HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 August 1994

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table a special report of the Auditor-General for August 1994.

Ordered that report be printed.

SODOMY

Petitions signed by 630 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to criminalise sodomy were presented by Messrs Buckby, Lewis, Olsen and Wotton.

Petitions received.

FILM AND VIDEO CENTRE

Petitions signed by 32 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the South Australian Film and Video Centre were presented by Messrs Andrew and D.S. Baker.

Petitions received.

STIRLING COUNCIL

A petition signed by 2 405 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to assist the Stirling council with repayment of its bushfire debt was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

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 10, 21, 29, 35 and 44.

GAMBLERS' REHABILITATION FUND

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As members are aware, the Government has been concerned about problems associated with gambling addiction in light of the former Government's decision to pursue the introduction of gaming machines. In particular, we want to help protect the lives and well-being of families of addicted gamblers. I now announce the Government's decisions which will result in $1.5 million, including $500 000 of Government funding, being made available over this financial year to initiate programs to deal with gambling addiction and to help their families. Effective immediately, a Gamblers' Rehabilitation Fund is being established. This fund will provide programs for gamblers in need of rehabilitation and for family counselling services. Funding of the programs will be authorised by a committee comprising representatives of non-government welfare agencies and the Department for Family and Community Services. The welfare agencies and the department will have the opportunity to submit programs to the committee for its consideration.

Contributions from the Independent Gaming Corporation and the Adelaide Casino will be paid into the fund. The Government's negotiations with the Independent Gaming Corporation, which represents hotel, hospitality and licensed club interests, have confirmed that a contribution of $1 million will be made available by the IGC in 1994-95 to fund rehabilitation assistance for gamblers addicted to gaming machines. This contribution will also fund, to the extent of about $50 000, a program to monitor the social impact of gaming machines to assist in the effective targeting of rehabilitation programs. The Government also believes that, on the grounds of equity, all gaming machine operators should be liable for a contribution towards rehabilitation programs for machine users and others who experience financial and other difficulties as a direct result of addiction to gambling. Accordingly, the Adelaide Casino, as the other major operator of gaming machines, has been asked to make a financial contribution in 1994-95. This will be achieved by increasing the casino levy on video gaming machines from 4 per cent to 4.2 per cent so that it is set at the same rate as that applying to other establishments operating those same gaming machines. This will result in a contribution of about $500 000 in 1994-95.

It should be noted that this levy is payable into general revenue. The funding of about $500 000 for the remainder of this financial year therefore represents a direct Government contribution towards the costs of rehabilitation programs. These funds will be allocated fully to the non-government welfare agencies for their broad welfare programs. In a full year this contribution will amount to about $800 000. These decisions have been made after consultation with the South Australian Heads of Christian Churches, representatives of non-government welfare agencies, the Independent Gaming Corporation and the Casino Supervisory Authority. They reflect the Government's determination to promote, as much as it is possible, a responsible community approach to gambling, at the same time recognising that there can be many innocent victims of gambling addition, particularly children and other dependants of those who do become addicted.

In considering the Government's response, the House and the community should be aware that some estimates of the gains in Government revenue to be generated by the introduction of gaming machines have been greatly exaggerated. Indeed, gaming machines are expected to result in a major redistribution of the gambling dollars rather than a straight line boost to Government revenues. For example, in framing the 1994-95 budget, a significant reduction in revenue from the activities of the Lotteries Commission is being forecast. The 1994-95 revenue from the Lotteries Commission is estimated at just over $68 million compared with $84 million in 1992-93, a decline of almost 20 per cent over a two year period. It should also be recognised that the Government's total revenue from gambling taxes goes to the Consolidated Account which already funds a range of programs to assist the community, including services provided by the Department for Family and Community Services.

In closing, I contrast the actions of my Government with those of our predecessor. In 1983, when the legislation to establish the Adelaide Casino was introduced, the former Government promised to provide funds to monitor the social impact of gambling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has leave to make a statement. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I stress again, a promise was made by the former Government in 1983. However, the former Government never honoured that commitment. In 1993, when the former Government legislated for the introduction of gaming machines, it promised funding for rehabilitation of addicted gamblers.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has leave to make a ministerial statement. The Chair does not wish him to be interrupted any further.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Giles. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: However, the former Government made no provision in the budget forward estimates for this funding. That funding was only to be provided after the gaming machines had been in full use for a period of 12 months. In contrast, my Government has acted fairly and sensitively to deal with the impact of legislation it did not introduce and, despite major budget problems, it did not create.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1993-94.

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Supreme Court Act—Rules of Court—Various.
Starr-Bowkett Societies Act—Regulations—General.

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board—Report, 1993.

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report, 1993.
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act—Regulations—Written Determinations.

By the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

South Australian Health Commission Act—Regulations—Prosthesis Fees.

By the Minister for Health, for the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Passenger Transport Act—Regulations—Fares Vehicle Age.

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Dried Fruits Board of SA—64th Report, 1993.

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Institution of Surveyors, Report, 1993.
Dog Control Act—Regulations—Registration Fees.

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, for the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Housing Co-operatives Act—Regulations—
Membership and winding up.
Shares.
City of West Torrens—By-law No. 3—Garbage Removal.

PRISON REFORM

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Correctional Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I am now in a position to advise the House of details of some of the changes which have occurred to the Correctional Services Department during the past eight months. This Government inherited from Labor the most expensive prison system in Australia. On page 52 the Audit Commission identified the following:

> In 1992-93, South Australia spent around 25 per cent more on corrective service activities than was required to provide the same level of comparable services across all States.

Further, the prison system had insufficient bed space to cope with the State's prison needs. Rather than admit to this problem, the previous Labor Government managed its prison bed space by inappropriately releasing violent prisoners early onto home detention. The Audit Commission identified that one of the reasons for our State's high prison costs was its high level of staffing relative to other States. On coming into government we also inherited the highest remand rate of any State in Australia. Twenty-five per cent of the South Australian prison population comprised remandees compared with the national average of 17.4 per cent. Under Labor, South Australia imprisoned fine defaulters and is the only State in Australia which has a purpose-built fine default facility. Apart from it being inappropriate to imprison fine defaulters in the first place, the fine default facility has added significantly to the Correctional Services Department's problems. In the last financial year alone, 10 people are recorded as having escaped from the fine default facility.

On becoming the Minister I received a report from the Correctional Services Advisory Council that highlighted problems in the fine default facility as follows:

> Council was disappointed to hear reports of suspected overnight abscondings and the 'security' fence shows sign of constant use from people climbing over it. . . Since there is evidence of multiple escapes it is obvious that security is poor.

I was also aware that not just the Fine Default Centre but the whole Northfield Prison Complex had serious problems. On 20 January 1994, my CEO established a review team to investigate the problems at Northfield. The review team completed its report on 10 February 1994. In part, the report reveals:

> The team identified, and this is supported by the high incidence of WorkCover absences related to stress, that Northfield Prison Complex is currently a poisonous environment with staff in deep and chronic conflict with their colleagues resulting in cases of litigation, allegations of the fire bombing of one officer's home, physical threats and verbal abuse. All of these problems are attested to by management and the staff interviewed by the team.
>
> It was troubling to the team that these issues as well as other structural systems concerns have been clear to prison management for around three years. It is also clear to the team that these problems cannot be solved within the present structure of Northfield Prison Complex. The destructive tension between the two main groups of staff is having a clearly destabilising and confusing effect on prisoners.

We also inherited a prison system where there was no reward for effort. The worst offenders were put into the best accommodation in Yatala. We inherited a prison system with poorly developed education and rehabilitation programs and

very little in the way of work programs, rendering it almost impossible to rehabilitate a person during the time they were in gaol. At Port Augusta Prison we inherited a standstill on building work because the major contractor had gone into liquidation.

We inherited the almost completed Mount Gambier Prison—a prison for just 56 inmates—completely defying, through its small size, all national and international trends for cost effective prison administration. The facility was inappropriately built as a group of houses, expensive to build due to its design and would be equally expensive to manage in that form. At a Correctional Services Ministers' conference in Sydney in May this year, I found that Labor's Mount Gambier Prison concept was the laughing stock of Australia.

We inherited a department without a forward plan and a prison system with a high level of staff absenteeism and associated call backs and overtime, as well as an unacceptably high WorkCover claim level. In short, this Government inherited Australia's most expensive and probably worst managed Correctional Services system. In the past eight months we have set about the task of rebuilding Correctional Services and giving the department direction with a sense of purpose.

The problems I have outlined are just a summary of some of the things we have found. I now report to the House what has been achieved to date. Early administrative action was taken to cease the release from prison of inappropriate offenders onto home detention. This action resulted in increased prisoner numbers. In May this year, the prison system was 72 beds short for the numbers it needed. At that time, as an interim measure, prisoners slept on mattresses on the floor while additional accommodation was being prepared.

This Government, having finalised and resolved construction-related difficulties at the Port Augusta Prison site, resumed construction work. On 14 June 1994, Port Augusta Prison extensions provided 88 more beds. In addition, 52 bunks were installed in that prison to cater for expanding prisoner numbers. At Port Lincoln, the prison was reconfigured to add nine more prisoners and reduce staff levels to make it a more cost effective institution. Additional accommodation was created for high and medium security prisoners at Yatala by moving 70 remand prisoners to the Adelaide Remand Centre. Extra accommodation was provided at the Remand Centre by installing 90 bunks.

The installation of the bunks at the Adelaide Remand Centre and at Port Augusta Prison fulfilled the medium term need to provide additional accommodation quickly. The recommendation of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody highlights a clear need to provide dual accommodation cells to reduce the potential for suicide. More than half of the inmates at Port Augusta Prison are of Aboriginal descent. At Adelaide Remand Centre, as well as prisoners of Aboriginal descent, remandees, because they have not been sentenced, are vulnerable and volatile. They are unsure as to what is likely to happen to them and therefore can benefit from sharing a cell with someone else with whom to talk about their concerns.

Even with this dual cell accommodation, South Australia still has comparatively low dual cell numbers. As at yesterday, 18.5 per cent of the prison population was in dual cells. This compares with 25.1 per cent in Victoria. We do, however, recognise the managerial benefits of a higher proportion of single cell accommodation, and for that reason new accommodation, including that presently under construction at Mount Gambier, is to be single cell. We have put in place a forward plan known in the department as 'Prison 2000'. This plan details a blueprint for the configuration of the prison system from now to the year 2000 when it is expected we will need to accommodate approximately 1 800 prisoners.

I have previously announced that this will necessitate the building of a 500 to 700-bed prison in or near the Adelaide metropolitan area. It is likely that, subject to the passage of legislation presently before this House, the new prison will be private sector designed, built and possibly financed. High staffing levels of the department have been considerably reduced. At the time we were elected to Government there were 1 333 departmental staff. A total of 133 staff have now accepted targeted separation packages—a staff reduction by 10 per cent—while at the same time accommodating extra prisoners.

South Australia's prisons now have a capacity to hold 1 464 prisoners, and today there are 1 335 prisoners. Therefore, there are 129 empty beds, despite the fact that there are 102 prisoners more than when we were elected to office. New management has been placed at the helm of the department and has also been installed at the Adelaide Remand Centre and Northfield Prison Complex to tackle the particular difficulties at those sites.

I take this opportunity now to highlight finally to the House the significant reforms which have occurred at the Yatala Labour Prison—reforms which would not have been possible without the total support of staff at that institution. Staff of Yatala were advised that they needed to reduce the number of staff at that prison; change the regime of the prison so that it provided prisoners with incentive for reward for effort; and operate the prison under a regime of unit management, devolving responsibility to more officers.

As a consequence, the staff formed a committee of 16 representatives, which deliberated for a period of approximately one month and devised a plan which was implemented on Thursday 18 August 1994. Yatala staff have:

- reduced their staffing levels by 28—the first time staffing levels have been reduced at Yatala under any Government.
- undertaken what is probably the largest single movement of prisoners in our State's history—more than 300 prisoners were moved to different cells in Yatala Labour Prison to create the regime proposed by Yatala staff.
- Yatala's E Division, which comprises the old Northfield Hospital and has for many years housed two prisoners to a cell, is now a reception and assessment area. All new prisoners admitted to Yatala will start off in E Division. Prisoners who demonstrate that they are prepared to be rehabilitated and behave will 'earn' a move to B Division.
- B Division is now a high security section offering single cell accommodation. Prisoners who continue their rehabilitation and behave will 'earn' a move to F Division which is now operated as a medium security division. This is the best accommodation in the prison system—the accommodation built by Labor where each cell has its own shower and toilet facilities.
- F Division is now also the prison's working division. These prisoners have access to the best jobs in the prison system in recognition of their effort.

This is the regime that has been devised by Correctional Services staff at Yatala and I pay tribute to the effort of these staff to make sure their plan was put into effect. In the words of some of the Yatala staff, they 'sink or swim' by their own changes. The staff at Yatala have demonstrated an unprece-

dented contribution in their endeavours to help reform the State's prison system. There is still a long way to go at Yatala but the prevailing staff attitude will assist this Government in delivering the necessary reforms.

Yatala will also be the focus for work program changes. The State's prison system does not have sufficient work for all prisoners. This Government has therefore set the objective of ensuring that prisoners are gainfully occupied during the day and have the opportunity to work to assist with their rehabilitation process. New education and rehabilitation programs have already been implemented and others are being developed. To create prisoner work opportunities, we are seeking to sign agreements with private sector companies to have part of their manufacturing process undertaken within the prison system. This is in contrast to the system used in Victoria where prison industries were established to compete with the private sector.

Our focus is on companies which are experiencing difficulty competing with overseas imports and would therefore benefit from having part of their manufacturing process undertaken in our prison system. The conditions of any agreement will be stringent, with an insistence that prison labour cannot be used to reduce the work force outside the prison—

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Apart from this being the longest travesty of a ministerial statement, I believe that the Minister is now canvassing legislation before the House this week.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. I point out to the Minister that he is making a particularly long ministerial statement. I ask him to draw it to a conclusion.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: There are some six paragraphs remaining.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will complete his ministerial statement.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: All the noise over there is surprising, because they made this mess in the first place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will withdraw leave if the Minister does not complete his statement.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The conditions of any agreement will be stringent, with an insistence that prison labour cannot be used to reduce the work force outside the prison but rather will help guarantee the jobs of South Australians outside the prison system and assist the viability of South Australian companies. Similar measures have worked well in New South Wales and the United States of America. This prison industry proposal has been welcomed by the South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The first agreement has been negotiated in principle and will be announced by the Government in the near future.

The Attorney-General and I have focussed attention on remand numbers. Through improvements to court processes and through ensuring that bail can be granted to remandees with no fixed address, the remand level has been reduced to below 20 per cent. This is well on the way toward achieving our objective of reducing remand levels to the Australian average.

In addition, the Attorney-General has released a discussion paper on fine payment options in a bid to reduce numbers imprisoned for fine default. It is this Government's objective to reach a situation where it can close the fine default facility and no longer have people needlessly languishing in gaol, at the taxpayers' expense, for not paying fines.

A staff support program is now in place to help Correctional Services officers reduce sick leave and WorkCover claims and is already having a significant effect.

It has been a tough eight months for my department. I pay tribute to those officers who have dedicated themselves to the implementation of those changes. They dislike the tag of being Australia's most expensive prison system and are determined to reduce the cost of imprisonment in South Australia. It also needs to be said that much of this reform I have detailed would not have been achieved without the presence of the Bill before the House tomorrow to allow private management of part of the State's prison system.

While a great deal has been achieved in eight months, there is still more reform to occur within the department and I look forward to revealing further details in a briefer ministerial statement as that occurs.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier stand by his assurance that public transport fares will not increase above inflation, or will he confirm that in May the Government deferred a proposal for a mid-year CPI-based increase in public transport fares so that much larger increases for passengers in outer suburbs could be introduced later this year?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, let me make quite clear that this Government has set out to build up the public transport services of South Australia, and it has made that a specific priority. It has introduced TransAdelaide and it has set up the Passenger Transport Board, which was a very innovative and important move. Look at what happened under the previous Labor Government: over 11 years this State literally lost millions of passenger transport journeys each year. At the same time, that same Labor Government substantially increased public transport fares. The position of the Liberal Government was, first, that it implement a new Passenger Transport Board and that it introduce competitive tendering, so that the costs of supplying the same services would be reduced and the taxpayers of South Australia would not have to make a commitment of millions of dollars.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am glad the member for Giles is interjecting because, as Treasurer under the former Labor Government, he had a commitment to make sure—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Numerous breaches of Standing Orders—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation across the Chamber. I cannot hear the member for Giles.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you very much, Sir. Numerous breaches of Standing Orders have occurred in the address that has just been given by the Premier, one in particular being that he referred to me as 'he' rather than as 'the member for Giles', and that is definitely out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In response to the member for Giles, I point out that it is also contrary to Standing Orders to continually interject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier will refer to members by their district.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I point out that, under the former Labor Government, all these journeys on our passenger transport system were lost and that the taxpayers' contribution continued to rise. The exact figure is enormous—roughly $1 billion over a 10-year period—and the previous Government did absolutely nothing to reduce the costs of delivering those services. All it had to do was to introduce competitive tendering, because a Cabinet submission introduced by the former Minister under the Labor Government revealed that, if it had brought in competitive tendering, it could have saved the taxpayers of South Australia about $35 million a year.

What did members opposite do in government? They sat on their hands and did absolutely nothing. They were prepared to have the taxpayers of South Australia continue to pay an extra $35 million because they were not prepared to introduce competitive tendering within the public transport system. This Government having introduced a new Bill, we now have a commitment at long last that over a three year period we will be able to have competitive tendering for up to 50 per cent of our services.

The Government has introduced TransAdelaide and taken a number of other initiatives to minimise the level of graffiti and damage done to public transport, both buses and trains, in South Australia, trying at the same time to improve the quality of service by revising timetables. The Government has been looking and will continue to look at restructuring fares, because we believe that the present fare structure is particularly unfair on people who take shorter journeys.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport has been asked to come up with a new structure on fares: there is no secret about that. So far she has not come up with a satisfactory system and in the meantime the existing fare structure will continue. If the honourable member requires any further information I suggest that he sit back and wait until the budget is introduced on Thursday.

The SPEAKER: In the absence of the Minister for Infrastructure, questions otherwise addressed to that Minister will be taken by the Minister for Industrial Affairs. In the absence of the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources will answer questions otherwise directed to that Minister.

PUBLIC SECTOR TENURE

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): My question is directed to the Premier. What decisions, if any, has the Government taken in relation to public sector tenure?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government has not taken any decision except to continue the permanency or no-redundancy policy in the public sector. The Government recently put that position down and confirmed it in the Industrial Commission through the Minister for Industrial Affairs. The sort of rhetoric coming from the Opposition this morning, particularly from the member for Ross Smith, highlights the fact that the Labor Party is in something of a bind on this issue. I take the member for Ross Smith back to what his own Leader, as the then Premier, said in April last year in his Meeting the Challenge statement. Perhaps the member for Ross Smith may care to listen to this, because he seems to be out there deliberately making a lame duck of his own Leader. The Leader of the Opposition has one position which he stated in this House last year as Premier and which he has stood by until now, but then we have the member for Ross Smith overriding it this morning. Incidentally, this was not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This was not the only issue upon which the Leader of the Opposition was made a lame duck this morning. We had the shadow Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources coming out and saying that she would reject the storage, on a temporary basis, of radioactive waste at Woomera. Yet, the former Labor Government actually wrote to the Federal Labor Government over a number of years and embarked on a program of discussing the possibility of storing radioactive waste in South Australia at Woomera.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will bring some other matters to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition in a moment. Twice this morning the Opposition Leader's own shadow Ministers have made him a lame duck Leader. The Leader of the Opposition is over there, holding up one policy as he has done up until now, while, apparently without consultation, his colleagues have taken an entirely different tack.

A so-called draft Bill on public sector employment has been reported in the media this morning, but I stress that that draft Bill has not been approved by Cabinet for Parliament. So far it has not been the subject of any consultation whatsoever. It is a very preliminary draft and it has been misinterpreted, because the contract provisions were never intended to apply to all Government sector employees. In that Bill they were intended to apply to only the executive level or other key appointments. If there was a specific project, for instance, which had a life of three or four years, you might appoint someone to run that project on a contract basis for a three or four year period. Therefore, to come out and make these suggestions, based on a preliminary draft which has not been endorsed for introduction by Cabinet and which has not even gone to the trade unions involved or to Government employees for consultation, is inappropriate, because I promised to do that.

I sent a letter to the PSA on 4 March this year saying that the Government intended to introduce amendments to the legislation and that there would be an appropriate period for consultation. I reinforced that fairly recently with Jan McMahon, the PSA General Secretary, and the Government will stand by that arrangement. First, let me make it quite clear that nothing should be inferred from the draft legislation, which has not yet had the Government's endorsement and which has not yet even been to the Parliamentary Liberal Party. Therefore, it has no standing whatsoever. I stress the fact that this Government is about making sure that we achieve improved management of the public sector in South Australia. That has been needed for some time, because the former Labor Government clearly failed to provide that leadership and management.

We need to make sure that people at the senior levels of the Government sector are held accountable. We also need to ensure that as senior executives they are able to stand up and meet certain performance criteria and, therefore, that the Government Management and Employment Act reflects the

requirement for CEOs to carry out management of their respective Government departments more effectively.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is also directed to the Premier. Has the Government agreed to recommendations by the Minister for Transport to restructure public transport fares with increases ranging up to three times existing fares in a number of areas? The Opposition has been given a copy of a submission to Cabinet yesterday signed by the Minister for Transport on 18 August 1994 recommending sweeping increases in fares for public transport to take effect from January 1995. For example, a multi-trip ticket for long distance journeys out of peak time presently costs a pensioner $3.60. It would leap to $10.20 according to the Laidlaw plan. The Laidlaw submission also recommends that the cost of a four zone multi-trip ticket should increase from $14.60 to $20.50 and the two section multi-trip ticket, which now costs $8.50, is replaced by a one zone ticket costing $14. Or has the Minister for Transport been rolled from this social-justice-in-reverse submission?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can assure the House and the public of South Australia that the Government has rejected the proposed fare restructuring. It has rejected those proposals—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —on the basis that they did not conform with Government policy.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have just been asked by a Minister to table a Cabinet document, and I am quite happy to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader well knows that he is not in a position to table documents.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Well, I was just asked to do so by a Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader. The member for Frome.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mr KERIN (Frome): My question is directed to the Premier. Has the South Australian Government approved a Commonwealth decision to deposit low level radioactive waste at Woomera?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, I know that this matter will be of intense interest to you, because the site is in your electorate. I stress to the House—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am sorry, apparently it is in the Giles electorate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Federal Government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Federal Government wrote to me last week indicating that it had taken a decision to store low grade radioactive waste at Woomera on a temporary basis. I was annoyed when the Federal Government took this decision and implemented it in the manner that it did. It did not give the South Australian Government the opportunity to either accept or reject the very specific proposal that was put forward. There had been ongoing discussions, commencing in 1991—in fact, earlier than that, but certainly confirmed in 1991—under the former Labor Government, about the possible storage of low grade waste at various locations around Australia.

South Australia, Woomera in particular, was one of the locations being looked at. I have already detailed to the House how that was confirmed both by Cabinet decisions of the former Government and by correspondence dated 2l October 1991, sent by the then Deputy Premier and Minister for Health, Dr Hopgood, to the Federal Government's Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, Simon Crean. As this is not new, I found it astounding this morning that the shadow Minister for the Environment in another place should be saying that the Labor Party of South Australia will not accept the storage of this low grade waste.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was the Leader. The Opposition seems to chop and change from day to day. I have a letter from Dr Hopgood, who happened to be the Minister at the same time that the present Leader happened to be a Minister (I presume they sat around the same Cabinet table; I presume they sat there and put the same stamps on the same documents), clearly indicating the willingness of the Labor Government in South Australia to negotiate with the Federal Labor Government about the storage, on a temporary basis, of low grade radioactive material at Woomera.

It is interesting to note that on 27 September 1993 the Leader of the Opposition, who was then Premier, sat at the head of the Cabinet table when a Cabinet submission was presented about a national radioactive waste repository. The proposal reads:

> The proposal was to brief Cabinet on developments for the Commonwealth Government's proposals to establish a national radioactive waste repository for the disposal of low level radioactive waste and for temporary storage of some waste at Woomera.

