in the budget sector last financial year was less than the original target of 942. They achieved a mere 796 full-time equivalents. The Government's debt reduction strategy began this financial year well behind target, and it is continuing now to slip further behind. It amounts to numbers on paper only, and not to a resolve by this Government to deal with the problems created by its own gross financial incompetence and mismanagement over the past 11 years.

The next Liberal Government will also inherit serious morale problems in the Public Service caused by this Government's departmental restructuring. It is clear that this restructuring has been embarked upon to give some impression of decisive action by this Government. It is certainly not based on any logical plan or identified benefits to the taxpayers in terms of cost savings. During the Estimates Committees, the Government consistently failed to produce estimates of what those cost savings would be as a result of the restructuring. Instead, this is what the Minister of Transport Development had to say about the implementation of that restructuring in her portfolio:

The decision to create a Department of Transport will require much work to determine exactly what the structure should be. That work will proceed over the next few months.

Here they are: they have restructured the department and announced that restructuring publicly, but she is admitting that it will take another two to three months at least to work out what the structure should be and therefore what savings, if any, may result. In other words, these major changes have been embarked upon without any overall strategy, without any clearly identified benefits. There is no doubt that this budget is based on false and not firm projections for cost savings and wage decisions.

Equally, the revenue projections are very dubious. Let me give some examples. The budget assumes additional revenue of \$8.7 million in gambling taxes based on the introduction of poker machines by November this year. However, the

Liquor Licensing Commissioner, Mr Prior, who has significant powers affecting when poker machines will be introduced, told the Estimates Committee:

At this stage I cannot give any indication whatsoever on when gambling machines will be introduced.

Here is the man who has the control over the introduction of poker machines, four weeks before the allocated deadline set down by the Deputy Premier, saying he cannot give any indication whatsoever as to when those poker machines will be introduced, yet the Government is budgeting on \$8.7 million coming from those poker machines. This is so typical of this Government's hope-and-a-prayer approach to this budget: it hopes the holes will not be exposed before the election; it has prayed for a political miracle which has not occurred.

The Premier has also referred to divine intervention in addressing the issue of the fifth bail-out of the State Bank. Heaven knows, he needs divine intervention at this stage. Interviewed on the ABC television on 26 September, he said effectively that whether or not there was a fifth bail-out of the State Bank was entirely in the lap of the gods. He refused to deny the possibility of another bail-out, putting himself in quite direct conflict with what the Deputy Premier had said. With only \$113 million of the bail-out money uncommitted, the bad bank expects losses for at least the next two years and the property market is showing no signs whatsoever of improving; indeed, it will take a miracle to prevent another bail-out of the State Bank. This will add more interest costs to the budget and more money. It is my projection that in fact in about two to three years time, it could well be by the end of this financial year, we the taxpayers will have to put in at least another \$100 million, if not \$200 million, to prop up the bad bank.

The Government's own recent disastrous experience with property revaluations shows that a fifth bail-out is well and truly on the cards. Just look at these marvellous property managers within the Labor Cabinet. Let us look at what they have inflicted on South Australia through their property dealings. This Government has turned a Nelson's eye to all those property dealings, but they are still set to blow up in the face of South Australian taxpayers who will have to pay for them. I will analyse some of the revaluations which have significantly reduced the value of properties owned by Government agencies.

As the Premier pointed out during the Estimates Committees, the value of the State Bank Centre—that building which stares out across the whole of Adelaide, with 'State Bank' displayed across the top—has reduced by more than half. When the Government approved this project in 1986, the estimated cost was \$85 million. The actual cost, because the Government failed to control wage blowouts and gave in to union officials, was more than \$130 million. The total cost of the entire building so far, with interest payments, has been \$208 million. The bank has sustained significant losses since the completion of the project because rental revenues have not met targets and loans associated with the project have become non-performing. As a result, the bank faces losses of more than \$130 million on that one property alone which stares down upon us.

Let us go across to Rundle Mall, where we find that the losses on the Myer-Remm site could now exceed \$600 million. At the same time, Government agencies are continuing to pay huge rents to prop up this project, even with that sort of loss. This year the Tourism Commission and the

MFP will pay \$781 000 in rent for space in the Remm Centre because it cannot be leased out. Just across the Mall, we find the Lotteries Commission building, which has just been reduced in value by \$4.7 million. Then, on North Terrace, a further revaluation of the Terrace Hotel, just across from Parliament House, has meant that its value has been reduced by \$60 million in just three years.

Let us go west along North Terrace to STA House, the North Terrace underpass and the railway station site—all owned by the STA. There, \$17.1 million has been wiped off the valuation. Going in the opposite direction along North Terrace, opposite the Art Gallery, two buildings bought by the Government in 1987 have been vacant ever since. Then we go down to the East End Market site where the Government has recently announced a new development. The Government is getting no guaranteed return whatsoever for the transfer of that land to the developer. Yet, so far, taxpayers have lost at least \$48 million on that one site.

Let us go then to Angas Street, where the Housing Trust's former headquarters have been vacant for four years without a buyer, clocking up council and water rates of \$400 000 in that period, with no rent coming in whatsoever. It is a disgrace, and your colleagues, Mr Deputy Speaker, who sit there as Ministers, have inflicted this sort of disgrace and loss upon South Australian taxpayers. At the same time, the Housing Trust has paid more than \$14 million in rent to occupy accommodation on the ASER site in the Riverside building on North Terrace. Rental at the Riverside will cost the Government another \$3 million this financial year at a time when there is record demand for Housing Trust accommodation with a waiting list of more than 43 000 people. A total of \$3 million to house the staff of the Housing Trust and \$400 000 for water and council rates for a vacant building could have been used to house approximately 60 families in South Australia immediately.

Taking this nightmare journey across the border, we come to Melbourne, where taxpayers' outlays on 333 Collins Street now exceed \$600 million, with a likely loss on this one property alone of \$400 million. Here we have the so-called independent member for Elizabeth wanting to become a member of this ratbag Party, the Labor Party of South Australia: he is prepared to brush aside all those financial disasters, grasp their grubby little hands and become part of the Labor Party of South Australia so that he can enhance his political career in the Federal Parliament.

An honourable member: Thirty pieces of silver.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There was no 30 pieces of silver paid: it didn't even get near that. I know that there is some speculation about the fact that the honourable member really wants the position of Leader of the Opposition, but I hear from Government members that they are not prepared to let him be Leader of the Opposition after the next election; instead, they want him to go off to the Federal seat of Bonython so that some of their other colleagues can stand for the position of Leader of the Opposition. One thing is certain: after the next election they can hold their Party Caucus meeting in a telephone booth to elect someone to that position.

The details I have just given are not just some fictitious game of monopoly: these are just some of the failed ventures that this Labor Government has approved in its property dealings for which we are now paying. Put all those losses together and we, the taxpayers of South Australia, have now had to pay well over \$1 100 million in connection with those property transactions—and Government members ask us to

trust their word that there will be no further bail-out of the State Bank. Who would trust Labor on such a matter? No-one at all. Not content with destroying the finances of the State, Government Ministers are now squandering taxpayers' money like drunken sailors in a crude attempt to get themselves re-elected.

In the Estimates Committee, the Minister of Business and Regional Development acknowledged spending in just three short months virtually all the funds that the Government had put aside for economic development under its economic development program for this financial year and next financial year. It is quite clear that the announcements about this program have been manipulated for cynical election purposes. While the Government promised \$40 million of actual spending last financial year, total allocations were less than half that amount. Now, suddenly, with an election approaching, the Government has indulged in an orgy of announcements. I have little doubt that Government promises made under this program will significantly exceed the funds available, with the Minister expecting the Liberal Government then to have to take all the blame. While the Government continues to search for quick headlines as the election approaches, the standard of vital services continues to deteriorate.

Information obtained during the Estimates Committees shows that a further 123 teaching positions and 47 ancillary staff will go this year. However, at the same time the Education Department's bureaucracy is set to increase by 44 positions. So, we rip out the teachers but we build up the bureaucracy. A Liberal Government will reverse those trends. I wonder whether your colleagues, Mr Speaker, have the hide to go back to their electorates and say that they are reducing teacher positions but putting 44 extra bureaucrats into the Education Department. Further information from the Estimates Committees shows that 68 Government schools have been closed since 1986. This action has been taken by the same Government which promised only in 1985 not to reduce teacher numbers and not to close any schools. Yet the Minister of Health, the former independent member for Elizabeth, is willing to go and rejoin this discredited bunch.

