

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19 October 1993

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

STATE DISASTER (MAJOR EMERGENCIES AND RECOVERY) AMENDMENT BILL

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

CITIZEN INITIATED REFERENDA

A petition signed by 875 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to conduct a referendum in conjunction with the general election on the question of citizen initiated referenda was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS

A petition signed by 248 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to appoint an additional speech pathologist to serve Eyre Peninsula was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

LAKE EYRE BASIN

A petition signed by 234 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to oppose the proposed world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre Basin was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

STATE BANK

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to prosecute those identified as responsible for the losses of the State Bank Group was presented by the Hon. J.P. Trainer.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following Questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1, 92, 97, 102, 104, 110, 112 and 119; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

RURAL FINANCE

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (7 September).

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I have been provided with a background to both applications by Rural Finance and Development which I am quite prepared to make available to the member for Chaffey. In summary, the first application on 29 June 1972 was made as a result of frosting on 15 October 1971. It was assessed twice by the then Rural Industry Assistance Authority.

On the first occasion a carry-on finance loan of \$11 106 was declined. It was the committee's view that with their present debt

structure the applicants had very little prospect of reaching a stage of long-term commercial viability within a reasonable time.

The application was re-assessed at the applicant's request on the basis of the Rural Industry Assistance Authority taking over a Bank of New South Wales overdraft, Berri Co-op debt and paying out hire purchase commitments.

The application was again declined on 9 February 1973. The committee recorded that the applicants had approximately \$8 500 equity in their property, which was considered insufficient to cover poor seasons or depressed fruit prices. It should be noted that the first application referred to a property in the Berri irrigation area. This property was sold on 25 September 1974.

The second application was received from the applicants on 29 June 1993. It was an application under the heavy rainfall exceptional circumstances package of the Rural Adjustment Act 1992 (Commonwealth). The property referred to in this application was in the Cobdogla Irrigation area, purchased on 21 October 1974. The two applications, 21 years apart, from the one person are related to two entirely different properties.

To be eligible for assistance under the current RAS scheme, a farmer must have long-term prospects. In assessing sustainable long-term profitability, the following relevant criteria must be taken into account:

(i) The past and expected future profitability of the farming enterprise as measured by its ability to meet financial commitments relating to:

- a. costs of operation of the farm enterprise
- b. living costs of the farm family
- c. investments in sustainable farming systems
- d. allowance for depreciation of capital and future capital requirements
- e. servicing and repayment of debt of the farm enterprise; and
- f. the long-term economic trends which impact on the farm enterprise.

(ii) The provision of financial support for the farming enterprise by commercial lenders.

The enterprise in question made a profit of \$11 818 in 1989-90, not sufficient to cover living expenses for two adults and a 13 year old child. In 1990-91 the profit was \$306. Living costs were met by off-farm income from cleaning contracts. In 1991-92 a profit of \$9 433 was made. This was supplemented by off-farm contracting of \$9 262 and cleaning wages of \$10 395.

The applicants again predict a loss this season, to be supported again by cleaning contracts.

Whilst I acknowledge the applicants' willingness to seek additional off-farm income, the enterprise appears not to have long-term prospects. In addition, there was no letter of support from the commercial lender with the application, which is a requirement of eligibility. It is not a sustainable commercial enterprise and the application was declined accordingly.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

MFP Development Corporation—Report, 1992-93

By the Treasurer (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

State Bank of South Australia—Report, 1992-93

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

Australian Financial Institutions Commission—Report, 1992-93

Court Services Department—Report, 1992-93

Legal Services Commission of South Australia—Report, 1992-93

Office of Planning and Urban Development Board—Report, 1992-93

State Electoral Department—Report, 1992-93

Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal—Report to the Attorney-General and Chief Justice, 1992-93

Legal Practitioners Act—Regulations—Indemnity Insurance Scheme

Corporation of Tanunda—By-laws—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Street Hawkers and Traders

No. 3—Bees

No. 4—Animals and Birds
 No. 5—Garbage Removal
 No. 6—Dogs
 No. 7—Repeal of By-laws
 Ministerial statements—Attorney-General—
 Public sector reform agenda
 Reform of statutory bodies
 Public Corporations Act implementation
 Public Trustee—draft citizen's charter
 Citizen's charter office—draft guidelines

By the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources
 (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

The State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1992-93

By the Minister of Public Infrastructure (Hon. J.H.C.
 Klunder)—

Engineering and Water Supply Department—Report,
 1992-93
 South Eastern Water Conservation Drainage Board—
 Report, 1992-93

By the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational
 Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Workers Compensation Review Panel—Report, 1992-93

By the Minister of Business and Regional Development
 (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Economic Development Authority—Report, 1992-93
 Office of Business and Regional Development—Report,
 1992-93

By the Minister of Primary Industries (Hon. T.R.
 Groom)—

South Australian Timber Corporation—Report, 1992-93
 Stock Act—Regulations—Stock Tags.

MABO

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In accordance with my
 previous practice, I propose to advise members about recent
 developments in relation to the response of the
 Commonwealth, States and Territories to the High Court's
 decision on *Mabo v Queensland*. My Government has
 consistently stated its view that there should be a joint
 national legislative resolution of the key aspects of the Mabo
 issue by all Governments. I reiterate my Government's
 absolute commitment to the principles of the delivery of
 certainty for existing titleholders and a just outcome for
 Aboriginal people.

As members will recall from my most recent statement to
 this House, the Prime Minister wrote to me proposing
 legislation to resolve uncertainties created by the decision
 while ensuring that native title be treated with fairness and
 justice. Following the release of the Commonwealth
 Government's outline of proposed legislation, there have
 been numerous meetings between Government officials
 where the detail of the Commonwealth's proposal has been
 discussed and clarified. These negotiations, the most recent
 occurring as late as last week, have been constructive and
 have sought to address a number of concerns of States and
 Territories. I am advised that the Federal Cabinet yesterday
 considered further its proposed Native Title Bill 1993
 together with the modifications suggested by the States and
 Territories and consideration of concerns of Aboriginal and
 Torres Strait Islander communities, mining, pastoral and
 other industry groups. Following the Federal Cabinet
 decision, the Prime Minister released a statement describing

the main elements of that decision. I now table that statement
 for the information of the House.

I am pleased to advise honourable members that many of
 the concerns and fears debated publicly in the past few days
 and as reported by the media have been allayed by the Prime
 Minister's report of what was actually decided by his
 Cabinet. I remain optimistic that an agreement on the scope
 and content of complementary Commonwealth-State
 legislation can be reached. However, while indicating broad
 in principle support for the proposals today, before giving any
 unqualified support to the Prime Minister's proposals, my
 Government wants to see the text of the proposed
 Commonwealth Bill and to examine its detail. Only when we
 have had this opportunity will we be able to assess its full
 implications.

Further, we must be satisfied that the Commonwealth is
 prepared to reach an acceptable arrangement regarding
 compensation and other costs relating to the accommodation
 of native title considerations in this State; that the Bill
 provides the certainty previously assured on pastoral and
 other leaseholds; that the new approach to the Racial
 Discrimination Act 1975 meets the required policy objective
 of establishing certainty for the validation of grants; and that
 the Commonwealth Bill in its final form permits a workable
 land management system for the State.

Should such agreement be reached, then South Australia
 and other States and Territories will be able to introduce draft
 complementary legislation. Based on the original time frame
 proposed for the introduction of the Commonwealth Bill into
 Federal Parliament, namely 1 October 1993, my Government
 anticipated introducing draft legislation at or about this time.
 However, given the detailed and lengthy negotiations in
 relation to the Bill, as well as the complexities of drafting a
 comprehensive response to the issues, there has been cause
 to delay the introduction of the Commonwealth Bill and thus
 our own legislation.

I am advised that the Commonwealth Government now
 intends to introduce its legislation to Parliament as soon as
 drafting is complete. The Commonwealth is committed to
 making its final draft legislation available for scrutiny by the
 States as soon as possible. Consequently, my Government
 will at that time be able to introduce complementary legisla-
 tion into the State Parliament.

QUESTION TIME

MABO

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):
 My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government
 still intend to introduce its legislation relating to the High
 Court Mabo decision during the current session of
 Parliament; and, if so, is it also the Government's intention
 that this legislation should be passed through both Houses of
 Parliament before an election is called?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader has asked two
 questions. The first was a supremely irrelevant question,
 because it was answered in anticipation by the ministerial
 statement that I have just given. That first question, as I said,
 is supremely irrelevant. As to the second question that the
 Leader asked in his double-barrelled question today, what I
 have indicated is that it should be introduced to the
 Parliament. I have not given any commitment as to its later

progress through this place. That will be determined by other events.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training inform the House of the effect that a policy on school closures similar to that being implemented in Victoria would have on education in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON:—and is the Minister aware of the concern expressed by the South Australian Institute of Teachers that a Liberal Government in South Australia may adopt the same approach? With your concurrence, Sir, and by leave of the House, I wish to explain my question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair wishes to hear the explanation. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: They are very noisy, Sir. Last Friday the Kennett Liberal Government announced the closure of another 159 schools on top of the 55 closed earlier this year. This has been described as a catastrophe for education in Victoria.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is a major policy issue for South Australia. Indeed, it highlights the fundamental difference between the economic rationalist approach to education which is adopted by conservative and Liberal Governments in England—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The economic rationalist approach taken by conservative Governments in the United Kingdom, New Zealand, New South Wales and Victoria seeks fundamentally to change the policies of access and equity which have been pioneered by Federal and State Labor Governments. I would remind members that the Liberal Party wheeled out the same approach during the last Federal election when it promised to charge full fees and to issue vouchers for university places. I hope people have not forgotten that the Opposition in South Australia supported that policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Goyder and Bright are out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I would like to take a point of order. The member for Goyder suggested that I was telling lies; I ask for a retraction.

Mr MEIER: The Minister was peddling the same—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder is out of order. The Minister has requested a withdrawal. It is open to the member for Goyder only to withdraw or deny.

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, I was—

The SPEAKER: There is no explanation.

Mr MEIER: I am not withdrawing—

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder will either—

Mr MEIER:—unless I replace the word 'lies' with 'untruths'—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder is well aware of the Standing Orders of this place. If he contravenes

them, I will have to do something about it. Did the honourable member withdraw or did he not?

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, I cannot withdraw the truth.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Goyder and I wish him now to make a statement that either he will or will not withdraw.

Mr MEIER: I will not withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The Chair did not hear the actual words. Did the honourable member actually say that the Minister was telling a lie?

Mr MEIER: I said that the Minister was telling lies.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is well aware that he cannot make that accusation in this House without a positive motion to the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is out of order to make that accusation. You can only make that through a substantive motion. If the honourable member does not withdraw—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: He—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. If the honourable member does not withdraw, the Chair will have no choice but to take action against him.

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, under the circumstances you have explained, I withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Opposition can personally abuse and denigrate me in a personal way, but I will not be deterred from putting the facts of the matter on the table.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Heysen.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am aware of the concerns expressed by the Institute of Teachers with respect to spending cuts, which the Leader of the Opposition has already announced a number of times will take place in this community. I say that this, of course, will lead to wholesale school closures in South Australia under a Liberal Government. I might also remind the House that before the last Victorian election the Liberals also promised that there would be no compulsory school closures and no forced amalgamations. The total is now 214 schools to be closed within one year and—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would be delighted. It is important—if we are talking about the Victorian Government having unilaterally, with no consultation, closed 214 schools—to mention that in the record of this Government, since 1986—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: They do not want to hear.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The Minister will resume her seat. The member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: It is difficult because of the tone of the question to pick the debate. The honourable member asked whether the policy was applied. I think the Minister is now debating. I would ask her to bring her response—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! —to a close as quickly as possible.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This Government, since 1986, has closed 59 schools and has opened 28 schools. That is the fact; they are the figures that have been provided to the Opposition and, indeed, every cent of that money has gone back into education.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is interesting that the *Age* devoted five pages to the closure of the 114 schools and the projected budget reduction in education in Victoria by \$500 million between 1992 and 1996. The *Australian* had a front page story. What did we see in the Adelaide media? We saw nothing; not one word.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I assume the member for Davenport is going to take a point of order that the Minister is debating the response. I would uphold that point of order, and I think the Minister has completely answered the question.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier agree that the latest assessment of the commercial property market by the Government City Valuer increases the likelihood of a fifth State Bank bail-out? The City Valuer, Mr Wayne Butcher, has said that the value of CBD commercial properties will continue to fall and more offices will become vacant because of public sector cutbacks and head office closures. In this assessment he has included the Remm-Myer Centre, which remains in the books of the bad bank at the value of \$205 million—more than double that of the Valuer-General.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: A number of other major city properties also remain in the books of the bad bank, including Chesser House in Grenfell Street, with part of an exposure of more than \$40 million from the Pennant Group; the Australis Centre, also in Grenfell Street; and the Henry Waymouth Centre in Waymouth Street, on which exposures to the State Bank Group have resulted in almost \$200 million in non-performing loans.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In short, the answer is 'No'; I do not agree that there is the prospect of a fifth bail-out on the basis of that sort of information. The matter of a further bail-out has been effectively answered by the Treasurer and me on many occasions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reality is that the valuations used by GAMD in this matter of looking at the assets are market valuations determined by private sector valuation sources; they are valuations assessed by private sector valuers who say, 'What could this asset achieve in the marketplace if sold at this particular time?' Two points need to be made about that: first, it is a valuation related to what can be attained in the marketplace; and, secondly, it is a valuation related to a sale at this time. The whole point about losses that may have been sustained on certain assets is that they are not losses until actually crystallised by a sale process that has taken place.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, your Deputy Leader clearly is not. The actual provision for losses in the bank has to be done on the basis of what is likely to be the crystallising

of losses over the time frame that will require support. It is not uncommon that Valuer-General valuations do not reflect what the marketplace valuation will be. Generally speaking, those valuations are on the conservative side of the situation, and that is not unique to this situation: it has been the case in many other circumstances, not only now but over many years. For the Deputy Leader to simply try and draw that conclusion is drawing a very long bow indeed.

SECOND LANGUAGE

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to the Premier. Is the Government planning to make it a requirement of senior public servants that they have a second language in line with Opposition policies announced over the weekend?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I noted that the Liberal Party had its launch on ethnic affairs matters. I noted particularly that it is still living some years back, since the whole issue is now referred to as multicultural and ethnic affairs and it has not really caught up with the changes happening, possibly because it does not actually have a policy on multiculturalism, but that is something which has been quite obvious from the other side of politics for some time.