The Leader of the Opposition was sitting in the chair and the proposal was actually signed in the Cabinet under his name. Nowhere in the Cabinet submission does it say that the Labor Government of South Australia rejected the storage of this waste material at Woomera. It goes on and indicates clearly that the Labor Government of South Australia was continuing in negotiation with the Federal Government for the storage of that low grade waste at Woomera. In fact, let me read just one or two sentences, as follows:

> The most preferred of such options is an interim measure to store the waste on a temporary site on Commonwealth land at Woomera rangehead. An interim measure is necessary because of the time delay in identifying and preparing the final repository site selected.

That quite clearly shows that the former Government was willing to sit down and in fact had a preferred option. Its preferred option was to allow this low grade waste to be stored at Woomera.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE: The Premier is reading from a document. We ask him to table the entire document.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the Premier prepared to table the document? He may if he wishes, but it is not required because it is not a Government docket.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is not a Government document—

The Hon. S.J. Baker: It's not a Government docket.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is not a Government docket.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not need guidance from the left. I ask the Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is up to the Premier if he wishes to table the document. However, as it is not a Government docket, Standing Orders do not require him to do so.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am willing to make available quite freely copies of what I have here, because it is pretty embarrassing stuff for the Labor Party. At the bottom of this two page Cabinet submission, it has 'In Cabinet', it is noted and signed by Lynn Arnold, and it is dated 27 September 1993.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Members seem to believe that, if I pick up a Government docket and quote from it, I am required to table it in the Parliament. I have here a photocopy and I am quite willing to make it available to every member of the House, if they like, and to the media also. It is pretty embarrassing stuff. How could the Labor Party in September last year tell the Federal Government that it was willing to have uranium here in South Australia at Woomera, yet this morning, when the announcement is made, come out and say they will not accept it? How hypocritical! Here is this straw man, purporting to be the Leader of the Opposition, who sways from year to year in terms of what he stands up for. When will the Leader of the Opposition stand up and be consistent? Last year he argued for a change in tenure for public servants: this year he rejects it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Last year he said it was okay to store low-grade uranium at Woomera on an interim basis: this year he rejects it. That highlights how the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party have no idea where they are heading in South Australia.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer confirm, or will he deny, that from 1 October 1994 public transport tickets will no longer be issued to children holding schoolcard benefits? In her submission to Cabinet dated 18 August, which recommends increased fares for public transport, the Minister for Transport advised Cabinet that calculations were based on the assumption that schoolcard transport benefits will cease on 1 October. The submission states:

> The estimates in this submission assume that the issue of schoolcard tickets will cease at the end of the third school term in 1994.

This would cut benefits to schoolcard holders by $3.5 million. This is all in the submission which, unlike the Premier, I am prepared to table in this Parliament.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The honourable member is involved in budget speculation. He will have to wait until Thursday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith has had a pretty fair go this afternoon. The Chair has been most tolerant.

Mr Brindal: More than a fair go!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

McDONNELL INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of the benefits that may accrue to South Australia and our health services from the investment by McDonnell Information Systems announced this morning?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This morning I was pleased to announce an in-principle agreement between the Government and McDonnell Information Systems (MDIS), which is a leading international software health computer development company. The proposal is to develop a major hospital based computer software project which comes from the international parent company in London, McDonnell Douglas. The Australian company won the right to help develop this throughout the world. We have grasped the opportunity to set up the project in South Australia, taking it from under the noses of at least two other States.

I am delighted to announce that the project, which will generate more than 30 jobs in South Australia by July next year and possibly up to 40 in a couple of years after that, will begin immediately. Mr Richard Jackson, the Managing Director of MDIS, was in Adelaide this morning attempting to look at accommodation which his company will lease to start work on this project on 1 October this year. The project links the South Australian Government's initiatives in a number of other areas to be regarded as the 'Smart State' in computer technology, and it is a great coup for the system that we have managed to get MDIS to South Australia.

As I indicated, MDIS is a large international company with over 1 600 employees. The important part for South Australia is that there are over 400 hospital clients of MDIS so, if we get this clinician driven system up and running in South Australia, there is an enormous export potential which the MDIS Managing Director indicated this morning could be as high as several hundred million dollars. Obviously, this is a very significant project for South Australia.

The project was not won on the basis of financial benefits, because the benefits in the other States outbid our claims. What won the contract for South Australia was the Government's commitment to be regarded as a 'Smart State' in the computer area, the fact that the South Australian health system was prepared to go out on a limb and be part of this international project in a creative and lateral thinking way, and the cogency of the whole of the South Australian Health Commission with its service provision to about 1.4 million people. The benefits are as follows: the short-term benefit to South Australia of $13 million being invested over the next few years; the 30 to 40 jobs that will be generated; the significant exports that will obviously accrue; and the fact that international recognition will once again focus on Adelaide as a place to do business. Obviously, for the clients or patients in the public hospital system, anything that improves management, clinical systems and so on will be of benefit to them.

So, once again the South Australian health system is looking to the future, and it will be able to provide better than state-of-the-art computer technology and obviously will be part of the Government's drive for economic health. I believe that the Health Commission can be a great part of the economic drive to increase South Australia's export potential.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services. Did the Minister for Transport present a family impact statement to Cabinet to support her recommendations for higher fares for the outer suburbs and less in concessions on public transport and, if not, why not?

The Premier and Minister recently announced that, in recognition of the Year of the Family, Cabinet would require all submissions to outline the effect and impact that recommendations in those submissions would have on families. The submission presented to Cabinet recommending increased fares made no mention of the impact on families but did acknowledge that it was based on the cessation of schoolcard tickets and acknowledged that long distance travellers in the northern and southern suburbs, short distance one-way travellers and some inter-peak travellers would be disadvantaged. Where was the family impact statement?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When the Government and the Premier announced recently that family impact statements would be introduced, we made quite clear that it would occur after November this year. We have made that clear, because there needs to be consultation with the CEOs of all departments. However, let me ask the honourable member a question. Why did the previous Government do away with family impact statements after they had been introduced by the previous Liberal Government? The previous Liberal Government introduced family impact statements which ran for the term of that Government and which, immediately on coming into office, the Labor Government removed from Cabinet decision making. Let the Opposition answer that; let it tell us why it took that action when in government. As far as I am concerned, I am delighted that family impact statements are to be reintroduced. They are supported strongly by my Party and they will be introduced in November this year after the appropriate consultation with all departments.

YOUNG FARMERS INCENTIVES SCHEME

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I address my question to the Minister for Primary Industries. What response has been received following the Government's decision to extend eligibility for the Young Farmers Incentives Scheme, which entitles all men and women under the age of 30 who are interested in entering the industry to apply for interest rate subsidies to buy or lease properties?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the member for Flinders for her question and interest in this matter, because it is vital not only to her electorate but also to young people who want to enter farming all over South Australia. One of the commitments made by the Liberal Party before the last election was that we would introduce a scheme to help young farmers, and I must say that the Government has ensured that the scheme is carried out. Members would understand that we have provided $7 million over three years for this scheme. Already the department has answered some 850 telephone inquiries for information about this scheme.

The Premier announced at the Farmers Federation annual meeting recently that we would backdate the scheme to 11 December because some young people claimed that they had made financial decisions prior to its implementation in May. Since May, 10 young people have already been helped, to a total of $45 000 per annum over a three or five year period. We are adamant that we wish to spend the money allocated and budgeted for the Young Farmers Incentives Scheme, because if the State's agricultural future is to be in any hands at all it is very important that these young people, who are our future farmers, have a chance. I reiterate that the scheme is not there to help the sons and daughters of wealthy farmers: it is there to help people who want to go on the land and who have not had the opportunity, who do not have the means or whose parents do not have the financial security to allow them to go on the land.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I have been noted for that, as the honourable member said. It is not only for those who want to purchase land. Some people seem to think it is to purchase land. Many farmers in South Australia today started by leasing land or by going into share cropping arrangements. If young people can show enough initiative to go out into those two areas, the Government is prepared to stand behind them to ensure that South Australia's farming is in good hands in the future.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister representing the Minister for Transport confirm that increases in public transport fares proposed to Cabinet yesterday by the Minister for Transport are necessary for the success of the Government's policy on tendering out public transport services? In her submission, the Minister for Transport advised Cabinet as follows:

> Fare levels are currently very low. In the longer distance categories, Adelaide fares are significantly below those of interstate public sector operators.

The submission also states:

> The Government is preparing to implement a policy of competitive tendering and there is a need for a new fare structure which will complement the service reforms.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: For one who rides a bike, it will probably not make any difference at all. As the Premier clearly said in answering the question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Premier clearly outlined the position when he answered the question, and the Treasurer said it far more succinctly when he suggested that members should wait until Thursday.

NATIONAL COMPETITION POLICY

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Premier report to the House on the outcome of last Friday's meeting of the Council of Australian Governments in Darwin and explain in particular why South Australia is holding out to obtain a fair share of increased Commonwealth revenues to be generated by the introduction of a national competition policy?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections on my left.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It would be nice to know where the Labor Party of South Australia stood on the issue of competition policy. It is opposed to bringing private funds to or selling the airports; it is opposed to the selling of ANL; it is opposed to any competitive tendering, as we found with the Passenger Transport Bill; and it is opposed to every single principle laid down by the competition policy that has been enunciated by its Federal colleagues. It is as if we have two quite separate Labor Parties: one here in South Australia, which is dead opposed to anything to do with competition, selling anything or competitive tendering; and one in Canberra which keeps pushing this policy of competition. One has to ask why the Labor Party in Canberra pushes it. One of the fundamental reasons is that the Labor Party in Canberra can see an opportunity to substantially increase the amount of revenue it gets out of the States.

Estimates prepared here in South Australia indicate that the amount of money that would be transferred from the State to the Federal Government under a competition policy is initially likely to be about $100 million and, ultimately, well over $200 million and up to $300 million. Yet, on Friday all that Prime Minister Keating had to offer the State of South Australia was $12 million a year in compensation for five years. That is the sort of Federal Labor colleagues that the South Australian Labor Opposition has. The Labor Party has no regard whatsoever for the position of State Governments throughout Australia. The one thing that came through in Darwin on Friday was that the Federal Labor Government would like to see the power and the influence of the States diminished very significantly.

I think it is time that the Labor Party in this State stood up and clearly told us whether it is in favour of competition and the sort of policies being enunciated and thrust down the throats of every State Government in Australia by its Federal colleagues. When will Opposition members be prepared to stand up and take on Keating, Willis and their Federal colleagues? It is time that the Labor Party in South Australia stood up and was counted. Where does it stand on Hilmer and on these key policies that are being thrust upon the States by Keating?

Mr Cummins interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In answer to the member for Norwood, I can indicate that Friday was largely a waste of a day for two reasons, first, because the Federal Government came along absolutely ill-prepared for the COAG meeting. It had draft legislation which was not consistent with its own State-Federal agreement and which was not consistent with the communique that it prepared. It was interesting, because the Federal Government prepared a 45-page communique, which it slipped under the doors of State Premiers at about 12 o'clock at night, expecting us to agree to it the next morning.

The communique grossly misrepresented the position of the States. For example, it advocated that there should be a national WorkCover system—again, apparently Labor Party policy. When will the Labor Party in this State stand up and say whether it agrees with the abolition of WorkCover in South Australia and handing over the responsibility for that to the Federal Government?

When I pointed out to the Prime Minister that his communique contained lies, he said, 'But it is only a draft.' As one of the other Premiers immediately retorted, 'That means it was a draft lie.' It highlights the fact that Friday was a day that Mr Keating and Mr Willis would rather forget, because they came along absolutely ill-prepared. They were prepared to offer next to nothing to the States in terms of compensation—a mere $12 million a year for five years to South Australia. What concerns me is when the Labor Party in South Australia is going to have the gumption to stand up and oppose this centralisation of power in Canberra. When will the Labor Party in South Australia stand up for this State rather than cling to the coat tails of Keating, as the former Premier did on every possible occasion?

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier rule out the introduction of a distance-based fare structure imposing increased fares for outer urban areas, as contained in the Laidlaw submission, and changes to the inter-peak fare structure?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government has made no decision whatsoever in terms of any change in public transport fares. The current fare structure—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hart. He has had fair warning today. The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The current fare structure already has a difference in terms of distance travel.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No. The present fare structure already has—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The present fare structure already has a clear differential for the distance travelled and, as I stressed, the Government continues to support that fare structure.

INDUSTRIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr BUCKBY (Light): My question is directed to the Premier. Is the Government cutting programs to assist South Australian industry?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can assure members opposite that in this year's budget they will find a very substantial increase in funds to be spent this year to assist industrial development, industrial expansion, the establishment of new industries and the creation of jobs. That is the main priority of the Liberal Government, and so it should be, after the devastation inflicted upon the young unemployed in South Australia over the 11 years of Labor administration.

We have a sharp comparison between the former Labor Government and this Liberal Government, which has a clear focus on making sure that new industry establishes and expands in this State under its industrial incentive scheme, and at the same time we are taking on new trainees within Government. I was able to announce over the weekend that this year we will be taking on 700 additional trainees. Those 700 trainees within Government will get work experience, training and employment for 12 months. The level of training and the number of trainees taken on by the Liberal Government in its first 12 months will be three times higher than in the last 12 months of the Labor Government. That shows the additional commitment that the Liberal Party has to training and taking on new employees in South Australia.

I also point out that, although the Leader of the Opposition yesterday said, 'But we allocated $40 million for our

economic development program last year,' it could spend only $20 million of it. That was because no company would come near South Australia under the former Government. It had only three companies negotiating with it, using the Housing Trust incentive scheme for a new factory. Eight months into this Liberal Government, we have 30 companies negotiating with the Government over the establishment of new Housing Trust factories. That is the sort of dramatic change that we have seen. There has been a tenfold increase in eight months in the number of companies negotiating to set up new factories under the Housing Trust scheme. That highlights the extent to which industry deserted South Australia.

At the end of the recession South Australia was the only State in the whole of Australia that had fewer jobs within the State compared with the beginning of the recession. We have 15 per cent fewer jobs compared with the beginning of the recession. We underwent the biggest loss of jobs and employment of any State in Australia, even including Tasmania. It is tragic, and it is now the job of this Government to rebuild the industry that will provide and create the job opportunities. When the honourable member sees the budget on Thursday, he will see a range of new initiatives that the former Government did not even have; but, most important of all, he will see $150 million committed to the establishment and attraction of that new industry and the creation of jobs.

The SPEAKER: In calling the member for Elizabeth, I suggest to the two members who sit in front of her that the member for Elizabeth has set a good example for a new member.

ORACLE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Premier. What measures were taken to ensure that the computer software company Oracle set up its Australian base in Adelaide? Oracle is the third largest software company in the world; it services 27 countries throughout the Asia-Pacific region. In view of the Government's stated commitment to establish South Australia as a centre for information technology, this would have been an important opportunity for our State. Oracle has instead decided to set up in Melbourne.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I can inform the honourable member that every effort was made to attract Oracle to this State. We believed that it would be a significant benefit to this State to have Oracle, as the honourable member said, the foremost company in the world in computer-based systems.

It is important for the House to understand that we are into this area in a big way. We are making every endeavour to get that critical mass of high tech computer-related applications up and running in South Australia. We have done particularly well already, but it would have been fantastic if we had been able to get Oracle to add to that sweet.

We already have Motorola and Australis. We are working on a number of other fronts to create that critical mass at the Levels campus and also as part of the MFP and the new IT Centre of Excellence. I can assure members that every endeavour was made. If the honourable member would like a briefing with the Minister, who is absent today, that can be arranged. I can assure this House that every possible endeavour was made to get Oracle to come to South Australia.

HIGH TECH INDUSTRIES

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): With the growing emphasis on developing high tech industries in South Australia, can the Minister for the Ageing explain what benefits this trend might have for older people and how the Government proposes to pursue such benefits?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The question is very timely. Recent events would suggest that a considerable amount of energy is being put into improving technology and technological innovation through community services for older South Australians. Members will be aware of the personal security alarms that have recently been made available to older people in this State. The alarms allow users to summon help by means of a radio signal beamed through their domestic telephones. The device also allows users to move freely around their homes, and for some older people and their family carers it has provided a new and convenient form of reassurance. I am sure that is something that all members of the House would support.

This technology is being further developed. However, I have recently had the pleasure of launching a product which not only incorporates a telephone linked personal alarm for the user but also offers a facility for streamlining the monitoring and management of care service providers to older people in their home. At a time when all community services are seeking ways of becoming more efficient and more adaptable to their customers' changing needs, I believe that this kind of technology has a considerable amount of promise.

Perhaps the greatest potential lies in the enhancements which technological innovations can bring to older people's independence. During recent months I have been delighted to meet a number of people who have had a vision of what technology could contribute to more user friendly homes: personal mobility, easier communication with friends and family, and so on. These people are working within our universities, in the private sector and, indeed, in the older community itself. The Government is keen to encourage this kind of thinking both for the contribution it can make to older people's quality of life and, of course, for its long-term market potential.

With South Australia still being proportionally the oldest State in the Commonwealth, it is most appropriate for us to be taking a lead, focussing our technological expertise on the needs of an ageing population. As a practical step to this end, I have asked the Commissioner for the Ageing to convene a group of interested people later this year to consider the application of technology to support independent living and to advise the Government on strategies for encouraging innovation in this field. It is something I am very keen to support and I would be glad to keep the House informed of these developments as they progress.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Does the Premier stand by his written, unequivocal commitment given to 25 000 members of the Public Service Association prior to the 1993 State election that 'the Government Management and Employment Act will remain', and will he guarantee that the Government will not introduce legislation that will take away from GME Act employees their right to permanency and their right to appeal on matters such as promotion and grievances?

The PSA in an election eve edition of its journal printed answers to questions supplied by each of the major political Parties. One question asked was:

> Are you committed to retaining the GME Act in its present form? If not, what changes will you make?

The answer from the then Liberal Opposition Leader was:

> The GME Act will remain.

Yet, in a radio news broadcast this morning, the Premier, in answer to the question 'Did you give any promises that you weren't going to change the Act?', said, 'Ah, look, I—I'm not going to comment on that.' Later it was reported that the Premier phoned back saying that the Government was keeping the Act as pledged but would be making changes.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: He found his script.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As the honourable member knows, and as I have already indicated to the House today, I wrote to the PSA on 4 March, I think, indicating that the Government was about to review the Government Management and Employment Act and that the PSA would be consulted on that. The answer is that the Act is being retained but there will be substantial change. In fact, there will be a complete rewrite of the Act: that is probably the easiest way of doing it. The Act will be retained. But, more importantly, there will be a chance for the union to have a say in it.

After all, I stress to the House that the former Premier, the now Leader of the Opposition, himself clearly indicated that he was intending to change the Act, to change the tenure, and apparently put more responsibility into Government departments. He apparently also indicated that he was willing to see more contract positions. I have made quite clear that, as far as this Government is concerned, when a suitable draft becomes available there will be consultation with the union and it will have a chance to go through the Act and respond to Government. No draft has yet been finalised to that point and the Government continues to maintain a very close liaison with the union on a range of matters.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been particularly tolerant but the patience of the Chair has now run out. I will not warn the member for Ross Smith again today: he will be named.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I make clear to the House that the Government will consult with the union at the appropriate time when a suitable draft of the Bill has been prepared.

STEAMRANGER

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Premier. What support and assistance is the Government able to provide to the volunteer organisation which owns and operates SteamRanger as a tourist train here in South Australia in its fight for survival with the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can indicate to the member for Ridley that the Minister for Transport wrote to the Federal Minister for Transport on 2 August this year seeking Federal Government financial assistance to allow SteamRanger to be relocated from its present location to Mount Barker. This is extremely important because, with the standardisation of the rail link, which is currently going through as one of the One Nation projects, by about March next year there will be only a standard rail link from Adelaide through to Melbourne and, therefore, the SteamRanger trains, which require a broad gauge, will not be able to run on that rail.

The honourable member, as a keen supporter of SteamRanger and the tourism services it provides, would know that, therefore, the service to Victor Harbor could not carry through from Adelaide: a new depot at Mount Barker would allow the relocation of locomotives and carriages from the Adelaide depot, and that would then allow SteamRanger to operate from Mount Barker right through to Victor Harbor. I am a very keen supporter of that service. Of course, it affects my own electorate. Literally thousands of young South Australians each year look forward to the prospect of riding on a steam train.

It is a unique tourist facility that we have in South Australia, but the responsibility for that must lie with the Federal Government, because that Government is introducing the standard rail link and should be putting up the $2 million to build the new depot at Mount Barker. I also commend the State Minister for Transport on the initiative that she has taken to write to all Federal members of Parliament seeking their support for this venture. The former Labor Government approached the Federal Government in May 1993 but could not get a commitment from its colleagues on that matter. That is when, in fact, the commitment should have been made: when the first announcement was made about the standardisation of the rail link from Adelaide through to Melbourne. So, I commend the honourable member for raising this issue. I am sure that he, along with most other members of this Parliament, will be out there supporting very strongly this move to get SteamRanger relocated to Mount Barker and to establish a depot there so that the SteamRanger services to Victor Harbor can be continued.

WEST LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Does the Minister for Family and Community Services support the call by the member for Lee for the West Lakes High School site, which the local community is pushing to be used for a low fee Anglican school, to be used as a close observation centre for what he describes as 'problem families'?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The previous Government approved the replacement of the ageing and inefficient youth detention facilities at both Enfield and Magill with two new facilities, each accommodating up to 36 young offenders. One of those new facilities is at Cavan and was opened some 12 months ago. The Magill Training Centre is inefficient to operate; it consists mainly of ageing and inappropriately designed buildings, and it occupies valuable real estate. It is now timely that the suitability of Magill be reassessed, in the light of 12 months experience in the new Cavan facility; the experience with the changes to the juvenile justice system, which were implemented on 1 January 1994; the new Government's policies and priorities; and the availability of an unoccupied potentially suitable site at Royal Park.

The department is currently assessing proposals in determining, first, its future needs for youth detention facilities; secondly, the feasibility of redeveloping the existing Magill facility on a reduced site; thirdly, whether it would be a more cost-effective option to build a new facility on a different site; or, fourthly, how the currently unoccupied

former West Lakes High School site at Royal Park could be utilised for youth detention and other purposes, should that prove to be the best option. It should be noted that the first and major component of the study being carried out will be to develop and assess the relative merits and indicative costs of several approaches, and the one now referred to by the Opposition is only one of those being considered. So, it is a matter that is still to be determined by the Government and one that is being considered as part of the review of this overall issue of how we can deal most effectively with these young people who need detention.

GAS EXPLORATION

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): My question is directed to the Minister for Mines and Energy. As the South-East has long been identified as having great potential for gas exploration and discovery—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I said 'as the South-East has'; don't be mean.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Can the Minister explain to the House what steps have been taken to prove up additional gas resources for the State?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in this area because, as you would know, he has been fundamental in much of the development that has taken place in the South-East and he has been pushing for his electorate for many years. Members would understand that the Katnook find, when it occurred a few years ago, caused considerable excitement in the South-East almost to the point of overwhelming the member for Mount Gambier, as he then was, because gas was very expensive in that city as it had to be produced there.

The discovery of the Katnook Well meant that gas could be piped to Mount Gambier as well as to the neighbouring electorate of MacKillop (Victoria, as it was then), to the Apcel factory, which employs 750 people. However, exploration and drilling have continued in the ensuing years because, if we are going to find enough gas to enable us to supply the Adelaide market from the South-East, it is very important that the exploration program continue. In fact, that has taken place and recently it has been announced that some $10 million will be spent on it. However, last Sunday another significant discovery took place and that was the Hazelgrove 2 Well, which flowed gas at the rate of seven million cubic feet per day. This adds to the field generally in the South-East, and goes quite a way towards proving up a reserve in the South-East that is large enough to ultimately some day help with gas supplies to Adelaide. So, Hazelgrove 2 is a very important discovery; it adds to Hazelgrove 1, which initially provided a new area of gas other than the Katnook field. The ongoing exploration that is occurring in the South-East augurs well for the development of not only the electorate of Gordon but also its very important neighbouring electorate.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport. Does the Government support policies to increase patronage on TransAdelaide services, or does it accept that increases in public transport fares averaging 9 per cent would reduce the number of people using these services? Although the Minister for Transport told Parliament on 17 February that the Government was determined to stop the falling patronage of STA services, her submission to Cabinet acknowledges that, as a result of her recommendations for new fares, patronage is also expected to decline by 2.4 per cent. This seems to be in contrast with the Premier's statement about patronage to the House earlier today.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I had the privilege some three or four years ago of being shadow Minister for Transport, and during that time one of the most outstanding issues in relation to transport was the increasing numbers of people that were moving away from the system. Under the 10 years of Labor, in the order of 10 million fewer rides were taken on public transport than under any previous Government, and at the same time there was a massive increase in cost to the system, from approximately $30 million to $40 million a year to over $150 million a year. The Opposition, which absolutely ruined the transport system in this State when it was in Government, seems to have no qualms at all about asking questions involving the transport system.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

The SPEAKER: I inform the House that this week is the one hundredth anniversary of the presentation of the original petition calling for the universal suffrage of women in this State.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): It is very interesting today to see the Government not only leaking: it is haemorrhaging. We have Ministers leaking against Ministers. We have the Brown camp leaking against the Olsen camp. We have backbenchers white-anting the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Affairs, and we have staffers for some Ministers leaking against other Ministers. Today's unprecedented leaking of a Cabinet budget submission is really about a Minister in the Upper House, Diana Laidlaw, who is not coping. Although publicly she talks in triplicate, privately she abuses staff and officials. It is quite clear that she is not coping with the volume of dockets or with her portfolio load and has clearly lost the confidence of many senior officials and, if we are to believe the Premier today, of some of her Cabinet colleagues—if she has actually been rolled. Certainly, the Premier was very quick to abandon the Minister for Transport.