The Minister of Education, Employment and Training is getting 19 personal staff in this budget, while the Grange school, with 430 students, has to do with only 18 teachers. In other words, the Minister's ego is so great that she needs 19 personal assistants fussing around and looking after her, boosting her ego and her image publicly, when the Grange school gets only 18 teachers. So much for the education priorities of this Labor Government.

In the Department for Family and Community Services, the amount of funding available for people in need has been cut by \$10 million in the past three years, at the same time that the Liberal Party exposed in the Estimates Committees more than \$500 000 being spent on refurbishing the FACS office. In other words, it is spending the money on the bureaucracy but it is cutting essential services out in the community. Frankly, it is hardly surprising, given the example set by the Premier as leader of the Government. In his April Economic Statement he promised that the work on refurbishing the State Administration Centre would be deferred. However, as the Liberal Party established during the Estimates Committees, this is yet another broken Labor promise. The work is to proceed and now, because of the delay earlier this year when the Minister stopped the work, the completion cost will be increased by a further \$800 000.

The total completion cost on improving accommodation for the bureaucracy in Victoria Square is to be \$28 million. This is typical of a Labor Government, which thinks nothing of spending \$1 million to get rid of Mr Bruce Guerin from the Premier's Department, because he is considered a political liability, and shunting him out to an academic position at the Flinders University, with no regard whatsoever for what benefit that will bring to South Australia. While this Government continues to waste money, while it continues to mismanage the State's finances, the cost to South Australians amounts by the day. The cost is measured in rising taxes and charges and lower standards in terms of basic services. The Government plans to cut more than 1 000 jobs in the Health Commission, while 950 people are on the waiting list.

In breach of a commitment by the Premier, nursing positions in hospitals are now being cut. For example, the South Coast District Hospital at Victor Harbor, an area with a very rapid population growth—one of the highest in the State—is losing 7.5 per cent of its nursing staff this year. Yet the Premier stands up publicly and says that there will be no cuts whatsoever in nursing staff throughout the State. The Government also wants to cut more teaching positions while inadequate standards of literacy and numeracy cause parents increasing concern. I am delighted that the Minister of Education, Employment and Training has now come into the House, because I was pointing out, Madam, that under this budget you have a personal staff of 19.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Rubbish! Wrong!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, I am quoting the documents that you as Minister presented to this Parliament.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition should not be using the personal pronoun 'you' and should be addressing the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out to the honourable Minister of Education, Employment and Training that she is putting 19 staff into her personal office.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Sixteen!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: She is saying 16: 16 staff to boost her ego, fuss around her and enhance her public image, when the Grange school with 430 students can get only 18 teachers, is the sort of disgrace we have to witness. She promises a new school for Goolwa, which at present has the worst school in the entire State.

I ask the Minister to sit there in her state of embarrassment and listen to this. As Minister of Education, Employment and Training she promised a new school for Goolwa, because every classroom at the Goolwa school is a wooden one, and most of them are at least 30 to 40 years old. So, she promised a new school. But what has she done? On the new site there will be 12 classrooms, four of which will be new and the other eight will be the old wooden buildings dragged over from the former site. That is the sort of priorities that this Minister and the Government have, but they can afford to spend \$5 million on a bridge which the people at Goolwa do not want.

That demonstrates the embarrassment that the Minister is to this State. Of course, the people at Goolwa want a new school, but they want 12 new classrooms, not shabby, dirty, old, wooden classrooms which they have had to paint with the parents—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is very courageous of the Minister to take on alone the total Opposition, and I congratulate her on her bravery. However, the Minister's interjections

are disrupting the Parliament, and I ask her to cease. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out to the Minister across the Chamber the anger of the people of Goolwa that they have been conned. They were told there would be a new school, but they have found that eight out of the 12 classrooms will be shabby, dirty, broken down, old wooden classrooms from the old school site. It is a shame, and the Minister should be embarrassed that she ever stood up and boasted that the town was to get a so-called new school.

I am delighted, Mr Speaker, that you have returned to the Chamber because this Labor Government is cutting police patrols while the crime rate in South Australia escalates. It is paying \$3 million for Housing Trust head office accommodation while Housing Trust waiting lists climb. These are some of the examples of the high social costs of Labor's failures that are now being imposed on all South Australians. This is the way in which we are all paying for the collapse of the State Bank because of the financial mismanagement of the Labor Government. This is a failed budget from a failed Labor Government. For South Australians there can be only one conclusion: this is the last Labor budget that will be inflicted upon this State for a very long time.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): The Leader of the Opposition has just portrayed a dismal and depressing situation in South Australia. I would like to look, in particular, at some of the figures which the Leader has quoted in relation to what that money could do in an area such as health if it was not being used to prop up a bungling, incompetent and tired Government. One of the figures mentioned by the Leader was \$600 million that has been lost on the Remm development, this wonderful icon of the way in which the State was heading under the 'flair and light' of the now disgraced and soon to be former member for Ross Smith.

The total health budget for South Australia is \$1.4 billion, yet the South Australian taxpayer is being asked to foot a bill to the tune of \$600 million for the Remm building alone. So, it could be said that almost half the total State health budget is being absolutely and totally wasted. Let us ask the 9 500 people on the waiting list whether they would rather have money provided for their operation or to prop up a dodgy deal done by a lousy Government. I am certain that we all know the answer.

Not long ago I released a document which stated that \$1 million would pay for about 464 operations at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I know, Mr Speaker, that you are about to reach for your calculator, so I will save you the trouble: \$600 million would pay for 278 400 operations. In other words, the money that this Government is squandering on behalf of South Australian taxpayers would obliterate every patient from that waiting list 30 times over.

As the Leader has said, we lost \$400 million on that wonderful icon 333 Collins Street; again, the South Australian Government was a bit too smart by half. Mr Speaker, I will again save you the trouble: that would cover the total number of patients on the waiting list 18 times. I put to everyone in South Australia that one of our major dilemmas and embarrassments is the fact that people in pain are being obliged, because of a bungling, incompetent, tired and lazy Government—

Mr Lewis: Half-witted.

Dr ARMITAGE: I will not say half-witted; that is being a bit too generous. Because of this Government they are being forced to wait. Yet, we are covering the Government's

financial mismanagement when with two of those deals alone we could have abolished the waiting list in South Australia by 48 times.

I turn to the budget process itself. I received an answer to a question that I asked during the Estimates Committee relating to the health portfolio. I would like to point out a difficulty, dare I say it, in this time of Mr Keating going feral on the republic, although I note that he has been given a big rap over the knuckles by his cronies. As a member of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, it is difficult to be as incisive as I would like, because it is impossible to make head or tail of the budget figures that we have been given. One of the questions that was asked was: what is the additional funding from Commonwealth programs for specific programs which were not included in the initial budget estimates? In other words, as Her Majesty's loyal Opposition we are given budget papers, but we find that a lot of other moneys are coming in.

Two matters on the lists of specific programs that have not been included in the initial budget estimates are: dental services, estimated amount \$1.8 million; and Medicare incentives for casemix funding, \$100 000. The answer continues:

The commission is also likely to get additional funding from the Commonwealth Disability Agreement, Medicare incentives capital planning and hospital access. Negotiations with the Commonwealth are currently occurring, but it is too early to estimate the amount of additional funding.

That makes the role of an Opposition absolutely impossible. How can we be expected to quiz a Minister and indeed a Government, in what is obviously a pre-election period, when we do not know the level of funding, and particularly when we are not quizzing sensitive areas such as Medicare incentives and hospital access? Hospital access is nothing more and nothing less than money which will be given to this State Government by its Federal Government colleagues to buy the votes of people who have been on waiting lists for many years. What do we hear? Negotiations with the Commonwealth are currently occurring but it is too early to estimate the amount of additional funding.

If I were a betting man, and on occasions I have been known to have a bet, I would be willing to stake a small wager that this Commonwealth funding will arrive in the nick of time for the State Government to solve some of its problems. In my view, that is close to immoral, and it is certainly impossible for an Opposition to do the job which it is required to do, because it is simply not given the information.

Of course, areas such as the Commonwealth disability agreement, Medicare incentives and capital planning are also particularly sensitive and, as I intend shortly to go on to capital matters, I emphasise that that is another area where it is impossible for an Opposition to do its job properly. Whilst we occasionally jest in Parliament about the Party political system and we jibe across the Chamber, and indeed some of us might even jibe outside the Chamber, the job of an Opposition is to question the legal right of a Government to spend taxpayers' money. If we are not given the facts and figures, or if those facts and figures are hidden for political purposes, we cannot do the job properly and the whole process is subverted.