I know that the Liberals had a policy launch on Sunday in a hall that was more than half empty, and when I heard about the ideas—a lot of people have told us since that they decided to go along and have a bit of a listen to what was to come out—I was reminded a bit of *Star Wars*. We all know about those robots R2D2 and C3PO: the Leader came out as a very good likeness of the robot 'Me2'. He talked about issues to do with financial support for ethnic chambers of commerce in this State. Which was the first State in Australia to introduce that? It was South Australia. Indeed, as the then Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, I was the Minister who introduced that.

He then talks about support for overseas trade fairs. Which was the first State Government in Australia to support participation in overseas trade fairs by ethnic chambers of commerce? This Government, and I as Minister. I attended some of those trade fairs on behalf of ethnic chambers of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! First, interjections are out of order, and the member for Kavel is very well aware of the Standing Order that says that you shall not display material. If he does it again I shall have to take him to task.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We then come to the issue of languages other than English in our primary schools. The first State to introduce that policy was South Australia, and I was the Minister who introduced that policy, saying that we would get there by 1995. And the best the Leader can do is say that they will continue that if they end up in government. The whole list of policies goes through like that, with very few exceptions. It is not a policy of new ideas: it is a policy that says that what the Government has been doing in multicultural and ethnic affairs is absolutely correct; that these are the policies that should be followed. The only thing is that we have left them behind, because we have gone on with other new policy initiatives, which will be announced in due course.

As to the one area that he does talk about, that senior CEOs of departments should have a language other than English, I encourage people throughout South Australia having knowledge of languages other than English; that is a

very good thing. That is why I introduced the policy of languages other than English being available in all our primary schools by 1995. That is why I gave support to the South Australian Secondary School of Languages, so that we can increase access to languages in our secondary area. That is why I supported the South Australian Institute of Languages, so that we can get more language teaching in our tertiary and higher education institutions. So, I fully support the principle of more people in South Australia speaking languages other than English.

But here we have the Leader coming out and saying that that is what he would demand of senior public servants if he were in Government and, when asked by the media the very obvious first question, 'Do you speak another language?' what was the answer? The answer was 'Basically, I speak English.' That is absolutely correct: he speaks English pretty basically. But that is all that he could say. Then on a radio program yesterday to talk about this policy, the Leader said how important it was for Economic Development Authority officers to speak languages other than English—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, the Premier is debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I am sure the Premier will finish very quickly.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Very quickly, Mr Speaker. Yesterday the Leader was saying how Economic Development Authority officers should speak languages other than English and spoke about his own experience as a business person successfully doing deals. On the one hand, he admits that he does not speak any of the languages of the countries in which he has done the deals and, on the other hand, says that these deals can be successfully done only if you do speak a language other than English. The logic of the Leader is beyond me, because it is clearly such an illogical position for the Leader to take.

STATE BANK CENTRE

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Treasurer confirm that there has been a further reduction in the valuation of the State Bank Centre and will he now explain how this is to be accounted for in the sale of the bank? The Treasurer told the House on 6 October that he would bring an update to Parliament if there had been a further revaluation of the centre. According to the Government's city valuer (Mr Wayne Butcher) the centre is now valued at \$54 million. This compares with the total final cost of the building of \$208 million.

I am informed that the centre has always been a non-performing asset and, if it were in the bad bank, a fifth bail-out would have been unavoidable. While the centre previously was account managed in the bad bank, the effect of retaining the liability in the good bank will be to significantly depress its sale price.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As the member for Bragg stated, I responded to this on 6 October, he said, and I have no reason to disbelieve him. I stated then that, had there been any new revaluation of the State Bank, I would bring that to Parliament, and that is still the position. I will contact the bank today and bring back a response tomorrow—if there is any new information. But all the information about the State Bank Centre is on the record for the member for Bragg to read and analyse. I am afraid that I have no information to add further to that, disappointing as that may be to the member for Bragg.

ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training advise the House of steps being taken by her department to assist the Aboriginal Community College at Port Adelaide to resolve issues raised by a group of four teachers about a number of management matters at the college?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question because the Aboriginal Community College is in his electorate and he has done an enormous amount of work to try to find solutions to some of the issues. Mr Speaker, you will recall that last Thursday in this House the Leader of the Opposition asked my colleague the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs for an assurance that the college would not collapse through inadequate ministerial control and accountability. I am sad to advise that the Leader of the Opposition got it wrong because the college, as I said in one of my answers last Thursday, has no fundamental organisational responsibility or accountability to the State Government.

The college is a non-government organisation incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act and, as such, the affairs of the college are managed by a council established under the college's constitution. Under this arrangement neither my colleague nor I have any legal power or right to intervene in the management or operation of the college. The Leader also asked whether student attendances have fallen from, I think, 120 at the beginning of the year to 30 last week. Once again the Leader got it wrong, because enrolments in the first half of the year totalled 150, and as at yesterday—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: If you let me finish the answer, you might hear it. Has the honourable member not had enough trouble for one day? As of yesterday 95 students were enrolled, which is a far cry from 30 students. Of course, not every student enrolled attends every day. The Principal, Mr Bill Wilson, points out that there are special factors which affect the attendance patterns of these students, and I would have thought that we might have had the sensitivity in this Parliament to understand that fact. The Chief Executive Officer of my department has met with the chairperson of the college council and the acting principal of the college and it has been agreed that Mr Roger Thomas, a senior Aboriginal adviser in the department, will work with the college to establish reporting mechanisms in relation to the State Government's contribution to the annual operation of the college.

In addition, the college has agreed to advise the department on action to be taken to resolve the issues raised by the four teachers. In conclusion, I understand that the Principal of the college has extended an invitation to meet the Leader of the Opposition—who is busily talking on the telephone, as usual—and the member for Fisher, to discuss—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is an important issue raised by the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct her remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Principal has offered to meet with both the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Fisher to discuss the matter, and I suggest that they take up that offer if they genuinely want to be informed,

rather than trying to score cheap political points at the expense of Aborigines in this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order we will continue with Question Time.

STATE BANK

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I address my question to the Premier. Has the Government received a report from the State Bank Criminal Prosecutions Task Force? If so, can he indicate if and when prosecutions will be initiated? If the task force has not yet reported, what is the reason for the delay? Following the tabling of the final royal commission report on 7 September—five weeks ago—the Premier told the House that the State Bank Criminal Prosecutions Task Force announced by the Government in July would be able to report progress ‘within a few weeks’.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have not received a copy of any report from the task force. I will check with my Attorney-General to see what is happening on that matter, but there is an implication—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—in the question from the member for Kavel and certainly from the Deputy Leader’s interjection that there is some reason why the Government is not interested to receive that report. I remain eager to receive it. The Government has absolutely no purpose in having an interest in there being delays in the receipt of the report. Quite frankly, the sooner it is received the better. The Government awaits the receipt of the report with the same eagerness as members opposite. I have not yet received the report. I will check with the Attorney-General as to when the report can be expected and, as I say, the sooner it is available the better.

HOUSING, ELDERLY

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:—of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations advise the House what housing assistance the Government provides to older South Australians?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: I am pleased to answer the honourable member’s question, and it is particularly pertinent during Seniors’ Week to reflect upon the needs of seniors in our community, particularly their housing needs. The majority of older South Australians enjoy very good housing conditions because of the ongoing housing policies and programs of this Government, which are second to none in this country. Indeed, the Government recognises that, by assisting people to achieve home ownership and other forms of secure housing early in their life, this then avoids the pressures associated with inadequate and inappropriate housing later in life.

I have previously argued in this House that, to be effective, housing policy must be integrated. That is, we must be as concerned with housing finance as we are with the supply of land, building materials and the development of a skilled and available building work force. In all of these areas the Government has policies and programs in place to support the orderly and efficient operation of the housing industry. One

has only to look at any of the many housing activity reports that have been released in recent months, or the annual reports of HomeStart Finance or the Urban Lands Trust to see how strong the housing industry is in South Australia today.

In addition to these mainstream activities, the Government also has a network of policies and programs in place to ensure all older South Australians enjoy a high standard of housing security. According to the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, more than 30 000 South Australians over the age of 55 live in the security of public housing. This represents almost 22 per cent of the total number of South Australians living in public housing. In addition to public housing, the Government also provides various forms of assistance to help older South Australians remain in their own home for as long as is practical.

Indeed, only earlier today I had the pleasure with my colleague the Minister for the Aged in South Australia of launching a new seniors’ loan, which will provide loans up to \$22 000 to assist South Australians over the age of 55 years to undertake necessary maintenance work and other works on their own home or to undertake modifications to make their home more suitable to their specific needs. The loans will be provided through HomeStart Finance, which has already built itself an enviable reputation in the home finance area by providing loans to more than 14 000 South Australian families over the past four years. The new seniors’ loan will extend options for older South Australians to remain in their own home.

For example, a person on a single aged pension will be able to borrow enough money to replace a roof, remodel a kitchen and bathroom or repaint the house whilst repaying less than \$25 a week. These are often the very sorts of situations which result in older people leaving their own home prematurely and moving away from familiar surroundings and family, friends and other supports. We are all aware that the number of seniors in the community—

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is providing enormous detail, which would have been better as a ministerial statement. He is only using—

The SPEAKER: Order! The answer and the question have been going for three minutes. It is probably one of the shortest answers—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order. The answer has not deviated from the question, but I agree that it would be much better to confine many of the answers in Question Time to ministerial statements. However, with the Minister at this stage of the response, it would be ludicrous to pull him up now. I ask the Minister to bring his answer to a conclusion as quickly as possible.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: In conclusion, we are all aware that the number of seniors in the community is growing and that new needs are emerging to meet that group in our community. We have taken some very positive steps to ensure that the standard of housing which older people enjoy remains high and relative to the standards which the remainder of our population enjoys.

CLARK, MR TIM MARCUS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Premier. What advice has the Government received from the Director of Public Prosecutions about whether Mr Tim Marcus Clark can be prosecuted for conflict of interest offences under the State Bank Act? On 8 September the

Opposition raised in this House the possibility that Mr Tim Marcus Clark could not be prosecuted for conflict of interest offences because the period during which such action could be initiated had expired. In response, the Premier said that the Government had asked the Director of Public Prosecutions to advise whether any possible prosecutions were out of time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have not received any report as yet. I will refer that matter to the Attorney-General for further advice on this matter and advise the House as soon as possible. I repeat the comment I made in answer to the previous question: the Government does not intend to delay any of these matters. We are very keen to receive the report, and as soon as we have it we will advise members of this place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The front bench of the Opposition is obviously more interested in the question than the answer, because there were no interjections at all from anyone in the House when the question was asked. I would ask the front bench to pay the same respect to the person answering the question. The member for Stuart.

ARID AND PASTORAL ZONE RESEARCH CENTRE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Primary Industries provide the House with details of the new South Australian Arid and Pastoral Zone Research Centre? Will he also provide information on the expressions of interest, if any, which have been received so far, and the details of the process involved in this?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I thank the honourable member for the question, because this is a most important initiative and will be a very significant boost to arid and pastoral regions in South Australia. The aim of the centre is to provide a national focus for applied research into arid zone ecology and to identify ways of better using arid regions and improving our natural resource base. In fact, there is no equivalent institution in Australia comparable to the proposed South Australian Arid and Pastoral Zone Research Centre. It is proposed that the centre be operated by the South Australian Research and Development Institute. No current research facilities of the nature being proposed exist in an appropriate arid zone location. A certain amount of project work has been carried out by various agencies, such as the University of Adelaide, CSIRO and the Department of Environment and Land Management, but this would be an extremely valuable and unique facility for our arid and semi-arid regions.

I believe that this facility will hold great benefit for both South Australia and the nation in providing a research base to develop arid zone production and better understanding of the ecology of these regions. The way in which we propose to undertake this task is to seek expressions of interest from northern rural towns, and that process is already under way. In that way, all northern rural towns will be able to compete with each other and put forward proposals to the South Australian Research and Development Institute to promote this facility. Basically what is needed is laboratory and administrative facilities and sufficient area for field work and extension activities, and of course land is in abundance in arid and semi-arid regions.

I could indicate, although this is not definitive, that I would like to see a partnership developed by local councils and the Government in this regard. The way in which we establish the field crops management line at Clare is a very

good example of this type of partnership, where the district council of Clare secured this facility for Clare, and I might say that the member for Custance played a very positive and valuable role in this process. The District Council of Clare put forward a proposal to erect a building at the council's expense to house the management team—the commodity line—and as a consequence they were able to secure that facility for Clare with my department being the tenant, and that is a very good way in which we fostered this partnership between the State Government and local government.

So, while not definitive, that would certainly be most favourably received if some of the northern rural towns put in submissions along these lines. The way in which centres of this nature operate overseas is that they receive very significant amounts of industry funding. As an example, the desert research centre in Israel receives 50 per cent Government and 50 per cent industry funding for operating and overhead costs. I would expect this facility to attract very widespread support from industry.

Research support of this kind would be provided by such a centre, and new industries and a more productive use of arid and semi-arid lands by developing diversification projects suitable for these fragile environments would obviously follow. It is a most important initiative. At this stage I would expect the expressions of interest to close about 30 November, and from then on we will carry out a more detailed analysis, working in conjunction with those towns that put in submissions. I would expect to see new enterprises such as intensive plant production in arid zone greenhouses; new pastures; and saline water irrigation or fish production using saline waters. The centre would obviously support these initiatives and this diversification which will be an enormous boost for northern towns.

PUBLIC SECTOR RENUMERATION

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Treasurer. In view of the criticism by the Economic and Finance Committee and the Auditor-General about excessive State Bank salaries and the staff reductions of the bank, how does the Government justify the executive salaries reported in the bank's annual report tabled today? The annual report shows that one executive was on a salary range of \$750 000 to \$760 000, and two others in the bands between \$580 000 and \$600 000 per annum. At June 1992, the highest reported executive salary was between \$500 000 and \$510 000. Of those officers still employed by the bank, the highest remuneration is between \$590 000 and \$600 000, which is greatly in excess of the salary of \$239 000 for the Chief Executive Officer of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: This represents an increase of at least \$210 000 on the previous highest salary and it is in conflict with the Treasurer's stated attitude to such bank salaries.