What we have seen again in this submission is that the Premier would win a gold medal for breaking promises. Despite the Premier's fudging, the truth has laid bare the fact that public transport users will in some cases be facing a trebling of fares. In some cases, public transport users will face up to 300 per cent increases in fares under the Laidlaw plan—all in the name of helping to flog off a valuable public asset to their mates. As much as the Brown Government will

try to dress up these changes with a slick $500 000 television and radio campaign saying, 'Don't worry about it; it'll be all right on the night', voters—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. If I heard correctly, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to 'flogging off the transport system to their mates'. I believe that is an imputation against every member on this side of the House, and I object to it and believe it should be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: It is contrary to Standing Orders for any member to impute improper motives. The Chair's attention was distracted during that part of the honourable member's speech. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition whether he actually made the comment to which the member for Unley has alluded.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government trebling fares in the name of—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You asked me what I said, and I am reading it to you, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Do it quickly or the Chair will withdraw leave.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —all in the name of helping to flog off a valuable public asset to their mates.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the view that those remarks are getting very close to imputing an improper motive. I therefore leave it to the honourable member to withdraw if he is so inclined.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will continue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Will the members for Kaurna and Reynell tell their constituents when they discover that they will be hit with massive fare increases? Will they tell members of Cabinet what they think of this appalling decision? No matter what they say or ask, if this decision does not go ahead, it is quite clear that the Minister for Transport has lost the confidence of her colleagues and has lost the confidence, following her discussions with Treasury officials, of the Premier. Where do the members for Kaurna and Reynell and many of their colleagues in southern seats stand? Cabinet has chosen to embrace a scorched earth policy by wasting a few of its colleagues in the outer suburbs in an attempt to prop up inner city marginals. Some of the assertions made in the fare-increase Cabinet submission were simply astounding, and the section on social justice appeared to be a sick joke one week after the commitment about family impact statements.

Firstly, it asserted that a flat fare structure favours the better off. It would be a good idea if the Minister tried examining a social atlas and she may then discover where the people most in need in this State live, even though she has never visited them herself. Secondly, the submission appears to assume that we are in a situation of full employment, not double-digit unemployment, when it states:

> Low paid jobs are low paid because the skills they require are freely available. Employers can get the labour they need within a local catchment area. Conversely, specialist and managerial labour is more likely to be drawn from the metropolitan area as a whole.

That is quite simply a disgrace.

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Sir, I seek leave to table a Cabinet submission which I was challenged to do by a Cabinet Minister.

The ACTING SPEAKER: You are unable to table that document. It is not a point of order. The honourable member for Mawson.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It is interesting to listen to the preaching on the other side of the House but it would be a lot better for this State—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. As I understand it, the Deputy Leader sought leave of the House to table a document and you ruled that out of order. I am wondering if you might reflect on that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members other than Ministers do not have the right to table documents.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not suggesting that he has the right at all. All I am suggesting is that he asked for the leave of the House. Is the House refusing leave?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Does the House grant the honourable member leave? Leave is not granted.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is not a question for the House. The member for Mawson.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: For the past five minutes we have heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition preaching about social justice. Where was social justice under the previous Labor Government when it cut health funding to the McLaren Vale Soldiers District War Memorial Hospital?

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The member for Mawson has started speaking but the clock has not started, and we have already heard too much.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The problem has been rectified.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Where was social justice when the Labor Party cut funding to the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital?

Mr Andrew interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I rise again on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The member for Chaffey is interjecting out of his seat. Why cannot members on the other side of the House show the same amount of discipline as members on this side?

The ACTING SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld. The member for Chaffey is out of order to be interjecting out of his seat. The member for Mawson.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Of course, the Labor Party always tries to block the grievance debate when I, as the local member for Mawson, remind the House of how the former Government cut funding to the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital by 60 per cent over the past three years. The Labor Party talks about social justice. Members of the Opposition speak with forked tongues and are absolute hypocrites.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I am very pleased to say that the south, once again under the Brown Liberal Government, has gained. It did not gain much over the previous 10 years under the former Labor Government. I am delighted to say that Mawson, Finniss, Reynell, Kaurna, Fisher and Heysen have all gained, thanks to the Liberal Government. Yesterday at a public meeting at McLaren Vale I was able to advise constituents of Mawson that there is very good news for the McLaren Vale Hospital. The fact is that, thanks to the efforts of the Minister for Health, Michael Armitage, who is doing a very good job under difficult circumstances to keep health services going, the McLaren Vale Hospital now has autono-

my, direction and a future, something it clearly did not have under the previous Labor Government, which had a hidden agenda to destroy that hospital.

We have now made a decision whereby the McLaren Vale Hospital will be rezoned to a country zoning and become a private community hospital, fully recognising once again just how important the rural sector of my electorate is to this State and the general district. Yesterday, we were also able to advise that the Liberal Government has approved 25 private bed licences for the hospital and that, through the Public Service sector, it is able to take on casemix funding based on the 1993-94 budget allocation with access to the throughput pool. The hospital now has the flexibility to get on and operate as intended by the people who built it almost 50 years ago, namely, for the community of the southern area. The mix of private and public patient facilities and services now guaranteed by our Government will provide excellent flexibility for managing the hospital and ensure once and for all, under a Brown Liberal Government, that the hospital will continue to look after the constituents of the southern area.

The Premier made a commitment when he was Leader of the Opposition. He has honoured that commitment, and he did it within eight months of coming into Government. It is now up to the board and the community to get behind the hospital and forget the devastation that was wrought on the community and the hospital under the previous Government and stand up and be proud of their efforts in lobbying and supporting me as I work as the local member to make sure that the hospital continues to serve present and future residents in the southern area with the best of health care for many years into the future. In conclusion, I indicate clearly that I appreciate the Premier's support and that of the Minister for Health in their excellent decision.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I, too, want to talk about public transport fare reform but, before doing so, I refer to the comments of the Minister for Transport earlier this year when she said:

> The Liberal Government would regard the delivery of passenger transport services as one of the four basic areas for service delivery.

I refer to the document tabled by the Minister yesterday in Cabinet in terms of what she stated earlier this year. The Minister's document talks about the move to a zonal system of fares. It goes on to state:

> There would be significant innovations to travel conditions and a more uniform level of concessional discount.

The document then states that it assumes that the issue of schoolcard tickets will cease at the end of term three in 1994. For those members who do not know, the school-card is a Government grant to disadvantaged students that gives them $170 a year and enables students to have access to free public transport during school hours for 41 weeks a year. It will now cost $5.10 a week for each student, which means that needy families will have to spend an extra $200 a year to send their children to school.

Elizabeth City High School, a school which I know well, has 350 of its 600 students receiving the schoolcard and concessions and free travel as a result of the scheme that the Government now assumes will be done away with. The new fares show increases across all areas, and I will quote some of them. The document lists a number of fares, as follows: for people travelling two zones, there is a proposed increase of 16.4 per cent; for those travelling three zones, a 30 per cent increase; and, for those travelling four zones, the increase is 40 per cent. For concessional fares the increase is 36 per cent for two zones, 63 per cent for three zones and for four zones it is an increase of 183 per cent. For people who live further away—

Mr LEWIS: Mr Acting Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member claims the information she is quoting is already an accomplishment when in fact it is not and the Government has rejected such proposals. The member for Elizabeth is misrepresenting what the Minister said during Question Time.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Ms STEVENS: The Government has in mind that the people in the outer suburbs to the north and the south will suffer, and they will suffer greatly. They will suffer out of proportion. People who live a long way from the centre of a city suffer locational disadvantage, and that is a well known fact. The previous Government's method of scaling fees on a flat rate tried to address this disadvantage. I refer briefly to the amazing paragraph on social justice set out in the Cabinet submission. My colleague the Deputy Leader has already referred to it, but it needs to be put on the public record for its superficiality and falseness, and I quote it as follows:

> The current flat fare structure was introduced in January 1992 on the grounds of social justice for people living in poorer outer suburban areas. However, it is argued that low paid jobs are low paid because the skills they require are freely available. Employers can get the labour they need within a local catchment area. Conversely, specialist and managerial labour is more likely to be drawn from the metropolitan area as a whole. Accordingly, the flat fare policy has not worked because outer suburban residents tend to work near where they live and shop and recreate at their regional centres as opposed to the CBD.

This is an amazing way to treat a social justice issue: it is superficial and false, and the submission is not worth the paper it is written on. Therefore, I am pleased that Cabinet has knocked back the submission. However, the issue is that people in the outer areas need consideration. People in the outer areas need some help in meeting the transport costs with which they are faced.

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

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I wish to speak on a totally non-controversial issue. I commend the South Australian Police Traffic Safety Section, which has been headed by Sergeant David Hearn for many years. I wish I had encountered such a program when I was a young fellow, because it probably would have saved my father's car. I worked closely with Sergeant Hearn when I was involved in education, and I believe the work done by David and his team of nine is invaluable—although their work is often taken for granted, I refer to their sponsorship with SGIC and the fact that, through lectures and displays, the team makes contact with over 100 000 South Australians per year, and that includes adults, teenagers and junior primary school students. These lectures are very important to young people because they are able to discuss road safety laws and a variety of related matters in a relaxed and laid back manner. The work of the South Australian Police Traffic Safety Section is crucial and beneficial to all South Australians, especially young teenagers who sometimes, after the Grand Prix, believe that they are Nigel Mansel or some other famous formula one driver.

As members know, road accidents are tragic and devastating to many families. They cause so many innocent deaths, often involving young people. Many accidents produce

shocking injuries, permanent injuries and others sometimes require years of rehabilitation. If we can stop just one death or one serious injury, whether it prevents a person becoming a paraplegic or suffering brain damage, this program is well and truly worth it. The presentation by the lecturers is very positive and graphic. Certainly, it is a very professional presentation, and it is also laid back and extremely friendly; and the police officer lecturers have a marvellous rapport with young people. The section has a staff of nine people, and in 1993-94 it addressed more than 100 000 people.

The Youth Driver Education Program was presented to 201 groups comprising 15 080 students in senior schools across the State. The program was also presented to 201 groups of school crossing monitors comprising 10 200 children who are trained to work at crossings throughout the State. A further 202 adult groups were involved, comprising 6 200 participants. Obviously many people were involved in each session. Sixty-eight youth groups, involving 2 800 participants, took part in the program; and at Port Road, Thebarton (where the section is based) 248 groups involving 8 000 children from kindergarten to Year 7 visited the Children's Road Safety School. As to display units, 113 static units Statewide were produced, and 46 000 contacts were made with the public in that area. Certainly, I commend the work of the South Australian Police Traffic Safety Section and the work of Sergeant David Hearn.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I want to mention something of immediate concern in my electorate. I hope that the Premier looks at the map of the distribution of electorates, because he will notice that Woomera is in my electorate. Leaving that to one side, I refer to the decision apparently taken by the Federal Government to locate certain low level radioactive wastes into the Woomera area. If, as the Premier said, the Federal Government gave no notice to the State Government and did not have any substantial discussions with it, I certainly do not support that. There is no reason why the Federal Government ought not have had significant discussions with the State Government prior to making this decision.

The previous Government's position was very firm. On a couple of occasions we told the Federal Government, 'Put a firm proposal to us and we will have a look at it. No blank cheques will be given. Don't just come up with the idea—that is easy. Put a firm proposal, with such issues as how it will be stored, how it will be transported, etc.' This was not forthcoming prior to the election. Leaving all that to one side, there is a very important and substantial issue here, that is, what do we do with low level radioactive waste? It is a problem for the community, and I cannot see any reason at all why sensible debate cannot be held on this topic. It is merely another topic to be debated.

I do not accept that the 'not in my backyard' syndrome is appropriate. The position adopted by those who simply say that they do not want it here in South Australia lacks any moral or intellectual basis, because it is a very real problem. The benefits of this technology are enormous. For example, with respect to its medical use, whether it is medical imaging, CAT scans, X-rays, or the treatment of various cancers, the benefits to the human race are enormous and should not be cast out. However, at the same time some waste is generated and, if we are to enjoy the benefits of this technology, we ought to be able to sit down and work out how to deal sensibly with the waste. If you adopt the 'not in my backyard' approach, or 'in no circumstances will we have anything to do with the waste', and, if you have any integrity whatsoever, you should also argue for the other side of the coin: that is, there should be no more use of this technology in industry, medicine or any other area. In other words, no more X-rays, no more imaging, and no more cancer treatment: because the waste is too hard to deal with, we should go into the hospitals and switch off all the machines and stop people from having this treatment.

The point I am making is that you cannot have the benefits of this technology without dealing with the problems. Fortunately, it is a very minor problem. At the moment the waste is distributed all around Australia. There are probably at least a dozen areas in Adelaide that have this waste. It would probably do no harm for it to stay there. It is very low level waste and causes little or no offence to anybody if it is kept reasonably carefully. However, if the decision is that it is better for society to deal with this issue by concentrating the waste in one place, let us have that debate. It may well be that the best place is Woomera. It may not be. It may be that the best place is literally my backyard. But, wherever it is, let us have the debate. Let us not have this knee-jerk reaction by some people who say, 'We do not want it under any circumstances. We want the benefits but not the down side.' I for one am strongly in favour of having the debate, with society coming to a sensible decision, and that decision being carried out. Such is the very small nature of the problem, I believe a decision can be arrived at very quickly.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I would like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that, 100 years ago today, a petition for women's suffrage was presented to Parliament. Earlier this afternoon, a re-created petition containing 6 918 signatures was presented to the Minister for the Status of Women on the steps of Parliament House following its parade through the city by students from Annesley College, Gepps Cross Girls High School, Mitcham Girls High, Port Adelaide Girls High, St Mary's College and Wilderness.

The original petition of 11 600 signatures, measuring 120 yards, calling for the suffrage of women, was presented to Parliament at 2 p.m. on 23 August 1894. The great petition had been organised by Mrs Mary Lee, Honorary Secretary of the Women's Suffrage League, and distributed throughout the province by that group and the Women's Christian Temperance Union. The main purpose of the petition was to remove the plea that women had heard over the previous six Bills in eight years, that most women had not asked for the suffrage. The petition was presented on the day that the Women's Suffrage Bill, having passed all stages in the Legislative Council, moved to the House of Assembly.

I would like to take a moment to quote from the wording of the petition received in today's re-enactment. It is in three parts, and the first part states:

> . . . your petitioners are convinced of the absolute justice of equal rights for all people and that there is continuing evidence of inequality in education, in employment, in access to information and Government assistance; in health, in support for families, in housing, and in protection of the environment.

The second part of the petition asked young people to state where they lived and to bring matters of local concern to the attention of the Parliament. The third part of the petition states:

> They therefore respectfully pray that, when legislation is being prepared by your honourable House, provision for the removal of inequalities will be included.
> And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray. . .

Since the end of May, students from all secondary schools and young people from the community in South Australia and the Northern Territory have been invited to sign a petition supporting a request to the Government that it bear in mind the continuing inequalities in our society when it is preparing legislation. A number of other additional requests are also included from all areas where young people have signed the petition. I also mention that we have included the Northern Territory because, in the time of the original petition, the State and the Territory were included under the title of the Province of South Australia.

The event that culminated here today on the steps of Parliament House offered young people the opportunity to participate in an informative, historically accurate activity that compliments the range of suffrage centenary festivities taking place throughout our State this year. I would like to congratulate the six organising schools for a presentation important in its own value as well as its historical echo.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (FELONIES AND MISDEMEANOURS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): 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.

At common law, crimes developed as felonies and misdemeanours. In general terms, it might be said that, at least until relatively recent times, felonies were more serious crimes than misdemeanours. There are a number of exceptions to this, however, even of quite early date. One of the more obvious is that the ancillary offences—incitement, conspiracy and attempt to commit murder, for example,—are misdemeanours although murder is, of course, a felony and there are many felonies less serious than those misdemeanours. In general, the classification of common law offences is determined at common law.

The major significance of the division between felonies and misdemeanours originally lay in punishment. A felon forfeited all his or her property to the Crown, while the person guilty of a misdemeanour did not. Further, the felon was almost invariably subject to the death penalty whereas the person guilty of a misdemeanour was not. Neither of these consequences is remotely true in South Australia today.

South Australia inherited the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours in 1836. It remains in South Australian criminal law. But in the last century, the key classification of offences, which is all-important from a procedural point of view, has moved from the felony/misdemeanour distinction to that between indictable and summary offences and, latterly, major indictable, minor indictable and summary offences. It is these classifications which determine, for example, mode of trial, procedural steps and, to a degree, penal consequences.

It is quite clear that the designated classifications of crimes as felonies or misdemeanours at common law no longer makes any sense at all. For example, murder is a felony, but attempted murder is not. Manslaughter is not a felony, but attempted manslaughter is (by statute). A second example—one of the many possible—suffices to make the point. All larcenies are a felony—even the stealing of $2 worth of sweets from a shop. But an act of gross indecency with a minor is a misdemeanour.

These anomalies have been aggravated by the statutory designation of certain indictable offences as felonies by s. 5(2) of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act*. This section was inserted by the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Act*, No 90 of 1986. The principal purpose of this Act was to make large scale reforms to ancient offences dealing with assaults and the like and damage to property. The addition of s. 5(2) was a short hand way of preserving the existing felony status of many of the repealed offences for other purposes. It may have achieved that aim in a rough way—but it leads to further difficulties and anomalies.

The South Australian criminal justice system does not need the felony/misdemeanour distinction. One reason is its irrelevance. It outlived its reason for existence a century ago. There is simply no reason for its continued existence. A second reason is that its current form gives rise to what can charitably be called anomalies. The distinction is not only irrelevant, but also the distinction no longer makes sense. A third reason is that the vestiges of the distinction left in South Australian law affect the operation of other laws in a way that is counter-productive and that makes no sense. South Australian criminal law can do without these unproductive disputes.

Of all Australian jurisdictions, only New South Wales and South Australia retain the terms. It is more than time they were abolished.

Abolition of the distinction requires more than the mere replacement of the terms in question—although it involves at least that. That kind of routine and uncontroversial amendment may be found in the two Schedules to the Bill. But the abolition of the distinction also requires the examination of some areas of substantive criminal law.

They fall under the following headings.

1. The Felony Murder Rule

The felony murder rule goes back a very long time in the history of the criminal law at common law. In general terms, it is murder if a person kills another by an act of violence committed in the course of commission of a felony involving violence. The point of the rule is that an accused will be guilty of murder in such a case even if he or she has not had the fault elements (such as an intention to kill or cause grievous bodily harm) normally required for conviction for murder. This rule applies only in relation to felonies.

It was abolished in England in 1957, and is no longer law in the ACT. It has been declared to be contrary to the Charter of Rights in Canada. It was recommended for abolition by the Mitchell Committee, the Victorian Law Reform Commissioner, the Victorian Law Reform Commission, the Queensland Criminal Code Review Committee and the Canadian Law Reform Commission.

Against this unanimity of professional opinion, there can be no doubt that the doctrine has been employed in recent highly publicised cases in South Australia, and it has a certain popular appeal. When Victoria abolished the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours in 1981, it enacted a provision retaining the rule to a large degree.

This Bill adopts the latter course, despite a number of submissions to the Government that sought to have the rule abolished entirely. The reason is that such a reform would be controversial, and that controversy would be destructive of the main aim of the Bill—which is to abolish the anachronistic distinction.

2. Burglary and Allied Offences

South Australia has a very ancient structure of offences of dishonesty. It derives from the time at which the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours was central to the classification of offences. In many cases, it is possible to abolish the distinction quite simply. But in the cases of ss. 167-171 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act*, the irrationality of the ancient distinction still retains full hold.

The object of the Bill is to abolish the procedural distinction while retaining the status quo in terms of the substantive law so far as is possible. Literally, such an objective would require the Bill to restate the old distinction in modern legislative form. But such is the anomalous state of the law, that is neither wise, nor desirable—nor possible. Hence, the offences have been re-enacted with a scope as close as is possible to their intended scope.

3. Complicity

The common law rules are described by a noted authority as follows:

> "At common law the rules of complicity are exactly the same for both felonies and misdemeanours but different words describe them. If D instigates the commission of a felony, and the felony is in fact committed, he is called an accessory before the fact and what he has to do to become an accessory before the fact is counsel or procure the commission of the felony. If D participates in the commission of the felony he is called a principal in the second degree, as opposed to the person who actually commits it, who is called the principal

> in the first degree. To become a principal in the second degree D has to aid and abet the commission of the felony. If the crime is a misdemeanour, D's liability to conviction is still described in terms of counselling, procuring, aiding and abetting, but he is not called either accessory before the fact or principal in the second degree, and the person who actually commits it is not called principal in the first degree. Indeed, neither of them is called anything in particular as a matter of established custom. These categories. . . are quaint and have no significant bearing on the principles of responsibility for the promotion of crime.".

The Bill deals with all of this by simply enacting the common law formula of "aid, abet, counsel or procure" and applying it to all offences.

4. Power of Arrest

Currently, ss. 271 and 272 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act* contain a statutory version of the common law power of arrest. Because it predates the creation of the police force, it vests powers in private citizens.

It is arguable whether or not ss. 271 and 272 could simply be abolished without replacement. Certainly, s. 75 of the *Summary Offences Act* provides police with a comprehensive power of arrest without warrant. Section 272 is an anachronism and there appears to be no recent record of its use. However, in the interests of caution, and taking into account the fact that this Bill is not intended to constitute a review of powers of arrest, it has been decided to re-enact the effect of s. 271.

SUMMARY

The eminent criminal jurist, Sir James Stephen, writing in 1883, strongly advocated the abolition of the felony misdemeanour distinction on the ground that it had then grown to be irrational and no longer served any useful purpose in the criminal law. In 1994, in South Australia, that is all the more true because it is now causing anomalies and quite unnecessary complexities in the criminal law. The distinction simply does not belong in a modern criminal justice system. The home of the common law, England, abolished the distinction in 1967. In Australia, only New South Wales still has it (apart from this State). It is time that South Australia caught up with the rest of this country.

The Bill was introduced in the last session and has been lying on the Table of the House during the recess. The Government has conducted consultations on the terms of the Bill during the recess and has received favourable feedback from interested parties.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 5—Interpretation

Clause 3 substitutes a new subsection (2) in section 5 of the principal Act. The current subsection (2) deems certain offences to be felonies for the purposes of the Act. The abolition of the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours makes such a provision inappropriate. New subsection (2) specifies that notes written in the text of the Act form part of the Act. This consequential amendment is necessary because of the drafting style used in new sections 12A, and 167 to 171 and the amendments to 270b(1) and (2).

Clause 4: Insertion of s. 5D

Clause 4 abolishes the classification of offences as felonies and misdemeanours.

Clause 5: Insertion of s. 12A

Clause 5 inserts a new section 12A into the principal Act. New section 12A provides that a person who causes death by an intentional act of violence committed in the course or furtherance of a major indictable offence punishable by imprisonment for ten years or more is guilty of murder. This provision may be seen as providing a statutory replacement for the common law "felony-murder rule", although the scope of the statutory rule is somewhat different as it applies only to serious crimes. There is, however, a specific exception for causing death in the course or furtherance of an illegal abortion, to preserve the common law leniency in relation to this offence.