In dealing particularly with the budget Estimates process, I will not describe in great depth the disappointment which one sometimes feels about the whole process. Indeed, other members of the House have done that. However, it is

disappointing when Ministers are handed a stack of answers, obviously pre-prepared by busy people, although sometimes one wonders just how busy they are given the number of support staff employed by Ministers compared with those of the Opposition. One would expect them to pull the right answer out at the right time, because it is very distressing for someone who believes that the process of quizzing legal expenditure is an important one in the parliamentary process when the wrong answers are given to questions. I suppose it is the right of Ministers to always claim that they are correct, that they gave the right answer and that they were just asked the wrong question. But, whatever, the process is clearly not working properly.

Rather than go on about that process, I want to talk about the budget. I would like to quote from some letters between me and the Flinders Medical Centre, and between me and the former Minister of Health. In particular, I quote from a letter which I wrote to the then Minister of Health on 6 December 1991, as follows:

In a draft copy of the 'Feasibility study to upgrade the accident and emergency department' of Flinders Medical Centre, dated May 1991, I note: . . . that the South Australian Health Commission, Metropolitan Health Division, and Flinders Medical Centre reviewed the preliminary report in January 1991, and:

'It was acknowledged that the A and E department's current annual throughput of nearly 57 000 patients, one of the busiest in South Australia, could not be satisfactorily serviced from the existing facility.'

In other words, the South Australian Health Commission in January 1991 said the A and E department at Flinders basically could not cope. So I wrote to the then Minister and in January 1992, after my letter of December 1991, I received a reply which said that there had been considerable planning, and so on. The letter then went on to say:

. . . the Health Commission agreed to give priority to the accident and emergency department upgrade and the project was listed on the 1991-92 forward capital works program at an estimated cost of \$2 million. . .

Well, the people at Flinders were delighted, because the Health Commission said that the A and E department could not cope, and shortly after that the Minister of Health said, 'It is all up and running, and the project is listed on the forward capital works program'. Therefore, it is particularly disappointing to note that nothing has happened.

In fact, in the same letter from the Minister, he went on to say:

. . . commencement of the major building program (was) anticipated in 1993-94.

I know time flies when you are trying to solve the problems of the State Bank, Scrimber and SGIC and all of the factional problems of your colleagues, trying to work out when to retire and how to prop up comrades who are failing, but nevertheless 1993-94 has arrived. The people at Flinders Medical Centre, I think quite legitimately, went to the budget papers and looked for the allocation to upgrade the A and E department, given that the Health Commission had acknowledged three years ago that it was not coping. What did they find? Nothing! Of course, this was disappointing, and again we come back to the morals of Government and the process of Government. In an article in the *Southern Times* of 6 October, Polly Haynes said:

After years of broken promises, the State Government now says work on a \$5.3 million upgrade of Flinders Medical Centre's chronically overcrowded casualty section is 'full steam ahead' and will start next June.

Quite clearly that is nothing more and nothing less than pork-barrelling in marginal seats prior to an election. It is unconscionable that a Government is prepared to play with people's health to that extent. But it is not surprising, given page 57, appendix 3 of the budget's capital works paper. This Government, without any morals whatsoever, put in its wish list, looking for the tooth fairy and hoping that all would be well tomorrow!

It reminds me of a reply that the former and now disgraced Premier gave in this House to a question I asked about hospital funding, when he said: 'If only the State Bank disaster had not occurred, we would be able to provide more nurses.' If only, if only, if only! Appendix 3 is very much like that, because it lists possible future capital projects. The report says:

It is essential to note that inclusion of a project on the list does not imply Government commitment to proceed with the project.

In other words, we have no idea how we will pay for it, we are really not going to do it, but we are putting it down in case in a pre-election context we can float it out and perhaps win a few votes.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Dr ARMITAGE: I was drawing the attention of the House to the fact that the infrastructure projects that are put down as possible future capital projects are hopeful wish lists of this Government to be used for base electoral purposes. In particular, I draw the attention of the House to the following:

Whilst the schedule contains a wide range of major projects, it is not intended to exclude other infrastructure projects which may be suitable for provision by the private sector.

When one looks at the Health Commission area, one can only say, 'What a joke,' because one of the items mentioned is the Flinders Medical Centre Accident and Emergency upgrade, and that is clearly being used for the basest of political motives. However, one of the other items mentioned is a new hospital and community health centre at Mount Gambier. Would it not be lovely if in fact the private sector were able

to provide for that? I am sure all members opposite would remember that the former Deputy Premier and Minister of Health was actually all systems go on a new hospital in Mount Gambier to be provided by the private sector. In fact, the plans were already drawn. What stopped it? The Mount Gambier Branch of the Labor Party said, 'We aren't going to put up with this. We will move a motion at the State conference and stop it.' So, here we have a major capital project put up as a wish list with no intention of providing it and, on the other hand, the Government is saying, 'Let's hope the private sector might do it.' Given its performance, it is an absolute joke.

Of course, all the other things—the 48 schools mentioned, all the hospitals, the housing and urban development projects, family and community services, and education and training—are nothing more or less than attempts to use the system for their own base electoral purposes with no intention of providing the necessary infrastructure. This is one more example of a Government without morals.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Education, Employment and Training): I move:

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): As this Bill comes out of Committee I reiterate the Opposition's dissatisfaction with the budget, our dissatisfaction with the direction of this Government and our dissatisfaction that this Government will remain in power one more minute. The Bill will, in fact, pass in another place in a very short period and there will be no reason whatsoever why we cannot go to an election as soon as humanly possible.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 12 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 6 October 1993

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

BENEFICIAL FINANCE

13. Mr BECKER:

1. Why did Beneficial Finance Corporation bank with the National Australia Bank?

2. How many State Bank and former Beneficial Finance subsidiaries bank with other banks and, in each case, why?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Beneficial Finance (BFCL) used the National Australia Bank (NAB) as its banker well before BFCL was acquired by the State Bank of South Australia (SBSA). BFCL required a banker that could provide national banking facilities as it had operations in all states of Australia. In addition, most of the fund raising of BFCL was conducted in the eastern states and use of the short term money market required an efficient method of banking and passing funds between states. NAB provided the national banking facilities required and so BFCL continued to use NAB as its banker.

Consideration was given on several occasions to transferring all banking facilities to SBSA but SBSA had only limited banking facilities outside of South Australia and could not offer the facilities required. BFCL did, however, use State Bank accounts for head office, branch operations and other banking facilities.

2. Apart from BFCL, there are currently only two SBSA or BFCL subsidiaries which bank with banks other than SBSA. They are:

Asset Risk Management Ltd Group NSW & Qld

- Originally a joint venture. Has various accounts with ANZ, CBA, NAB and Westpac, mainly specific to customer leasing transactions.

Leasefin Corporation Ltd—NSW

- Joint venture in which BFCL has 51% interest. Has an account with NAB specific to its NSW leasing operations.

As both of the above subsidiaries have operations outside South Australia, bankers with full banking and branch facilities were chosen.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FINANCE TRUST

25. Mr BECKER:

1. What was the increased investment activity of South Australian Finance Trust which necessitated the borrowing of \$1 351 000 000 for the year ended 30 June 1991 and how and where was this money invested?

2. What total limit has been placed on the borrowings of South Australian Finance Trust Limited and South Australian Finance Trust?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:

1. The borrowings to which the Member for Hanson refers were temporary borrowings from SAFA, invested in cash and readily liquefiable short term money market instruments (eg bank bills). These assets were held as a liquidity buffer, both to ensure adequate cash was available to meet general public sector needs and, more specifically, any further payments that the Government was required to make in support of the State Bank of South Australia. The volatile nature of the financial market at the time (especially vis-a-vis non-AAA semi-government issuers) meant that there was no guarantee that large volumes of funding could be raised on an as-required basis.

Loan Council rules at the time were such that borrowings to fund liquidity buffer assets could not be held in SAFA. Hence, the South Australian Finance Trust (SAFT) was utilised for this purpose. Following changes to Loan Council guidelines, operative from July 1992, it is now possible for SAFA to maintain all its liquid assets on its own balance sheet—a practice which accords with Government Management Board ('GMB') Review Team's recommendations.

As indicated in SAFA Annual Reports, the primary activity of SAFT in recent years has been to assist in the management of South Australian public sector liquidity. This change in SAFT's focus (ie from reinvestment activity) has been acknowledged in the Government Management Board (GMB) Review of SAFA. The GMB Review also notes that the existence of SAFT resulted in the funding of the State Bank rescue package having minimal impact in the financial markets.

2. At the time, there were no formal limits on SAFT's borrowings. Indeed, in the light of the uncertainty as to the State's funding needs, it would have been impracticable to have set limits.