The Hon. Dean Brown: It's outrageous!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Leader says it is outrageous. The Leader has not even heard the answer; the Leader wants to pre-empt. I can assure the member for Coles that it has nothing to do with the CEO and the CEO's salary. A special group of people operate a Treasury function within the bank, very special people who have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can tell members precisely how you would justify it. You would have to know how much these individuals have made for the bank and the taxpayers. That is how you would do it, and that is how you would justify it. Because they have a contract—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: They have a contract which is directly related to the amount of money they make for the bank. I thought that the criticism of the previous regime of the bank was that their salaries were related to the amount of business they wrote, and not whether they made a profit at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. Once again the Opposition is more interested in the question than the answer. The Chair is very interested in the answer and I warn all members to watch their behaviour. The Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I think that was pretty legitimate criticism, because by and large all those people wrote rubbish, and as I have described them they were a pack of Libs who lent to another pack of Libs and lost a lot of money for the taxpayers of this State. These people's contracts are in quite a different category. They are very highly remunerated. The only reason they are highly remunerated is that they make very large, direct, instant profits for the bank. That is a fact. My guess is that—

The Hon. Dean Brown: We are all being ripped off.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My guess, and my information, is that the amount of money that these people are paid for the function that they perform and the contracts they are on are purely industry standard. These people can leave tomorrow and get a similar contract—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Murray-Mallee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —in any bank in Australia, and if they make the amount of profits that they make for the State Bank they will get at least the same amount. They do not get paid in advance. They must have the profits on the table. We are talking about incentive.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Exactly. We are talking about the Liberal Party's policy. The Liberal Party always lectures us that people ought to be remunerated in accordance with their value to the company. I do not necessarily agree with that in its totality, but that is Liberal Party policy. Here we have a handful of specialist people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Coles.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—who have a contract, who have over-fulfilled that contract and who have made many tens of millions of dollars for the bank more than they have earned.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS: The Treasurer is debating the reply.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is debating it. I ask the Treasurer to draw his response to a close as quickly as possible.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Sir. All I can say is that I wish we had a few more of these people and I wish we had had a few more of these people over the past five years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Victoria.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I also wish that over the years we had had performance-related contracts, as these people are on, rather than the contracts that they were on. As these people are paid in line with Liberal Party policy, I think that Liberal Party policy in this regard is pretty well correct.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Newland wish to interject, or is she just practising?

BEACH EROSION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources inform the House of progress in implementing the sand replenishment program along metropolitan beaches? The Minister recently announced that an allocation of \$2.3 million has been made in the capital works budget of his department for the sand replenishment program this year. I have previously pointed out to the Minister the particularly severe erosion problems in my electorate at Semaphore Park and, in particular, around Marinna Court, of which I am sure you, Sir, are aware. Will that replenishment project be undertaken as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Albert Park for his continuing interest in the foreshore and coastal areas of his electorate and, in consequence, Mr Speaker, the coastal areas in your electorate where the depletion of sand causes great concern not only to residents in the vicinity but to those who use the beaches for recreation and enjoyment. I can advise you, Mr Speaker, and the member for Albert Park that the Coast Protection Board has recommended that we immediately commence the replenishment program. It has recommended that \$100 000 be allocated to the Tennyson and Semaphore Park areas so that we can commence trucking sand immediately. I point out that the board recognises that the problems at those two sites are very pressing and in many ways separate from the overall replenishment program with which the community must deal on an ongoing basis. There is a need to realise that it is affected by the northerly drift, which is part of the natural process.

I am further advised by the Coast Protection Board that the erosion at Semaphore Park and Tennyson is in large part the result of natural processes which we see occurring along our coastal areas. It is generally linked with the northbound movement of sand, and the board wishes to deal with that in a specific way. Of course, we are faced with the loss of the near-shore seabed as well, which is a further complication in those areas.

I think it is important that we should put to rest some of the comments that have been made about its being caused by any delay on our part. As we know, the whole process is one of those natural phenomena that we must address as a community. From the point of view of the Tennyson and Semaphore Park areas, which affect the two electorates to which I have referred—yours, Mr Speaker, and the District of Albert Park—the program will be supported by the Woodville council. The State Government will be funding the Woodville council to undertake the trucking. So that members can inform constituents as to where it will be happening, I am advised that the sand will be trucked from near the jetty

at Semaphore for the Semaphore program and from near the jetty at Grange for the Tennyson program. I understand from the Coast Protection Board and Woodville council that the program will probably commence tomorrow.

PUBLIC SECTOR REMUNERATION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer explain why the highest executive State Bank remuneration package reported to the Economic and Finance Committee was \$406 864 when the annual report shows the highest remuneration is in the \$600 000 to \$610 000 band? Has the Economic and Finance Committee been misled about the true level of executive remuneration in the State Bank?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I doubt it very much. I do not know the timing of the amounts that were reported to the Economic and Finance Committee. It may be that one of the members can let me know. I can assure the House that the bank would not have misled them one iota. It has no interest in doing so. Why would the bank wish to mislead them?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I must admit that I do not know what information was asked for by the Economic and Finance Committee and to what date. That is something that the Economic and Finance Committee dealt with directly with the bank, as is perfectly proper, and it would not require my permission to give those figures. I have no idea what the cut-out date was. The annual report was tabled today and it contains the figures. Only one individual got that much, and he was the head of the section. It is not the CEO or any of those people; it is one particular group of individuals in the bank who operate a highly profitable section for the taxpayers of this State. They have operated it in the past 12 months in a very highly successful way. Their contracts provided that, if they over-exceeded their targets and direct profits to the bank, which have been reported to Parliament and paid into the Consolidated Account, they would be paid a certain amount. What I have done—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I cannot hear you, so you are wasting your time; you have to speak up.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have asked the bank to ensure that these contracts are the industry standard. I have not asked the bank to say to these people, 'Restrict your earnings and restrict the earnings for the taxpayers of South Australia.' What I have said to these people is that, if their contracts are industry standard—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Wouldn't you agree with that? I would have thought that was a fair enough statement. I have said that, if their contracts are industry standard and if they exceed their targets by many, many millions of dollars of profit for the people of this State, and it is reported in the annual report, as far as I am concerned, that is fair enough.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Minister has answered the question. If the member for Victoria has a question, he should let the Chair know.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Public Infrastructure tell the House of the expected rise in Murray River levels?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have been advised by the E&WS Department that it is still too early to say with any degree of certainty what peak flow levels or what river levels will occur in South Australia. What can be said at this stage is that the river levels are likely to be at a slightly higher level than those of 1990 and probably very similar to the 1981 flood levels. The department's operations engineer for the Murray-Darling Basin, Mr Jessup, believes a much more accurate prediction will be possible when the peak reaches Wakool Junction near Swan Hill in late October. The peak levels are currently between Echuca and Swan Hill and are expected in South Australia in early to mid-December.

Substantial areas of the flood plain in this State will be flooded, affecting shacks, access tracks and low-lying areas. No significant problems or damage are at this stage expected to occur but some ferry services and some houseboat waste disposal station services may well be disrupted. The department has strongly advised people with either livestock or property on the flood plain to begin planning now to minimise those losses. These arrangements should be completed well before the access tracks are cut off by the rising river. The E&WS is also preparing a proposal to establish a flood liaison committee, which is normal under these circumstances, to work with local councils, other authorities and community groups to determine the extent of the protection works that will be necessary and to make recommendations regarding funding.

TRADE FAIR

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I address my question to the Premier. Following receipt of a very critical letter from the Italian Chamber of Commerce dated 18 October, did the Government immediately give an assurance and forward it to the chamber to underwrite the cost of the trade fair in Turin, Italy; and does this reflect ineptitude in the Premier's office, a disregard and lack of interest for the exhibition and South Australia's trade promotion overseas, and a response to the chamber which attempts to minimise political embarrassment? The letter dated 18 October (yesterday) states:

Dear Mr Arnold,

We are sorry to inform you that, after an exhausting three months waiting to get even a simple reply to our request on this subject, our chamber has no other alternative but to cancel the presentation of the South Australian advanced technology infrastructure at the meeting point of Turin, next November. We regrettably have come to this conclusion since there has been no communication, response or support from your office in this matter, and at this very late stage, we do not have the assurance needed to go ahead with the project of receiving the support you have promised to the chamber.

Furthermore we have to add, that it appears that every efforts have been made to hinder us in having direct contact with you in relation to this matter. . . It is . . . too late for the official catalogue, that has already been printed with the first 16 pages dedicated to the Australians, who will not be any more attending [the exhibition in Italy].

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader has been very cruel on the member for Kavel. He has set him up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will read another letter from the Italian Chamber of Commerce.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We will come to that one—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was asked in absolute silence, and I will ensure that the response is heard in absolute silence.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will come to that one in a minute but I will read another letter, dated 27 September 1993, from the Italian Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Australia, Incorporated, Adelaide. The same person who wrote the letter quoted by the member for Kavel wrote to me and said:

Following our conversation on Wednesday 22 September 1993 . . .

Apparently, there has been no possibility of contacting me over three months. I can tell the honourable member that that is just not true: there have been a number of contacts between myself and the President of the chamber, and this letter, by his own words, acknowledges at least one such contact. The letter continues:

I would like to express my sincere thanks for your assistance given to the chamber in reference to the presentation of the South Australian pavilion at the Turin meeting point.

During that conversation I said, 'We will give you support but you have to put to us what it is you want support for.' Up until 27 September this year—and that is not too many days ago—we did not have any information as to what they actually wanted. They are saying 'three months', yet I do not read a period of three months between 27 September and 19 October. They go on and list a series of costs that amount to \$10 960. Then, there was further conversation between Government and the chamber—so it is not true to say there was none—indicating that it was not quite \$10 960 that they wanted: they also wanted a further \$6 000, making a total of nearly \$17 000. The letter continues:

I hope that this expenditure (this is the \$10 960 lot) meets your expectation. In this case I would very much appreciate if the amount could be made available to us not later than Friday 29 October.

We are 10 days away from 29 October. There have been discussions between Government and the chamber about various details with respect to this amount, and I am not at all embarrassed by the fact that there have been those discussions, because it is only right and proper that questions should have been asked.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: What do we find in the answers obtained by officers of the Government to questions asked of the chamber? We find a number of things that are rather telling. As the Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs and the former Minister of Industry, I have actively supported the participation of the Italian chamber in various trade fairs; for example, I was personally present at both the Milan trade fair a few years ago and the Naples trade fair. We also financially supported the participation in Cibus last year, and on that occasion we said, 'We will provide support for you if you can have five companies attend with you.'

In fact they did not get five companies: they got two, yet we still provided them with some support, notwithstanding that they did not fulfil their part of the contract that they should have five companies (which they said they would have

but did not have). Yet, in a spirit of generosity, to help this chamber, which does a lot to promote trade in this State, we still gave them some money notwithstanding that they had not fulfilled their part of the contract. We have also indicated that we will support them in future trade fairs. When this trade fair in Turin on 14 November was announced the chamber asked for support and we dealt with that. The question we asked was, 'What commercial interest do you have? What other South Australian companies do you have to go with you to this trade fair?'

That was not an unreasonable question, and it is the sort of question that was taking up some of the time between 27 September (not three months ago) and now. The answer is that no commercial interest has been obtained from any other private sector companies. I do not know whether the Leader told the member for Kavel that when he asked him to ask this question. No commercial interest has been obtained from any other companies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have no problem with the member for Kavel taking it to the Italian chamber because if it does have some commercial interest I would be very pleased to hear that. That is not what it told officers of the Government. What it was wanting was support from various organisations in South Australia, and I have been pleased to say that it should get that support from various organisations, and those organisations will be making information and other support available to the chamber, against the advice, I may say, of the Austrade Commissioner responsible for Northern Italy who did not think it was a particularly significant trade fair; he felt there were other trade fairs where the focus should more appropriately be given. We have still proceeded to provide support to the Italian Chamber of Commerce and Industry because we believe the offer that was made by the organisers of this trade fair to the Italian chamber is a generous one that should be received in that spirit. We are simply not able to accept the amount that they asked us to give.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The Premier will resume his seat.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The Premier is not only being repetitious: he is also debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Premier to close as quickly as possible.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: They have asked for two to three times as much as has been given to other ethnic Chambers of Commerce for participation in very successful trade fairs to date, for example, the Thessaloniki trade fair this year, which has been very successful for the companies that were present, and the trade fairs in Milan and Naples and the Cibus trade fair organised by the Italian chamber. For none of those trade fairs was support to the value of \$17 000 given, yet that is what they have asked for on this occasion. We have given consideration to this matter and the member for Kavel is right on this point. We said, 'Yes, we will give you some support', just as I mentioned we would do in my conversation which he acknowledges took place on 22 September this year. That support is the amount of \$7 500.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Public Infrastructure provide the House with details of the blue-

green algae outbreak in Lakes Alexandrina and Albert which have received some publicity in the past few days?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The presence of *anabaena circinalis*, which is the blue-green algae capable of producing some neurotoxin, had been noticed by the department in and around Milang and Goolwa as early as June this year. The same algae was also observed as isolated scum at Narrung and Goolwa throughout September and into October and one concentrated sample was tested as neurotoxic. While the Health Commission was advised, no action was required at that stage as water supplies for Goolwa and Milang were not being taken from the lake. However, when routine sampling by the E&WS revealed high cell counts at both Milang and Goolwa on 11 and 13 October, action was required. The Blue-Green Algae Task Group met on 14 October and implemented the following actions:

- the barrages were manipulated to increase the flushing of the Goolwa river;
- samples from Goolwa, Clayton and Milang taken on 15 October tested positive for neurotoxin;
- an aerial survey on 15 October detected extensive surface scums along the north-western shore of Lake Alexandrina, from Mosquito Point to Point Sturt; the northern shore of Hindmarsh Island from Goat Island to the Goolwa barrage, and the Narrung channel into the northern portion of Lake Albert;
- a media release was issued on 15 October following consultation between the Department of Primary Industries, the Health Commission and the E&WS. The release informed residents of the potential dangers of drinking, stock watering or recreational activities in areas where visible scums were present.

The E&WS Department has advised that the high flows currently progressing down the River Murray towards South Australia will help in flushing the lake, but that is still six to eight weeks away. In the meantime, all people using the lakes are advised to exercise care.