Clause 6: Substitution of s. 75

Clause 6 substitutes a new section 75 in the principal Act dealing with alternative verdicts on trials for rape or unlawful sexual intercourse. New section 75 does not effect any substantive change but removes all references to felonies and misdemeanours and is in modern drafting style.

Clause 7: Repeal of ss. 134 and 135

Clause 7 repeals sections 134 and 135 of the principal Act which prescribe the penalty on conviction for larceny after a previous conviction for a felony and after a previous conviction for a misdemeanour, respectively.

Clause 8: Substitution of ss. 167—172

Clause 8 substitutes a number of new sections in the principal Act. New sections 167 to 171 cover the same ground as the existing sections 167 to 172 but use modern language and delete the references to felonies. The offence created by the current section 171 is incorporated in proposed section 170.

These sections of the principal Act deal with the offences of sacrilege, burglary, housebreaking, breaking and entering and various offences at night which involve being in possession of an offensive weapon or instruments of housebreaking, being in disguise, or being in a building. Most of these offences are currently triggered by the intent to commit, or the commission of, a felony. The proposed sections delete the references to felonies by having these offences triggered by the intent to commit, or the commission of, an offence of larceny, or an offence of which larceny is an element, an offence against the person, or an offence of property damage which is punishable by imprisonment for three years or more.

Clause 9: Substitution of ss. 267 and 269

Clause 9 repeals sections 267 and 269 of the principal Act and replaces them with a single provision on aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring an offence. The abolition of the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours means that it is no longer necessary to have two separate provisions dealing with accessorial liability. New section 267, like the sections it replaces, provides that an accessory may be prosecuted and punished as a principal offender.

Clause 10: Substitution of ss. 271 and 272

Clause 10 repeals sections 271 and 272 of the principal Act, which deal with the citizen's power of arrest in two different circumstances, and replaces them with a general power of arrest. New section 271 would allow a citizen to arrest and detain a person found committing, or having just committed, an indictable offence, larceny, an offence against the person or property damage.

Schedule 1

Schedule 1 consequentially amends all other provisions of the principal Act which mention felonies and misdemeanours. This schedule does not make any substantive changes to the law but amends the terminology used in keeping with the abolition of the classification of offences as felonies and misdemeanours.

Schedule 2

Schedule 2 consequentially amends all other Acts which mention felonies and misdemeanours. This schedule does not effect any substantive changes to the law but amends the terminology used in keeping with the abolition of the classification of offences as felonies and misdemeanours.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 August. Page 36.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition supports the legislation before the House. In doing so, I will make a few remarks about our position on this matter. In essence, this is a piece of complimentary legislation that is passing through every Parliament in Australia. In fact, it was part of an arrangement struck in February this year between the Commonwealth and the States and reflects in particular arrangements that will come into play for future borrowings at State level.

My understanding is that in part this piece of legislation recognises some of the maturity that has now developed between the States and the Commonwealth in their financial arrangements. I would hasten to say that this step is not before its time, and I would also suggest that many further negotiations down this track are necessary. At least with this piece of legislation there seems to be a reasonable working arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States with respect to the continued operation of the Loan Council.

The Opposition would like to place a few remarks about Commonwealth-State financial relations on the public record. In general, they have been stormy relations since the late 1920s; I believe that in 1927 there was a formal arrangement between the States and the Commonwealth. Since then there have been a number of milestones, such as the transfer of the income taxing powers from the States to the Commonwealth during World War II and the various arrangements that have come into place since that time for the States to get an adequate share of taxation, to operate as separate entities and to organise their own borrowings on both the domestic and the overseas market.

The current position is that the States have much more autonomy in this regard than they had not so many years ago. My understanding is that this Bill will recognise a lot of the realities that currently exist between the States and the Commonwealth. It is necessary to point out that three years ago a review was carried out which, unfortunately, died an ill-fated death and which was much broader than a financial review of the affairs between the Commonwealth and the States. I believe the program was called New Federalism. Unfortunately, it became the basis of an argument primarily within my own Party at the Federal level and was one of the things that brought down Bob Hawke as Prime Minister in 1991. But issues were raised at that time, and the incoming Prime Minister, who took over in December 1991, has admitted that a number of these issues need to be discussed.

Obviously, some of the discussions that took place last Friday—the Hilmer discussions and various other problems on the State-Commonwealth relations agenda—are more prominent within the newspapers. The financial arrangements which are encapsulated within this Bill will go some way towards the concept of New Federalism, but there is a whole range of other areas where the duplication and (dare I say it) the triplication of certain services need to be addressed at the Commonwealth and State Government and local government levels.

I would suggest that in many areas the local council is now attempting to provide the same level of service in a whole range of areas that State and Federal Governments are already providing, and the States and the Commonwealth need to sit down and discuss seriously with local government the triplication now prevalent in many areas. There is no doubt that in 1991 there was a hope—certainly I had the hope—that we would see a working out once and for all of the relationship between the Commonwealth and the States. In particular, I had hoped that the arguments over the duplication of services in many areas—and, dare I say, the lack of certain services in other areas because of the wastage resulting from duplication—would be sorted out once and for all. Unfortunately, that was not the case: 1991 slipped into history and, unfortunately, those provisions for New Federalism failed to materialise.

It is now essential that the Commonwealth-State relationship should be mature enough to reflect those debates again so that we are not seeing resources squandered at the State or Federal level on the same or similar programs, or money wasted that could wisely be spent on a whole range of other projects which all members of this House would concur in believing necessary.

It is also important that the States and the Commonwealth now work out their relationship with local government. There is no doubt in my mind that federalism in Australia now sees a three tiered Government structure. Indeed, if we are not careful, with the republican debate and if the argument succeeds for the election of a head of State, whether that be a President or whatever, we may see something similar to the United States situation, where effectively there are four tiers of Government in most areas.

It is my hope that we can sort out and go beyond these arrangements into a whole range of other areas to resolve the duplication between State and Federal services. My hope is that we can stop the triplication of services that many of us see emerging in our electorates. Local councils today are not the small shows that they were 20 years ago; the rate revenue is not their only financial base these days and many of them receive a large share of Commonwealth moneys. I understand that there is a trickle of State moneys (the Treasurer could correct me) through the petrol tax levy: about 3¢ per litre goes to local government in South Australia, and there are probably other grant moneys in one form or another from the State Government in particular which find their way to the various local government agencies in South Australia.

The Opposition supports the Government's Bill. We want to put on the public record that we think it is a step in the right direction. Obviously, much more mature discussion needs to take place, not only in this area but also about the entire Commonwealth-State relationship. I conclude my remarks by saying that, as I understand it, in large part this Bill recognises the reality under which State Governments and the Commonwealth Government are working today.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Naturally, I support the legislation and rise to speak on this occasion only because it distresses me that the current Federal Government sees very little merit in the continuing role and function of a Federation, and it is about that to which I relate the substance of my remarks. If we have read the Treasurer's second reading explanation, we will all know that the original financial agreement between the Commonwealth and the States was made in 1927 and that that agreement established the Loan Council.

This Bill provides for the new arrangements under which the Australian Loan Council will operate. In particular, it provides for the formal membership of the council of the Territories by including the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory. It also changes the terminology used in the arrangements for debt retirement by simplifying those debt redemption or debt retirement arrangements through the Debt Retirement Reserve Trust Account, which will replace the existing arrangements known as the National Debt Sinking Fund. That is all very well, but the measure goes some way towards making it easier for the Commonwealth to take even greater control of the affairs of the States, given that the National Debt Sinking Fund is to be more dependent upon the Commonwealth for approval before the States can act on those arrangements and the way in which the retirement would occur.

In a specific sense, one can argue that the Bill does nothing which is clandestine. However, in a general sense, since before I became a member of this place, I noticed during the mid-1970s when the Labor Party had two short terms in office—from 1972 to mid-1974 and from mid-1974 to late 1975—that the trend was to centralise control in Canberra, wherever possible, and to reduce the level of involvement that the States had in making decisions. The Federal Government would exercise that control.

The move was already under way, and it followed moves which were initiated, if one reads some second reading speeches, in the 1940s when Labor was in Government during and just after the war. Indeed, it is to be found as a

common thread running through speeches made particularly by Federal Labor members of Parliament and Treasurers from that time forward. They use, as a model for an ideal structure of government in this country, a central law-making legislature for the nation in its national capital; with no States, but simply regional administrations rubber-stamping those decisions made in Canberra by that single House legislature. Their model has a unicameral Parliament running the entire nation. Nothing to my mind would be more appalling for the future of Australian society; nothing could be more catastrophic for the capacity of citizens to gain access to their elected representatives; and nothing could be more devastating in its impact on the role and function of Parliament.

The Government of the day would write the rules for the conduct of business in the Chamber and determine for itself, for instance, how long Question Time might be, how long debates would take, what moves and forms the passage of legislation through the legislature would take and how, in effect, that legislation would be given the breath of life and authority. By that last remark I mean that in those circumstances it would be very easy through a unicameral Parliament to pass a law giving the Government the power to make whatever laws it chose through subordinate legislation, regulations, proclamations and that kind of thing without there being any debate whatever relevant to the impact that such subordinate legislation and proclamations would have on the lives of Australians living several thousand kilometres away and providing no means whatever, as is presently provided and referred to in the Bill, for the raising of taxes and debate about the raising of those taxes and the final redistribution of those taxes as transfer payments in the economy.

Sir, there would not be the opportunity for you and for me to participate in the process at all, and our constituents such as come to see us with problems from time to time would have no chance, with their problems, of seeing an elected representative who would have the power to change or introduce new legislation or repeal bad legislation. There would not be that capacity, and that is the worry I have about the present state of relations between the Commonwealth—the Federal Government in Canberra—and the State Governments and their Parliaments.

It is a worry not only for the reasons that I have mentioned but also because it would mean that a Federal Government would no longer be a Federal Government: it would simply be the Australian Government, and it need not give a fig for any regional interests beyond those interests relevant to its need to win a majority in that unicameral Parliament. I am sure that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, know what that would mean. It would mean that those of us west of the Victoria-New South Wales-Queensland border and north of Brisbane would have no say or influence over the way in which the taxes raised from our efforts, as much as those on the east coast and in the south-eastern part of the continent to whom I have referred, would be spent.

There would be no focus on the regional development of this land mass that we call Australia and, therefore, no responsibility and no moral obligation, let alone political opportunity, for debate about the most responsible way to go in ensuring that we made the best use of our country, Australia, for the benefit of the whole of humanity, not just those of us who live here. To my mind that is appalling. That is why this afternoon I am drawing attention to what I think is going on slowly but surely through this and other similar pieces of legislation that have been brought before our Parliament in recent times.

I should like to say something else relevant to that theme. To my mind laws made by this Parliament to comply with the rest of Australia, as it were, for no other reason than to provide uniformity, are not laws well made. Too often ministerial councils determine what they believe will be in the best interests of their Administrations, and they are taking advice in the process from Sir Humphrey, not from their elected colleagues in the Parliament. Sir Humphrey dictates what will be in Sir Humphrey's best interests. Sir Humphrey, duplicated throughout the States and in the Commonwealth, knows that the most important thing for him—I do not know the feminine of Humphrey, but I can think of a few nouns, too indelicate to use here—is to make sure that the function of his bureau is simplified, not complicated, by any change in the law.

Such people will make sure that the onerous responsibilities of complying with any such legislation are on the citizen, not on the bureau, and that the incidence of effort and cost involved in the interaction between the citizen and the bureau will also fall on the citizen. That is the anathema of democracy in a representative form as we know it. It does not allow for the individual to be sovereign through the Parliament. Indeed, it allows for the vested interests of the public bureau to be sovereign by compelling the Executive to do its will, even through the Parliament.

Therefore, I do not like the quantity of legislation that we are seeing in the Parliaments of the States of the Federation which has been written by Sir Humphrey and his kind and brought back into our Parliaments by Ministers who are too busy to analyse carefully the longer term implications of the legislation for society at large.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: A mate I may be, but representative of the people of Ridley I am first and will continue to be as long as I have breath and am successful in election to this place.

It is important that we do not take lightly the trust we are given whenever we go to election as members of this place seeking re-election and being re-elected. We are given a trust, and to abuse that trust for the sake of expedience may be convenient today or this week for us in our respective programs, whatever it is we have to do, but it will not make for a better nation, for a healthier society or for a more prosperous community not only capable of looking after itself and those incapable of looking after themselves who are members of our society, but also capable of defending itself and/or helping other societies anywhere else on earth.

Mr Quirke: Tell us about CIR as well.

Mr LEWIS: There is no necessity for me to digress to that matter. The member for Playford, I know, treats this place with disdain and treats the processes of committees and referrals from here to the committees of this place with contempt. He is on the record as having said that in the course of his remarks during the last Parliament. I am not that sort of a representative, and I do not agree to that kind of approach, either through our finances or through the legislation that we introduce here. As far as I am concerned, the Federation was carefully thought through by those people who had the responsibility for it some 100 years ago. Most members, including the member for Playford, do not understand nor have they studied the thoughts, opinions and reasons of those who established the Federation and, I guess, they really do not care to do so. They are happy to go on down the path of seeing the destruction of the States and the

creation of the kind of process for governing this country to which I have referred. It will not be helpful to any of us to allow that to continue. If anyone in this Chamber does not believe in the Federation the sooner they stand up, throw off the cloak of hypocrisy and say so, resign their seat in this place, get the hell out of it and let someone take their place in here who does believe in their responsibilities as a member of this Parliament—who does believe in this State of South Australia—the better off we will be. If they believe that the people of South Australia want to see this Parliament abolished, then let them contest the next election on that basis and not continue with such political hypocrisy.

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Will you draw the honourable member's attention to the substance of the legislation before the House? We have put up with this for 14 minutes now. I thought for the last few minutes we might actually get some comments on what the honourable member thinks of the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member is straying around the point rather than directly referring to it but I can follow the implications of his argument. I ask the honourable member to return to the nub of the debate.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I commend the Treasurer for his part, whatever that may have been, and the Premier for his part in getting the agreement in the form in which it is, wherein it removes the Commonwealth's explicit power to borrow on behalf of the States, and that reflects the State's own need for borrowing activities outside the provisions of the agreement. The Commonwealth gave an undertaking some six or seven years ago that there would be no new money borrowings on behalf of the States. It is important then that we recognise those small blessings, the positive aspects of this legislation, where it tends to support the retention of a Federation. Mr Deputy Speaker, with that kind of observation and the observation that the sooner the Northern Territory becomes a full State of the Federation the better. Finally, in making the observation also that the sooner the States recognise the threat to their continued existence posed by the Commonwealth and by Keating the better off we will all be, I conclude my remarks.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I thank the members for Playford and Ridley for their contributions. I believe that both made valid points associated with this Bill. The Bill clearly marks a change in arrangements, although these arrangements were very much in place prior to the event and perhaps in some ways could have been deemed somewhat illegal under the previous Financial Agreement. As a community we have come to recognise that the means of financing States and the Commonwealth have changed over a period—that there is some innate responsibility on each of those jurisdictions to look after there own affairs, but that there should be some scrutiny of the performance of the States in particular.

I do not have a problem with that. If I were a little cynical I would suggest that the one bit of leverage we had over the Commonwealth—which I understand Tom Playford used on one occasion—was the refusal to grant the Commonwealth the right to borrow moneys for a particular year. That right existed under this piece of legislation. We go through the farcical rounds of negotiations every year, where the Commonwealth makes an offer, the States get upset, the Commonwealth comes back with a counter-offer, everybody goes home lamenting the fact that they have not done as well as they should, and Mr Keating goes back and tells Treasury, 'They'll never believe that we've done such a good deal for the States.'

The fact of life is that the Commonwealth has screwed the States to an unbearable point over the past 10 years, and I would make the point quite strongly that there is now no partnership between us—the Commonwealth and the States. The figures speak for themselves: if the Commonwealth tax revenues had been shared in the same way as they had been previously, we would be $370 million a year richer. That is more than the task we have set ourselves on savings over the next four years. The impact has been quite dramatic. The Commonwealth has continued to increase its outlays, while at the same time reducing the capacity of the States.

Our financial problems are totally of the Commonwealth's making. We had a State Bank, which caused us and will continue to cause us dramatic financial problems over the next 10 years. However, in principle there is now a lack of partnership between Canberra and the States. In fact, sheer arrogance is exercised on the part of the Commonwealth. It might well have been a historical battle that took the Premier of the State—whether it be Playford, Dunstan, Tonkin or Bannon—to Canberra for the local round, but there were some reasonable understandings about the financial outcomes when those people went off to Canberra.

There is no longer that degree of back-room negotiation where the States have some reasonable level of comfort. There is never enough, although if we look back over the years we will see that there has been a sufficiency until the past 10 years. The relationship between the States and the Commonwealth has deteriorated dramatically. I would like to think that there could be some maturity in the negotiations between the Commonwealth and the States, as suggested by the member for Playford. Maturity requires that each party negotiate in good faith and, as we would recognise just from the sheer fact of losing $370 million a year, there is a complete lack of faith on behalf of the Commonwealth in allowing sufficient revenues to flow to the State commensurate with its taxing capability.

With respect to the issue of the Hilmer report and how we spent our time last Friday, I can only reflect that it was probably the two most frustrating days I have spent in the past 12 months, including being in Opposition. That is a reflection on what I believe was a clear intention by the Commonwealth to consider only its own agenda and not enter into a partnership in any shape or form. The States made it quite clear that competition is foremost on their agendas and, as we would recognise in this State, we are pushing back the barriers in that regard. We have seen dramatic changes in Victoria, and we are already seeing them in Tasmania, Western Australia and the Northern Territory. We have also seen them in New South Wales and elements of them in Queensland.

Yet the changes that have been undertaken by the Commonwealth in this regard pale into insignificance. They simply have not got up to the mark. Even last night the Federal Government said that the Australian National line was just too debt-ridden to be floated on the market, be subject to market forces and, indeed, become more efficient. It said that the debt is too high. There is a very simple answer to that, and that is that the Commonwealth can assume a proportion of that debt and enable that undertaking to be a competitive operation.

We see examples of that time and time again. The Commonwealth has paid out $330 million for early retirement

packages for a number of wharfies, but we have seen no real reform on the wharves to make them competitive, to facilitate the passage of ships and to allow them to be loaded and unloaded in a space of 24 hours as occurs in a number of ports around the world. I could go on pointing out where the States are getting their priorities right; where they are making their systems more competitive and making their State trading enterprises far more efficient and effective in order to return a dividend to their taxpayers; and where they are focusing on their key levels of service in order to be competitive because the Federal Government has laid down the agenda that they must be competitive and that they must open themselves up to competition.

So, in terms of maturity I can only say that, when we were in the meeting with the Prime Minister, the Sir Humphry syndrome, to which the member for Ridley referred, was alive and well, because when the papers for agreement were brought before the table the States said, 'Our officials said "No" to this; they said "No" to that; it has to be reworded; it is not consistent with what we want,' yet the Canberra officials' documents did not reflect an agreement between the States and the Commonwealth and they persisted with those documents. It was not a case of the States being unreasonable, because they are at the forefront of competition. We want to be more competitive, we want to be the best and we cannot close the doors; so it is in our best interests to provide the most efficient and effective services. The States do not mind being in competition. We want to be in competition and one of the best deliverers of public services in the world if that is possible, and that will only come through competition. However, that is a far cry from the Commonwealth's position, which is indeed one of centralisation of power.

As I said, my belief about the Financial Agreement Bill is that it probably was a trade-off. The Commonwealth did not like the idea that, if there was a dispute in the negotiations on grants and special purpose payments at the Premiers' Conference, the States could suddenly hold it to ransom and say, 'You can't have your borrowing program.' I believe that that has been the thought behind this Bill. It does change the power base somewhat, but we had to get our programs approved through Canberra. That has changed the role of the Commonwealth into a more monitoring one, subject to financial probity and performance, and I am more than happy with that. We no longer have to set up straw dogs or special financing authorities to handle our borrowings, and that means it is a cleaner and more efficient system. We do not have and do not need a central borrowing authority specially set up for that purpose with a number of other associated entities in the same way as we have in the past. That is going to be good, and the Parliament recognises that this Government is now winding itself out of the number of entities associated with SAFA in the process, because these particular entities are not necessary to transact business.

So, whilst I suspect the Commonwealth's motives, I believe that this Bill reflects a common wish by the States and the Commonwealth for the States to be more responsible for their own affairs. The rules were being broken more than they were being adhered to. It is a step forward in making these entities responsible. I note that the Commonwealth requires the States to wind out their debts to it, mainly because they are very low interest loans and it wants them off the books. It could be said that it is not in South Australia's best interests to do so, but we are going to, and by the year 2004 or 2005 we will no longer have any loans outstanding from the Commonwealth.

Again, I am not upset by that provision: it was part and parcel of the development of Australia and of the States. Most of those loans were at extraordinarily low interest rates that we only dream about now, so it is important that the States take responsibility for their own affairs, that they are responsible for their own borrowings and that they structure their borrowings in order to accommodate their market needs, with an overall scrutiny by the Commonwealth. So, I am quite relaxed about the provisions in the Bill, even though I might suspect the motives of the Commonwealth.

The member for Ridley made a very important point about transfer of power to the Commonwealth. That was quite evident in our Hilmer discussions, where according to the Commonwealth there is one-way traffic and if you do not join up you will experience the heat of the Commonwealth. That is an issue that we will debate for a long time, and perhaps if there is a change of Federal Government in the meantime we might get back to a more constructive arrangement than we have at this time.

Importantly, I believe that we are being hijacked by the Canberra bureaucrats. I believe that the Commonwealth Government may have a view on centralisation and it is being processed in quite a dramatic way by those people employed by it to give advice. Of course, the biggest industry in Australia is the expansion of Canberra and the expansion of Commonwealth responsibilities. So, I welcome the comments made by the two members. I believe they made important contributions to the Bill, and I thank them for their support for the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: This is the first chance that I have had for some time to a make a speech from the floor of the Chamber, and I will be brief for the benefit of the Deputy Premier. This measure is fundamental to the future of State Governments and State Parliaments. I believe that the financial arrangements between the States and the Commonwealth are paramount in a democracy, particularly for the people who live in the outlying parts of South Australia and the other large States. The States must be adequately funded to carry out their responsibilities, even though the people in Canberra do not know—or want to know—they exist. Therefore, with Bills of this nature, it is very important that the States are properly financed and that their powers are protected, allowing them to provide those services which no-one else can adequately provide. That is why I wanted to briefly make this comment today.

The only other threat to the welfare of State Parliaments arises if bureaucracies are allowed to become too centralised and insensitive to the needs of people in isolated communities, and I appeal to the Deputy Premier as Treasurer of this State that, under no circumstances, should he give in to the centralist views which emanate from the bureaucracy in Canberra and which would have such a devastating effect on both the people whom I represent and other people in the isolated parts of South Australia. The only warning I give to the State Government is: keep a firm hold on your own bureaucracy, because there is a tendency for senior public servants and others to become isolated and insensitive, and to want to impose their own views, instead of those of the Government, on the people of this State.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 4), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GAMING MACHINES (PROHIBITION OF CROSS HOLDINGS, PROFIT SHARING, ETC.) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debated on second reading.
(Continued from 3 August. Page 37.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition's position is that gaming machines are a conscience matter and that every member is entitled to pursue whatever course he or she wishes. On these issues it would be fair to say that there is general, if not complete, support on the question of the proliferation of gaming machines into restaurants. I will talk more about that in a moment. I suggest that there is some disquiet in Opposition ranks over the financing arrangements for gaming machines in South Australia. I will make a few other remarks because it seems to me that this is an appropriate time to discuss gaming machines, given their introduction into South Australia last month. However, first, I will discuss the reason why this legislation has come before the House.

As I understand it, and the Deputy Premier confirmed this the other week, the successful licensee of an Adelaide restaurant who challenged the existing legislation will still be able to install gaming machines. I think that is totally appropriate, and the Opposition is satisfied with the Deputy Premier's off-the-record explanation. The Opposition would find it intolerable if somebody successfully challenged legislation that had passed this House and on that basis procured equipment, made alterations to their building, bought the machines or whatever, and was then faced with the fact that legislation cut them off at the knees some time further down the track. I will come back to the retrospective nature of this legislation shortly. The Opposition is somewhat disappointed that the Government finds it necessary to take this action, but let us deal with the restaurant first of all.