Now that Government's funding needs can be managed entirely within SAFA's balance sheet, and due to the discontinuation of reinvestment activity by SAFT, the SAFA Board has approved the winding up of SAFT, which should be completed by 31 December 1993. Hence, the setting of borrowing limits is unnecessary.

Similarly, there is no need to set borrowing limits for South Australian Finance Trust Limited (SAFTL). Its primary role is that of Trustee of SAFT and, as a consequence, the only borrowings that will now be required will be in respect of certain transactions relating to the funding of public sector assets undertaken a number of years ago (it has not undertaken any new structured transactions since 1990).

NICHOLLS CASE

35. Mr BECKER: What legal costs were incurred by the Minister of Transport Development in the recent case against Chris Nicholls, former ABC journalist; and were the Minister's costs paid by the Government and, if so, why?

The Hon G.J. CRAFTER: The Minister of Transport Development was involved in the case against Mr C. Nicholls as a witness for the prosecution. In the trial Mr Nicholls sought discovery of confidential material namely the transcripts of evidence given by the Hon. Barbara Wiese and Mr Stitt before the inquiry into the Minister of Tourism. It was considered necessary to have the views of the parties affected. Consequently, the Hon. Barbara Wiese incurred legal costs of \$660.00. These costs were paid by the Government as it was considered to be a flow on from the inquiry.

POWER LINE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

37. Mr BECKER: How many persons are currently members of the Power Line Environment Committee; when was the committee formed; what is its purpose; what are the annual remuneration and allowances paid to each member; and how many meetings are held each year?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There are eight members of the Power Line Environment Committee.

Clause 1 of the Charter of PLEC states:

'The committee shall comprise eight members being one representative of each of the following:

- Department of Environment and Planning (now the Department of Environment and Land Management).
- Department of Road Transport.
- Tourism South Australia (now the South Australian Tourism Commission).
- Local Government Association
- Australian Conservation Council (represented by the Conservation Council of South Australia).
- Electricity Trust of South Australia

and two community representatives.'

The committee was formed on 28 February 1990.

The charter of the committee states that its purpose '... is to determine the eligibility of and establish priorities for projects to improve the aesthetics of the electricity distribution system for the benefit of the general community, primarily through the undergrounding of electricity mains. The charter does not extend to the undergrounding of systems in urban residential streets for the benefit of the residents unless that is an incidental consequence of a project'.

Clause 4 of the charter of PLEC states:

'Members who are not employees of a Department or Instrumentality shall be paid fees which shall be determined by the Minister and be adjusted in accordance with movements in the fees payable to the members of ETSA'.

Chairman \$2 826 per annum

Members \$1 739 per annum

Meetings are convened as required. Their frequency is governed by the flow of applications for funding from councils, or other committee business which may require attention.

A total of 27 (PLEC) meetings have been convened since its inception. The following indicates the number of meetings conducted within each year.

1990 (6)

1991 (7)

1992 (9)

1993 (5)

SEWER RATES**54. Mr BECKER:**

1. Why were property owners of land adjacent to the sewer main in Jill Court, Victor Harbor and surrounding areas not advised from April 1990 (following notice in the *Government Gazette*) that sewer rates were due and payable?

2. How many property owners have now been requested to pay sewer rates over due and what was the total amount due at time of discovery that rates were not being collected?

3. How many other subdivisions have been discovered in which sewer rates were not being collected in the year ended 30 June 1993?

4. What authority does the Minister have to collect rates due retrospectively in such instances and how does an error like this occur?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. Owners of land adjacent to the sewer main in Jill Court and a portion of Mayflower Court, Victor Harbor were not advised that sewerage rates were due and payable from 1 April 1990 because of an oversight by staff engaged in advising rating information to newly created account numbers as a result of land divisions. This oversight was discovered when a Certificate of Water and Sewer Charges was requested for one of the properties.

2. A total of seven customers were advised in writing on 27 May 1993, that sewerage rates were to be raised retrospectively from 1 July 1991. Each was debited \$162.00 for the period 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992. The sewer main was entered on departmental rating records in the week ending 26 May 1993, and as a result sewerage rates totalling \$124.50 were automatically levied for the first three quarters of the 1992-93 financial year. The fourth quarters water and sewerage rates were levied on 9 June 1993.

3. The department carries out an audit of records to determine which properties should be rated but are not because of errors or omissions in administrative procedures. This ensures that legitimate rates are charged and persons enjoying the benefits of the services are meeting their share of the costs of providing and maintaining the services.

During the 1992-93 financial year, the audit was done for records created during the 1991-92 financial year. 2538 records which did not have a water and/or sewer main recorded were checked and 559 were found to be rateable. Of these, 195 had retrospective rates levied. Approximately \$96 000 of retrospective sewerage rates were debited for the 1991-92 financial year.

4. The Minister's authority is contained in section 80 of the Sewerage Act and whilst the legislation does not limit how far back the debit adjustments may be made, in accordance with current policy, they are limited to the current and previous financial years only. This is applied keeping in mind the debit cannot precede the date of current ownership. As stated in Question 1 above, the reasons for these oversights are unknown. In most instances the oversight is discovered a long time after it is made and the date is not available.

Whilst customers have been disadvantaged by receiving two years worth of sewerage rates totalling \$328.00, they have not been levied sewerage rates of \$153.00 for the 1990-91 financial year.

JUSTICES APPOINTMENT COMMITTEE**61. Mr BECKER:**

1. Were all normal procedures with respect to Justice of the Peace applications followed in the appointment of Mr J. Ienco, ALP candidate for Colton and, if not, why not and why was he appointed so quickly?

2. When was Mr Ienco's application lodged and by whom?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:

1. Yes, normal procedures were followed in relation to this application including an interview with a member of the JAC (Justices Appointment Committee), nominated by the Royal Association of Justices.

Mr Ienco first applied for appointment in January 1991 but, in accordance with the recommendation of the interviewing officer, his application was not approved at that time.

A second application was received in September 1992. This application was accepted and processed in the usual way. It was approved in December 1992 and Mr Ienco was subsequently appointed on 4 February 1993.

The history of the processing of this application is as follows. The application was received on 25-9-92; a police report was sought on 15-10-92 and received back in late November; the views of Mr Ienco's local MP were sought on 20-10-92 and received on 26-10-92; Mr Ienco was interviewed by a member of the JAC on

18-12-92 and was recommended for appointment by the Committee member; the subsequent appointment was made on 4-2-93.

While on the shorter end of the scale, this is not an unusually short processing period. The length of time between receipt of a JP application and subsequent appointment depends upon a number of factors such as: whether the application is in order when received; the time taken for receipt of the various reports; the stage within the department's 'processing cycle' at which the application is received. As can be seen from the history detailed above, Mr Ienco's application was received towards the end of the 'processing cycle' but within sufficient time for the various reports to have been sought and received before interviews were arranged. In fact half of the applicants appointed at the same time as Mr Ienco lodged their applications in September or October.

2. The application was received in this office on 25 September 1992. It was forwarded to this office by the South Australian Branch of the ALP.

WATER POLICE BRANCH**68. Mr BECKER:**

1. What was the 1992-93 budget for the operation of the Water Police Branch?

2. How many persons are employed in this branch and in what classifications?

3. How many emergencies were attended to by the branch in the year ended 30 June 1993 and how do these statistics compare with the previous years?

4. Were the branch's water patrolling activities curbed or reduced because of budget restraints or over expenditure and if so, to what extent?

5. Will the Government continue to fund and maintain the Water Police at the same level as in previous years and if not, why not?

6. What budget overrun is permissible for this branch in case of emergency?

7. What private funding is available to the branch from say insurance companies or recoupment of costs?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. Water Police Services is one of the specialist groups within the Operations Support Division. The 1992-93 total budget allocation for Water Police Services was \$517 707.00.

2. 1 Sergeant	Officer in Charge	
4 Senior Constables	Master V	
	Classification	
4 Other Ranks	Deckhands	
	1991-92	1992-93
3. Search and rescue missions	85	90
Vessels towed	106	110

4. On 13 May 1993 the Divisional Commander issued a directive to Water Police Services restricting the use of police launches within the following parameters:

- response to any tasking requiring the use of a launch;
- between Monday and Friday, one launch may be used for patrol purposes, provided the duration of the patrol does not exceed 3 hours;
- during weekends each launch may be used for up to 3 hours for general patrol purposes.

This directive remained in effect until 30 June 1993 as a means of significantly reducing the overall fuel consumption costs debited against Water Police Services.