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I lay on the table a ministerial statement made in the Legislative Council today by my colleague the Minister of Public Sector Reform and the following documents which have been referred to in this statement:

1. A paper on statutory bodies, including a list of statutory authorities which forms the basis of a comprehensive register.
2. A document expanding on the principles for the implementation of the Public Corporations Act.
3. Draft guidelines for the development of citizens charters.
4. The citizens charter prepared by the Public Trustee.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I refer to a meeting which was held last Friday evening at Mannahill but which I was

unable to attend because of another commitment, but I asked for a report on what occurred. As a result of that meeting, the following motion was carried:

We, the communities of Oodlawirra, Mannahill, Olary and Cockburn are totally committed to the continuation of our townships as viable service centres for local communities, Barrier Highway commuters and national and international tourists. We call upon the Government to provide our towns with the infrastructure support that other South Australian towns can take for granted. People of these communities are, after all, proud South Australian citizens and taxpayers. Accordingly, we:

- (1) reject any suggestion that these towns be denied adequate public water supply and condemn the E&WS Department for commissioning a consultant's report without proper and full consultation with our communities.
- (2) express our deep concern at the secret nature of the report and the difficulty in obtaining a copy of a Government report that presents such dire threats to our viability.
- (3) acknowledge the advice of the Minister of Public Infrastructure that he will not act upon the report, but ask that all copies of the report be shredded so that some future Minister or bureaucrat resurrect it.
- (4) ask the E&WS Department for a breakdown of the annual costs of supplying water to each of the townships in each of the last 10 years including which years water has been carted. Furthermore, we ask the E&WS to enter into full and frank discussions with the communities on whether in light of this information the current water pricing system is fair and just.
- (5) invite the Minister of Public Infrastructure and CEO of the E&WS to visit our communities, inspect our water systems and discuss the above four matters with us.

I was approached about this matter a few weeks ago and as a result I contacted the Minister to try to get some clarification as to what was to happen with regard to the water supply for those people. I would like to say that I do congratulate Iris Williams of Mannahill who called the public meeting because of the concern being expressed by those people; it was a very successful meeting, I believe, attended by 60 or perhaps more people. Given the number of people in those towns, that was a very good representation. It is obviously a very important matter to those people and one which needs to be looked at and addressed.

My information is that people in those four towns, with Yunta, pay twice as much for basic water (137 kilolitres) and four times as much for excess water than other South Australian communities pay. For example, water is pumped 400 kilometres to Whyalla at one-half and one-quarter of the price residents of Yunta pay for water that is pumped 50 metres. The reason that I was given for this apparent unjust situation is that, when the Barrier Highway towns run out of water, supplies are railed in by water tankers at considerable cost. However, at the meeting it was stated that water had been carted to Oodlawirra only twice in the past 50 years and to Olary once in the past 10 years.

Apparently, when the South Australian Railways and AN joined in the 1970s, the State Government required the E&WS to take over that responsibility for the towns in that area, and that was when the problems first arose. A major cause for concern for the people in this area is the lack of maintenance on the railway dams. They do not hold as much water as they once did, because the banks are not being maintained and the main dams are not being cleaned out periodically. That problem has to be addressed. At present, some dams can be and are filled to only 60 per cent capacity while huge amounts of water trapped in those self-lining ponds are being wasted.

I urge the Minister to have the whole question of the water in that area reconsidered and also to hold discussions with the people in that area in cooperation in order to see what can be

thrashed out to resolve this problem. It is a concern to all those people who live in that area, which is an isolated one, and I think it is important that we try to do something about that.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): With the State election approaching, the public of this State are entitled to ask all State Labor members of Parliament, in particular the Labor backbenchers in this House, why they sat in silence and did absolutely nothing to protect the interests of the people of South Australia from an incompetent and ineffective Government. Since the last election this Government has allowed the State Bank fiasco, the mismanagement of the SGIC and a range of other blunders which have created the economic downturn that this State has suffered. This State is in the worst financial situation of any State in Australia. Since 1989 those Labor members of the House of Assembly, including the member for Stuart who has just spoken, have sat silently in their places supporting Government attacks on the Opposition, when the Opposition set out to protect the people of this State from the most incompetent Government we have ever had.

How can they offer themselves for re-election when they have been so incompetent and when the people's welfare has been squandered? How can the Labor Party so ignore public opinion and the long-term interests of this State by again endorsing people who have let them down so badly? Why should they be given a second chance? Why should they again be put forward to the people when not one of them has had the common decency to apologise to the people of South Australia for their incompetence, for their mismanagement and for their failure to protect the interests of the people of this State? Not one of them has had the good grace even to say they are sorry.

Their individual share of the State Bank losses amounts to \$130 million per member of the House of Assembly. That \$130 million could have solved all the problems in the electorate of Eyre. We would not have the member for Stuart talking about a meeting that she did not attend at Mannahill, because it would not have had a problem. And what do we have? We now have unacceptably high unemployment; lack of job opportunities; rundown Government services; lack of confidence in the community; and our children and grandchildren's future has been mortgaged. Yet these Labor Party failures again seek the opportunity to represent various electorates when they have let the people down; they have failed in their obligation as elected members to protect the interests of the people of this State.

By their inaction, their gross incompetence and their failure to question or to ensure that this Government acted responsibly, they have voided the right to sit again in this Chamber. No matter what excuses or platitudes they put forward during the next election campaign nothing is acceptable, because they have failed the people. Each year the people of this State will have to pay \$300 million in interest because of the State Bank fiasco. We could have had another 400 police on the beat; we could have created 5 000 jobs by giving subsidies to employers; we could have improved our national parks; we could have abolished hospital waiting lists; and we could have offered a reduction in water, sewerage and electricity costs.

Let me say one or two things about the meeting at Mannahill on Friday night. It was very well attended by a group of people who asked for very little from the Government and who, in fact, received less. I say to the member for Stuart that I advised them of the best way to

ensure that they have a future, that is, to support the undertaking given by the Leader of the Opposition that an incoming Liberal Government will not be attempting to take away their facilities or services: we will maintain them. We will not be listing their area for world heritage listing: we will protect them against this nonsense in which the Federal Government has engaged.

Therefore, their best course of action is to support the endorsed Liberal candidate for the seat of Eyre and their problems will be solved. I know the history of this exercise from the time Australian National left the area. The people up there worked hard and put their case well, and I will be giving their submission in a few minutes to the Minister, so that he can be in no doubt of their views. That was a request of the meeting, and I am very pleased to carry out the request.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It is a great pleasure to follow the member for Eyre when he says 'we will protect', or 'we will consult'. Let us have a demonstration of the consultation by members opposite. I have a long and vivid memory of my time in this Parliament, some 14 years and, prior to that, in the trade union movement, particularly under conservative Governments, when they came down with the hatchet, and no consultation. There was a lot of rhetoric but little consultation. Recently I went to Western Australia to look at the industrial scene and listened to all the promises that were made by the Liberal Party leading up to the election in February this year.

As an illustration, in the Midland workshops, people were promised some \$18 million and that the Midland workshops for railway workers would be made a centre of excellence. What happened after the election? Down came the guillotine: 800 workers were sacked and the Midland workshops closed. Those are the sorts of promises we hear. Let us look at what Victoria has done in terms of school closure. Consultation? Like hell, they will consult with them! Let us read from *The Age of Saturday* last, not reported, I am surprised to say, in the *Advertiser*.

One would have thought that such an unbiased newspaper would have reported what took place in Victoria so that the people in South Australia could understand what conservatives are doing throughout this nation. But no, not a word about the lack of consultation and the arbitrary closure of so many schools. *The Age* article of last Saturday read as follows:

Angry teachers and parents are threatening mass protests following the State Government's decision to close 159 schools across Victoria. In a display of defiance unions, school organisations and parent groups warned late yesterday that serious unrest would spread through the education system as a result of the closures. Victoria's main teacher unions also disputed the final number of schools to close: they said the true figure would be closer to 200. The closures were widely criticised and there were warnings that the cuts would undermine the quality of education, forcing many students to drop out of the school system. The Minister for Education, Mr Hayward, announced yesterday that 147 primary schools and 12 secondary schools would close at the end of this year. . . Mr Hayward's [the Minister's] announcement came less than 12 months after the Government closed 55 schools, and it brings to 214 the number of schools closed or listed for closure by the Kennett Government.

The Opposition Leader . . . said further school closures were inevitable in light of the Kennett Government's plans to cut almost \$500 million from the education budget between 1992 and 1996. He also warned of larger class sizes, lower quality education and a higher dropout rate in the wake of ongoing cuts to education.

This is the information that was given to me in my electorate office this morning by a person who came back from Victoria. He said to me, 'Lies, lies and more lies: that is all we are getting from conservative Parties throughout this country. They will not consult with the trade union movement and, if they do, a la Victoria and a la Western Australia, what are they doing? They will decimate working conditions in this country.' As we know, they are dictated to by the extreme Right, and their consultants are advising them to keep quiet, not to say too much and not to let them come under scrutiny as they did with their tax. Hewson, foolishly, educated the workers as to what he was going to do.

This is what we will get under a conservative Government in this State: no consultation with teachers or the trade union movement. They will slaughter the workers in this State. It may well be that, with members opposite a little bit bent, I agree, in the way they are prepared to get stuck into the teaching fraternity in this State, people will rue the day they support a conservative Government in power after the next State election.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): What a lot of tripe! The honourable member opposite ought to be sobered by the knowledge that his Minister of Education has simply disbanded the Country Areas Program for rural schools in South Australia before he begins to wax eloquent from his position in high dudgeon, claiming the high moral ground for himself and his colleagues as against what he claims is being done in Victoria, where a Labor Government left that State's finances in tatters and with no option open to the newly elected Government but to rein in all kinds of expenditure in order to ensure that the State's Treasury can survive.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I have no doubt whatever that we will find the same problems in Treasury on taking office here in South Australia, especially given the kind of information provided in answer to questions by the Hon. Treasurer (who is now leaving the Chamber) such as we witnessed here today. The anomaly between what was told to the Economic and Finance Committee about the salaries of executives in the State Bank and what they have provided to the Parliament and, indeed, to anyone who wants to read it (not only people of South Australia but from elsewhere) in the annual report tabled in this place today, is outrageous. It is outrageous for the Treasurer to then say that, in some way or other, the Opposition has conspired to mislead the public.

That was the drift he was trying to get across. So much for the integrity of the Government. All we have to do is remember that, during the run up to the last election campaign, the Government and all the Ministers sitting opposite, including the member for Unley, were party to the bribe paid to the State Bank of \$2 million to buy that election and keep interest rates down so that people would not be as concerned as they had every reason to be. The people were deceived.

I now turn to another matter. In June I drew attention to the mess in respect of the heavy vehicle driver's licensing scheme. It is possible at present to create a false identity for oneself and obtain a heavy vehicle driver's licence by applying for and obtaining an extract of a birth certificate and then doing a course at a TAFE college. Anyone can obtain such an extract under any name they like, so long as the name is on the record, and they can then claim to be the person named in the extract. People can get their photograph taken, do a TAFE course and apply for a heavy vehicle driver's licence and lo and behold, within 12 months, they have not

only a licence in their real name but a licence under their assumed alias.

That is going on, and no attempt is being made to stop it. It is about time this Government got out of the way and allowed an Administration to do the jobs that need to be done in South Australia to tidy up the mess, a mess which I point out again is treating rural communities harshly indeed. The beating is being administered by Ministers across a wide range of portfolio areas. I refer to the way in which the Coonalpyn Downs District Council has had its Coonalpyn swimming pool repair costs ignored after being told by the Government that it wanted the pool to be kept up to standard.

The council needed only \$22 000, yet the Government built four smaller pools for a total cost of \$700 000, and it calls that responsible. The Government could have invested the difference of \$678 000, collected the interest and paid for taxis to drive every student to and from the school every day it wanted to take them swimming and still had change. But no, the Government said, 'We will not give you the \$22 000. We have spent money, and we are going to continue the program of spending \$700 000.' That is the kind of responsibility or irresponsibility that this Government seems to be capable of. There is no way the Minister of Education, Employment and Training can avoid responsibility for that.

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

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Natural Resources): I thank the House for the opportunity to raise a matter about my electorate and my electorate office in response to what I regard as gutter journalism last night by Channel 7, unfortunately stimulated by the previous speaker, the member for Murray-Mallee, who made serious allegations and, as a consequence of those comments, I will be pursuing them in another place. I do take exception to the manner—

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

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I have a point of order, and it relates to the *sub judice* rule. If the Minister is telling the House that he is proposing or has already taken steps to sue me, he cannot raise this matter in this place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have no idea of the position. If the Minister breaches the *sub judice* rule—although I have no knowledge of that at this stage—he is well aware of the consequences.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: There are no problems at all, Mr Speaker. The issue relates to the relocation of a number of electorate offices, and clearly the member for Murray-Mallee spat the dummy in this regard. I refer to the situation that was basically distorted by Channel 7 in what was a blatant attempt to politicise the issue and use whatever influence it has against me. It was claimed, 'A small fortune was spent on shifting his own office a few doors away.' Just to put the facts on the record as to the Unley electorate office, the SACON report to me states:

Unley electorate office is the smallest electorate office at 46.5 square metres. . .

Only two offices in the whole State are smaller, and those are the two offices of the member for Eyre—I am talking collectively—and the member for Eyre had double the area that I had. The SACON report goes on to say 'compared to the average of 77.5 square metres'. That was in 1991. The report also states:

Some members have offices exceeding 100 square metres, for example, the member for Coles at 140 square metres and the member

for Baudin at 150 square metres. The small size of the office has presented occupational, health, safety and welfare problems simply due to the fact that there is not enough space for staff and members of the public coming in with inquiries and appointments to see the member.

With respect to security, the report states:

Due to the design of the office it is just not possible to make it reasonably secure.

In fact, my office has been broken into on a number of occasions. The average size is now 79.85 square metres, and my office is 80.6 square metres. The average then was around 77.5 square metres. In effect, my office was half the average size of any other electorate office in this State. Let me say for the edification of Channel 7 that a number of people requiring access to my office are in wheelchairs. I have several aged homes in close proximity to my office and I have a couple of constituents—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:—who have wheelchairs and who need access to my office. I had to meet those constituents in front of my office under the verandah on Goodwood Road. Not only was there a need for a ramp but, if we opened the door to allow constituents with a wheelchair into the office, we could not get them in or close the door. When I had more than five people in the waiting room, the fifth person in the row could not get down to my office because of the lack of space behind the counter.

Further, the Channel 7 report talked about the rent. It claimed that the rent skyrocketed to \$20 000. One other electorate office, that of the member for Hayward, pays \$20 000, which is marginally less than my \$22 000 per annum. It is important to record that fact. I refer to another misleading statement, as follows:

It is a touch ironic that the old office is now a doctor's surgery.