The Opposition would have found it absolutely impossible to support a measure before this House that, in terms of natural justice, cut off an arrangement to such an extent that that restaurant would have been unable to install gaming machines. I think every member who was here in 1991 and 1992 knows full well that the legislation at that time was for gaming machines to be installed in only pubs and clubs in South Australia. There is no doubt that a number of members did not support various provisions within the legislation and did not support the legislation as it came out of Committee. I do not think there was any illusion by any member in this House or in the other place that we were talking about only pubs and clubs in South Australia.

There were arguments, and I put amendments myself, with respect to the provision that allowed the smaller hotels and clubs to be treated equally with the big boys on the block so that geography was not a factor that would influence who received the gaming machines. I moved amendments because in my electorate a number of facilities all have the necessary club licence, and in turn they all could have been successful applicants for gaming machines. If the amendments I moved had not been successful, the first in would have been the best served and the others would have dropped off the end of the table. Despite that, and despite the debate about the extent to which clubs ought to be able to participate in gaming machines—and I point out that the concerns I had at that time have not yet materialised because, to my knowledge, none of the clubs has applied for a licence—nobody in this place argued that what we know as restaurants in Adelaide ought to be able to install gaming machines.

It is sufficient for me to put forward a few remarks which are different to my colleagues. I do not fear gaming machines out there. I am not a gambler, a drinker or a smoker—I am a general wowser in all sorts of ways. I have not put two bob in a machine, but at the end of the day if somebody wants to do that I have no problem with them doing so. I have no problem with that because, if that is what they want to do, it is entirely their business. Further, I do not have too many problems with the proliferation of machines into pubs and clubs. If you pushed me far enough, I would have to say that I do not have much of an argument against them going into other areas as well. However, the legislation was quite clear, and the understanding of all members in this place and the other place was also quite clear: it was for only pubs and clubs in South Australia. It was not for restaurants and it was not for other areas.

I feel somewhat bound by that at this stage. In fact, I think most, if not all, members of the Opposition are of the opinion that in South Australia at this stage the legislation that passed this place two years ago must be implemented in its entirety so that gaming machines are installed only in pubs and clubs. The legislation was successfully challenged, and this measure seeks to ensure that that is as far as the proliferation goes. The Opposition is satisfied that those who successfully challenged the legislation will not be financially affected by that and that they will be able to carry on as they have in the normal course over the past few weeks procuring the necessary equipment and making alterations to their building, etc. I guess their machines will come on line at some stage in the future. At this stage the Opposition does not support—and quite a number of members on this side will speak to the Bill—the general provision of gaming machines or any other instance of gaming machines going into restaurants or other premises in Adelaide, the suburbs or the country.

The other part of this Bill relates to financial arrangements. I am speaking purely for myself on this matter because other members of the Opposition have different views on it. I think a number of my colleagues will agree with some of the remarks I make, but they will speak for themselves as the debate proceeds. I am somewhat puzzled about why we have singled out certain financial arrangements and why we are proceeding to outlaw those arrangements. For example, if I open up today's paper—and I have not done that yet—to the car section, I will find all sorts of favourable arrangements encouraging me to buy a Holden. There are probably some favourable arrangements enticing me to buy a Ford as well because, whenever I open up the paper, there is always a photograph of a Falcon that is cheaper than the last time it appeared, and there also are attractive financial arrangements and other inducements.

In some instances some companies offer a cash back rebate. Sometimes there are factory bonuses, and sometimes they throw in a fifth wheel and the like. All sorts of incentives are offered and, if I want to, I can access those incentives and obtain finance through a company which is usually operated by the vehicle manufacturer under another name. The company providing the finance usually makes it clear that it is a different division of the same company that manufactures the vehicle. No-one complains about those financial arrangements. No anti-trust argument has been run in this place saying that, if I buy a Ford, I cannot go to Ford Credit to get the finance or that I cannot lease the vehicle through Ford Credit and so on.

Similarly, I know of no provision that prevents me from buying a new Holden or the like and obtaining my finance or

lease through GMAC, which is the manufacturer's financing arm. However, with gaming machines we are singling out the manufacturers and saying that they cannot provide in any way, shape or form finance for gaming machines, alterations and so on. We are saying that the manufacturers cannot have any cross holdings in these arrangements because that would be totally inappropriate.

As I understand it, part of the argument is that we do not want to see the money from gaming machines in South Australia flying out to other States. However, that is a curious argument. Where are Ford Credit and GMAC headquartered? They are not headquartered in King William Street. If the argument works for gaming machines, I look forward to seeing it being included in a whole range of other measures brought before the House. Will we outlaw all financing arrangements that go outside our State borders?

Further, that position is not supported by the current legislation in any case. We have persons who have been successful in getting their gaming machine licences and who have gone to the Commonwealth Bank, Esanda and one or two of the finance companies that have good packages that many pubs and clubs have accessed to obtain gaming machines. Someone told me that AGC had one of the best deals and had been successful in obtaining a reasonable share of the gaming machines financing market. If that is so, and I have no reason to dispute it, where is that company headquartered? It is not in King William Street.

The argument about the money flowing over the State's borders is still valid. Let me look at another argument, although I do not know that anyone has said too much about it or articulated it so far. It comes down to this: everyone who has anything to do with gaming machines is bent in one form or another. I am not saying that the Deputy Premier has that view, but that was certainly the view of a number of members a couple of years ago in the debate on this matter. The argument was that we could not allow the manufacturers in because that was vertical or horizontal integration and we do not allow those things because we do not want those sorts of people too heavily involved in this area.

If that is so, I make a couple of challenges. First, I doubt whether any group of persons conducting business in Australia has the integrity of gaming machines manufacturers. Before they can make or sell their machines in any jurisdiction, the manufacturers are subject to review by the Liquor Licensing Commissioner in South Australia (or his counterpart in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland) including company records, police records and other records associated with them. They must be given a clean bill of health before anyone can go near them. I believe that South Australians can feel absolutely confident about the way that gaming machines have been introduced and also about the persons involved in administering the machines.

One person sought my assistance because about 19 years ago he was visited by police in Western Australia as a result of a domestic violence dispute. This person was knocked back from working with gaming machines because the incident was reported in a police officer's notebook 19 years ago in another State. Commonsense prevailed after discussions and I understand that that person is now happily working with gaming machines, and so he should be. If that incident were regarded as a criminal offence and something that should disbar a person from working in this area, it would be a disgrace. However, the stringency of these laws ensures that manufacturers and all the people associated with the machines have the cleanest corporate bill of health of any company in Australia or the world.

Also, there is a view in the community, and I sense that it is held by some members, that we are not overly proud about gaming machines—and neither should we be, because they are a manufactured product the same as other things. However, I want to place a couple of points on the record. There are a few things that we do pretty well in this country, and one of them is gaming machines. We are the world leader in gaming machines technology. One gaming machine company in Australia has 40 per cent of the world gaming machines market. Another company manufactures largely here in Australia and many years ago was an offshoot and had a partnership with the company I referred to a moment ago. Between the two of them those companies manufacture a large number of machines for use in every jurisdiction in the world. Indeed, they are accessed and checked out by authorities in every jurisdiction where they sell those machines.

For one reason or another we have singled them out, yet we have not singled out Esanda, AGC or any other financier and said, 'Because you make these things, you cannot sell the finance for them to go into pubs and clubs in South Australia'. It is totally inappropriate. There is a puritanical attitude in South Australia towards gaming machines that members need to confront because, in many respects, these people have been unfairly treated and have been the subject of anti-competitive measures—and one such measure is before us now—which I believe are both short sighted and unfair to the industry in general. Certainly, I have similar views about the servicing of machines. I find the present arrangement absolutely intolerable and I give notice that, at some stage next year when things have settled down, I will be moving to break up the service monopoly for these machines.

I will do that for one good reason. If I am not satisfied with the person servicing my car, I can do something that I believe is a basic right: I can take the car to the man down the road and ask him to fix it. If I am not happy with his service, I can take the car somewhere else. However, in South Australia we have the installation and servicing of gaming machines all being done by one agent. State Supply has the only licence. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner has deemed that there will be only one servicing organisation in South Australia, and to hell with what it costs people out in the community, and to hell with what that organisation charges—there will be only one servicing agent.

I make quite clear that I am happy to let this system settle down for another six months or so, but that issue will be raised again in this place and also in the community. It is already coming up in the hotels, which have been receiving very large bills for service contracts that bear no reality whatsoever to those in the commercial world in relation to similar machines.

Let me return to financing. Under this Bill, the financing of many of these machines is perceived as being different from the financing of cash registers and a number of other such items in a hotel. In effect, a publican or a club manager could buy a Holden and get a kickback from the motor company (but do not call them kickbacks—they are factory bonuses), they could have the car serviced at the local Caltex or Mobil garage or they could take it to another organisation and have modifications done on it—they could have a whole range of things done to it—and they could organise their financing arrangements through the manufacturer or whoever they want but, if they own a gaming machine, they have to

have it fixed by one organisation, irrespective of competition. We have been talking about Hilmer: here is a gross example of where that needs to be broken up. They cannot choose who will service it and, as a result of this Bill, they will not be able to work out who will be financing that arrangement.

I understand there are a large number of companies, such as Fauldings in the pharmaceutical area, which provide finance for all sorts of business, at favourable terms, to people who run pharmacies. No-one here would suggest that that is wrong. We are singling out one organisation and saying, 'This is special. These people obviously must be bent, and therefore they should not be involved in the financing arrangements whatsoever.' I am sure that, if anybody could cast the slightest slur or shadow on any of these manufacturers, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner in South Australia, and his colleagues in all the other States and jurisdictions in the world, would have no problem closing out that company or group of companies from competing or selling machines anywhere in the market. They would not be licensed here in South Australia.

My own view on this matter is quite clear: the gaming machine manufacturers are being singled out for an illogical and specialised treatment which I believe they do not deserve and which in many respects is unfair and very unreasonable. Some members would not support the proposition that restaurants would be able to access gaming machines: certainly, the Opposition does not support it. Whilst I make these comments about the financing arrangements under the Bill, I can count, and I believe that the Government will have the numbers on this issue. I know that a number of my colleagues support the Government's position with respect to these financing arrangements. I just want to put on the record some of my concerns in that area.

When gaming machines were introduced into South Australia in July this year, there was a great flurry of activity and I believe in general there was a successful implementation of gaming machines into a large number of venues. There is no doubt that in the next six months or so in particular we will see more machines and other venues come on stream. The public of South Australia can make a choice about any dollar in their pocket: they can spend money in the machines, spend it on something else or keep their dollar. That is their choice. That is a situation that is entirely satisfactory to me.

Although it took two years to get the machines up and running on Monday 25 July, many people worked very hard to make the South Australian legislation work and work well. I was a solid supporter of the IGC proposal. I did not support the Lotteries Commission proposal. In my view, I have seen nothing so far which has disavowed me of the view that I expressed many times on the public record in 1992. In retrospect, we saw a large number of machines come on stream perhaps later than we thought would be the case, but in general those machines came on stream in large numbers and the issue is settling down now.

I want to make a couple of other remarks with respect to gaming machines and this whole debate. It is important to note the Premier's statement today in this House. He said that he was redressing some of the issues that members in this House feel very strongly about. In a ministerial statement the Premier referred to a fund into which I believe $1.5 million will be paid annually to help address some of the social problems associated with those persons who cannot control their gambling activities. I am pleased that that is the case, and I believe that most members on this side are also pleased. Indeed, had that not been so, the Opposition would have been looking towards some form of amendment to this legislation to achieve the same result. I am pleased that the Government has kept and honoured its word, which was given to church leaders in particular who visited the Premier some time ago, that those persons who cannot look after themselves will receive Government funding through various organisations, and I believe that a committee will be put in place to determine the disbursement of those funds.

Gambling is a problem. I have known persons who find gambling, whether it be at the Casino, the races or various other places, a problem. I am not one of those persons. I have always been too miserable to watch my money go around on a roulette table, at Keno or anything else. In general, you cannot be your brother's keeper all the time. The effect of gaming machines in South Australia allows those who wish to recreate in that way the ability to do so, but money will be provided to help that handful of persons who unfortunately will be in serious financial trouble as a result of the implementation of gaming machines into South Australia.

I also want to take this opportunity to wish all those venues that will be coming on stream soon all the very best. As I understand it, it has been an outstanding financial success so far. There are a large number of hotels and clubs that are receiving more money through these machines than they receive virtually through any of their other business activities. I did a check of some of the hotels after the first week, and most seemed to indicate to me that, with a pack of about 25 machines, they were turning over a very large amount of money. One such hotel indicated to me that it was receiving about $280 000 to $290 000, and that that amount was the same in the second week and slightly settled down in the third week. When I checked with some of the other hotels that had the full complement of 40 machines, it was about the same figure. There was not a great deal of difference. If you multiplied the amount by the extra number of machines, the revenue seemed to be coming in at about the same amount.

Rather than putting money in the back pocket, the challenge is now for these hotels and clubs to provide the sorts of services and facilities which we expect and which we have seen in other States. I hope that the next time we debate this matter in this House, whenever that will be, I can report on the favourable things that have happened not only in my district but also in the districts of other members and that the gambling revenues have been translated into a whole range of other things. I see that the $2 pub meal is now becoming a reality all over the metropolitan area. A number of people are going in and having a $2 hotel meal for whom going to a normal restaurant is beyond their means. A number of these people are on incomes that are sufficiently low that the provision of a meal of this sort is an interesting night or afternoon out. I am told by a number of hoteliers that a different clientele is going into these establishments. Not all of them are playing gaming machines: quite a lot of them are going in to socialise, have a cheap meal and maybe get involved in some of the hotel and other social club activities that the hotel offers.

We have a great responsibility to the hoteliers and to the various clubs in South Australia to ensure that profits from these machines are returned in one form or another to the local community. When we debate the provisions of the Bill, I hope to be able to report that that has been the case. It is now much too early; I believe that the other machines have been going for less than a month. In fact, I think there has

been only three weeks of returns so far. At some stage in the future we will make a judgment on that matter, and I hope that clubs such as some in New South Wales that provide a range of services to a very broad cross-section of the community will be a feature of this legislation.

It is unfortunate that we have retrospective legislation in this form. I understand the reasons for it and I support it, but it is not something on which I am very keen. It is something about which the present Government made similar remarks when it was in Opposition and on which in some instances it went over the top. We on this side know that there are times when retrospective legislation is necessary. From my reading of it, in this instance it appears that this is the only way to close the loopholes. As a consequence, the Opposition reluctantly supports that aspect of this legislation.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I thank the honourable member for his support for this Bill. It was introduced in haste, given that many changes to the Act are needed, as the honourable member would understand. I have already made quite clear that the control arrangements are unsatisfactory. Legislation will be introduced later, but whether that will be later this year or early next year is not something I have spent a long time thinking about, because I have had a lot of other things on my mind. It will be introduced and it will address many issues which are causing enormous frustration for the Liquor Licensing Commission, State Supply, State Services, the police, the Casino Supervisory Authority and the IGC. We have a whole lot of players in the system. It is not satisfactorily controlled, but that will be fixed up.

Two major problems have been signalled and both were referred to by the honourable member. The first was the issue of whether a gaming machine manufacturer could be the machine operator. If any members of this House wish to go back through the record to the 1970s, when the Casino and poker machines were first debated, they will find on the record that the greatest danger to the integrity of the system is a manufacturer combining its efforts to provide the product at the gambling site. That allows for the greatest element of corruption. There is a mountain of material on that issue on the record. I guess there is another reason: the spirit of the Act is that hotels and clubs would be the major beneficiaries of the introduction of gaming machines. Whilst some members of either House did not support the introduction of gaming machines, it would be fair to say that all believed that the beneficiaries should not include the gaming machine manufacturers.

As it turned out, the legislation was deficient in a number of areas. It signals to me and to anybody who has been in the Parliament for some time just how badly a Bill can finally be constructed if it is a private member's Bill and even more so if, as is obviously the case here, the Bill is a matter of conscience, because then we have the greatest mishmash of ideas simply to get the Bill through all its stages, where amendments are traded off to get support. The Bill that we created was not a monster but it certainly was not the most effective or efficient piece of legislation ever to be debated and passed in this House, as every honourable member here would understand. We had a marathon debate until 3 a.m. in the House Assembly and then the Bill was debated in the Legislative Council where, because the numbers were somewhat tighter, there were some interesting trade-offs to get the Bill passed.

It was probably useful to get the Bill through; however, reality says that the Bill should work effectively, and it does not work effectively in a wide range of areas. One of the two issues that we have taken up in the Bill is that the gaming machine manufacturers should not be the recipients of cash from the machines. The Act was not sufficiently efficient at restricting their entry into the operation of gaming machines, and that is therefore one of the major amendments. I made a statement to the House on 19 April that there was a loophole which had to be closed but that there was insufficient time for us to address that issue.

The second matter came up a little later, when we discovered that a restaurant had made an application, because that restaurant had a general facilities licence. Quite rightly, under the provisions of the Act the Liquor Licensing Commissioner could not prohibit that application. Our great fear was that, once that became well known, we would again be faced with a tremendous problem of a large number of restaurateurs saying, 'It is not such a bad idea to have a few poker machines in the corner.' It would not have been everybody, because it is not everybody's cup of tea and most restaurants are there for food, but I know that a significant number of restaurants, had they known that the loophole existed, would have put forward their application. It would have related only to those who held a general facilities licence, and from memory about 44 restaurants have a general facilities licence and would have been eligible.

That created a precedent in that those operating under the general facilities licence were in all respects similar to those operating under a restaurant licence. Therefore, two classes of restaurants would have been capable of applying for gaming machine licences. Quite frankly, it all got too hard. We believed that, if the door were opened in this way and those who had general facilities licences came forward, we would have a rush from other licence holders who did not comply with that provision saying, 'Why not us?' It was in conflict with the spirit of the legislation, which provides that the major beneficiaries should be pubs and clubs.

The comments made by the member for Playford have been noted. It was not with a great deal of joy that I rushed this legislation into the House; it was a matter of the need to fix a problem that was arising. The member for Playford listed a number of issues, and I would be pleased for any representation that he might wish to make on those issues so that when we are putting forward amendments to the Act I can take them into account in my deliberations on what changes would be suitable.

I have some concern about the operation of the Act, which I intend to fix, but the member for Playford may have other issues in consultation with his constituency which also need to be addressed. When those changes are put together in draft form, I will ensure that they are circulated so that everyone with an interest in this area has an opportunity to participate. That does not necessarily mean that their suggestions will be taken on board; it is simply that I am interested in making the Act more workable than it is at the moment.

I do not have any difficulty with greater competition. The issue of implementing the system had to be addressed, and we experienced a number of delays. Even though we had some delays with the time frame, from the point when the regulations were brought in to the time when the first machine was operating was the shortest period in Australia. I believe that reflects great credit on the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and the extraordinary effort made by his staff; on State Services for its efforts in processing the machines

through the system; and on other people who have been involved in making it feasible for the system to operate. It was an exceptional effort.

A number of difficulties created along the way, taken from a very long list by the member for Playford, were overcome at the time, and there was flexibility. We had Techsearch working almost 24 hours a day, seven days a week, at certain stages of the process to check the integrity of the various games. It was an interesting period in this area of activity. I might add that it is not one that I would want to repeat, and obviously we will not have to repeat it. It taught us a few lessons, and I think they will be reflected in any further legislation that comes before the House.

If the member for Playford or any of his colleagues wish to suggest particular ideas or changes that they believe would be beneficial to the operation of the Act, I shall be delighted to take them on board. From what I have heard from the member for Playford, I do not believe that I shall have any great difficulty with a number of the areas that he has already signalled.

I do not want to spend a great deal of time on this Bill: it has been more than adequately canvassed by the member for Playford. Whilst we have made it a conscience issue, it is not the sort of issue that necessarily exercises the conscience in the same way as the primary legislation of allowing or disallowing poker machines in this State.

I thank the member for Playford for his contribution to this Bill, which I believe will overcome two problem areas that have arisen. Many other areas have to be sorted out, and that will be done in the fullness of time when we have had an opportunity to canvass the options with the industry and with the various participants in the industry so that we get an efficient and effective industry operating in South Australia.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CLOSURE OF SUPERANNUATION SCHEMES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 August. Page 158.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Unfortunately, I cannot give the support to this legislation that I gave to the last two Bills. In fact, it would be remiss of me to do so. I want to take the House through some of the history of this issue. Earlier this year we had assurances that there would be no change to superannuation arrangements. I know that Government members will say that this is historical, that we had this debate not so long ago—in fact, we had it in the last week or so of the previous Parliament, in May—and that is correct. The Bill went through this place over the top of Opposition members who did not support it at that time, and then it went to the Legislative Council where the numbers reflected a different reality.

We moved a series of amendments in the other place that had been moved here, and amendments were moved by the Australian Democrats which, because of Labor Party support, were successful. That triggered two things. First, it triggered a further debate through the conferencing that was going on during those hectic days in May when we were seeking to complete the legislative program. Secondly, it triggered another rash of promises from the Government. One of those promises was that superannuation would be looked at specifically. I recall the Deputy Premier assuring me that the Police Association would be consulted in detail and that a scheme would be rolled up that would satisfy police officers in South Australia. Indeed, what was going to happen—and I can get the *Hansard* report out, but it is from a different session—

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The inference was that police officers would be satisfied.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is in order for such debates to take place only in the Committee stage.

Mr QUIRKE: I gather that certain understandings were communicated to the Police Association. The Secretary of the PSA and other officials who were in the gallery said that they had not been to see the Minister at that point in the debate. The last time we debated the Bill here, he had not seen her or any other representatives of the PSA at that stage. They confirmed to me later that they had a meeting that night, or some time later, with the Deputy Premier. There was a difference in the attitude that seems to have been communicated to the Opposition from the Police Association and the PSA.

The Police Association was somewhat wary of the Government's plans. The PSA had virtually nothing to hang its hat on at all. From that point of view, I do not believe there was any inference that PSA members would be in receipt of any generosity from this Government. The Police Association had a different view. The piece of legislation that was eventually agreed to at conference was that the schemes would be closed and would reopen later in the year, which was a way of ensuring that certain new schemes would come into place.

I do not want to canvass too much of the debate about superannuation because we will be doing that tomorrow when we deal with the triple S scheme, which I understand from the Government will be the major part of the debate in this place.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Fine. We are ready any time you want to bring it on. There is no problem with that. Our attitude to it is very much the same as it was in May this year. The Audit Commission was used as an excuse for stomping all over reasonable superannuation entitlements for persons who worked for the Government and, in particular, for police officers who risked their lives every day in South Australia. So, we do not support the closure of the lump sum scheme. We do not like the idea of it being closed one bit, and members on this side will make that point repeatedly.

We do not support it now, we did not support it back in May and, if it comes back to this House in whatever amended form, we will not be supporting it then either. Our view is that the existing lump sum superannuation scheme had a number of benefits for members which were not unreasonable at all. We are constantly told by the Government that it will be providing—through the triple S scheme—a scheme that is commensurate with normal employer provided schemes. I have to tell you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that is just out-an-out nonsense. It is providing no more than Paul Keating demanded that State Governments provide through Commonwealth legislation. If the Government did not do it, it would be in breach of the Commonwealth Act.

Many employers do not treat their workers this way. In fact, it is not the industry norm at all. The Government is taking the bare bottom approach to that Bill and we will certainly debate that matter at the appropriate time. We are seeing rightful entitlements stripped away from a large

number of Government workers and, in particular, police officers. Not only do we have a Government that is closing the scheme, but when we asked the Deputy Premier a couple of weeks ago about the level of contribution and the benefits concerning both of the closed schemes we learnt they were being examined. Unlike the case with the previous two pieces of legislation, where the Opposition said, 'Let's go straight to the third reading', we will be asking some questions in Committee about this examination and what is likely to come out of it, although I do not know that we will get much of an answer.

The answer we received the other week was that the Government was looking at probably one of the worst levels of retrospectivity. It wants to go in, open up schemes—not only close them to new members but open up schemes—and potentially reduce the benefits and potentially increase the level of contribution to persons who had put their financial affairs in some sort of reasonable shape for what they believed would be an adequate retirement. In Committee we will be asking questions about that and about the lump sum scheme in particular. We want to know what is going on with it because, as I have said many times in the media, no-one's superannuation is safe with this Government; no-one's superannuation is safe at all.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Mawson wants to interject in this whole affair. I think the member for Mawson ought to take stock of himself. A lot of shop assistants right now would like to give him a much bigger haircut than he has had since I saw him two weeks ago. Indeed, a few PSA members—not to mention police officers—may want to take similar action. At the end of the day, we do not support the closure of this scheme, and we did not support it earlier this year. We believe that the level of benefit was reasonable and was the sort of level of benefit that a large employer such as the Government of South Australia ought to be providing for its members.