Staff were otherwise deployed on mobile patrols in the Water Police patrol vehicle.

5. Water Police Services is funded from the Operations Command budget. There is no intention to reduce the 1993-94 level of funding for this group.

6. There is no identifiable budget overrun as such. Water Police Services will continue to be tasked to provide a water patrol and search and rescue capability.

In cases of emergency taskings, there are no budget restrictions placed on this group and any shortfalls are addressed in the broader context of the overall budget for the Support Region.

7. At the present time, all costs associated with maintaining Water Police Services are borne by the Police Department.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE**74. Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle, registered VQE-311 attending to on Friday 14 May 1993 at 8.30am

whilst dropping off a student who removed his bike from the boot of the vehicle on Parham Road, Blackwood, opposite the Blackwood Primary School?

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. LYNN ARNOLD:

1. I have ascertained that the nominated vehicle was driven by an officer who has permanent allocation of the vehicle as her duties require frequent after hours usage.

The driver of the vehicle has indicated that on 14 May, 1993, at approximately 8.30 a.m., she transported her son to the Blackwood High School. Apparently at that time it was raining heavily. Our employee elected to drive her son to school owing to the inclement weather. As he normally rides his bike, the cycle was placed in the boot of the vehicle so that he could return home.

I am given to understand that the journey was on the employee's direct normal route to her place of employment and this is the only occasion where the son has been conveyed to school in a Government vehicle.

2. The South Australian Housing Trust.

3. The terms of the Government Management Board Circular 90/30 were not being observed. The employee has received a reprimand.

CONSERVATION COUNCIL

78. **Mr GUNN:** How much financial assistance or other help does the Government provide to the South Australian Conservation Council?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The principal assistance provided by the Government to the South Australian Conservation Council is in the form of an annual grant of \$60 000 which is now paid from the budget of the Department of Environment and Land Management and previously by the former Department of Environment and Planning. Of this amount, it is a condition that \$20 000 be made available to the Nature Conservation Society.

Other small scale assistance is sometimes provided. For example, during 1991-92 the department provided funding of approximately \$1 000 towards vehicle costs for a Commonwealth funded National Estate project undertaken by the Conservation Council.

Further to this financial assistance, the building in which the South Australian Conservation Council is located, 120 Wakefield Street, Adelaide is three quarter owned by the Government and one quarter owned by the Conservation Council. As part of an agreement at the time of purchase in 1983, the Council undertook to be responsible for all running costs and maintenance of the building but occupies it rent free. In addition, two member groups, the Australian Conservation Foundation and the Nature Conservation Society occupy space in the building, while others utilise the building for meetings.

PLASTIC MILK BOTTLES

81. Mr BECKER:

1. Will the Government establish a five cent deposit on two litre plastic milk bottles and if so, when and if not, why not?

2. When did the Government receive representations, and from whom, to introduce two litre plastic milk bottles and what was the response?

3. What benefit is there to consumers in using plastic milk bottles?

4. How are these bottles recycled and into what products?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. A five cent deposit has applied to these containers since the 29 August 1985.

2. Verbal indications were given by industry that it intended introducing this type of container in representations received and at meetings during the course of the Soft Market Appraisal (non-alcoholic) of the beverage industry currently being undertaken by the Beverage Container Unit of the Office of the Environment Protection Authority. Southern Farmers gave written advice in a letter dated the 28 May 1993 that they would introduce this container during the 1993-94 financial year, while Dairy Vale advised staff and announced in the press that they would introduce a similar container during November 1993.

This Industry is aware that at present a deposit applies to this type of container if marketed in South Australia, although they are hopeful that on completion of the appraisal by the department that an alternate method to deposits for these containers will be sanctioned by the Government.

It is anticipated that the finalisation of the position paper detailing the options available with respect to the beverages and containers serving this market sector will be presented to me by the end of this month for Government to consider.

3. Benefits to consumers indicated are that the containers are more convenient to handle and the screw top lid makes sealing easier. Additionally there are cost savings as the containers will be blow moulded in South Australia and their use will allow the local dairy industries to remain competitive.

4. In the Eastern States these containers are returned via kerbside collection systems and are used to produce such products as water pipes and mobile garbage bins.

DRIVERS LICENCES

86. Mr BECKER:

1. During the past financial year how many persons sat for motor vehicle licence examinations?

2. Of those people, how many were—

- (a) unemployed;
- (b) receiving Austudy;
- (c) receiving some other form of Social Security benefit or pension;
- (d) failed on their first examination;
- (e) failed on their second examination; and
- (f) failed three or more examinations?

3. What is the total amount of income derived from licence fees in respect of re-examinations?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. 33 740

2. (a) Unknown.

(b) Unknown.

(c) Unknown.

(d) In the period from July until September 1992 total failures were 5 951.

In October 1992 the standardised Vehicle On Road Test (VORT) was introduced and for the period October 1992 until April 1993 there were 3 912 failures.

In April 1993 the Accredited and Authorised Driving Instructors Scheme was introduced. Consequently practical examinations were conducted by Authorised Driving Instructors as well as Government examiners. In addition, novice drivers had the opportunity to acquire their licence through progressive log-book evaluation associated with competency based training provided by Accredited Driving Instructors. Accordingly, no 'pass-fail' rate applies in these circumstances and since for the period April-June 1993, some 70% of novice drivers chose to use the Accredited option, a 'pass-fail' rate is not comparable with previous figures.

In future years, given that a uniform arrangement will be in place, whole-of-year statistics will be kept on those using Government examiners and those using the Authorised option, along with their respective pass-fail rates, and on those using the Accredited option.

(e) Total failures on second attempt under old system (July to September 1992)—1 487.

(f) Total failures on third attempt under old system (July to September 1992)—178.

3. Revenue recouped from applicants undertaking licence re-examinations provided by Government examiners amounted to \$276 172 up to April 1993.

In April 1993 the charge for a Government conducted licence examination was increased by \$10 to ensure full cost recovery. While there are indications that the Government charge provides a benchmark for the charges which Authorised Driving Instructors set in the market place for licence examinations, these obviously vary according to market forces. Total revenue generated in respect of licence examinations conducted by Authorised Instructors is, therefore, not known.

As the vast proportion of licence candidates are opting for the Accredited scheme involving progressive evaluation, the concept of a 're-examination' does not apply. The costs of progressive evaluation are built into the market-driven pricing structures which also cover the training component.

HELLENIC SHOOTING COMPLEX

87. Mr LEWIS:

1. What Government financial assistance from the State and/or any other public source has been provided to the proponents of the proposed Hellenic Shooting Complex at Monarto?

2. What other forms of funding is the Government contemplating to the proponents of this project, if any?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:

1. The Commonwealth Government has granted the Hellenic Game Shooters Association \$42 000 to establish a shooting complex at Monarto. This grant is available from the Commonwealth Government's Community, Cultural, Recreational and Sporting Facilities Program of 1992/93.

2. The Hellenic Game Shooters Association has made an offer to the Department of Environment and Land Management to purchase Section 195, Hundred of Mobilong. The Department of Environment and Land Management has agreed to sell the land to the Association subject to Council approval in the terms of the Planning Act. The Association would have the option of paying for the land outright or by paying 20% of the value and the balance by nine equal annual payments of principal plus interest, as is the Department's current funding policy.

ELECTORATE OFFICES

88. Mr LEWIS:

1. During the past two years commencing 1 January 1991—

(a) what electorate offices have been relocated;

(b) what was the rent at the old location and what is the rent at the new location;

(c) what was the cost to the public purse of the move, divided into the categories of:

(i) moving furniture, fittings and equipment; and

(ii) renovating and/or modifying (including fitting or connecting services) and redecorating the new premises;

(d) in any of the foregoing circumstances, is the relocated electorate office still within the bounds of the electorate currently represented by the Member occupying the new premises; and

(e) what has been the total cost or saving of relocating these electorate offices?

2. In which electorate offices has the photocopying entitlement been exceeded during the period commencing 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1993 and by how much?

3. What reimbursement has been made of any such excess in photocopying by the Member in whose electorate office the excess has occurred?

4. What is the average rental now being paid for electorate offices, which offices have had an increase in rental during the period commencing 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1993; on what dates and by what amounts per annum have those increases occurred?

5. What are the circumstances in which Members are entitled to have landline connections from their electorate offices to their homes such that it is possible for telephone calls to be transferred at no additional call cost from their offices to their homes and in which offices is it possible for calls to be switched from the office to the Member's home (and vice versa) without incurring an additional call cost?

6. Which Members have currently applied for and/or have had the cost of mobile phones allocated to their electorate office telephone account; on what date did they apply for inclusion of the mobile phone connection to the electorate office telephone account and on what date was the connection provided?