It is not a doctor's surgery: it is the office of a single practitioner physiotherapist who works part-time in that office, has no additional staff, and who obviously has adequate space. However, that accommodation was not adequate for an electorate office. I take the strongest exception to the way in which Channel 7 presented this story. If anyone, including Channel 7, wants to look at my office, they are welcome and they will see that it is not a luxurious office. We kept as many of the fittings as possible and we avoided any expense above abnormal and we kept—

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

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Today the State Bank report was tabled, and all South Australians would have to be appalled with the information with which we have been provided. I refer particularly to the salaries paid to State Bank executives. We have found that 77 executives in the State Bank are paid more than \$100 000. It is the most top-heavy bank in Australia. It happens to be the worst performing bank in Australia yet it seems to pay the highest rewards of any bank in Australia. When we compare it to a national bank like the Commonwealth Bank, we find that bank has 55 executives receiving more than \$100 000. What is going on in this State? We have to ask the Treasurer and the Premier this question: what the hell are they allowing to occur in the State Bank? The situation is just not good enough. It is important that we understand what is happening in the money market, because some of the highest paid people in the State Bank are those operating its treasury arm. It is

important to look at the annual report and see the explosion in the amount of money that is made available for money market activities.

When the Treasurer tells the House that these are high performers, I can only say that they have to be astronomical performers, because we can see in the report just released for 30 June 1993, in the liquid and trading securities, which are the major areas in which these people are operating, there was \$2.61 billion worth of securities. If we compare that to last year's asset base, the figure was \$1.44 billion, so there has been almost a doubling of the asset base dedicated to liquid money market activities. If we look at the liabilities on bills payable and other liabilities, that has gone down from \$2.7 billion to \$2.48 billion but, importantly, what we have is a conversion of the asset base of the bank into the short-term money market—into traded securities—and a number of people from the treasury arm of the bank are operating in this marketplace.

How do we measure their performance? Is their performance so much better than any other bank that they can be paid the extraordinary salaries and commissions that they are now being paid? Even if we set that aside and came to the conclusion that they are, we would still have to ask why 77 people in the State Bank are receiving salaries and wages over \$100 000. We would have to ask why, when the Economic and Finance Committee had the bank officers before it, the highest salary was deemed to be \$405 000. We are talking about taxpayer's money here; we are talking about the bank operating off government guarantees. We have not seen these and other officers of the bank in the past take a cut in salary when they have made losses, and we have not seen any of these officers take a cut when they have underperformed, yet we have seen some enormous bonuses being paid because these people are operating in the money market.

Who is to judge? Is the Treasurer of this State, who has no financial competence, to judge the merits of the performance of these people? Do we believe that we have the best Treasury officers in Australia who should be paid well in excess of the industry standard? Those are the questions that need to be answered, and those are the questions we will be getting answers to as soon as this Government changes. On the face of the figures we have before us, we are seeing a continuation of the old rorts we saw with the State Bank, with highly paid officers taking a commission when they have traded and increased the volume of trade but not taking a loss or cut in salary when there have been adverse results. It is of serious concern to South Australians and it must be investigated. We give the undertaking that we will investigate this matter very diligently.

DENTISTS (CLINICAL DENTAL TECHNICIANS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dentists Act 1984.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of this short Bill is to allow registered clinical dental technicians to supply partial dentures directly to the public. Hon. Members will recall that the 1984 *Dentists Act* provided legal recognition for clinical dental technicians in South Australia for the first time. Following an assessment of their skills, there are 29 clinical dental technicians registered in this State.

The Act restricts clinical dental technicians to the provision of full dentures directly to the public. Specifically, "clinical technical dentistry" is defined as "the fitting of, and the taking of impressions or measurements for the purpose of fitting, dentures to a jaw—

(a) in which there are no natural teeth or parts of natural teeth;

and

(b) where the jaw, gums and proximate tissue are not abnormal, diseased or suffering from a surgical or other wound."

A clinical dental technician is not permitted to provide dental treatment other than in those terms.

Registered clinical dental technicians are subject to the sanctions and disciplinary provisions of the *Dentists Act*.

A survey of publicly-funded dentures conducted by the South Australian Dental Service in 1988 indicated both a high level of patient satisfaction with full dentures supplied by clinical dental technicians under the Pensioner Denture Scheme and that they were very satisfactory from a technical point of view.

With the advent of mutual recognition, further consideration has been given to the area of activity of clinical dental technicians. The Australian Health Ministers' Conference has agreed that clinical dental technicians (or dental prosthetists as they are called in some places) are one of a group of health occupations in respect of which mutual recognition should apply. A number of other jurisdictions permit clinical dental technicians to provide partial dentures directly to the public. As the law stands, a clinical dental technician from another State registered in South Australia in terms of mutual recognition would not be able to provide partial dentures directly to the public, even if he or she had been doing it in his or her home State. A South Australian clinical dental technician who went interstate may find his registration subject to conditions precluding him from providing partials because he came from a State where he is not permitted to do so.

If mutual recognition is to operate in the fullest sense, South Australian clinical dental technicians should not be disadvantaged. The South Australian public should no longer be denied the cheaper service that clinical dental technicians claim they could provide for partial dentures, and have shown they can in relation to full dentures.

Their activities in their extended role will still be subject to the sanctions and disciplinary provisions of the *Dentists Act*, with its builtin public protection mechanisms.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for the commencement of the measure on a date to be set by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause amends the definition of "clinical technical dentistry" to include the fitting of partial dentures to a jaw in which there are natural teeth or parts of natural teeth.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 41—Registration of clinical dental Technicians

This clause amends section 41 of the principal Act, providing the power for clinical dental technicians to fit, and take impressions or measurements for the purpose of fitting, partial dentures in jaws in which there are natural teeth or parts of natural teeth.

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

HOLIDAYS (PROCLAMATION DAY AND AUSTRALIA DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 August. Page 517.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): This is a very important Bill, as it affects the holidays of all of us on Australia Day and the Proclamation Day holiday of 28 December. In supporting this

Bill the Opposition wants to make several comments that have been put to us from the community at large and on some further amendments that have been made by the Minister in relation to bank holidays. This Bill will enable Australia Day to be observed as it falls from Monday to Friday. When it falls on a Saturday or Sunday the holiday will be put off and held on the Monday. It is interesting that we should go to all this trouble to shift around a holiday on our national day when the anniversary of that national day of 26 January does not change, but I suppose it has been done to keep everybody happy, in essence—to keep the workers and some of the employers happy, because there are a number of employers who have argued that if it falls on a Saturday or a Sunday, so be it.

It seems to me that we are really starting to make this whole situation a little bit ludicrous when we jump around and celebrate it on another day just because it happens to fall on a Saturday or Sunday. Many people in the community would argue very strongly that we should hold our national day on the day it falls, and their argument is pretty logical, because they say that if our national day is 26 January that is when it should be held.

The legislation disbands altogether the concept of having a holiday on Proclamation Day and moves it back two days to 26 December. A slightly different concept here is that, again for convenience sake, we move this day two days away from when it falls and place it alongside Christmas Day, because it gives us a continuous break from whatever we are doing—whether it be school or work or whether we happen to be home.

I recognise that the purpose of this is to attempt to give us some sort of national uniformity about when holidays occur around this country, but it does make a bit of a farce of the whole thing when it is in essence one of the most important days as far as the history of South Australia is concerned. We support the legislation, because the overwhelming majority of the community wants it that way but, when they look at it from a history point of view, I am quite sure that future members of this Parliament and our children will wonder why we would argue in our schools that Proclamation Day, which is on 28 December, is important when we always commemorate it on 26 December. It is fascinating that, if it falls on either a Saturday or a Sunday, it would be upheld on the following Tuesday. The reason for that is that when we roll on a day we need to ensure that we have those two consecutive days of holiday. There are probably more vocal South Australians wanting the Proclamation Day holiday held on that particular day than on 26 January. As we are to move the holiday, I hope that this Government and any future Government will make sure that the celebration of Proclamation Day is still on 28 December irrespective of whether or not we have a holiday. It is a very important day, and hopefully as a community we will continue to recognise it, even if we do not take that day as a holiday.

The other amendment relates to the Co-operative Building Society and the possibility of its forming a new bank in January next year. We note with interest that, as we have potentially a new bank coming into our State that previously had co-operative status, in essence it will force the banks and Governments to realise that having Saturday closed to trade is an anachronism and needs to be changed. It is interesting that the Co-operative is forcing that position. We support that direction. We believe that, if a bank wants to open on a Saturday and has customers whom it wishes to serve and, more importantly, customers who wish to use its facilities, it

should be able to do so. Therefore, we welcome this change. The Opposition supports the changes.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to put on the record the concern of the Tunarama Festival Committee in relation to this Bill. As members will know, the Tunarama has been conducted over the long weekend in January for about 30 years and, as such, the three-day break has been an integral part of its success. This legislation will affect that festival occasion. As a result of this legislation, from a tourism point of view and many other aspects, that festival will suffer some loss of patronage. However, there is an overriding view that 26 January is a very important day and that the occasion should be celebrated on the actual day. I do not have any great problem with the legislation in that context. However, I take up the point mentioned by the member for Bragg: why should we differentiate between the 26th falling on a Saturday or a Sunday and not being celebrated on that day or, more particularly, why should there be an extra holiday in lieu? I guess the compromise is that, with the extra holiday on the Monday taking the place of the Saturday or the Sunday, again it creates that three-day break which the Tunarama Festival was looking for in the first instance. Therefore, four out of seven of the holiday periods will be three-day breaks in succession.

I do not wish to say any more, other than to express the concerns that were communicated to me by the Tunarama Festival Committee about the difficulties that the festival will be facing as a result of this change. On the other hand, I am sure that, if a poll were taken amongst my constituents, most of them would recognise that Australia Day should be recognised and celebrated on 26 January.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): It is long past the time rationally when we should recognise that no country on earth other than Australia shifts the day on which it celebrates its presumed birth. It seems incredible that it has taken this State so long to realise that we should celebrate the event on its anniversary. I do not know whether the Minister at the bench (Hon. R.J. Gregory) celebrates his birthday on the Monday after the weekend nearest to when it occurred so that he can have a long weekend.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: You've stopped celebrating it, haven't you, Bob?

Mr LEWIS: He may well have. It seems crazy that if we have an anniversary we should celebrate it on a day other than the day on which it occurs. I support the measure.

I do not mind if the Minister, with his penchant for holidays, decides to provide a holiday to employed people on the Monday following if the occasion falls on a Saturday or Sunday. Of course, I do mind that under this legislation we will no longer celebrate Proclamation Day with a holiday on the 28th. In my judgment, it is just as important to have it on 28 December regardless of the day of the week on which it occurs. I do not think that the proclamation of the only province ever established by an Act of Westminster to become democratically self-governing is unworthy of being celebrated on the occasion on which it occurred—28 December. South Australia is the only province so formed in that way on this continent. All the other States were colonies established by military fiat, not by an Act of Parliament. They were established not by the Act of a democratically elected institution but rather as part and parcel of a strategy being pursued by the British during the eighteenth and nineteenth

centuries to extend the territories over which they had governance and control.

That brings me to my next point. I get no joy whatever out of celebrating the foundation of the Federated States into nationhood on 26 January. I think it is plain idiocy. If New South Wales wishes to celebrate what happened on that occasion for its own birth as a separate identity in the known world of literate and numerate human beings, that is okay, but it is not the day on which I reckon the nation to which I belong came into existence. That day is either 1 January or the election and swearing in of a democratically elected Parliament of our new nation—9 May.

I believe that the Australia Day Council is derelict in its duty to children and to history to insist, along with the other dills in Government, that we celebrate it on 26 January. Australia came into existence as a nation on 9 May 1901, not 26 January 1778. New South Wales came into existence on 26 January. There was no mention of the word 'Australia' on 26 January in 1788—no mention in any of the documents. There was no mention of nationhood, no mention of democratic government, just the proclamation of the establishment of a colony by an officer of the armed forces of his Majesty the King. Momentous as that might have been, it is not the day on which the nation, of which all of us are citizens, came into existence. That day, in my judgment, ought to be 9 May, because on 9 May 1901 members of the first Parliament of the Federation of Australia were sworn in. That is when democratic government of this nation, as a self-governing entity, first began.

I quarrel with the selection of the date and I still quarrel with the principle of having a holiday on a Monday, even if we otherwise celebrate the occasion on the actual day of the anniversary. I believe we ought to follow the example of other countries. Imagine celebrating Bastille Day by having a long weekend, or Independence Day in the United States or the Philippines by having a long weekend and not celebrating on 4 July. That would be unthinkable to anybody in the United States. I cannot, for the life of me, see why we have to be so hung up on our attitude to industrial relations and the like that we kowtow to unions whose office bearers believe they would lose favour with the workers if they did not stand up and threaten to call a strike were we to not have a holiday on a Monday if the anniversary fell on a Saturday or a Sunday.

For the sake of peace and rapid process, knowing the realities that I face, I simply put those remarks on record and join with my colleagues in the Opposition in supporting the legislation.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the proposition. I have to correct the member for Murray-Mallee, because I know that in other parts of the world where a public holiday falls on a Saturday the actual holiday is enjoyed on the Monday. I remember being in Venice when this actually occurred. The holiday fell on the Saturday and, much to my chagrin, the holiday was celebrated on the Monday. When they have a holiday in Venice, they have a real holiday: they shut down the museums and everything. It was very difficult wandering around Venice as a tourist trying to see the tourist attractions when the whole box and dice was closed down. So it is not true to say that in other countries they do not move around the holidays: they certainly do, and I can tell you that I have actually experienced it.

I was somewhat taken aback by the remarks of the member for Bragg, because he was a champion of having the

holidays when they actually became due. This, of course, would have the effect over time of reducing the number of public holidays that people enjoy: this, I believe, is the policy of the Liberal Party. We have already seen the Kennett Government in Victoria closing down three public holidays in that State. I have no doubt that it is part of the secret agenda of the Liberal Party that, as soon as it gets into power, it will reduce the number of public holidays that we enjoy in South Australia.