The rest of the debate where this matter is concerned will no doubt follow through on the triple S scheme and involve more detailed discussion in Committee. The Deputy Premier might have a bit of a problem here, unless he has squared away numbers in the other place, because my understanding was that unless an employer sponsored scheme was put in place—and done so before the temporary closure of the existing lump sum scheme (I think it was scheduled to be reopened on 1 October)—then the permanent closure of this scheme would not be supported in the other place.

This triple S scheme offers absolutely nothing other than what the Federal Government has demanded that all employers in this country provide. My understanding is that the policy of the Liberal Party of Australia is to oppose and repeal even that provision—to get rid of it altogether. That is what it ran on at the last election. It is a cheek for the various Bill reports to say, 'This triple S scheme will be worth 6 per cent on 1 July next year, going up to 9 per cent.'

We have a Government that says all the time, 'We want to see the Government change at Federal level and the probable repeal of this particular Act', which really means that these people will come back in here and say, 'The ground rules have changed. We don't have to provide any employer sponsored superannuation whatsoever and, as a consequence, we repeal and close even that out.' I hope the Australian Democrats in the other place support the Labor Opposition in not allowing this scheme to close. We are not talking about an enormous amount of money. What we are talking about is a reasonable level of superannuation for those many Government workers and, in particular, the members of the Police Force in South Australia who I believe have a rightful entitlement. Many employer schemes go well beyond the generosity of the present scheme here in South Australia. As I said the last time, it is a cheap, mean and miserable attempt to whip a few dollars away from Government workers here in South Australia, and we do not support it.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I rise in support of the opposition voiced by the member for Playford with respect to the Government's Bill in this matter for many of the same reasons that the member for Playford has already outlined. However, I want to add a few of my own. The decision made by the Government to close the superannuation fund for all existing public servants is an outrage on a number of counts: it did not go to the electorate in December last year and say, 'As part of our mandate in governing this State we will close the Public Service superannuation scheme.'

It did not go to the electorate last year and say that it was going to try to do over the employees covered by the old State Bank superannuation scheme, a matter which was debated in this House earlier this year. This Government did not go to the electorate last year and say that it would interfere with the independence and integrity of the Industrial Commission of South Australia. It did not go to the electorate and say that, for those members of our community who rely on public transport to get to and from work and who participate in normal social events, their fares would rise threefold over what they were under the former Labor Government.

That is a long litany of broken promises, the most recent of which deals with small retailers and shop assistants. The Minister for Industrial Affairs, when he was Opposition spokesperson for industrial affairs, said on the steps of Parliament on 8 December last year—

Mr BASS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thought the debate was about the Statutes Amendment (Closure of Superannuation Schemes) Amendment Bill. The member for Ross Smith has been on his feet for about two minutes and I do not think he has mentioned it. I understand that members have to debate what is listed on the Notice Paper, not anything else that they wish to debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member does have a point of order. The member for Ross Smith has been conducting more like a grievance debate against the Government. I ask the honourable member to return to the subject of the debate.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Sir, I certainly will. I can understand the embarrassment experienced by the member for Florey in having this litany of broken promises read out to him *ad nauseam* and placed on the public record. However, the fact of the matter is that the State Government Superannuation Scheme that currently exists is not overly generous when compared to schemes in the private sector. I am sure the Deputy Premier will correct me if I am wrong, but I understand the scheme to be one of six per cent contribution by the employee with an employer's contribution of the order of 12 per cent.

Prior to entering this House in December last year, I was secretary of a trade union which primarily covered employees in the white collar field who overwhelmingly were employed in the private sector. They were employed by organisations ranging from such great companies as Ansett Airlines, TNT Transport through to retail stores and manufacturing concerns, both large and small. It was my experience that, with

respect to the general run-of-the-mill employer—I am not talking about ultra-large or ultra-flush companies in terms of financial standing—the contributions of the employer were at least of the order of 10 per cent, and that anywhere between 10 per cent and 15 per cent was the order of the day. An employer contribution of 12 per cent was not considered to be unreasonable.

We have, particularly in this State whether we like it or not, demographic changes taking place, where we are seeing an ageing of our population. One of the great concerns of the national Government, whether it be Liberal or Labor, is to provide an adequate superannuation payment-pension scheme for members of the work force when they retire, rather than them having to rely purely on social security payments through the old age pension, and that requires a significant contribution by employers.

As the member for Playford has already pointed out, the State Government is probably the single largest employer in this State. It is a significant employer and, when it has sought to recruit people into its work force in the past—and up until we finally hear the Government's position with respect to the Government Management and Employees Act—it has been able to go out into the community generally and say, 'Look, if you come to work for us, we can offer you permanency of employment. We can offer a reasonable rate of remuneration. We do not have, as occurs in the private sector, over-award payments because we are a public authority and we deal with taxpayers' funds. Therefore, we are not able to play the favourites—those who should get higher rates of pay than others for exercising the same responsibilities. So, if you come to work for us your rate of pay will not be too bad, but you will not be able to enjoy significant rates of pay that you would get in the private sector for the type of work and skills that you exercise. However, we compensate for that, partly by offering security of employment, an independent appeals promotion system, an independent grievance appeals system and also a reasonable superannuation scheme to provide for security in your retirement.'

That is not an outrageous package. However, through this legislation, this Government is saying to all prospective employees, 'When you come to us, even though we are not going to be able to pay you over-award rates as they do in the private sector or guarantee permanency of employment in the future, we are not able to offer you a better superannuation scheme than that which the local corner deli has to pay with respect to its own employees, and that is the rock bottom superannuation guarantee levy which applies as a result of Federal Government legislation.'

Indeed, as has already been pointed out by the member for Playford, the Liberal Party went to the last Federal election with a policy to abolish that levy as a basis of levying employers with respect to providing adequate superannuation for their employees. That policy may have been modified recently to the extent that the Liberal Party may not abolish it totally, but if it gets into power next year, for instance, any further increases in that superannuation scheme, as were planned under the original legislation, will be scrapped and it will be frozen as at whatever date it happens to assume power. In one sense, that is very theoretical. We should not have to worry about that until well past the year 2000, as it is unlikely that the Federal Leader of the Opposition will ever be elected Prime Minister, given his comments with respect to the Native Title Act and the fact that he does not really know whether he is in the Northern Territory, Jakarta or Canberra at the time he makes his comments. So, in one sense I should not be too worried about what the Liberal Party may or may not do when it is elected to Federal Government as that will be well into the next century. Nonetheless, that is a genuine concern that prospective Public Service employees will have.

I believe that the Public Service should not only be independent and have its integrity retained but that the Government of this State, as an employer, should recruit the best types of employees that it can in terms of their willingness to serve the community and in the sense of wanting to give service where they have a range of skills and expertise to offer the community of South Australia. We are stretching somewhat their sense of community regard if we say to them, 'Look, we can't give you over-award payments and you will have to put up with a five year wage freeze.' That is what the Treasurer announced in his financial statement on 31 May where he called for a two year wage freeze in the Public Service. That is not just two years—it is a five year wage freeze because the last general wage movement for public servants was in September or August 1991. That means that it is really a five year wage freeze at least.

As an employer this Government is saying to prospective new employees, 'Look, notwithstanding your talents and notwithstanding the way we would like to employ your talents, we are offering you these wonderful conditions: a wage freeze on your classification for five years; we will rip away the permanency of your employment; we will do away with your right to an independent review of promotion and grievance procedures; and, on top of that, we will give you this magnificent superannuation scheme whereby we will offer you a superannuation payment which equates to the smallest employer in South Australia, the lowest common denominator of what an employer has to offer in South Australia or Australia.'

I ask the rhetorical question of the Government: how does it expect to recruit new employees into the work force on the basis of that type of offer? It will not attract the type of highly skilled worker that we want in the Public Service. Due to the large unemployment levels in this State and elsewhere at the moment, the Government may force people into the Public Service simply because they have no other option. They might come in but they will certainly be looking for alternative employment outside the Public Service as soon as possible. We will have this inevitable brain drain which will occur within the Public Service. I do not think we have the luxury in South Australia to say to our Public Service that in the future we will only be able to retain the services of people who cannot find employment outside the State Government.

When companies like Mitsubishi Motors and General Motors-Holden's offer an employer contribution of at least 13 per cent to their white collar workers, not just clerical people, but technical people, engineers, and the like—and I can refer to the other more generous superannuation schemes that exist in the oil, banking and financial industries generally—how will the Treasurer attract staff or future Under Treasurers to be employed by the Treasury Department on absolutely scandalous rates of superannuation payments when the competition in other financial institutions in Australia and in South Australia offers significantly higher superannuation benefits? It is an absolute act of stupidity in the long run. The talented people we require in the future to fill key positions in the Public Service will be poached or siphoned off by the private sector.

You will have the incredible situation, for example, where two police officers go out on patrol together and one police

officer is employed after the date of closure of the superannuation scheme and the other is employed prior to it. If a terrible tragedy occurred where both police officers were killed or severely injured in the course of their duty in protecting the citizens of South Australia, different payments would go to the widows and children of those police officers. This will happen not on the basis of their skills, their courage or attributes but simply because one of them happened to join the Police Force the day after the closure of the superannuation scheme. That is a totally iniquitous situation, and it should not be tolerated.

That can occur not only with the police but with the fire brigade and a whole range of other Government instrumentalities. It is ripe for industrial disputation. The Government might think it is being smart about this by saying, 'We will not make it retrospective to existing employees. We are not that dumb. We will not antagonise them to that extent.' We could not get the Minister for Industrial Affairs to talk to 1 000 irate shop assistants last Sunday, so I doubt whether the Treasurer would front up to 20 000 angry public servants outside this House to explain why he is taking away their superannuation benefits.

The Treasurer has tried to be a little too smart by half by saying that he will not make it retrospective but that it will be prospective and that existing employees will not care two hoots about new employees so there will be no industrial disputation. There is only one problem with that logic: inevitably, over time those employees who are employed under inferior conditions become not a tiny, insignificant minority of the State Government's work force but they grow in number until they become a very significant minority within the work force and ultimately a majority. They will not tolerate a situation similar to the example I provided where two police officers go out on duty and face the community and the risks and dangers that are involved.

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

Mr CLARKE: I appreciate that I have only four minutes left, but I have used my time during the adjournment and, if the House would permit me, I could go on for at least another couple of hours on this subject. On the off chance that that will not be permitted, I would summarise some of the arguments that I have already put. The 9 per cent contribution rate under the Superannuation Guarantee Levy set by the Federal Labor Government will not be reached until the year 2001, and that is the proviso that the State Government is putting into place with respect to the closure of the State Government Superannuation Scheme—that it will follow the bare minimum and only the increments provided for under the Superannuation Guarantee Levy.

With the recent debate about the levy at about the time of the last Federal election, prominent members of the life insurance industry—actuaries—computed that, if a bare minimum of economic security was to be provided for workers through superannuation at retirement and considering increased life expectancy of people today, a minimum of 12 per cent would need to be contributed to the fund. True, the SGL goes to only 9 per cent and there may need to be employee contributions to make it up to 12 per cent, but I emphasise that that would provide only an absolute bare minimum of economic security to retired workers generally. I come back to my earlier theme: how are we as an employer to attract the type of people we want to work in the State Government if we do not provide any sort of attractive superannuation package for the people we need?

We need innovative people working in all areas of our Government departments, particularly in Treasury. We have a poor Treasurer and it is absolutely essential for the safeguarding of the State's finances that we have trained and independent civil servants able to blunt the wild excesses and the absolute bone-headedness of our Treasurer. That is an absolute necessity. The Treasurer laughs like a hyena because he agrees with the view that I have just put. We have an absolute need for an Under Treasurer who can control the Treasurer and members of the current Administration because they are incapable of governing this State. Indeed, they would not be capable of governing a lolly shop and we will not attract the type of people we need into the civil service, people with the gumption to stand up to the neanderthal Treasurer that we currently have.

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

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I want to make a brief contribution tonight, but it is important that I follow the previous speaker. Of course, the previous speaker and I were singled out by you today, Mr Speaker, I must say somewhat harshly, taking nothing away from my colleague the member for Elizabeth, who is a fine member of the House. The member for Ross Smith and I were somewhat unfairly dealt with in your earlier comments.

The SPEAKER: Let me say to the honourable member that, if his conduct is even half as bad tomorrow as it was today, he will not even be in the House to make a speech tomorrow.

Mr FOLEY: I am not reflecting on the Chair in any way, Mr Speaker. I turn to what the Government is doing with State superannuation. One of the most notable features of the State Government since the last election has been its absolute single mindedness in breaking every election commitment it gave and breaking every election promise that it made. The Treasurer opposite yawns, and that is exactly the reaction we have when the Treasurer always blames the former Government for the decisions he is now having to take. At some point in time this Government will need to accept that it is making its own decisions based on its own work and it will no longer be able to simply blame the former Government for the decisions it now has to make. The area of State superannuation highlights this as no other area can do.

The State Government has had available to itself all the figures on the condition of the State's finances. The Audit Commission was one of the greatest con jobs of all time. The commission did not unravel or detail any level of debt that was not already on the published State accounts, and the Treasurer knows that. The only thing the audit report could do was to point to some illusory debt or liability figures that were conjured up to make the Audit Commission have some degree of credibility in the eyes of financial observers. The Treasurer knows full well that leading into the last State election he and the then Leader of the Opposition had available to them all the published and accurate figures that highlighted this State's debt levels and indebtedness.

It was incumbent upon them as the Opposition to highlight to the electorate before the election exactly where they would make cuts, where they would reduce the size of the Public Service and where they would cut essential services but, no, the then Opposition chose to do none of that: instead, it offered some sort of utopia. We had the Premier saying that

there would be no cuts in public expenditure and that there would be increases in health and education. We had the then shadow Treasurer making all sorts of claims about how they would achieve a reduction in this State's debt simply through nothing more than the odd contracting out. Certainly, the great phrase of the Premier (then the member for Finniss) was that he would contract out the cleaning services. Whenever we switched on a radio, we heard the then Leader of the Opposition saying how he would cut debt, and it was always by getting rid of the cleaners: somehow that would make a massive reduction in the State's indebtedness.

My point is that the Government, when in Opposition, knew exactly the State's level of debt. It fooled and misled the electorate and it put a number of untruths into the public arena leading up to the last State election. The then Opposition found itself in Government and is now having to face up to Government with all its responsibilities. No longer can this Liberal Party, which has spent more than a decade in Opposition, get away with Opposition tactics, negativism and the somewhat amateur approach to Government that it has been displaying for about 12 years. The Government has to face up to the real, hard and tough issues of Government. What has the Government done? It has attacked those groups, individuals and issues that are the easiest to attack.

This Government makes none of the very tough decisions and it makes none of the creative decisions about how it deals with the State's economic problems. It simply retreats into its age old philosophy and style of dealing with Government, that is, small Government. What do we see here: we see the Treasurer taking on what is one of his pet subjects. I give him credit that he has been on about public servants' superannuation for a number of years. I remember hearing him speak on many occasions, as reported in the media, and in this Chamber on his almost excessive views about the extent of public servants' superannuation. The fact that the Treasurer was a former public servant, I suspect, means that he has had some experience with life in the Public Service but for some reason he has felt that public servants' superannuation was fair game when it came to his trying to balance his budget.

This Government has attacked public servants in a way that very few in this State thought it would, except, I might add, the Labor Party. We knew exactly where it would take the axe and apply the cuts, but nobody would listen to us before the election. That is history. It is no good us now as an Opposition saying, 'We told you so', but I will: we told you so! This Government simply misled the public and the Public Service. It made statement after statement telling the Public Service, 'We will not attack the GME Act; we will not attack the superannuation benefits; we will not take away your rights to have subscriptions automatically taken out of your salary for your union fees.' They were simply playing the tune for anyone, anywhere in this community that suited them. They would tell people what they wanted to hear, because this Government was going to win government at any cost.

What it has done, of course, is to create so many of its own problems. Had the Liberal Party more honesty, more decency and, I suspect, a bit more political acumen, it would have realised before the last State election that in this environment you do not have to offer everything to everyone. The public is mature enough and has witnessed politics for long enough to actually want some honesty and decency from those who purport to represent them as a Government or an Opposition.

This Liberal Party would have a lot more respect out in the community and would face an easier time in the polls in three years had it gone to the last State election saying, 'Look, we believe things are crook; we believe the State needs a dose of economic medicine. This is what our prescription will be. Take it or leave it.' There would not have been 37 members in this Chamber had it adopted that policy. There would have been fewer than that. They may or may not have won government but, had they won government, they would have had a true mandate. They would have had a mandate that everyone in our community understood and acknowledged. They would have been prepared to put their faith in this Liberal Party.

But no, what did we have? We had a Liberal Party that had spent the best part of a generation in opposition which said, 'No, we will get into government using any device known to political Parties.' They would mislead, misrepresent and paint a picture that somehow, on the emergence of Dean Brown as Premier on 11 December last year, utopia would be created in this State. They said, 'We do not need a dose of medicine for the economy. We do not need to be honest with the community. We can just mislead, tell untruths and basically fudge the story all the way along.'

Well, members opposite now have to deal with that. It is their bed. They have made it and now they have to lie in it. But they should not expect this Opposition to sit in this Chamber and allow them to get away with gross hypocrisy, gross misleading and gross irresponsibility as a political Party. We will not let you get away with that. The unions will not let you get away with that. What is more fundamental is that the public will not let you get away with that.

I have said before in this Chamber and I will say it again: this Chamber is but littered with oncers. When you go back into your electorate and face up to your constituents, the onus is upon you to explain why this Government produced policies before the last State election that were not true. It is not good enough for members opposite to say, 'Ah, but we had the Audit Commission.' Even on that front, the Premier of this State misled the public. He said repeatedly in the lead-up to the last State election, 'I will not be in a position where I will have an Audit Commission report and say, "The books were not as good as I thought they were. The former Government was hiding all these problems, things are much worse".' The then Leader of the Opposition and now Premier repeated time and again that he would not use that age old political tactic to justify massive cuts. What did he do? What did the Leader of the Opposition cum Premier do? At his very first opportunity he said, 'Things are not as bad as they were.'

But on any fair analysis of the Audit Commission report, it uncovered no new debt. It uncovered no greater financial problems in this State than were already put on the public record by the former Arnold-led Labor Government. It managed to find or create an illusory $10 billion liability, but a liability is not debt that has to be serviced from the recurrent budget. But for the political expediency of the Treasurer—and I will give him credit, he can at times be very clever politically—who packaged it together within 24 hours, in this instance—

Mr Quirke: Hang on, take it easy!

Mr FOLEY: No, in this instance the Treasurer was clever and very tricky, because he imparted an image that all of a sudden some $10 billion of extra debt had been discovered, when it was simply not true. He knows that, because he is having to deal with the rigours of framing a State budget. I suspect that the Premier, who has already developed a very

obvious skill in leaving all the bad news for his Treasurer to announce—we must always remember that the response to the Audit Commission report was announced by the Treasurer, the Deputy Premier, as the Premier of this State hopped on his business class seat on his way to Japan, sitting back, I am sure, having a champagne and saying, 'Thank goodness it is the Treasurer delivering that response and not me.'

Again, I am sure much to the annoyance of the shadow Treasurer, I give the Treasurer a bit of credit: he took that issue on. He had to cop the flak for that. The Premier must learn a little bit about history: good news Premiers of this State end up by being caught out. The fundamental issue is why the Liberal Party needed to deceive the State to the extent it did. I do not know. I suspect that it was able to get a few more members into this Chamber who simply will not be here in four years. I suspect members opposite are regretting that now: it has given them more trouble than it has given them worth.

I return to the superannuation issue. Public servants voted for this Government in good faith. Members opposite did not tell them that they would interfere with their union subscriptions; they did not say they would cut their tenure under the GME Act; they did not say they would persecute them over Government cars; and they did not tell them they would cut their superannuation. They told them none of that but, within months of coming into government, they went to work and hit the most vulnerable in this community. I would not have thought it possible that, in a few short months, this Government could disfranchise such a significant body of people within this community.

I ask members opposite, all those members in marginal seats, particularly those in southern seats, where there is a high proportion of State public servants, how will you face up to those public servants? I suspect there are quite a few in the seat of Wright. As you go about your task of door knocking, how will you face up to them when they say, 'Why did you not say before the election that you would cut my tenure, cut my super, interfere with my union contributions and persecute me for driving a Government car?' I will not have to face up to that problem as I go about door knocking in my community. I will not have to face up to that, but members opposite will. They will have to look their constituents in the eye and say what is the truth, and also what is reality—that this Government has taken the easy way out. It has attacked the most vulnerable. It has attacked those who are intimidated by them as a Government.

If members ever needed an indication as to how intimidated and how disfranchised this Government is, they should look at what is happening to the Government. It has achieved in eight short months what some Governments take a decade to achieve, and that is a total dissatisfaction with the quality of the Government, a total dissatisfaction with the style of government and a total despair with the decisions this Government is making. We only had to see today the Opposition so skilfully putting before Parliament a leaked Cabinet submission. This submission was not leaked some six months after a Cabinet decision; this was a Cabinet submission leaked at the very time Cabinet was meeting.

Mr Quirke: On the same day.

Mr FOLEY: On the same day as Cabinet was meeting. As members opposite continually remind me, I have had a bit of experience working in Government. I have experienced what happens in Government, and in my six years as a political minder I knew of very few incidents where a Cabinet submission was leaked. I know that on the odd occasion when one was leaked it was six months after the event, and members opposite, including the now Treasurer, would make great political capital out of the fact that they had a Cabinet submission which had dropped off the back of a truck.

Mr Quirke: You instituted firing squads, didn't you?

Mr FOLEY: Well, I was not one to sit back and accept the fact that some public servant or public officer had been disloyal, but I never knew of an example where a Cabinet submission was leaked on the day of the Cabinet meeting. That tells us that the public sector of this State is terrified of and disillusioned with this Government and wants to see this Government held accountable. I suspect that in most cases the members of this Government who sit on the front bench have a margin in excess of 10 per cent, so when they sit around the Cabinet table they can make decisions about what they consider to be good government, but it is those decisions that impact on the second row and, more fundamentally, on the back row. Having had some experience of a Cabinet, I can say that, when Cabinet Ministers sit around that Cabinet table who have more than 8 per cent under their belt, if you are in a marginal seat you want to be pretty nervous and anxious. The Treasurer is single-minded as he goes about his job. He has a margin in excess of 10 per cent, he is now the Deputy Premier and he has reached his career goal; but all you new members who are starting out in your political careers, think very carefully.

Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I say to the member for Kaurna, 'Do it well for three years, because that is the only chance you will get; they are the only three years you have in this place.' In conclusion, I give the members opposite a bit of friendly advice from someone who was a minder: if you occupy a marginal seat, be wary of any Cabinet Ministers with more than 8 per cent, because they will not think of you. That is a true story: beware Cabinet Ministers with more than 8 per cent, because they will not be thinking of the Lees, the Kaurnas, the Reynells and the Elders. They will certainly be thinking about the member for Coles, who is in a category of her own as a very influential person, but for those members who sit on less than 5 per cent, I have to tell you that you are not looking healthy at the next election. If any evidence were needed, what about that classic Cabinet submission leak today? It had all the hallmarks of Treasury on it.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): As we all know, the purpose of this Bill is to close off the present superannuation schemes for public servants and police so that the Government can bring in the new scheme which has much less attractive conditions for workers but which of course is much cheaper for the Government. There are lots of issues involved, and some of them have been mentioned by previous speakers, but they will come up again when the new Bill is debated. I want to spend a minute or two discussing the process by which this has happened. It is common knowledge and commonsense that it is in everybody's best interests that employers and employees sit down in an atmosphere of goodwill and trust to try to work out the problems confronting both parties. This is another example where this Government has shown complete disregard for any sort of fair, open and consultative process with employees—any desire actually to sit down together and solve the problem.