7. Which Members have exceeded their telephone allowance during the past four years and by how much during any period have the excess amounts been repaid by them personally and otherwise what is the amount still outstanding in any instance?

8. In which instances was it possible at the time of billing to provide the Member with a list of the calls made from the Member's office phone, in order that the Member could determine if the calls so billed were in fact billed accurately?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:

1. During the past two years commencing 1 January 1991—

- Alexandra
- Florey
- Mitchell
- Unley

· Adelaide Electorate Office is currently under consideration for relocation.

(b) the rent was as follows:

· Alexandra (old location)	\$11 130 pa
· Alexandra (new location)	\$17 928 pa
· Florey (old location)	\$ 6 032 pa
· Florey (new location)	\$19 865 pa
· Mitchell (old location)	\$ 8 580 pa
· Mitchell (new location)	\$13 500 pa
· Unley (old location)	\$12 972 pa
· Unley (new location)	\$21 488 pa
· Adelaide (current location)	\$12 400 pa
· Adelaide (proposed location)	\$23 000 pa

(c) the cost to the public purse was as follows:

(i) all removal costs were no more than \$500.

(ii) commissioning costs were:

Alexandra	\$29 300
Florey	\$26 300
Mitchell	\$20 000
Unley	\$46 169

It is estimated that to relocate Adelaide Electorate Office will cost in the vicinity of \$46 000.

(d) all of the above relocated offices are within the bounds of the electorate currently represented by the Member occupying the new premises.

(e) there has been no saving in dollar terms by relocating the above Electorate Offices. The total cost of relocation was \$123 769.

2. See Appendix 1. It should be noted that the monitoring period for the photocopy allowance operates from 1st September to 31st August.

3. See Appendix 1

4. The average rental now being paid for Electorate Offices is \$12 277 per annum.

See Appendix 2 for Electorate Office rental increases.

5. Since 1989 only Members who live in the same Telecom exchange area as their Electorate Office are permitted to have an ODX (landline) facility installed. This enables the Member to receive calls after hours from the Electorate Office at their home at no additional call cost. This facility has been installed at the following Electorate Offices:

Adelaide	Light
Albert Park	Mitcham
Baudin	Morphett
Chaffey	Mt Gambier
Coles	Norwood
Elizabeth	Price
Flinders	Ramsay
Florey	Semaphore
Goyder	Stuart
Hanson	Todd
Heysen	Walsh
Whyalla	

6. The following Members have applied to have their mobile phone accounts allocated to their Electorate Office telephone allowance:

- Dr M Armitage MP
- Mr G Gunn MP
- Mr P Lewis MP
- Mr J Oswald MP
- Mr J Quirke MP
- Hon D Wotton MP

All of the above Members have forwarded accounts received after the Minister for Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety approved the scheme on 24th June 1993.

7. See Appendix 3. It can be seen that all Members have paid their outstanding accounts except for the Members for Davenport and Murray-Mallee.

8. During 1991 the then Minister of Housing and Construction requested Telecom to supply no itemised accounts for Electorate Offices. Accordingly any Member wanting details of calls made, must contact Telecom direct to obtain information from their computer records regarding the previous three months calls.

PHOTOCOPY ALLOWANCE SEPT 90 TO AUG 91

Electorate Office	Allowance	Actual	Excess	Invoice (\$)	Received (\$)
Adelaide	36000	47543	11543	\$277.03	\$277.03
Coles	36000	39611	3611	\$86.66	\$86.66
Davenport	40000	41945	1945	\$46.48	\$0
Fisher	36000	55326	19326	\$463.82	\$463.82
Hartley	36000	36976	976	\$23.42	\$23.42
Mitcham	36000	37419	1419	\$34.06	\$34.06
Mt Gambier	36000	37300	1300	\$31.20	\$31.20
Newland	36000	118393	82393	\$1 977.43	\$1 977.43
Spence	36000	66801	30801	\$739.22	\$739.22
Stuart	36000	55878	19878	\$477.07	\$477.07
Unley	36000	41069	5069	\$121.66	\$121.66

NOTE: The member for Murray-Mallee owes an additional amount from the period Sept 1989 to August 1990 totalling \$138.77

PHOTOCOPY ALLOWANCE SEPT 91 TO AUG 92

Electorate Office	Allowance	Actual	Excess	Invoice (\$)	Received (\$)
Adelaide	36000	59033	23033	\$552.79	\$552.79
Baudin	36000	36435	435	\$10.44	\$10.44
Bragg	36000	39172	3172	\$76.13	\$76.13
Briggs	36000	69838	33838	\$812.11	\$812.11
Davenport	40000	53168	13168	\$316.03	\$316.03
Fisher	36000	52983	16983	\$407.59	\$107.59
Mitcham	36000	49271	13271	\$318.50	\$318.50
Mitchell	36000	38642	2642	\$63.41	\$63.41
Mt Gambier	36000	48307	12307	\$295.37	\$295.37
Newland	36000	86574	50574	\$1 213.78	\$1 213.78
Playford	36000	36228	228	\$5.47	\$5.47
Ramsay	36000	49700	13700	\$328.80	\$328.80
Ross Smith	36000	46180	10180	\$244.32	\$244.32
Spence	36000	47694	11694	\$280.66	\$280.66
Stuart	36000	45408	9408	\$225.79	\$225.79
Unley	36000	36115	115	\$2.76	\$2.76
Walsh	40000	40438	4438	\$10.51	\$10.51

NOTE: The current monitoring period concludes end August 1993

APPENDIX 2

Electorate	Increase p.a.	Increase date	Current rent
Adelaide	5.1%	26/08/91	\$12 400
Alexandra (old)	4.9%	11/10/91	\$11 130
Baudin	1.9%	18/03/92	\$11 000
Bragg	5.1%	06/11/92	\$13 968
Chaffey	4.2%	01/08/92	\$ 7 000
Coles	2.5%	01/05/93	\$13 000
Davenport	2.8%	01/12/92	\$17 000
Eyre	5.0%	01/03/92	\$ 3 300
Florey	10.6%	01/12/92	\$24 313
Gilles	1.8%	01/03/92	\$14 000
Goyder	2.9%	07/03/92	\$ 5 400
Hanson	2.5%	01/07/92	\$ 9 700
Hayward	2.0%	01/10/92	\$22 056
Henley Beach	1.9%	11/01/93	\$15 536
Light	1.8%	01/05/92	\$13 704
Mawson	2.6%	03/07/92	\$20 000
Morphett	4.1%	01/01/92	\$16 336
Murray Mallee	1.5%	01/07/92	\$ 4 584
Newland	4.2%	10/12/91	\$15 936
Price	2.1%	04/11/91	\$12 700
Ramsay	5.6%	01/08/92	\$17 400
Ross Smith	8.0%	04/06/93	\$14 000
Spence	2.0%	10/12/92	\$ 7 645
Stuart	4.8%	01/11/91	\$11 869
Unley	5.0%	11/03/92	\$22 800
Victoria	6.0%	01/11/92	\$ 6 300
Whyalla	4.3%	01/08/92	\$19 980

EXCESS TELEPHONE ALLOWANCES

	1989	1990	1991	1992	total	amount paid
Bragg	\$244.63	\$231.08	\$259.10		\$734.81	\$734.81
Briggs	\$1 037.93				\$1 037.93	\$1 037.93
Coles	\$559.53	\$194.08			\$194.08	\$194.08
Custance			\$586.57		\$586.57	\$586.57

EXCESS TELEPHONE ALLOWANCES

	1989	1990	1991	1992	total	amount paid
Davenport *		\$960.64			\$960.64	\$0.00
Flinders	\$74.00				\$74.00	\$74.00
Hartley			\$290.22		\$290.22	\$290.22
Heysen		\$25.85			\$25.85	\$25.85
Mt Gambier					\$107.56	\$107.56
			\$107.56			
Murray Mallee			\$635.68		\$635.68	\$0.00
Newland			\$249.94		\$249.94	\$249.94
Stuart		\$330.48			\$330.48	\$330.48
Victoria	\$1 270.72	\$1 609.47			\$2 880.19	\$2 880.19

* Note: The Member for Davenport owes an additional amount from 1988 totalling \$87.80

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

94. **Mr ATKINSON:** Has the State Transport Authority considered whether it could use the public-address system (computer-generated announcer) at railway stations to warn that an express train is about to speed through the station?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The State Transport Authority (STA) has considered whether it could use the public address system (computer generated announcer) at railway stations to warn that an express train is about to pass through the station.