I was very disappointed with the Kennett Government's proposal to take Easter Saturday off the holiday list. As a Christian country, Australia sees Easter Saturday as a preparation for Easter Day. It is a very holy day in the Christian calendar, on which people take the opportunity to make preparation for Easter Sunday, which is probably one of the most important holy days. Had it been a bit earlier in our history, I am sure there would have been absolute outrage at what the Liberal Kennett Government has done in Victoria. I have no doubt that we will face up to the same sort of situation in South Australia with the Liberal Party reducing the number of public holidays when it gets into power.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: I am smiling, and I am smiling at the fact that members opposite could be so cheeky as to sit there and suggest that they are not going to make the changes if and when they come into power. The member for Flinders made an exceptionally good point, asking what happens when we take away public holidays: we destroy the tourism industry. He was very interested in the tourism industry in Port Lincoln. He is a very conscientious member and I happen to agree with the majority of things he puts to this House. I think he would probably be the most sensible member in the Opposition. He pointed out what happens when the number of public holidays is reduced. The first industry to suffer under that situation is the tourism industry.

Country members in particular should realise the great advantage they receive through public holidays, because people travel to country centres; they spend money in country areas, and that money helps to stimulate employment in those areas. I do not think they should be so keen to reduce the number of public holidays in South Australia. The Liberal Party should come out and tell the public exactly what it will do with its secret agenda in reducing the number of public holidays in South Australia. The member for Bragg nearly gave it away by supporting a reduction in the number of public holidays. I do wish to refer—

Mr INGERSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. That is a gross misrepresentation of the comments I made. There was no suggestion anywhere in my presentation about a reduction of the number of holidays.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is debating. What is he asking for?

Mr INGERSON: I am asking for the honourable member to withdraw that comment.

Mr FERGUSON: I cannot withdraw it. I think the member for Bragg has a very poor memory. He needs to go back over what he actually said. He said that there is some support in South Australia for reducing the number of public holidays. It is obvious that 'some support' comes from the Liberal Party.

Mr INGERSON: I rise on a point of order. I ask that the member for Henley Beach withdraw that comment, because my reference was clearly to the general consumer.

The SPEAKER: Once again the member for Bragg has requested a withdrawal.

Mr FERGUSON: I am afraid I cannot withdraw it, because the inference was plainly there that the members of the Liberal Party will reduce the number of public holidays when and if they come into power and it is part of their secret agenda.

I refer now to Saturday trading, to which the member for Bragg referred briefly. It is true that this situation is now before the House. It is with a great deal of sadness that I see the proposed changes, because it was Don Dunstan who introduced a private member's Bill into this place to stop Saturday trading for banks, and now we are seeing this situation opened up.

It was inevitable, when the conservative forces in Australia took the opportunity to try to change the industrial relations system and to get into enterprise bargaining, that we would see work and trade occurring on Saturdays, Sundays and in the evenings when we had never seen that previously. I do not think Opposition members realised the sort of problems they are causing some of their own supporters, particularly those people who support the Chamber of Manufacturers, when they introduced enterprise bargaining in Australia, creating a situation in which working hours that formerly attracted penalty rates are now normal working hours. They are introducing into the normal working period hours of work that previously attracted penalties, which were applied in such a way that employers were inclined not to employ anybody. This has been the will of the Liberal Party. This is its policy—enterprise bargaining—and what is occurring is that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach will resume his seat. The member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I do not think this Bill has anything to do with the restructuring of awards.

The SPEAKER: I believe that the member for Henley Beach may be linking his comments to the Bill, and I will allow some leeway for that to occur. However, if he does not do so, I will uphold the point of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I can link them with consummate ease. The fact that we have a point of order taken by the Liberal Party just shows how ignorant it is on this subject. It is absolutely binding under this Bill that there will be a change in hours, particularly in the banking industry, and those people who have not normally worked on a Saturday will now do so if this measure goes through. Therefore, enterprise bargaining has a lot to do with these provisions. I do not think members opposite understood the ramifications of their policy to introduce enterprise bargaining, including the involvement of individuals on the shop floor. Some of the Opposition's own supporters will now come under severe competition because of what is happening in this enterprise bargaining area.

Saturday banking will mean that those other financial institutions which do not operate on a Saturday will find themselves at a great disadvantage. Many financial institutions—institutions, I may say, which support the Liberal Party—will find themselves in grave difficulties if this Bill that is in front of us is carried, as I have no doubt it will be, having the support of both sides of the House. With some of the banks open on Saturday and other financial institutions not open, they will often be in direct competition with one another, and it will be all or nothing. Most of those financial institutions will be put in the position of having to open on

Saturday, and there will be a chain reaction forcing other people into these working conditions.

It is not the fault of this Government. This Government is in a situation where it had to introduce this Bill. It goes back to the enterprise bargaining that commenced between the banks and the union, involving also the large firms that are now making enterprise agreements that will change the working conditions of this country to the extent that those people who enjoyed leisure hours once considered to be normal in Australia will now be forced to work at such times. It would not surprise me if this led not only to work and trading on Saturdays but to complete deregulation, forcing people to work also on Sundays and through the night.

I have visited the United States, where that is occurring. It is highly likely that we will see shopping 24 hours around the clock, where through economic necessity people will be forced to work during hours and at times when they would rather not be working. That is the result of a policy that was introduced by the conservatives in Australia in their push for enterprise bargaining. We will see destroyed in this country conditions, penalty rates and overtime rates that we as a work force have enjoyed for many years. Our standard of living is being reduced by the sort of proposition now being forced on us by the conservatives.

Notwithstanding that, there is no way we can turn back. I understand that an enterprise agreement has been reached between the banks and the banking unions. The Government is a 'tail-end Charlie', and all it can do is comply with the conditions that have been agreed to by the various parties. I think that many people will rue the day that this occurred. Not only are we seeing an attack on leisure hours: ever so subtly, as indicated by their remarks in this debate, the Liberals are seeking to reduce the number of public holidays in this State. I hope we will see a policy statement from the Liberal Party indicating no such reduction for the first two terms of a Liberal Government. I hope the Opposition will come out and say this and refute the suggestion—albeit the very faintest suggestion made during this debate—that the Liberal Party wishes to reduce the number of public holidays in South Australia.

It has been a pleasure to support this Bill. I have always said that this State's Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety has had a very steady influence on these matters. He has been very wise in his handling of the legislation he has introduced, and this Bill is no exception. I support the Bill.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): The member for Henley Beach took the opportunity to make one of his last speeches: he knows he is on the skids. I am leaving by choice, but I do not think he will be. I thought that I should answer at least some of the comments he made. The member for Bragg at no time said that the Liberal Party was out to reduce the number of holidays. What the member for Bragg said was that there was some support for the notion, and there is, and there is some support for more holidays. All he said was that there was some support: he did not say how much, who it came from or where that support may be.

Mr Ferguson: But do you support it?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I support having more holidays, because I am retiring, so it is obvious that I support it. So, the honourable member's interjection does not carry very much weight at all.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: We might go fishing together, because he got a bite today and I got one back, so we have done all right. The member for Henley Beach said that he supports this Bill with pleasure, but all through his speech he said what a terrible thing it was and what it would do in the long term, how many people would regret it and how it would harm those people he has claimed to represent in all the years he has been in this Parliament and before he came here. He came here to help them and now he is leaving and, in the very last week, he is saying to the workers, 'It is with pleasure I support something that I believe will hurt you.'

I find that an amazing statement from the member for Henley Beach, and it really surprises me. The honourable member also said the Government has been forced to do this as 'tail-end Charlie' (I think they are the words he used). Who forced the Government to do it? The Parliament is supreme.

Mr Ferguson: You did!

Mr S.G. EVANS: Now he says that I did. He says that I as an individual had enough power to force the Government into this position. If I had that sort of power I would have achieved much more in this Parliament than I have, but I do not have that power, so his interjection again is ludicrous. I do not have that power. A Government is not forced into things. The Government can tough things out or decide to take a path to bow to pressures from minority groups or from majority groups. I do not know which group has forced the ALP into this situation, as the honourable member suggests.

I cannot say who that would be, but the member for Henley Beach says that enterprise bargaining (which was talked about quite strongly at the last election as what Dr Hewson would do if he were in power) has been forced upon the ALP. Which Government has been moving towards enterprise bargaining?

Mr FERGUSON: I raise a point of order: the member for Davenport took a point of order on me, suggesting that I was talking about enterprise bargaining and that it had nothing to do with the Bill in front of us. I take the very same point of order: the member for Davenport is talking about enterprise bargaining.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has no choice but to uphold the point of order. The member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I accept your ruling, Sir, although you amaze me. You did not support my point of order.

The SPEAKER: However, the Chair does take the point made. There was a case being made by the member for Henley Beach that brought in that there was union and employer agreement to support enterprise bargaining and, at this stage, the member for Davenport has not linked his comments to any enterprise bargaining in the Bill.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Sir, you gave the member for Henley Beach the opportunity to link his remarks. Will I be given that opportunity or do you believe that I cannot have that opportunity under your ruling?

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is well aware that he has 16 minutes and it would take a much stronger Speaker than I am to prevent him from speaking and making his point. I upheld the point of order but I did not deny the member for Davenport the right to continue his speech, nor to make any point he wishes, which the Chair would never do.

Mr S.G. EVANS: We have a Federal ALP Government in power that has entered into enterprise bargaining conditions with the unions and, as the member for Henley Beach has said, the unions entering into these agreements are not

only in the Federal but in the State field, yet the ALP at Federal election time said that it would not be doing this. The member for Henley Beach is saying that you cannot trust the Liberals going into government because they might do something about public holidays.

Mr Ferguson: Yes, but you're different!

Mr S.G. EVANS: We are different, Sir. His side of politics has proven to be untruthful, to be misleading, to be deceptive and to be taking the Australian people for a ride, and now the honourable member is suggesting that we are different! Of course we are: we will not do that. That is the difference, and it is quite clearly—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair understands that the member for Davenport has made his point and linked up his comments.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The Bill was produced, as the member for Henley Beach suggested, with a great deal of speed. There was no necessity for speed. I agree with the Bill although, if I had my choice (and it is a personal choice and I will not be here to influence the Parliament in the future), whatever day the holiday falls on is the day that should be the holiday, as happens in other countries, and we should not be messing around with it. I hope that the Parliament in future, and perhaps in relation to the speech that I made last week and to which I cannot refer in any detail, will indicate to this Parliament that there is an opportunity to change the style of Parliament to be of greater benefit to the community, and one day this will be reviewed again so that, when the holiday falls on a particular day, that is the holiday. As a first step down the right path I support the Bill and congratulate the Government for bringing it in.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): This Bill offends my sense of history. I find it very strange that a State that was founded as a colony on a given day in the nineteenth century should now abandon the observance of that day as the date of its proclamation and celebrate that important event on any other day. I can see that there are many practical reasons why the Bill has been introduced to change the holding of Proclamation Day from the 28th day of December, the day on which it falls, to the 26th day of December, for the simple convenience of employers in South Australia—and for the wider community, one might add.

Nevertheless, it says something about South Australians if this Parliament is willing to do just that. I cannot imagine that the citizens of the Republic of the United States of America would contemplate celebrating 4 July, Independence Day, on any day other than the day on which it falls. I cannot imagine the citizens of France celebrating Bastille Day on any day other than the day on which it falls. Only in Australia, the land of the long weekend, could we contemplate celebrating an important historic day on any day other than the date on which it falls.

This aspect of the Bill is symptomatic of the lack of a sense of history and lack of a sense of identity that Australians still experience at both State and Commonwealth level in terms of our historic origins and our relationship to the original settlers of this country—and, indeed, the purposes for which this country was settled. I will not win this argument, but I believe that it is an aspect of the argument that ought to be put. There are many South Australians who feel as I do that one cannot rewrite history and one should not attempt to rewrite history merely for the sake of convenience.

To do that is to deny one's heritage and, in a sense, that is precisely what this Bill is doing. We are at a stage in our national history when we are looking at the past and at the future in a way that may yet see Australia Day in the twenty-first century celebrated on the day on which Australia became a nation, not the day on which the colony of New South Wales was settled as a penal settlement.

In my opinion that would be perfectly appropriate. It would be appropriate only after public debate when all Australians felt that that was the appropriate way in which to go. As far as Proclamation Day is concerned, this State has an extremely proud and distinguished history. We were unique amongst all Australian colonies in the nature of our settlement, a settlement founded on the sale of land to finance the infrastructure which would establish the colony. We were settled by free settlers, and 28 December is a date of some significance in our history. To have it suddenly moved unceremoniously two days forward to suit the convenience of retailers and others to my mind reflects no credit upon us whatsoever. I restrict my remarks to those criticisms and note that the Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): I thank all members for their support for the Bill. I am pleased that they do not play on my football team, because they would be kicking the ball to the wrong end all the time.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: You could always play for the opposition team.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: You were not down there often enough to support us. A number of comparisons have been made today, and I want to comment on them. Bastille Day and American Independence Day have been compared with Australia Day and Proclamation Day. However, they are two entirely different things. Are the member for Coles and other members opposite suggesting that we should get an unruly mob and storm a prison, release people and then have a civil war and take over a commune in Paris and commence our independence on that day? For the people of France that was a significant event.

In the United States, 4 July commemorates the cessation of a war when the American colonies won their independence from Great Britain. Those two dates commemorate a time when people made a sacrifice and gained independence from enormous suffering. The formation of Australia has not involved that sort of suffering. Philosophers and historians have lamented that and claimed it is something that we ought to have had so that we had something that all Australians could coalesce around.

We are not abolishing Proclamation Day. We are not going into the Mortlock Library and attempting to rewrite history, claiming that Governor Hindmarsh read out the proclamation on 26 December. All we are doing is having a holiday on 26 December and not on 28 December. The member for Coles referred to retailers being advantaged by having the holiday on the day immediately following Christmas or as conveniently afterwards as we could provide it.

In my brief stewardship of this portfolio I experimented one year and broke the mould and had the holiday on 28 December. I did not receive any complaints from retailers; I received complaints from families, whose sons and daughters worked in the city. These people lived in the country and

lamented that their families could not spend Christmas lunch and dinner together because of the impact of the short break they had as contrasted when they had the break on 25 and 26 December. That is an important point.

Another reason for the move is to obtain uniformity. South Australia is the only State that does not have a holiday on 26 December. If this Bill passes, we will have it on 26 December and we will thus have uniformity between the States. Members opposite have said that they do not want to abolish any public holidays. I point out to the House that the member for Bragg and other speakers have complained about the transfer of the Australia Day holiday, when it falls on a Saturday or Sunday, to the following Monday. We are deliberate about that.