Previous speakers have mentioned that many times the Government assured public sector employees that there would be no change to their conditions. It assured the PSA of this as late as 21 April this year, on the very day that it was

setting up a committee to do away with the schemes. The important thing that the Government will end up realising is that deceit and underhanded methods devalue people; they lose goodwill and in the end society suffers and we do not get the best results. So, I oppose this Bill; I oppose what the Government is intending to do; and I oppose the deceit and the dishonest process; the devaluing of the public sector and public sector employees that this Bill is part of.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): We have had some interesting contributions from members opposite; interesting only to the extent that they are not short on repetition and they are not short on politics. I guess that should not be surprising, but they are short on sense, short on understanding and very short on history. Having sat through this drivel, I heard 10 good reasons why the Government had to change and five good reasons why the scheme had to be closed. I have 20 good reasons why this Government will stay in power a lot longer than members opposite envisage, if this is the level of debate we will have from the other side. The extraordinary thing we heard from the would-be, could-be, maybe Leader—

Mr Ashenden: Leaders; there are two of them.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No, I am just talking about the member for Hart; I will get to the member for Ross Smith later. I do not know that the member for Playford has made any claims in recent times but, given that there seems to be a lottery over there, nothing would surprise me. Getting back to the member for Hart, I heard him make this extraordinary statement: beware of Cabinet Ministers with more than an 8 per cent margin. I suggest to members opposite, in case they are short on counting, that it was impossible for any sitting member on this side of the House to get less than an 8 per cent margin, given the extraordinary backlash that the previous Government experienced at the last election and the overwhelming endorsement of a change of direction that was given to this Government. When people debate a matter, they are expected to know what is important, what are the matters of substance and what there may be that will take the debate further. I cannot think of one such criterion observed by members opposite; it was almost as if they were wind-up dolls that cried 'Mama', and it was just not good enough.

The issue was canvassed when we closed off the schemes earlier this year. We put forward the reasons for the need to close the scheme and the Opposition advanced its reasons for not closing it, so there was nothing new in the contributions made by members opposite on this occasion. It is a fact of life that we do not have sufficient numbers on our side in the other place to allow legislation to pass, irrespective of its merits. We have an antagonistic Opposition which will not support anything or which will support very little, because it sees that as in its own best interests, and we have the Democrats, who simply decide on the basis of which issues give them the most publicity. That makes for very bad legislation, bad Parliaments and bad decision making. I guess that is one of the things that we will have to put up with.

I was asked the other day whether I would wish to abolish the Upper House. I said, 'There are moments when that thought appeals to me.' Then I look at the abuses that take place in single House Parliaments and I return to the horrible truth that perhaps I will put up with the pain because democracy deserves a bit better than is provided by a single House Parliament. Obviously this matter will be debated again in another place, and I hope that wisdom will eventually prevail.

What are we taking away? Every member of the Public Service had a right to join a scheme. Those who wished could take up that scheme, and they did. About 15 per cent of the Public Service took up that option; the remaining 85 per cent did not. That is a fact of life. When we said that the scheme was closed, it did not take away the right: everyone had had that right. On the issue whether a new member of the Public Service came in on the understanding that that scheme was not available any more, the terms and conditions that would prevail would have been quite clear to the person concerned.

I took up superannuation when I joined the State Public Service, and I was paid out 10 years later. I think I made a loss. When I joined the Commonwealth Public Service I took out superannuation and also had a private superannuation scheme because I decided to provide for my future. On all three schemes I went backwards, but that is a fact of life.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It is a fact of life that if you keep changing employment you do not necessarily accumulate the benefit of that sort of investment. At least my private superannuation provided a better return than my Government superannuation. If someone contracts to come into the Public Service, that person is not disadvantaged in any shape or form if that particular benefit is known at the time. All those people who are already in the public sector have had the opportunity of taking up that scheme. The issue has been debated long and hard. I understand that the member for Hart recalled that I have on numerous occasions in this Parliament decried the fact that the Government had not provided for superannuation. The liabilities were exploding and, when provision could have been afforded, no provision was made.

I have been consistent about the extent to which the liabilities had to be met. The rest of the world is meeting them: they have their 20 or 30-year schemes. Indeed, we have embarked on a 30-year scheme to fund those liabilities consistent with the rest of the world. We are not going to be different from the other instrumentalities right across the world which suffer from some of the same deficiencies as we have. The fact is that governments have spent the money and not provided for their liabilities.

The Audit Commission highlighted the extent to which, if that liability continued to explode, we could afford to fund it and the extent to which, if we were committed to funding it, other services would have to be cut. Opposition members' concept of economics and mathematics is totally deficient. I remind members of the statement I made in the Parliament two weeks ago. I mentioned that in the space of two months, since the 31 May statement, the cost of the forward estimate of interest on the budget had gone up by $80 million more than we had estimated. We had already estimated that there would be an escalation, because the inflationary budget being brought down by the Federal Government would put pressure on interest rates. Therefore, we pushed out our interest costs, but they went much further than could be expected, so suddenly we had another $80 million to find. If we are to continue to fund our liabilities, either we put up taxes or we cut services.

No Opposition member has put forward a solution. Members opposite cackle and carp, but I have not seen one response, except the former Premier saying, 'It would have been all right. Under our scheme we would have made it.' The Federal Government did not believe the former State Government was going to make it. It did not believe that the former State Government was within a bull's roar of making it, and the Leader of the Opposition would recognise that. The

Federal Government had concerns about the former State Government meeting its targets. The only reason that we got our payment in June was that we brought down the financial statement and it clearly showed our undertaking to get that debt down to reasonable levels. The monitoring that had taken place up to that point had shown that, even though there were some reductions during that time, the former State Government's strategy was way off target, that it was not going to meet its target and that it would have to take a soft line and then take the hard decisions after the election or let the debt blow out and forget about the remainder of the State Bank bail-out sum.

I find it absolutely hypocritical that we had a Government that caused so much damage, that caused us to have to make these decisions, and now in Opposition is saying, 'It's all wrong, and it's not proper that you should be making these decisions. We would prefer you to let the State's debt run on and commit future generations to debt that cannot be paid for.' The former Government—now the Opposition—would prefer us to keep service levels going and the debt escalating, knowing that the State would become more and more impoverished and that the interest bills would get higher and higher. Either we make every attempt to get out of our debt and try to get our finances under control in the best way possible and in the shortest manageable time, or we continue to suffer the reputation of being a second-rate State. We have been called a basket case and a few other names which are not particularly complimentary. I am sick and tired of the Leader of the Opposition and his fellow travellers saying, 'It would have been all right. We are going to keep the Government to its promises.' I can say that we have kept most of our promises.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That's not true.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: If the Leader of the Opposition wants to go back through the documents—I am sure he has them—and tick them off, he will find—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am sure you are, but you will not mention that we have kept most of them, and there are some from which we have had to depart.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Oh yes indeed.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: You have a very poor score card.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I think the Leader of the Opposition needs a new set of glasses or some remedial reading.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am sure that members opposite can be particularly selective about what they perceive as election promises kept and not kept.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I think that members opposite should read what I said at the time and they can repeat it to me any time they like. The facts of life are that we have got to the point of no return. Members opposite recognise that it is good politics to keep carping. I am saying that the time for a decision is now. We have already made a decision—it was part of the Bill in April. It has now come back to this House. As we suggested at the time, we have now produced another scheme. That will be debated in another Bill, so I will not go through the matters canvassed in that legislation. I make the point that a blow-out involving billions of dollars will occur if some effort is not made to haul back the situation. It is a 30 year scheme—it is not a tomorrow scheme. The member for Hart said, 'We do not have to pay for them tomorrow.'

We are not paying for them tomorrow; we are taking 30 years to pay for them. Even though we are closing the schemes, it will take 30 years to get our liabilities under control. One could hardly say that that was irresponsible, but members opposite would suggest it was. We have a time frame. We are committed to meeting our commitments. We have a scheme in place where we will get the State back on track, and we intend to get there. Someone said, 'The Libs couldn't run a lolly shop.' Can I say that, after the previous Government's performance with the State Bank and SGIC, I did not think members opposite would make any comparison whatsoever. The level of hypocrisy reaches new heights.

As Treasurer I would have liked to come into Government and manage the finances in a fashion that pushed money into areas of greatest need to the point where we were not closing off options. We do not have that luxury, and we will not have it for several years. But, by hell, by the time we finish the process I would hope to think that this State can afford to do the things that are necessary. We would like to spend far more on economic development than we can afford. We would like to broaden our base as fast as possible. We cannot afford to do those things, and we have had to cut our cloth in a number of areas.

I know that various interest groups will say, 'Look, what about us?' I understand that. That is politics. The facts of life are that there is a bottom line. The bottom line is that the State is bankrupt; the bottom line is that hard decisions have to be taken; the bottom line is that we have to reach a savings target of about $300 million, give or take a few million dollars, to get the State's finances back on track. That will occur only if the schemes remain closed. If they do not remain closed, we will have to increase that savings task. Members opposite can make up their mind. If they want to hijack the process with their little mates in another place, they should think very carefully about the extent to which they put extra pressure on the budget savings task. It is just a simple fact of life. If this is not agreed to—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am just saying that, if this measure is not agreed to and we reopen the schemes, we will accrue further liabilities. Mathematics say that the costs have to be paid. It is a simple fact of life. If members opposite can think of some brilliant ways of paying for them, I will be pleased to hear them—I have not heard one yet, but I might be mistaken. Given time, they might think of some great schemes to come up with $300 million. Where will they find $200 million over the next 10 years? If members opposite hijack the process, if they say 'No' to the process, I would like them to tell me where we will find $200 million over the next 10 years to pay for the schemes that they would reopen.

I make the point quite clearly: the point of no return has been reached. It is not necessarily my wish that we do some of the things that now have to be done. However, they will be done, and they will be done for very good reasons: we want to give this State an opportunity; we want to make this State financially viable again; we want to make this State relevant again; and we want to make the people of this State proud of what we can achieve. We will not achieve while the State is being dragged down by debt. If members want to look at what happens when debt gets out of hand, I suggest they wander up to Canada and look at the provinces on the west coast. They should go to Newfoundland and see how many—

An honourable member: The east coast.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am sorry, the east coast.

Mr Quirke: It's the big lump in the Atlantic Ocean.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Exactly right. It is the east coast; the honourable member is correct. Just go to the east coast of Canada. America has a different system, where they talk about balanced budgets. When one looks at the American financing system most of the constitutions of the States demand a balanced budget. Then they find ways around it.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As the Leader said, they do not balance it too well. The City of New York and the City of Philadelphia were declared bankrupt and put under a scheme of arrangement organised by the Federal Parliament of the US. However, their level of debt *per capita* was a quarter of ours. They do not do it particularly well but they do not have our level of debt, either. If members opposite can see what the importance of a strong financial management system can mean to the State, they will appreciate that the financing has to be brought under control. The issue is quite straightforward. The matters have been previously debated.

The issues have been thoroughly canvassed. The only reason we are now debating this issue is that the Upper House refused us last time. I am hopeful that will not occur again, otherwise it will cause greater budgetary stress, which will have to be somehow managed. That will not concern the Opposition of course because it has never been constructive. It was not constructive during its period in Government and I do not expect it to be constructive during its period in Opposition. I commend the Bill to the House.

The House divided on the second reading:

AYES (25)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, S. J. (teller)	Becker, H.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Cummins, J. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G.	Leggett, S. R.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Rossi, J. P.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Wade, D. E.
Wotton, D. C.	

NOES (10)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Atkinson, M. J.
Blevins, F. T.	Clarke, R. D.
De Laine, M. R.	Foley, K. O.
Geraghty, R. K.	Hurley, A. K.
Quirke, J. A. (teller)	Stevens, L.

PAIRS

Penfold, E. M.	Rann, M. D.

Majority of 15 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr QUIRKE: If this Bill is successful through this place and through the other place, we will see the permanent closure of this scheme on 30 September 1994, as that is when the legislation is to come into force. The scheme has been temporarily closed from about 17 May. As I understand it, something of the order of at least 1 000 public servants saw the Channel 10 news program on the Monday prior to the Wednesday when this scheme was closed, and they put in their application forms on the day of the closure itself. Those forms were held in abeyance at that time and I am curious to know how that matter has been dealt with by the Treasurer and, indeed, what the current status is for people who made application to join this scheme on the death knock and, in fact, what has happened to the processing of those applications.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: My understanding is that a number of applications did not reach the appointed deadline. As the honourable member quite rightly points out, some people watched Channel 10 and were motivated to put in an application. Some leeway was given in the system and any application that we believed had been filed appropriately was accepted. I am not sure how many applications were accepted in that short space of time. I know that about 700 applications did not make the deadline, even though we used a reasonable amount of discretion as to which ones we accepted.

Mr QUIRKE: There are about 14 500 members of this scheme. What are their entitlements? A number of those people bought into a certain level of superannuation during that time. If a person is currently a member of this scheme but has not taken the full entitlement that that person is eligible for in the scheme—in other words, they have opted to pay in only 2 or 3 per cent of their salary instead of the 5.5 per cent which I believe was the maximum level of contribution—what happens to that person now? In relation to those 14 500 persons—some of whom may not have taken up the full superannuation—is it still open for them to take that up or is the scheme closed to those persons who are now members?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The scheme was open to them originally on the basis of an average six per cent contribution, and that will prevail. So, if they are below the prescribed level they can increase their contributions to that level. The conditions relating to those people who are contributing to the scheme today and who were contributing at the time have not altered.

Mr QUIRKE: The other question that immediately springs to mind is this: in answer to a question that I asked him a couple of weeks ago in this Chamber about the closed scheme and the scheme before it—the old State Government Superannuation Scheme—the Treasurer indicated that the schemes were under the microscope in terms of the contribution rate and the benefits at the other end. Can the Treasurer tell us what the latest thinking is on this point, and will he take this opportunity now to rule out any changes or any increase in the contribution rate and/or a decline in the benefits in these schemes to people who, in good faith, took on a contract of superannuation, in some instances many years ago, and who had a reasonable expectation and thereby arranged their financial affairs on the basis that they thought the Government would honour that side of the contract?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The statement was made two weeks ago that it was one of the 336 recommendations of the Audit Commission that were being examined, and that is still the position today. We have until 1 October to determine a position on that.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My comments will not take long. We had a tirade from the Treasurer, who unfortunately

stopped at one of the key points. He said that, if we have the audacity to try to make these people keep their promises, that is, their promise that they will not do these things, he will hit back at us in all sorts of other ways. I want him to take the opportunity tonight to tell us in which ways he will hit back at my constituents. I want to know that, because we had the episode of bus fares this afternoon and there is no doubt that a whole pile of other things will find their way to the Opposition. I would like a bit of pre-warning on these things, because it always makes for a juicier Question Time. The Treasurer should take my invitation to provide a few details about what is in his bag of tricks for us, because I think he will have a few problems with this Bill when it gets to the other House.

He can rest assured of one thing: the Labor Party in this House and in the other place will insist that the Government honours its commitments. We will stand by that position. I am not sure what position the Australian Democrats will take: that is for them to determine. Let me assure the Treasurer that the Labor Party believes that there was a reasonable level of superannuation for employees in this scheme. The Government promised to maintain the scheme, as it promised a number of other things. We will not sit back and watch that promise be flushed down the drain without pointing it out to the whole community. The Treasurer can call that politics: he can call it whatever he wants. We call it basic decency and honesty.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTHERN STATE SUPERANNUATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 August. Page 196.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The debate on this issue is not dissimilar from the debate on the closure of the old scheme. We have had a pea and thimble trick played by the Government but minus any thimbles and without any pea. The Government has tried to tell us that this scheme is wonderful, but it hopes to hoodwink a number of people. It wants to hoodwink the Opposition, but that is very difficult. It wants to hoodwink the Australian Democrats and I will make no comment on its success in that regard. What it is trying to say is, 'We are bringing in a brand new, lovely scheme. It is a wonderful scheme and it has a level of benefit which we are happy with, and we believe we can afford it.' What the Government does not tell us in the fine print is that it is bringing in the absolute minimum level of superannuation that it can get away with.

Government workers in this State can be very grateful that the good doctor was not elected on 13 March 1993. If he had been, the superannuation level would not be 6 per cent next year: it would be zero, because superannuation at the Federal level was the child of the Labor Party. It had nothing to do with the Liberal Party; it opposed it. As I understand it, its Federal policy is to repeal the superannuation guarantee charge. The triple S super scheme is predicated on the SGC—a Labor Party initiative at the Federal level. When we look at the provisions, we find that the scheme comes into its own at a level of 6 per cent of employer sponsored support on 1 July 1995. What do we find in the Federal Act? We find the same story. We find that the Federal Act sets out the bare minimum superannuation that every employer in this country has to abide by.

This Government will not pay a penny more. It is doing the pea and thimble trick without the pea or the thimbles. It is simply saying, 'We cannot get away with less. We are already in the High Court on two or three other matters. We have already been referred to as one of the most dishonourable employers that has come to the forefront.'

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Where is the Minister? I appreciate that the Government Whip may be in charge of the entire Government tonight, but where is the Minister? This is a very important issue and I think the Minister should be present.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Minister has indicated that he will be back in a moment. There is no necessity for the Minister to be in the Chamber.

Mr QUIRKE: The Government has determined that it wants to get out of this as cheaply as it possibly can. In reference to the last Bill, the Treasurer said that he cannot even guarantee that he will not put up the contribution rates for people in the two old schemes that he closed off. He said he will not guarantee that people will get the benefit at the other end that they think they will get by paying into it. What do we find now? Do we find the Treasurer running around the countryside, following Alexander Downer in a plane through Central Australia, asking him, 'Will you take on board a very strong representation from the South Australian Liberal Government that the SGC must remain in force? We ask that the promises that you, the Leader of the Liberal Party at a Federal level, are making about repealing this measure not be kept.' We do not find that at all.

What we found when we debated this issue previously—and this is such draconian legislation that it is chucked out at the other end of the corridor and comes back here to be referred to conferences and the rest of it—was that in this Chamber we have one of the greatest converts to the SGC: the Treasurer believes it is a great scheme. He took about 20 minutes one night late in May to tell us what a wonderful scheme he thought the SGC was. The only thing was that we had never heard a word from him before 13 March 1994 about the whole thing and we have not heard a word outside this place from him since. It is an argument of convenience.

This legislation is predicated on the Federal Labor Government's SGC provisions. It is predicated on the fact that there will be a continued Labor Government presence in Canberra and that the system will be lifted per cent by per cent until the 9 per cent levy is reached. That will not happen until the year 2002 and chances are that by that time the Federal Labor Government will not be there. The whole system, if we believe the Liberal Party at the Federal level, will be repealed and lifted from employers: this obligation will be gone. This Bill is a cheap and shoddy trick. It is typical of the Government to treat people this way. It has brought in this brand new scheme, saying it will do this, that and the other, but in reality it will do nothing more than it has to do. There is not a penny more in it. In Committee I will be circulating amendments in my name. If we do not get there tonight, we will do it tomorrow.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Doubtless those amendments will create a great deal of mirth from the member for Ridley, because that is all we get from such a member who has no care or compassion whatsoever for Government workers in his electorate. We hear him going on here about farmers and the like, but we never hear him talk about Government workers. I opened the Saturday *Advertiser* a few months ago and the tears were tripping us about what a hard worker he is and how

much work he does for his constituency. Here is one end of his constituency that he could not care less about. The member for Ridley can laugh, giggle and guffaw, but we will take the fight up to him.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is a direct reflection on my reputation and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has no point of order. He has an opportunity to make a personal explanation at the conclusion of the debate. I can offer him no more than that.

Mr QUIRKE: The honourable member and some other members opposite are an absolute disgrace and the member for Ridley, who has been here for many years, ought to know better than to come in here and laugh over the misery of Government workers. Let me single out one group of Government workers about whom the member for Ridley might want to have some care, that is, members of the Police Force in South Australia. This new legislation will guarantee a two tier system of superannuation for police serving in the community. In the future male and female police recruits who have family obligations will go to Fort Largs for training. However, courtesy of the Government, there may be other police officers in a squad car with them one night when a terrible incident happens. One police officer will know that his or her family is covered, but the other will know that his or her family is not covered. That is a disgrace. I would like to see a few members opposite, particularly the member for Ridley, defend that position. I bet he will not do that and I bet that a number of others will not do it.

I intend to call for a division on this measure and to make sure that everyone out in the community knows about it. Every Government member has Government workers in their electorate. Every last one of them has police officers and teachers and probably they have more Government workers in their electorates than members on this side. They will know of this, because the PSA and the Institute of Teachers will tell them. Certainly, the Police Association will tell them which way Government members voted on all these matters.

The Labor Party rejects this Bill in its entirety. We will seek to amend it and bring back to a reasonable level the superannuation that we believe all employers should be able to meet. That is the absolute minimum. That level ought to be met and the promises made by the Government must be kept. So far as this measure is concerned, the absolute silence of many members of the back bench, including members whom I will not single out, is significant. I singled out the member for Ridley earlier because of his jocularity on this important issue, but there are many members on the Government back bench who ought to be thinking long and hard about this measure. This Bill will hurt, and people will remember it for a long time.

If people spend many years putting their financial affairs in order and have this sort of stuff done to them, they remember it. It is the job of the Opposition all the time to point out to this Government what its promises were and what its performance is. We do not need the conscience of the Government back bench to tell us that members will keep the Government honest. The Opposition's job is to point out clearly where promises repeatedly have been broken. In this respect I refer to the comments of the member for Unley. That is an interesting case. If ever there was a large number of Government workers in an electorate who will be affected by these provisions, it is those workers living in the electorate of Unley. I will look forward with interest to see how the member for Unley enters this debate and defends the Government on it, or whether I will read in tomorrow's paper that he has gone out there and decided to bucket this one as well. The reality is that we find him saying one thing in here and saying something different when he goes outside the House. At the end of the day this is a miserable-

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I refer you to Standing Order 127.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It refers to attributing improper motives to a member, something I am very familiar with. I do not think there is a point of order. The honourable member was expressing an opinion and I will allow him to continue, but I will listen to his remarks.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. So that we get the record absolutely—

Mr LEWIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I draw your attention to Standing Order 127, which provides:

> A member may not
> 1. digress from the subject. . .
> 2. or impute improper motives. . .
> 3. or make personal reflections on any other member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member wishes to question the ruling of the Chair, he has the simple expedient of doing it in writing. The Chair has made a ruling and the Chair believes that it was correct. If the honourable member wishes to dispute that ruling, it is his prerogative to do so. The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. In this case we find that the Government is betraying a basic trust. It told the people of South Australia, the unions and everyone that it would maintain the existing superannuation schemes. It did that by letter. As to the new scheme—

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: If the Treasurer had been here, instead of being absent for a while, he would have heard that I had much to say about the new scheme—about its being a pea and thimbles trick. At the end of the day this new scheme provides absolutely nothing more than the Treasurer can get away with without being dragged into the High Court and made to cough up a basic level of superannuation. I will wait to see when he makes—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek your guidance. The member for Playford has done this before. I am not sure whether it is contrary to Standing Orders—

Mr Quirke: What's your point of order?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley will resume his seat for a moment. The honourable member should rise with a point of order and not stand and say he is not sure what he is going to say. That is incumbent on every member. A point of order is a point of order. If the honourable member wishes to make a point of order, I will listen to him.

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise, Mr Deputy Speaker. My point of order is that it has been a longstanding tradition in this place that no member refers to the absence or otherwise of any member during a debate, but the member for Playford has done that repeatedly. Is that contrary to Standing Orders or will it be a tradition in this place to refer to everyone who has not been here in every part of the debate?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has no point of order. The reflection on the presence or absence of another member is not an infrequent occurrence in this

Chamber. It is not an improper thing to refer to. The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE: I would have thought the Treasurer was capable of defending himself. He did not need his little factional mate back there to give him assistance. Do you want to take a point of order and name yourself or are you quite happy to sit back and let that one wash over you? I am quite happy for you to get up and name yourself on that. That is the first time the member for Unley—I will have to name him—did not jump on the hook, and I put some nice bait on it. The Opposition totally rejects this Bill. We will be moving our own amendments at the appropriate time. We will be spirited in this debate. We will be debating the matter in this Chamber and in the other place at every opportunity. What is more, we will be using it out in the community. We will be showing the record of this Government and its broken promises.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I was quite happy to allow a member of the Government to stand up, but I do not believe they would want to because they do not want to identify themselves with another atrocity. This just carries on the debate that we had when I was on my feet prior to the dinner adjournment with respect to the closure of the superannuation schemes. What is quite evident from the Government's intentions with respect to the Southern State Superannuation legislation is that this Government has been quite ruthless in deciding that at least a dozen of its backbenchers are expendable. The Deputy Premier has worked out that, to be in government, you need only 24 members out of 47: in that respect he is numerate.