Messages announced by the Passenger Information System at railway stations consist of a fixed word structure which cannot be changed or supplemented manually. The message is designed to give intending passengers relevant information about the next train to depart from the station in each direction of travel and is computer based.

The signalling system identifies an approaching train and the appropriate message is automatically selected from the timetable information stored in the computer system.

The passenger is required to stand at or near the annunciator to obtain train running information because use of a high volume would be particularly intrusive in the neighbourhood of railway stations. This, together with the limited message range of the system make the change undesirable.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY

95. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:**

1. What caused a water main to burst and flood the Elizabeth City Shopping Centre on 3 August 1993?

2. What is the estimate of the damage and the cost of cleaning up?

3. What is the estimate of claims that have been made or are anticipated against the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. The water main burst as a result of localised external graphitisation corrosion to the 200mm diameter cast iron pipe. The burst occurred when the internal water pressure exceeded the residual combined strength of the cement mortar, corrosion products and remaining cast iron. Water from the burst was channelled to the doors to the Mall by brick paving adjacent to where the burst occurred.

2. There is no estimate available. Damage due to flooding occurred to approximately 60 shops including Venture and John Martins. John Martins estimated their damage at \$250 000.

3. Only two claims have been submitted to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The two submitted are from Big W Discount Stores \$5 400.84 and CIC Insurance Ltd for Cross Cut Hair \$3 000. Affected owners are pursuing claims through their insurers.

TRAFFIC OFFENCES

98. **Mr BECKER:**

1. During the past 12 months how many motorists were fined for speeding (including all forms of speed detection) along Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach?

2. What were the lowest and highest speeds recorded?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. During the 1992/93 financial year, there were seven people issued with expiation notices for speeding on Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach.

2. The recorded speeds of the seven vehicles were: two at 90 km/h, two at 91 km/h, one at 94 km/h, one at 97 km/h and one at 99 km/h.

99. **Mr BECKER:** Over the past 12 months how many crashes have occurred at the following intersections with Tapleys Hill Road—

- West Beach Road;
- Charles Veale Drive;
- Ingerson Street; and
- Burbridge Road,

how many injuries and fatalities were recorded at each location, what was the cause of each accident and estimated speed at the time of impact?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

(a) 5 accidents (0 fatalities, 5 property damage);

(b) 2 accidents (0 fatalities, 2 property damage);

(c) 1 accident (1 property damage);

(d) 33 accidents (0 fatalities, 8 injury, 25 property damage).

Statistics are not maintained on the cause or speeds associated with these accidents.

RURAL ARTERIAL ROADS

100. **Mr GUNN:** How much does the Department of Road Transport intend to spend on rural arterial roads in this financial year?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Department of Road Transport intends to spend approximately \$47.8 million on rural arterial roads in the 1993-94 financial year.

These funds will be spent on the following activities:

Specific Projects	\$ 9.6m
General Maintenance	\$19.0m
Reseals/Rehabilitations	\$ 9.0m
Pavement Marking	\$ 1.9m
Land Acquisition	\$ 0.1m
Roadside Development/Landscape	\$ 0.3m
Minor Roadworks	\$ 1.3m
Ferries	\$ 4.8m
Safety Related Roadworks	\$ 0.6m
Material Stocks	\$ 0.3m
Maintenance of Bridges	\$ 0.9m
TOTAL	\$47.8m

In addition, the Department of Road Transport will spend approximately \$33.0 million on National Highways in the rural area and approximately \$11.0 million on rural local roads.

LOOP SYSTEMS

101. **The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:**

1. What is the Government's policy on installing 'loop systems' to assist hearing impaired people in public buildings?

2. Is there a program for installation of such systems and if so, what is the program timetable and in particular, when will systems—

- be installed in Parliament House;
- be installed in Her Majesty's Theatre;
- be updated in the Festival Theatre; and
- be available in all courts at all times?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:

1. There is no general Government policy to install 'loop systems' in public buildings. As with other specialised equipment, Government agencies will consider the necessity for installation in the context of improving service provision to their clients. As an

example, the Education Department has installed the system in some schools where there are children with hearing impairment.

2. It is appropriate that the decision to install the 'loop system' be considered by the asset managers of those specific facilities not only in the context of service provision but also in terms of improving the asset value of the facility.

CATASTROPHE INSURANCE

103. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** What are the upper and lower limits to catastrophe insurance taken out by the Government on its assets?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Under the current commercial catastrophe insurance program taken out by the Government on its assets, the Government retains the first \$1 million of loss arising from any one identifiable event (\$3 million for STA losses) together with the first \$30 million of aggregate losses in any year above this \$1 million (or \$3 million) level.

The program then provides cover to the sum insured of \$375 million.

AIR TRAVEL

105. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** Which officers (by classification) of the Government and its authorities are entitled to first or business class air travel?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Treasurer's Instruction 9111 (issued in September 1993) states that in relation to domestic travel, only Ministers of the Crown, Chief Executive Officers or employees travelling in the company of Ministers or Chief Executive Officers may fly at any standard other than the cheapest economy rate, unless there are extraordinary circumstances.

The Guidelines for the Preparation and Review of Overseas Travel Proposals (October 1988) state that employees travelling overseas shall travel by air, economy class, except Heads of Government Departments and large Statutory Authorities who may travel business class. Exceptions are only made in special circumstances where an individual's itinerary is extremely demanding or the employee is travelling with executives from private companies.

These guidelines apply to all government agencies which are bound by Treasurer's Instructions; (that is all agencies audited by the Auditor-General). Furthermore, the Government would expect all agencies to observe the principles of the guidelines and to minimise travel expenditure.

FUEL LEVY

106. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** What agreement, if any, has been reached with the Local Government Association regarding the disposition of the special fuel levy?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The petrol levy for local government purposes was introduced as part of the process of negotiation and reform begun in October 1990 by agreement between the Premier and the President of the Local Government Association.

The process is based on developing improved functional and financial relationships between the two levels of government and to remove overlap and duplication. A broadening of the role of local government and a strengthening of its resource base are both important features of the reform process.

The petrol levy funds will help the State and local government to achieve both these aims and result in better services for less cost.

The petrol levy raised \$32.1 million in 1992/93 which has been used to offset State Government spending on a range of State administered local government programs. The funds were administered by the State, not local government, last financial year because the two levels of government have not yet agreed on which services will be provided under new arrangements—either jointly funded or transferred to local government.

The process of negotiation has continued through 1992-93.

In the 1993-94 budget the Government decided to establish a special deposit account—the State-Local Government Reform Fund—into which the petrol levy receipts will be paid and from which the funds required will be drawn to administer a range of local government programs. This underlines the Government's continued commitment to the reform process.

When agreement is reached between levels of government on the new arrangements—either joint funding or possibly clear transfers of responsibility to local government for particular functions and programs—then the levy monies will be available to local government to take up new additional expenditure responsibilities

without adverse impact on local government budgets or on the State budget.

In the meantime the petrol levy monies offset the costs to the State budget of a range of local government programs and mean that these important programs may continue to meet community needs despite the difficult budget position and expenditure reductions the Government is required to make to achieve the budgetary targets set in the Economic and Financial Statements in April 1993.

PUBLIC SECTOR ASSET SALES

107. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** In respect of the \$492 million asset sales by Government departments and authorities in the past three years, what were the individual assets sold with value of over \$100 000, by authority, per year?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As there is no central register of asset sales, the information in the attached schedules was obtained from individual agencies. In view of the time and effort involved, it was not considered justifiable to circularise all agencies. Instead information was sought from the Department of Environment and Land Management which handles the sale of most Government land and property. Details were also sought from several other agencies (SA Housing Trust, ETSA, SAULT, STA, E&WS and Road Transport) which normally do not sell their property through Environment and Land Management.

The question refers to asset sales of \$492 million over the last three years. This is based on information provided by Treasury to John Ferguson of *The Advertiser*. Those figures included the budget estimate for 1992/93 because the actuals were not available. In addition the figures were based primarily on the amounts shown in the Budget Papers for the Sale of Land and Property and the Sale of Plant, Equipment and Motor Vehicles. However, the figures did not include other proceeds from asset sales which are shown in the Budget Papers as Net Gain or Surplus on the Sale of Properties. Allowing for these changes, the asset sales over the last three years were:-

	\$m
1990-91	175
1991-92	176
1992-92	158
Total	509

Schedules, which are provided for the honourable member, may not appear to explain a large proportion of the total asset sales. However, about one third of the asset sale receipts come from the Sale of Plant, Equipment and Motor Vehicles most of which involve individual sales of less than \$100 000. The sale of houses by the Housing Trust and the Office of Government Employee Housing is another significant area of asset sales involving individual sales of less than \$100 000.