It has been the tradition that, when these public holidays fall on a Saturday or Sunday in South Australia, the holiday is celebrated on the following Monday, and we see no reason to change that. As to banking hours, significant change has occurred in the relationship between employees and employers. The State Bank and the Commonwealth Bank have reached agreement with their unions on an enterprise basis which allows for Saturday trading. The House would have noticed several weeks ago in the *Advertiser* a joint announcement by the Financial Services Union and Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Ltd saying that when their enterprise agreement was finalised, which they expected would be some time in November, they would be looking at providing limited facilities on Saturdays.

The amendment allows for Saturday trading, but the normal days of business are still Monday to Friday, and Saturday cannot be included. That is why we have included a provision prohibiting people from doing certain things on a bank holiday, which would be done on a Sunday. That still applies in respect of Saturday. When that matter was raised with bank officials, they understood what we were talking about and agreed to the provision. We have seen a change in how business is done and the way in which people want business to be done in this State. Service industries are there to provide service to people. As to the way people work, 74 per cent of women between 18 and, I think, 54 years of age are working in industry somewhere. By the turn of the century more than 50 per cent of the work force will be female. Despite the best efforts of the feminists and those males in the community who believe we should take our fair share of household duties, it is still the females who predominantly shop in the supermarkets.

My wife will not let me do that because she believes I am not prudent enough. If that is her view, I am not about to have a great fight to take over from her. However, whether we like it or not, many women in the work force do such tasks, and they will find that the changes to trading hours will suit them. It behoves us in this Parliament to enable people to have the freedom to use our service industries.

Reference has been made to exploitation, and I am of the view that there has been a vast change in our relationships with work. At one time, a shop assistant worked during the period a shop was open. The Shop Assistants' Union used closing hours as a way of limiting the hours that its members worked so that they could have reasonable rest and recreation. Bank officers did exactly the same thing, as did post office workers, but we now have a situation where industry groups can organise themselves so that people have rostered days off and the opening hours are not the total working hours of the employees.

That is exactly the arrangement the banks have been able to reach with the unions. Basically, all the arrangements are about the same. I understand that those officers who work on Saturday will be volunteers. Arrangements have been reached with the banks and the unions so that people will be reasonably well compensated in terms of time off or money. The Bill and its amendments are small, but they are far-reaching and bring South Australia into line with the other States. Banking conditions will be regularised in South Australia, and banks should be able to conduct business honestly, unlike the eastern States, where front companies operate on Saturdays on behalf of banks. My advice is that in some cases that is downright illegal and the Government in those States has chosen to ignore it. I thank members opposite for their support because I believe the objects of this Bill are worthwhile.

Bill read a second time.

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

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House that it have power to consider new clauses relating to bank holidays.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

Page 1, line 10—Leave out 'and Australia Day' and insert, 'Australia Day and bank holidays'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

New clauses 3a. and 3b.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

Page 1, after clause 3—Insert new clauses as follows:

Substitution of s.3b

3a. Section 3b of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is substituted:

Certain Saturdays to be bank holidays

3b. The days mentioned in Part II of the second schedule and 26 December are bank holidays when they fall on a Saturday.

Amendment of s.7—Payments and other acts on holidays or Saturdays

3b. Section 7 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subsection (1) 'or bank holiday' and substituting 'bank holiday or Saturday'; and

(b) by striking out from subsection (2) 'or bank holiday' (wherever it occurs) and substituting, in each case, 'bank holiday or Saturday'.

New clauses inserted.

Clause 4 passed.

New clause 5—'Repeal of third schedule.'

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

Page 2, after clause 4—insert new clause as follows:

Repeal of third schedule

5. The third schedule of the principal Act is repealed.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PETROLEUM (PIPELINE LICENCES) AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 764.)

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): The Opposition supports this amending Bill. It is most important that we get natural

gas to as many areas of South Australia as possible. It is a worry that in its wisdom the Government could not declare the Riverland an economic zone and give it the benefits it has given to other areas—

Mr Olsen: Like Whyalla.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, like Whyalla. The Treasurer knows full well that that was pork-barrelling in his own electorate. However, the Leader of the Opposition has made a commitment that we will declare an economic zone, and the natural gas getting there will help that region immensely. We do hope that the only impediment to the construction of this pipeline will be in the form of holidays celebrated on the day on which they fall. We hope that the arrangements are concluded quickly so that the benefits can go to those areas. We support the Bill and hope that it passes quickly.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This Bill has the overwhelming support of the people of the Riverland, for very obvious reasons. The potential that it opens up by natural gas going to a highly productive area such as the Riverland for processing and value adding is beyond any doubt. The absence of natural gas is one of the main reasons why in some instances the Riverland has not been able to be competitive with other products in some of the world marketplaces. We only have to look at the potential for industries such as processing of vegetables and the dry-veg concept to see the ability of the Riverland, with centre pivots, ample water, ample suitable land and ideal weather conditions, to produce vast quantities of potatoes, onions and so on.

That type of vegetable product is ideal for dehydration, which then provides for a very effective export industry because of the fact that a vast quantity of the weight of that product has been removed. It can be very economically shipped and then reconstituted in the country to which it has been exported, such as South-East Asia or elsewhere. So, this legislation adds a totally new dimension to the Riverland and the possibility of further development in that area. We are talking about an area with a population of some 35 000 people, and the economics of the area are such that it desperately needs the delivery of natural gas, and it is not only the existing industries that will be very much dependent on it.

The potential for export from the Riverland is very great indeed, and the advent of gas to Berri will mean that the industries currently in Berri will have the opportunity of converting. Unfortunately at this point there is no provision by the South Australian Gas Company through the Pipelines Authority as the constructing authority actually to deliver gas or put in spur lines, whether they be to Renmark or Loxton, but the potential is there. Once the main line is through to Berri, it is up to the Riverland generally and the towns concerned to come up with the new industries that will then make it a proposition to provide gas to towns like Loxton and Renmark. The Opposition certainly is 100 per cent behind this legislation. We hope that the construction will go forth as quickly as possible so that gas will readily be available in the Riverland in the very near future.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I thank the members for Victoria and Chaffey for their contributions to the second reading debate and for their expressions of support. I heard some comment about pork-barrelling during the second reading debate. I do not like that term at all, but I make no apologies whatsoever for looking after both my electorate and the District of Chaffey just to show that,

wherever there is a need in non-metropolitan areas, I consider it my duty to meet it. This Government has followed that policy, whether in Whyalla or any other area of the State.

There is no doubt that this pipeline for the provision of natural gas to the Riverland will be of considerable economic benefit to that area. It is not yet necessarily one of the most prosperous areas of the State, but I believe that the potential is absolutely enormous: in fact, it is unlimited. It will require some significant restructuring, which is more within the province of the Minister of Primary Industries now than mine, but whatever the Government can do to assist the regions it will do. I commend the second reading to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATE LOTTERIES (INSTANT LOTTERIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 October. Page 764.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the thrust of this Bill.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I thank the Opposition for its expression of support and commend the second reading to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement and application.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: As this relates to rectifying an anomaly which has arisen in New South Wales in relation to the interpretation of a winning ticket, can the Minister tell the Committee whether there is any litigation of a similar nature in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I believe there is one case, but I have no idea how far it has gone. I can obtain the information for the honourable member later.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We need further advice on that matter. If we are to reduce someone's capacity to pursue legal rights, I would appreciate that information being provided before the Bill is debated in another place, because we may need to move an amendment to allow that legal action to reach fruition.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I should like to take this opportunity to raise the issue of scratch tickets.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that matter relate to this clause?

Mr S.G. EVANS: It relates to scratch tickets, people's legal rights and the opportunity for fair trading. It also relates to people being given a reasonable opportunity to know whether or not they have won a prize. Sir, you may rule me out of order if you wish, but I want to take this opportunity to refer to a complaint that I get from many people relating to scratch tickets: the symbols that are used to decide winners are changed frequently and the printing is so small that many people have difficulty in reading them and identifying whether they have won a prize. The symbols are nearly identical and not very clearly defined. Many people miss prizes because of that and the Lotteries Commission and the Government finish up with many unclaimed money prizes.

The clause seeks to avoid the opportunity for people to rig the system by claiming a different combination from that intended. We understand that that needs to be corrected. I

have raised with the Minister and the Lotteries Commission whether we can look at making sure that the symbols are made clearer so that the aged and those with partial sight can clearly see whether they have won. I am sure that, if private enterprise operated with tickets such as those used by the Lotteries Commission, the Parliament would make sure that they were corrected. We should ensure that people have a greater opportunity to know whether or not they have won. I won one of these tickets at a competition and as I threw it away one of my children said, 'You have thrown away a winner.' They are difficult to define and they do change frequently. I realise they have to be changed frequently to avoid the possibility of people producing fraudulent tickets. By changing them frequently, we can avoid that.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I take the point made by the member for Davenport. I am sure that there is no intention to deceive on the part of the Lotteries Commission and I know that the honourable member was not suggesting that. I am not quite sure how one would know that one had thrown away a winning ticket. If someone knew they had a winning ticket, they would not throw it away. However, that is a conundrum on which I will ponder tonight; I will not try to work through it now.

The point made by the member for Davenport is fair. I have no idea why the Lotteries Commission has printed tickets which appear, at least to the member for Davenport, to have small symbols on them. I have never purchased one, so I do not know whether the symbols are large or small. Nevertheless, the point is well made. I will write to the Chair of the Lotteries Commission about the member for Davenport's view on this matter and suggest that, if the symbols can be made clearer within the overall context of the size of these things, it ought to be done. I am sure that the new Chair of the Lotteries Commission, Trevor Barr, will comply with my request if it is at all possible.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Instant Lottery Tickets.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause intrigues me just a little. I do not pretend to have the ultimate legal advice on this subject, but I question whether the wording opens up more possibilities for legal action. I am seeking the advice of the Committee on this matter because, as we are aware, instant lottery tickets can take a variety of forms. They can comprise one panel, as indicated by the detail provided on the back. However, as we know, there are instant tickets with a number of panels.

The examples given here relate to the New South Wales case where there were three sets of pairs and it was deemed that, as a result of Supreme Court action, the person involved had won because it indicated that there were three matching symbols. In the case where there are a number of panels on a ticket, I wonder whether we are opening up a Pandora's box. I do not have the information to hand to put my concerns at ease but I quote new section 17A.(1), as follows:

If a statement relating to an instant lottery is made by, or on behalf of, the commission to the effect that a prize is won if a specific number of symbols, or identical symbols, printed on a ticket in the lottery or in a panel on a ticket are matched—

(a) the ticket is a winning ticket only if the ticket or panel (as the case requires) has printed on or in it the specified number of the same symbol;

It appears to be reasonably explicit but I question, and I would like it checked before it goes any further, whether the existence of three similar symbols on different panels would

comply with that simple instruction. Everything revolves around the words '(as the case requires) has printed on or in it the specified number of the same symbol'.

If we have three or four panels and between those three or four panels we have three aces displayed—and three aces may well pay \$1 000 or \$10 000—does the limitation placed therein restrict that person from claiming it to be a winning ticket? It is a very common circumstance with multiple panels, as members would appreciate, where you have a variety of symbols and you are required to have three matches across one panel. I am not sure, as the Act is being reworded, whether in fact we are opening that question up where it has never been under question before. If it cannot be answered by expert opinion here I would appreciate it if that could be looked into further during the passage of this legislation through another place.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is an interesting point. I make no pretence of being a legal authority, although I do have some eminent legal advice on this matter, and the eminent legal advice is that this solves the problem. However, I will draw to the attention of that eminent legal adviser the eminent Deputy Leader's view on the clause as drafted, and prior to the Bill being considered in another place I will have a detailed response to the query quite legitimately raised by the Deputy Leader.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC (BREATH ANALYSIS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 September. Page 644.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): It is with pleasure that I rise to support this Bill. This Bill changes principally the practice of how individuals may, if they wish, have their blood tested after their blood alcohol content has registered over .05 per cent. It is an important Bill because it enables a little practicality to be introduced in this important area. It is important to note that one of the principal reasons—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier will come to order.

Mr INGERSON: This Bill has been deemed necessary because of the waste of precious resources, involving the use of two policemen, at an estimated cost of \$130 000 per annum, to transport to a hospital or doctor a person (if he or she so wishes to have a blood test taken) who has tested at over .05. It also provides for the difficulty confronting doctors in country areas. For the first time there is a break with tradition in recognising that a profession, other than doctors, is capable of taking samples of blood from individuals, such sampling being recognised as a true sample. The fact that members of the nursing profession, instead of a doctor, will be taking these important samples and that this will be recognised by law is an important break with tradition.

It is an interesting issue, and I am surprised in a sense that the medical profession has allowed this to occur. It is a practicality and an important and obvious change to this area of breath testing. The RAA plays an important role in the motoring industry and has made some important comments

on the Bill. The RAA supports the Bill but proposes two amendments, as follows:

that to ensure drivers are adequately aware of optional blood test provisions, the police be required to explain the procedures that must be followed, as outlined on the written form to be handed to the driver.

I note that in another place that recommendation has been accepted. The second amendment states:

that a 'safety net' be included in the Act which provides, in the limited circumstances where arrangements cannot be made or are unable to be made in sufficient time for the blood test to be of any use to the driver, that the police transport the driver.

That matter was not picked up in another place for a number of reasons, and there is not much point in our reintroducing that amendment in this place. It is important to note that the RAA has raised that issue, and when the Bill is reconsidered by a new Government in the future I would hope that the RAA's point relating to a safety net is considered. The AMA also supports this Bill but requests, on behalf of the country doctors, an amendment that in country areas both nurses and medical practitioners be able to take blood samples. I did not think it would be very long before we saw that sort of suggestion coming from the doctors.

The Law Society, like the RAA, wants drivers to be provided with verbal and written advice about their rights to challenge the accuracy of the breath analysis by an analysis of the blood sample. Unfortunately, as a result of a tragic accident a member of our family was killed. All the necessary requirements were quickly and swiftly carried out by the police and the medical profession at the scene of the accident. It would seem that in some of these difficult situations the amendments currently before the House are not required. It seems to me that it is only in the Booze Bus area that this sort of amendment is necessary. We support the amendments made in another place and we hope that the Government will be successful in implementing this very important practical change quickly.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): It is important that we take a bipartisan stand on this. I was very pleased that my colleague in another place was able to accept amendments moved by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw. I guess my own expertise in terms of this Bill has been widely acknowledged. I would like to recap that the purpose of this Bill is to remove the requirement that the police facilitate the taking of a sample of a driver's blood at a hospital or surgery when so requested to do so by the driver following a positive breath analysis.