What he has decided, and what his Cabinet colleagues have collectively decided, is they want to go for the big hit in terms of trying to reduce what they see as the State debt, and in three years and four months time be able to say to the electorate, 'Despite all the pain we have inflicted on you, we have achieved $X reduction. No matter what pain we have inflicted on you, we have done this.' They know full well that many of their backbenchers are oncers and are not prepared to try to salvage their seats by going easy on the public sector or in terms of their conditions of employment. So, they have taken the quite ruthless decision to make 12 of their number expendable and they intend to get rid of them. Unfortunately for the Government, I think that they have overdone themselves, particularly with the revelations today on public transport fares, and that it will not be just 12 of their members who will be expendable in three years and four months time but a good many others as well, so they will be out of Government.

This Bill is an interesting one in that, as far as I can tell, and I guess we will find this out in Committee when I have the opportunity to ask questions of the Treasurer, there is no requirement by the Government to increase its share of contributions to the scheme in accordance with the superannuation guarantee levy as it currently exists through to the year 2001 or 2002—that it is actually linked to the maintenance of that Federal Act with respect to the various minimum levels prescribed by the Federal Government. This Government is part and parcel of the Liberal Party of Australia which went to the last Federal election promising the electorate that it would abolish the superannuation guarantee levy in total, although I understand it has been somewhat moderated since then so that, once they assume office, it will cut out at that date and will not rise any further. So, there is no guarantee for the State public servants of the future that they will in fact receive 9 per cent of income from the employer as at the year 2001 or 2002.

There is a misconception that many of the public servants who will be affected in the future by Southern State Superannuation are highly paid people: that is far from the truth. The overwhelming majority of employees who will be affected by this legislation earn $25 000 a year or less. Fortunately, because of the Federal Labor Government's policies, there is a low level of inflation and there has not been a very great rise in terms of wage growth over the past few years, nor is it projected to be on an across the board basis, at least to the year 2 000, because of the low rate of inflation. With the emphasis now being on enterprise bargaining, in terms of pursuing wage claims, and this Government's commitment to enforcing a wages freeze for a further two years, the reality of it is that, for the average public servant on $25 000 a year, that $25 000 will stay fairly stable.

We are effectively imposing through this legislation a reduction: on $500 a week, if the current levy is 5 per cent, it is only $25 a week; or, if it is 6 per cent, it is $30 a week. At the moment the same public servants would be entitled to $60 a week effectively going into the piggy bank for their long term retirement. So, this Government is effectively saying to the public servants of the future, 'You have to accept a $30 a week wage cut'—it is actually more than $30, because whilst it is $30 in the first week it is compounded over a working life of perhaps 35 years, and the lost earnings in terms of investment returns and the like on that sum of money over the person's working life amount to a huge sum of money. That is really a huge sum of money for a person on quite modest wages of an average of $25 000. There are many people in the Public Service who earn less than $25 000 a year, and there are only a few who earn significantly above that figure.

So, we are saying to what I would class as the average worker, the average battler, trying to raise their family, wanting to look after themselves in retirement in modest comfort, upon their retirement they will have to suffer a huge reduction in their standard of living. As I said in the previous debate, I do not think that is good enough. I do not think it is good enough because, whilst I have never been one to say that the State Public Service should have the zenith of conditions of employment, that it should be the absolute world beater of world beaters in terms of conditions of employment, it has to have some regard to the general community at large.

Given that they are losing significant benefits in terms of permanency of employment, rights of appeal and promotion and grievances, and the fact that they have been imposed by the end of this Government's self-imposed two year wage freeze—a five year wage freeze—and given that it is important for this State to attract and retain the best employees to serve as teachers and community aid workers, etc.—as I said earlier, as potential Under Treasurers to keep a handle on Treasurers who are a bit wayward from time to time (in particular the present Treasurer), we will need people of excellent calibre. What I regret sincerely is that, unless we are able to offer a reasonable package in terms of employment conditions, people will leave the service. It is all very well for the Treasurer to laugh. He himself was formerly a public servant. I might say that always there is an exception that proves the rule about merit and the selection procedures in the Public Service, because he slipped through the net, but you cannot have a system that is 100 per cent foolproof. Nonetheless, what the Treasurer wants to impose on the future public

servants of this State are conditions under which he himself would never have agreed to work.

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: It is true. The Treasurer says, 'Do you want to bet?' It is probably true that he could not get a job in private industry. He would be utterly unemployable in the real labour market and has therefore had to seek refuge as Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, because only that organisation would have him.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The member for Unley interjects about the Treasurer becoming a union organiser. Our standards are too high to allow that to happen; we would never allow him within the portals of our organisation. He would have been sacked very shortly after he joined, particularly in my own organisation. I have said this in the previous debate, but because these are separate debates it is nonetheless worth saying for the record in so far as the future is concerned, because this will come back to haunt this Government. If you want to drive people out of our civil service by offering them conditions significantly inferior to those which they can enjoy in the private sector, then by all means follow the path that you are pursuing. The member for Unley has a wry smile: I would have thought that as a former teacher he would appreciate the desirability of retaining excellent teachers in our teaching work force to ensure that our future generations are taught by capable persons. Fortunately for the children of today, the member for Unley is in Parliament rather than teaching students, and that is obviously to their benefit.

Another point with which I want to deal and which may come up during the Committee stage is the investment decisions to be taken by the superannuation scheme. One of the public sector's concerns in the past about its superannuation schemes is that all governments have sought to use the superannuation schemes as a form of cheap money for investment within this State. In many cases the rate of return that those investments have yielded has been well below the rate of return experienced by other commercial funds. I can understand that in some respects because, obviously, Governments want to generate investment in this State and from time to time will want to use accumulated funds such as the superannuation fund to encourage investment in a number of buildings or other establishments for the purposes of economic development. It would be fair to say that some rates of return have been well below the commercial rate. In one sense that has not mattered so much in the past, because of the commitment that previous governments have had to ensuring minimum superannuation returns for those employees when they retire. So, if they have not had the same rate of commercial return as have others in the private sector, effectively the Treasury has topped it up to guarantee a certain defined benefit.

The problem here is that I do not see any restrictions that may be placed on the Government in using these funds still in investments which will attract a low yield, but the Government's contributions to the lump sum are limited to whatever is the SGL limit at any particular time. It is 6 per cent at the moment and we hope it will go up to 9 per cent, but there is no guarantee, because it is tied to the maintenance of the superannuation guarantee levy. Presumably, the Treasurer will be able to answer these questions in Committee and he may be able to allay my fears in that respect. If he cannot, the end result could be quite disastrous for these people, because they would be getting an employer contribution well below that which the private sector pays for persons performing similar work and with comparable skills, responsibilities and the like, and at the same time it would not attract a truly commercial rate of return.

My final point, unless the Treasurer wants to move an extension of time, is the Government's cavalier disregard for promises made at the last election. The State's economic difficulties were well known to the Treasurer and the Government prior to the last election. Blind Freddy understood the financial difficulties the State was in at that time but, notwithstanding that, the then shadow Treasurer made unequivocal commitments, for example, to the 25 000 members of the Public Service Association, that the Government would not interfere with the superannuation schemes then in place. This fear was widely felt by that organisation because of what it saw happening in Victoria under the Liberal Premiership of Jeff Kennett.

It was quite right to approach the major political Parties prior to that State election and ask them, 'What are your promises and commitments to our membership in this vital area of employment?' The Treasurer was not shy in putting forward his position unequivocally, and again it is another broken promise. I know that after so many broken promises you can become a little cavalier and not worry a great deal about what your word is worth in the community generally, but ultimately that comes home to the Government and the persons concerned when the community generally does not believe what you say.

When large segments of the community, not just the ordinary citizens but also the organisations with which the Government has to deal on a daily basis, receive an undertaking from the Premier, Deputy Premier or any Minister saying, 'I commit the Government to this; we are honour bound to do it' and look at what the Government said about superannuation, shopping hours, industrial relations, union deductions, health, education and public transport, they see that the Government has reneged on the lot of them and told bold-faced untruths at the time of the last election. What I cannot understand is that members opposite knew they were going to win the election—everyone knew they were going to win the last State election—yet you had the Deputy Premier, then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, scrambling around making promises to everyone.

There was not a rock that he did not lift up and promise to a cockroach under it that they would be looked after by the Government if it got into office. There was not a rock that he did not turn up. He made all these promises to every interest group in our society, as if last year's election would be a close-run thing, that it would be neck and neck and that you had to win a few hundred votes in a couple of key marginals to win. Now your chickens have come home to roost; you promised too much to too many people, knowing all along that you could never honour your commitments, and you have large segments of our community saying, 'What's the point?'

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Can I ask that the member for Ross Smith not refer to other members in this place by the second person pronoun 'you' but rather by referring his remarks through you to the rest of the Chamber?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to members by their district.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Sir. I will conclude on this note: as I have said earlier, we have key sectors of our communities picking up any letter from any Government Minister today and saying, 'What is the point of accepting the word of this Government? It means nothing, unless it is in a

legal document, bound, witnessed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and even then in face of the Virgin Mary, and perhaps only if the Virgin Mary is present.' That will totally destroy any sense of trust and understanding within our community. Most of our business dealings are not done on the basis of having to sign covenants every day which are enforceable in the Supreme Court. The word of the Government should mean something and it must be upheld.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): We have been treated to some time wasting this evening. The contributions by the members for Playford and for Ross Smith would be wonderful for the Labor Party if only they were based on fact. The tragedy is that they were not. We on the Government side of the Chamber remember the deceit of the Labor Party during the last occasion when the Liberal Party was in office in South Australia. Labor members believed that, if they said it long and often enough in sufficient places, they would be able to convince a sufficient number of people to change their votes and believe that what the Labor Party was saying was true when in fact it was not. Opposition members will not get away with it this time.

The first thing that we will do is to let them and the general public know the truth of the matter. We have not had any of that so far. Let's take the assertions made by the member for Playford. The example that he gave about two policemen confronted with a life-threatening situation, one of whom was still a member under the closed State scheme and the other a member under the proposed new scheme that is brought into being (permanently in an enduring way) by this Bill, was quite specious and untrue. It is piffle. It really is drivel, and he knows it is. All he has to do is read the Bill. There is no difference. If either of those two police officers were to die, clause 30 provides for benefit as with invalidity. Members of the Police Force are guaranteed a minimum benefit by subclause (7). There is no difference. The member for Playford, like the member for Ross Smith who is trying to prate away now after having had his go, knows the truth of the matter. They are not telling the truth. They know that, if they tell these untruths often and long enough in sufficient places, some poor souls will be deceived by them into believing that what they are saying is fact, that they are telling the truth and that their arguments are logical. We will simply not allow them to get away with that kind of nonsense.

The member for Playford's arguments were as dishonest as his statements were untrue. Those arguments were quite irrelevant to this measure and they are deliberately deceitful. It strikes me that when he speaks it is with a sort of pious arrogance that one could only expect from a dill in the public domain, and I guess he deserves to be treated with the same kind of indifference. The simpler souls in our society might react to him as a second-rate coconut shy, but I will not dignify him with that. I simply point out for the sake of the record and the benefit of members that they need place no credence whatever on his remarks. They are political; they are not based on an accurate assessment of the State's situation; and they are deceitful in that they attempt to mislead the public. If the honourable member would only read what is to be found on pages 159 and 160 of *Hansard*, he would have a much clearer view of what it is about. It is about nothing of the sort that he has been telling the House this evening.

The member for Ross Smith made one point that I was able to understand. That is not so much a reflection on my intellectual capacity to understand him, but rather a reflection on his inability to put forward a cogent argument. He said that this legislation would drive people out of the civil service. That is drivel. It will not drive people out of the civil service any more or less than the maladministration of the past 12 years of Government will drive people out of the civil service, because the State no longer has the financial resilience to support so many so well, as was previously possible.

Apart from that, we have to be competitive. This State's enterprises cannot afford to continue to carry the burden of higher and higher taxation which would otherwise be necessary to keep the member for Ross Smith and others to whom he might have been referring in the fashion to which he believes they are entitled. We have to cut our cloth according to our means. If there are higher levels of taxation to support that kind of continuing escalation of benefits—and all we have done by this legislation is to cap those benefits where they were and introduce a new scheme in compliance with the Federal Government's demands—it will not be the civil servants leaving the Public Service who will bring down this State; it will be this State's taxation base. Business enterprises will leave the State in droves, as they did over recent times until the election of nine months ago, thereby leaving no revenue base to the public purse. Those are the kinds of alternatives that confront us as decision makers, regardless of the side of the House on which we sit and the organisation or political Party to which we belong, if any.

We simply cannot ignore reality. Even though we may want the world to be flat, it will not turn out to be flat. Even if we say that it will be flat 1 000 times a day and get 10 other people on the Opposition side of the Chamber to say that it is flat, that will not make it flat. We could get another 100 members of the public outside this Parliament to say that the world shall be flat, but the fact remains that it is not. The reality is that the world is round. The remarks we have heard from the members for Playford and for Ross Smith shows that they should join the flat earth society. That is about the level on which they have debated this measure, and to my mind that is unfortunate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Ridley to link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, I have, Sir. I have tried to explain in terms simple enough for members opposite to understand that their arguments about this matter and the statements that they have made simply do not stack up. The facts do not support what they have wanted and tried to say. I know that they will circulate this widely, and I hope they will circulate it fully throughout my electorate. I shall be very grateful to them because it will save me the postage in doing so. There is no question but that they will be the laughing stock and I will benefit in electoral terms.

This measure ensures that there is certainty about superannuation benefits not only to members of the civil service in South Australia but also to those who are contemplating joining the civil service and, more particularly, to those in the rest of the State's economy who will have to pay the taxes sooner or later to provide those kinds of benefits to employees in the public sector. It is on that basis that I chose to make it plain, if not to those two members then at least to all others, that this measure is not only desirable but essential.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I rise in grievance tonight on a matter which I hope will concern all members of this House. It is something for which we are normally held accountable by the media, and the media are very good in this State at pointing to instances where they accuse members of this House of hypocrisy. I want to highlight to this House a similar, and I think dangerous, incident that recently occurred in the media in South Australia. I refer to the *Sunday Mail* editorial of a couple of weeks ago which was headed 'Brown's backbenchers must stop rocking the boat.'

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Do you want to hear the speech or do you want to write it? I do not want to canvass in detail the contents of the editorial but some of the principles behind editorial writing. I do not believe many members on either side of the House would deny the media the right to express an informed opinion on anything that happens in this State, particularly on the political process, and especially when the newspaper has the gall a week later in response to the member for Colton's very reasonable and reasoned letter to claim that every person who reads that paper has given them a mandate to say whatever they like. To make that assertion implies some level of responsibility.

Informed opinion is not only the right but the responsibility of every media outlet. However, as I said, the responsibility that goes with that is that the opinion must be informed. I would like to point out to the House that in writing the editorial no member of the *Sunday Mail* staff at any level contacted me to find out my opinion on the matter about which they felt compelled to write. I do not believe they contacted the member for Colton about what he might have said or might have been thinking, nor the member for Elder, nor the member for Lee. They held their opinions without bothering to inform themselves.

When I put this in a phone call to the Editor, his answer to me was, 'Well, you realise that this was a comment piece and our journalists do not have time.' They publish only one newspaper a week, nevertheless the journalists did not have the time to check any of their information. It is apparently all right for the *Sunday Mail*, on behalf of its 777 000 readers, to express an opinion without informing itself first. When I told the Editor that perhaps he should have informed himself it was met with silence. We then moved on to the subject of the speech. This is what does concern me, and I hope will concern members opposite.

The Editor of the *Sunday Mail* admitted that he had never read the speech. I do not know about members opposite but I will stand by what I say in this House, and I do not mind people telling me I am wrong. I do not mind being wrong and admitting I am wrong, but I do object to people with supposed power and responsibility in this community going out and expressing opinions based on other than the facts and other than what I said.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member opposite says I was being shafted by my own side. Far from it. I believe I know why I was being shafted and it had nothing to do with this side. It had to do with a sequence of events that culminated in shop trading hours. I challenge any member of the Opposition or any member of the Government bench to refer back and look at the number of political comments written in the *Sunday Mail* about shop trading hours and the line it took over the issue. We only have to look at the *Sunday Mail* editorial of 14 August, after the decision was made. It was headed 'A spark to set us all alight.' The editorial concluded by saying:

> Let's hope this important renaissance sets the tempo for a giant surge in this State of ours, long yearning for a lift from the doldrums.

Under the editorial headed, 'Brown's backbenchers must stop rocking the boat', an article written by John Church appears headed, 'Shops Minister in the hot seat.' It was an article in defence of shop trading hours and the fact that everybody should stop rocking the boat and let Sunday trading take place in Adelaide. It was the same in many other opinions and leader articles published throughout the months before. On the Sunday before the Government parliamentary Party considered shop trading hours we saw an attack on any member of the Government backbench who dared to express a variation of opinion; an attack that I believe was calculated to keep the Government backbench in line and to maximise the chance of this Government acceding to Sunday trading.

I find hypocrisy in any form difficult to tolerate. The hypocrisy of the *Sunday Mail* has to be seen to be believed. I refer to the *Advertiser* editorial of Thursday 1 July 1993. I hasten to add that the *Advertiser* is owned by the same owner as the *Sunday Mail*. The editorial was headed, 'Why Arnold Government must pay the price.' The gist of that editorial was that the Executive Government of the day had not listened to its backbench; it had failed to heed the messages coming from its backbench, and therefore it had to pay the price. That was the *Advertiser's* editorial opinion. After Mr Brown had won office on 12 December, the *Sunday Mail* came out with this editorial:

> New solutions to old problems were promised and the Liberals must stand and deliver.

It continues:

> Business, large and small, must feel the warmth of better times. So must hapless families who have felt the pain of unemployment and helplessness.

It further states:

> The Brown Liberal Government has to press on with the necessary cuts to the Public Service—but with the deft touch of a surgeon not the brutality of a razor gang. . . . In turn, the Government has to serve every man, woman and child under its care.

Another article headed 'The budget we had to have', which appeared on 21 August this year, states:

> But so long as this budget is fair . . .

And then, at the end, underlined:

> Make no mistake, budget '94 simply has to be the shining light at the end of the tunnel.

In talking about editorial opinion on the pokies debate on 19 June 1994, a *Sunday Mail* article stated:

> Long-term costs without proper safety nets will be great harm not only in financial terms but human too.

Here we have a paper which talks about safety nets, which talks about the people, which talks about looking after the people and which thinks it can act as the custodian of public morality on behalf of the people but, when a member of Parliament gets up and exercises a word of caution, especially if it might impinge on the dollars that the *Sunday Mail* might earn from advertising, it is somehow wrong. I put to this House that the *Sunday Mail* exercised an editorial opinion solely for the purpose of gaining extra revenue from Sunday trading and that it tried to influence this House by so doing.

I think that is wrong. The people of South Australia have a right to know that the informed opinion of the *Sunday Mail* might be informed by its need to earn dollars and not by good and clear commonsense, and I think that that is a disgrace. The *Sunday Mail* is a monopoly and it should be treated as such.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I refer to the Government's proposal to privatise the Modbury Hospital, an issue that has been going on for some time. The matter has been raised by me and by my constituents on numerous occasions in the past couple of months. Speculation regarding the possible sale of the Modbury Hospital has caused many residents much concern. They are concerned for themselves, their families, their children, their elderly relatives and their neighbours. They are concerned that, should Modbury Hospital be sold, the nearest public health services would be at the Lyell McEwin or at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the city. Most of all, they are concerned at this attack on their inalienable rights to accessible and equitable public health services.

This Government does not seem to realise that our basic standards of living require such a public health service. Health care is a universal right and the people who live in the north-eastern suburbs have shown that they will fight for their rights to public health care. On 19 July the Coalition for Better Health held a public meeting at the Modbury Hospital in opposition to plans to privatise. More than 400 people attended that meeting, the seats were full and people were standing in the aisles and in the foyer in the auditorium. Among those 400 concerned people, there was only one Government member—the member for Wright. The Minister for Health did not attend. You would think these members would be interested to hear what 400 of their constituents had to say about the proposal, but I understand they had more important things to do.

As the only Government representative at that meeting, the member for Wright declared that the proposal to privatise Modbury Hospital was a proposal of the previous Labor Government. The residents at that public meeting groaned at the time, as we all do when we hear this oft trotted out excuse from the Government. However, that is not the case. The former Labor Government proposed to build a 60-bed private wing, which was to be in addition to the Modbury Hospital. There was no suggestion of turning over any public beds into the hands of private owners. The member for Wright also said at the meeting that he prides himself—

Mr Ashenden: You are not supposed to read, you know.

Mrs GERAGHTY: That's okay. I can have a go, mate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright and the member for Ross Smith will cease interjecting. The member for Torrens has the call.

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Wright also said at the meeting that he prides himself on his honesty. I doubt he has a level of pride if this is an indication of his honesty. I refer to the Audit Commission report, the document commissioned by the Government to justify its slash and burn policies. The Audit Commission recommended $114.5 million in savings be made in the health arena. How was the Government to save $114.5 million from such a vital public service? The report suggested that $84 million could be saved in admissions, $15 million could be saved by privatising outpatients and $6 million could be saved from workers' compensation pay-outs.

Members interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: I have news for you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: People do not go to hospital for the fun of it: they go because they are unwell and need treatment. To save $84 million on admissions would mean not admitting patients who need health care. Health workers do not have accidents on purpose. The word 'accident' means that there is no premeditation. Does the Government plan to outlaw workers' accidents, thereby saving $6 million in workers' compensation pay-outs? Will the Government please explain?

The Audit Commission also claims that South Australia has a 12 per cent greater admission rate than other States. That is probably true, but it is not because South Australians are a bunch of hypochondriacs taking up hospital beds for no good reason. This State has the highest unemployment rate—something that this Government has certainly helped along with its massive cuts to public service employment, but that is another story—the oldest population and the lowest average salary of all Australia. Could it be possible that our higher admission rate is due to an older and poorer society? That is a novel thought and perhaps one that members opposite could ponder.

Regarding statistics, I throw in another one for the interest of members opposite. South Australia has the lowest level of private health insurance in Australia, and the north-eastern suburbs have one of the lowest levels of private health insurance in Adelaide. It does not take a genius to figure out that a private hospital in the Modbury area is not a pressing priority and that a public hospital is much needed by the residents of that region.

Mr Ashenden: Who wrote this rubbish?

Mrs GERAGHTY: I am sure you would be really delighted to have a go at them. It is the taxpayers of South Australia, of the north-eastern suburbs, who paid for the establishment of the Modbury Hospital and who continue to pay for the provision of services at that institution. Therefore, it is those people who must be consulted before any change is made to their public health service. There has been no feasibility study, no letters to local residents and no consultation with hospital staff or users of the hospital. This Government cannot take the people for granted in its action to privatise every moving thing in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: Make no bones about it: privatisation means profit. A privatised hospital means a hospital which is out to make money. It is not interested in the sorts of patient services that are being introduced all over the country—services such as short stay, preventive medicine, outpatient services and early discharge. What is the use of these when you are concerned about your wallet? A privatised hospital is interested in keeping patients in for as long as possible and money-making procedures.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: Forget the rest; if they do not make money, they go. Members should look at what has happened in the United States. In the United States a sports medicine clinic is more financially viable than an emergency service.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is out of order. So is the member for Colton.

Mrs GERAGHTY: But what is the use of a sports medicine clinic when you are having a heart attack or are in

need of urgent attention following a car accident? We need a public health service to ensure that the priorities and the balance remain right.

Dr Peter Botsman, the Executive Director of the Evatt Foundation, has some interesting thoughts on the American system. Having worked in the States for a number of years on health policy, he believes Australia's current Medicare public health system is one of the best in the world. Like me, he cannot understand why Governments such as this would want to change it.

Despite having the world's highest costs for medical health care and Government spending per head of population on the health system, the United States system has a very poor overall health outcome, especially incomplete access to health insurance and care. More than 35 million Americans had no health care insurance for the entire year of 1991 and more than 60 million did not have insurance for at least one month of that year. Millions of others with inadequate coverage can be bankrupted by a catastrophic illness. Many uninsured Americans forgo care, and the uninsured generally raise costs for others because the costs of unpaid bills and charity care are shifted onto the bills of paying customers. The uninsured are more likely to seek less cost-effective forms of medicine resulting in the need for more costly treatments later. It should come as no surprise that, after listening to Dr Botsman, America's health outcome indicators lag considerably below those of most developed countries. The US ranked twenty-fourth in infant mortality in 1987, behind Singapore and Hong Kong, and twenty-second and sixteenth in terms of male and female life expectancies.

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

Motion carried.

At 9.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 24 August at 2 p.m.