WESTERN AREA PLAN

108. **Mr BECKER:** What was the cost incurred to produce the report Western Metropolitan Area Recreation & Sport Strategy Plan prepared by Hassell Planning Consultants and what ratio of the costs was borne by the Government and the Western Metropolitan Councils?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The cost incurred to produce the report *Western Metropolitan Area Recreation and Sport Strategy Plan* prepared by Hassell Planning Consultants was \$30 000. The State Government contributed 50 per cent of the cost (\$15 000) and the remainder was shared between the six participating councils on a *pro rata* basis.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE

109. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered UQZ-747 attending to at Tilleys Road, Brownhill Creek on Monday 23 August 1993 between 10.15 am and 11.15 am?

2. Why did the driver and passenger of the vehicle walk through the scrub at Brownhill Creek and return to the vehicle after one hour?

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

4. 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.D. RANN:

1. The driver and passenger of vehicle UQZ-747 were engaged in routine lamp replacement at the intersection of Fullarton Road and

Maitland Street between the hours of 9.41am and 11.40am on the day in question. During that time both officers went in the vehicle to Tilleys Hill Road for the purpose of a toilet stop.

2. The officers claim that the owner of the nearby caravan park will not allow them to use the on-site toilets and that the toilet stop took between 20 and 30 minutes. 3. The vehicle is attached to the Department of Road Transport.

4. Field staff are permitted to use the Government vehicle to seek a nearby toilet when the need arises, however the 20 to 30 minute period they admit to in this instance is excessive.

Both officers will be reminded of their responsibilities and appropriate disciplinary action taken. One of the persons involved has been on sick leave since the matter was brought to notice.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL COMPUTERS

114. Mr LEWIS:

1. What is the capacity of CPUs and total RAM of the new computers provided to the Legislative Council Members offices and in which of the offices is there or will there be a facility which will enable the installation of ROM documents—such as *Hansard* and all South Australian Statutes—when such documents are eventually supplied on disk?

2. Which computers have the capacity to be fitted with a modern and connected by telephone landline to ultimate suppliers of ROM material?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. New computers supplied to the Party Leaders of the Legislative Council are 486 SX-33 CPU with four Mb RAM. This hardware has the capacity to enable the installation of any package designed to read *Hansard* and the South Australian Statutes when released on disk.

2. Currently all electorate office and Legislative Council computers are able to be fitted with a modern and communicate via a Telecom line to another computer source.

VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

115. Mr S.J. BAKER: Of the 3 496 voluntary separations during the past three financial years, how many employees have been replaced in the positions they vacated by other employees?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Voluntary Separation Schemes require that the position occupied by a person who accepts an offer of a package and resigns, must be lost. However, the instructions also allow Chief Executive Officers to achieve a workforce reduction at an equivalent classification level for each package paid to an employee.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

116. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What percentage of parks and reserves under the National Parks and Wildlife Act are gazetted under some form of mineral or petroleum licence?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Sixteen per cent of the total number of the State's 250 reserves, covering 77 per cent of the area of the 20.7 million hectare park estate, is subject to mining access rights.

WILDLIFE SURVEY AND RESEARCH SECTION

117. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. Why is it that for some years, positions in the Wildlife Survey and Research Section of the Biological Conservation Branch of the National Parks and Wildlife Service have been filled by personal invitation without advertising or interviewing candidates?

2. Has the Director approved this policy and if so, why?

3. Will the Minister provide a list of positions filled in the Wildlife Survey and Research Section over the past 15 years, whether or not they were advertised, showing the duration of appointment or contract and the qualifications, gender and citizenship of appointees?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. The Wildlife Survey and Research Section have been staffed according to Government procedures with all positions advertised, applicants shortlisted and interviewed and appointments made in accord with due process.

2. No such approval is required as there was no departure from normal practice.

3. Senior Survey and Research Officer—Appointment duration, 18 years.

Qualifications—PhD. Gender—male. Citizenship—Australian. Scientific Officer—Appointment duration, 11 years. Qualifications—B Sc (Hons). Gender—male. Citizenship—Australian.

Senior Wildlife Officer—Appointment duration, 8 years. Qualifications—B Sc (Hons). Gender—male. Citizenship—Australian.

Senior Technical Officer—Appointment duration, 16 years. Qualifications—Diploma. Gender—male. Citizenship—Australian.

All of the above incumbents were appointed as a result of an advertisement process.

GRAND PRIX BOARD

122. Mr BECKER:

1. What property owned by the Australian Formula I Grand Prix Board was hired out during the past financial year, to whom and for what fee and how do these figures compare with the previous financial year?

2. What is the breakdown of income earned by the Grand Prix Board for support and other services including admission and competitive fees, sponsorship income and management fees for the past financial year and how do these figures compare with the previous financial year?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister of Tourism provided the following responses:

1. Property Hired Out:

(a) Fencing, webbing, isolation units, concrete barriers, panels, ticket boxes, distribution boards, shade cloth, general admission stands.

(b) These items were hired to various private sector companies.

(c) Total hire fees:

1992	\$42 851
1991	\$41 690

2. Income earned for support and other services:

	1992	1991
Admission/Competitors		
Fees	312 401	356 375
Sponsorship Income	319 416	201 500
Management Fees	23 753	0
Total	655 570	557 875

STOP SIGNS

124. Mr BECKER:

1. What are the criteria for installing stop signs at local street intersections and were such criteria considered in relation to a request for the relocation of stop signs at the intersection of Lipsett Terrace and Elston Street, Brooklyn Park?

2. Has the granting of power to local councils to instal traffic control devices met with the acceptance of the local residents as a means of reducing accidents in the area and if not, why not?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. The Minister of Transport Development advises that the criteria for installing Stop signs at local street intersections is as follows:

- the sight distance from the road to be controlled should be severely restricted as determined by using the survey method as laid down in the Code of Practice for the Installation of Traffic Control Devices in SA

- the road to be controlled joins the road which is allocated for through traffic at an angle of 40° or less

- in the preceding three years, an average of three or more right angle accidents per year has occurred involving traffic on the approach being considered for 'Stop' sign control.

With regard to the Lipsett Terrace and Elston Street intersection, both of these streets are the responsibility of the City of West Torrens. Council is required to install Stop signs as permitted by the criteria set out in the Code of Practice.

2. The Department of Road Transport has no relevant information as to whether the installation of traffic control devices by Local Government is met with acceptance by local residents as a means of reducing accidents in local areas.

WORKCOVER

125. Mr BECKER: Why are medical fees under WorkCover much higher than fees for normal medical or hospital services?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: WorkCover Corporation currently pays up to the AMA recommended fee for medical services delivered

by a legally qualified medical practitioner. These fees have been published in the Government Gazette dated 16 December 1992. These fees are indicative of the general charge for services delivered to insured or private patients. These fees may be higher than those charged for Medicare patients where the provider may choose to reduce their charge so as to avoid financially disadvantaging their patient.

Charge for Private Hospital services are paid at levels typical of those that a Private Health insurer would pay.

Charges for Public Hospital accommodation, theatre and outpatient services are levied at two rates—790 compensable and non-compensable. WorkCover Corporation has previously gazetted charges payable for the services that in most instances are lower than the South Australian Health Commission compensable patient rate.

Notwithstanding the above the Corporation undertakes regular reviews of the rates it is charged for medical and hospital charges. During this process one of its key objectives is to ensure that the WorkCover scheme is only paying reasonable rates for various services. This includes obtaining parity in charges between non-compensable and compensable patients unless there are other benefits which WorkCover will receive for payment of higher rates.

126. **Mr BECKER:** What are the fees under WorkCover for a 15 minute consultation for laceration of or removal of dirt from an eye and how long does WorkCover take to pay such accounts?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The fees payable for treatment of a laceration or removal of dirt from an eye by a legally qualified medical practitioner would vary according to the severity of the laceration or the qualifications of the provider performing the service.

The total charge would normally include a component for the consultation plus an additional charge for the associated surgical procedure. This charge may vary according to the length or depth of the wound, whether debris removal was required, etc.

For a simple procedure in relation to a laceration performed by a General Practitioner the general fee payable would be \$99 (Items A010 & TF044) while for a simple procedure in relation to a foreign body in the eye (dirt) performed by a General Practitioner the general fee payable would be \$58.50 (Items A010 & TF088). A complex process could cost in excess of \$225.

Subject to any investigations necessary on a new claim, accounts for such a process would normally be paid within the normal 30 day business cycle.