We all know the game: someone gets pulled up on Main North Road and they are found to be over .05 or .08 or whatever; they then say, 'That cannot possibly be true, constable, because we all know that I have been on medication and I think there might have been a bit of alcohol base in the medication, so I could not possibly be .05 or over. I insist on a blood test.' I know that I have not been heralded as one of the great champions of civil liberties following my graffiti Bill. I know that members opposite have attacked me for being too strong on law and order—for having an Islamic or even Shiite view of the law and order issue.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. My point is that the graffiti Bill has nothing to do with the Bill before us tonight.

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier will resume his seat.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: What we know is that a lot of people out there—a lot of people who put my children, your children and everyone's children at risk by drink driving—think that they might just be on a nice little earner by saying to the policeman, 'Look, I could not possibly have drunk this; it certainly did not come from alcohol. I only had one schooner of West End Light, so I demand a blood test.'

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Or Eagle Blue. They say, 'I demand a blood test.' What a vast majority of them are hoping is that somewhere between blowing in the bag and being found over the limit through a blood test at the hospital—which hopefully is a long way away—if they breathe deeply, drink plenty of water and all the rest, their blood alcohol level might just reduce. The fact is that their game is up, because modern technology can track back to find out what the level of alcohol was X hours before. The tragedy of all this is that two members of our Police Force are required to go with these snooks to the hospital or to a doctor actually to facilitate the blood test—to act as a taxi service. That is an extraordinary waste of police resources and one that does not occur anywhere else. I am pleased that the police will be freed up to do what we depend on them to do, that is, to fight crime and also ensure the safety of our citizens.

I strongly support this legislation. It is something that I am sure all members—on this side and on the other side of the House—endorse. Quite frankly, when it comes to drunk drivers, particularly those who persistently flout the laws, my view is that there can be no soft options. I commend this Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

FISHERIES (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUND) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 10 (clause 1)—Leave out '(Research and Development Fund)' and insert '(R&D Fund and Other)'.

No. 2. Page 1, line 28 (clause 2)—Leave out paragraph (e) and insert new paragraph as follows:

'(e) with the agreement of the Director and the fishery management committees—for any other purpose (including defraying the costs of administering and enforcing this Act).'

No. 3. Page 2—After line 3 insert new clause as follows:

'Commencement of certain provisions of Statutes Amendment (Fisheries) Act 1993

4. Notwithstanding section 2 of the Statutes Amendment (Fisheries) Act 1993 and the proclamation made for the purposes of that section on 27 May 1993 (see *Gazette* 27 May 1993 p.1754), sections 5(b), 5(c), 5(f), 5(g) and 6 to 13 (inclusive) of that Act will come into operation on a day to be fixed by subsequent proclamation.'

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

This is not a contentious amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

This amendment means that, with regard to administration and enforcement, the Director needs the consent of all the fishery management committees. The amendment is absurd;

it means that any expenditure would require prior agreement between the General Manager of Fisheries and the fishery management committees. For example, under this proposal, costs relating to the purchase of a new chair, storage, retrieval of material from archives, photocopying, stationery and postage incurred by the department, and of course any enforcement activities—everything that we do that is related to or incidental to enforcement activities—would have to go to the fisheries management committee for approval. It is an absurd arrangement.

The proposal has the potential to make the whole of the administration of the Research and Development Fund unworkable. The management committee would effectively control departmental expenditure and it could actually veto departmental operating funding requirements. I do not think that is a proper thing to do to management committees—apart from the issue of administration and enforcement—because it would actually give management committees a power of veto over any costs associated with administration or, indeed, over any costs or steps associated with enforcing the Act. The amendment simply makes the whole thing unworkable and is absurd.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I believe that the Minister has misunderstood the thrust of this amendment. Clearly, the fishing industry does not want to be loaded with costs which have been decided administratively or by ministerial fiat without proper consultation and the agreement of the industry. What this amendment obviously seeks to do is just that. If the Minister is discontent with the wording, it is up to the Minister to come up with another amendment: it is not up to the Minister to reject it out of hand. As the Bill was brought before the House originally, the clause gave the Minister the capacity to make decisions. Proposed new paragraph (e) refers to defraying the costs of administration and enforcing the Act.

It is quite clear that the fishing industry does not want to be hit with charges without some form of consultation or agreement prior to that event. If the Minister is to reject this proposition, I suggest that he think of a more appropriate amendment in the interim before the matter goes back to another place.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I oppose the amendment, for the reasons outlined.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Recently I had occasion to have lunch with a couple of people involved in a particular hospital. During that enjoyable lunch the question of medical costs, etc., was raised and it brought to mind a constituent who came to my office only recently and complained about the fact that she could not get her son into a particular hospital. To her dismay, she found that, despite paying into a health fund, she was not adequately covered. She was very distressed, naturally enough, that her son could not get in for

the required operation, given that she believed she had sufficient coverage.

The reason I raise this is that I believe that a large number of people in our community have little or no understanding of the benefits or non-benefits available through hospital benefit funds. It seems to me that there need to be advocates, if you like, or a health ombudsman, to assist those people who are not sure of their entitlement. If one goes to a medical fund to inquire what benefits are available, I suggest that a plethora of pluses will be provided by the person wanting to sell those benefits. Similarly, if the same inquirer goes to another health fund, I suspect that he or she will be given similar information that health fund B was better than health fund A.

So, there is much confusion in the community, which was illustrated by correspondence I received from a particular hospital, which reads in part:

You will note from the schedule the confusion which can be caused to prospective consumers with categorisation and classifications of procedures. As indicated to you, it is very difficult to accurately inform consumers of the costs when the system is totally dependent on the medical benefit schedule number. An example of this relates to an arthroscopy procedure, that is, an examination, under general anaesthetic, of the knee. MBS item No. 49557; classification, surgical; fee—accommodation, share, \$300; theatre band, \$275. To illustrate the problem of informing consumers, if the surgeon removes some bone fragment during the course of the procedure and uses MBS item 49560, the classification would still remain as surgical; the accommodation shared would remain the same, that is, \$300; but the theatre fees increase to band 5, that is, a cost of \$735. You can see therefore that the patients could find themselves having to pay an additional \$460 for this particular procedure. To complicate matters further, if the procedure is undertaken on a same day basis, then only a \$280 accommodation charge is rendered, but the theatre fee bandings would be the same.

In regard to health insurance it would appear that most people using the private system are covered for the hospital component but, given the wide variety of differentials in medical charges, that is, reimbursement under Medicare 75% of the scheduled fee, and from the patient's health insurance fund 25% of the scheduled fee, there is inevitably a balance to be paid from the patient's own pocket. This, unfortunately, is not able to be covered by the health insurance funds. Given that the majority of health insurers offer a variety of packages to prospective consumers, this too tends to further complicate the system and therefore it is essential for each potential consumer of our health services to check with their own individual health insurance fund to accurately determine the benefit that would be payable for a particular procedure. There is no doubt that the system as a whole needs to be simplified and translated into user friendly language which consumers can readily understand. This I believe will be a key focus of Senator Richardson in his forthcoming health statement. To this extent, all participants of health care, that is, hospitals, doctors, health insurers, have an active role to play in ensuring that Australia's health care system is improved to provide access and equity.

I could not have put it better. There is a lot of confusion out there. I suspect that many people in our community think they are adequately covered but, when they get their final bill, find they are out of pocket. That is where I believe we need an independent organisation or advocates where people can go and say 'Look, which is the best for me in terms of my particular needs?' and to be taken through those processes.

As I indicated before, I believe there are people in our community who, despite much talking to try to analyse their requirements, do not really comprehend what costs they will incur. Similarly, they may well find that after they have a particular operation they are up for a large amount of money. That is very sad, and I hope that the State and Federal Ministers of Health address this problem, because that has been my experience in dealing with my constituent.

Last but not least I want to thank the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources for the State Government's commitment to the replenishment of sand in the Semaphore Park-Tennyson area. It is a running sore, if you like; it will be there for a long time, and you, Sir, would be well aware of the difficulties. Many people believe that rocks may be the answer. I am not qualified in the area of stopping erosion, but I hope that that is not necessary. I hope that the northbound erosion taking place will quickly pass.

Whilst I do not necessarily wish it to go into the Semaphore or Hart electorates, I hope that the matter can be resolved. However, nature is very predictable. My constituents, justifiably, are concerned. They have built properties in that area, the biggest investment most people make in their life, and they have asked me and I have tried over the 14 years I have been here to try to facilitate their needs and get this money.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I thank the member for Spence for saying that I am attentive to my constituents. I believe I have a clear obligation and responsibility to my constituents. As I have indicated before, I love my work, I enjoy it and I enjoy it with fierce intensity. I have never made any apology for harassing Ministers and their staff and, over the years, they have been attentive to the needs of my constituents, and I thank them for that. I hope to see the work start quickly—and the Minister has indicated that that will be the case—so that it will allay the fears of my constituents in terms of the dunal erosion in that area.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am going to do a 'Keneally' today, on the basis of the former member for Stuart who took the opportunity at about this time before an election to make a few thankyou's and remarks relative to the experiences he had had in this House. Whether there will be an announcement late this week, early next week, in a fortnight or whether we are still members of Parliament come February does not really matter.

Mr S.G. Evans: I did mine last week.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The member for Davenport, who has been here longer than any of us, did his Keneally last week. The next person to get up might call it an 'Evans', an 'Eastick' or even a 'Hopgood'. It has been very rewarding to have the opportunity to represent some delightful people. I could go so far as to say that it has been delightful to represent people throughout the State because, as the member for Ross Smith who has just arrived in the House would recognise, in a leadership position, whether as Leader of the Opposition or as Premier, one is face to face with people right across the State. If one can hit the top job of Premier, so be it.

I still think of the 240 or 250 votes out at Gilles in 1975 as the difference between having aspired to both positions—not only one—but, that apart, one of the points that I have been able to pass onto a number of people who have asked, 'Hasn't it been frustrating and without value; and do you really believe that you have been able to achieve anything?', has been the fact that, whether you are in Opposition or in Government, you have the opportunity to express a point of view on behalf of the people you represent or develop a plan or put forward an issue.

A Bill dealing with a particular issue might not come back to the House with one's name on it, but not infrequently in

my experience of over 23½ years the view put forward three, six or nine months before in debate can suddenly appear in the middle of the next set of amendments relative to that issue. I remember saying to one of the older Ministers of the second Dunstan Government that it was rather refreshing to find a particular point in a piece of legislation, and he said, 'We thought it was all right when you first put it forward as an amendment, but we had to kick it around and make sure that it did not have some adverse or reverse affect somewhere else in the system. We had to make sure that, if it was going to be in agriculture, if it was going to be in health or whatever, it was compatible with the desires and interests of other departments and other people. Once it was kicked around it was brought back.'

That has been a real sense of achievement. If I can claim to aspire to any thanks, it relates to the matters that have been expressed and which have been picked up and brought to fruition. In 1970 I was fortunate to just get across the line in the district of Light. I say that because it was the last seat conceded in 1970. It was believed that Brian Chatterton was going to take all the boxes in Gawler. They were the biggest boxes and they came in last, so the early figures for Light did not reflect the hinterland of the Labor Party, which had been with the late Jack Clark and, before that, the late Les Duncan for 38 years before I became the member. I think the margin was about 1¼ per cent in 1970. I have experienced some delightful 60, 63 and 65 per cent returns since then in much the same territory, and I can do no better than thank the people I have represented for that type of support.

I have also had the opportunity to represent some great parts of South Australia. The current Light district, with the town of Gawler and the Barossa Valley, is one of the smallest rural seats in the Parliament, but I refer to it and the other areas that I have represented going through to Clare, across to Morgan, down through Eudunda, Robertstown and Kersbrook as areas that have been my privilege to serve for the past 42 years. I say that because Gawler was the base of my practice previously, and the people I had the opportunity to represent through all those years are the people who were my clients for about 20 years before I came into this place.

It is great to have had the friendship of many of those people, not only through the valley but elsewhere and to have a rapport even today with the third and fourth generation of a number of people with whom one has been in direct contact over 42 years. I remember some of the experiences that have come my way. I refer to the various select committees on firearms, ETSA, vegetation, death and dying, juvenile crime, Scientology, the first South Australian Health Commission Act and a number of others, all of which have been a great experience.

I can say to any member that the old Public Works Standing Committee was probably the most valuable committee on which one could serve, because you had the opportunity to meet senior people through the various departments; there were field inspections of projects that were under way and one had a great feeling of being close to the coal face, albeit not in Government. Mr Speaker, you would agree that it is a tremendous advantage to have the experience of occupying the position that you now occupy. It is not one that is altogether very—

Mr Venning: Comfortable!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes, comfortable, in a variety of different ways. It is certainly not one that gives a great deal of friendship on all occasions. It is a position that can be damnably lonely, but I say to all members of the Government

and the Opposition that I welcomed the experience when I occupied that position. I trust that whatever effort I was able to put into the activities of the House will be remembered after I go. That apart, associated directly with that involvement was the opportunity to visit the House of Commons over a period of almost four weeks. Other members, including the member for Flinders, have been there to enjoy the British CPA Presiding Officers Conference and rub shoulders with some of the great names of the current period. There was the opportunity to go to No. 10 Downing Street and be caught on photograph talking to Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister, to have breakfast with Enoch Powell on one day and with Ian Paisley the next.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: There was also Earnest Armstrong, the former Education Minister in the Wilson Labour Government, who indicated that the people on the other side were not his political enemies—they were his political adversaries. His political enemies were alongside

and behind him. I think there are a number of members in this House who will reflect on that issue. It is part of the total experience, as was the experience in 1975 of travelling overseas as Leader of the Opposition for 8½ weeks through some 17 countries, looking at the motor car industry which is so important to South Australia; looking at that time at new town developments which were likely to become a feature of South Australia with Monarto; and looking at worker participation in management, particularly in Germany, Sweden and Norway. They were all great experiences which I cherish, and I look forward to keeping abreast of what goes on in this place, although not in a direct sense. I leave just one thought which was passed by a Speaker some time ago. On retirement Arthur Onslow said that the freedom, dignity and authority of this House must be perpetual. I believe that is extremely important; we must remember our traditions, otherwise we go down the gurgler.

Motion carried.

At 5.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 20 October at 2 p.m.