

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 February 1995

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

### HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS) BILL

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

### EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES

A petition signed by 197 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to cut the Education and Children's Services budget was presented by Mr Buckby.

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 126, 166 and 169; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### ADULT BOOKSHOPS

In reply to **Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens)** 15 November.

The **Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD**:

1. Yes.
2. The location of an adult bookshop is a land use matter subject to the provisions of the Development Act 1993 and the Development Regulations 1993 made under that Act. The construction of a shop, or the change of use of an existing building to a shop, is defined as development for the purposes of the Act and cannot proceed without a development approval being issued by the relevant authority, in most cases the local council. When considering any application for development approval the relevant authority must not make a decision that is seriously at variance with the provisions of the appropriate development plan for the area. Development plans for the metropolitan area and all major country towns contain zones set aside for specific purposes. For example, there are neighbourhood centre zones and local centre zones set aside for shops and various residential zones. Most schools are located within residential zones. Any development application for the construction of an adult bookshop or a change of use of an existing building for this purpose would need to be considered by the relevant authority against the development plan provisions for the zone within which it is to be located. Consideration would also be given to the nature of nearby land uses, such as schools, as part of the assessment process.

The major difficulty with adult bookshops arises in situations where the adult bookshop occupies a building previously used as some other type of shop. In this case, the change is not classed as a change of land use for the purposes of the Development Act and, therefore, no development approval is required. This is because Schedule 1 of the development regulations contains an all embracing generic definition of the term 'shop' that does not distinguish between individual kinds of shops such as an adult bookshop, a second hand bookshop, a newsagent or a delicatessen. Any change to the current definition of shop or the creation of a new definition of adult bookshop must follow the procedures set out in Section 5 of the Development Act. These include the Development Policy Advisory Committee seeking public comments on the proposed changes and the opportunity for the Local Government Association to make a submission on them.

I am sympathetic to the member's concerns and I am seeking a report from the Technical and Procedures Subcommittee of the Development Policy Advisory Committee on possible options for greater control over the location of adult bookshops. However, there is no simple solution to the problem raised.

I do not favour the introduction of a control mechanism into the Local Government Act. It is the Government's policy to progressively incorporate all land use controls within the ambit of the Development Act.

### SCHOOLS, PRIVATE MONOPOLIES

In reply to **Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens)** 22 November.

The **Hon. R.B. SUCH**: My colleague the Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following response.

Any proposal for commercial ventures forwarded for ministerial approval must comply with the relevant Acts.

The Administrative Instructions and Guidelines for Schools were altered on 20 October 1994 to allow commercial ventures to be conducted on school sites subject to prior approval from the Minister. Schools contemplating conducting commercial ventures on school premises need to satisfy a number of legal requirements including complying with the Planning Act, the Education Act, State Supply Act, the Public Finance and Audit Act and the Fair Trading Act.

These changes were made in response to a number of principals and school councils seeking ways to generate revenue and outsource non-educational activities.

Prior to the amendments to the Administrative Instructions and Guidelines, schools were utilising a number of commercial enterprises which were contrary to the Administrative Instructions and Guidelines.

Some of the activities conducted are:

- the use of agencies for school insurance/banking
- lease of premises for after hours commercial use
- use of commercial photographers for school photos
- school canteens
- stationery
- school uniform shops
- sideshows at fetes
- joint use/lease agreements.

The Minister has recently approved the establishment of a small business which supplies school uniforms at the Golden Grove High School. This approval was granted following a call for tenders and after it was shown that the school complied with the Planning Act, Public Finance and Audit Act, State Supply Act, Trade Practices Act and the Fair Trading Act.

### DOG FENCE

In reply to **Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith)** 9 February.

The **Hon. D.S. BAKER**:

1. The electric fences intended for use as alternatives to the netting structure, are designed to present a measure of physical as well as psychological control. The Dog Fence Board is well advanced with research into methods for providing reliable 24 hour monitoring of these fences using remote sensing technology.

2. The existing netting fence has provided a good level of protection over many years. However, it is not and never has been infallible. I am advised that netting dog fences are far more susceptible to damage from wildlife and domestic animal pressure than electric fences. I am further advised that there are already about 300 kilometres of electric fencing constructed for the purpose of 'protecting' conventional netting dog fences which are not able to provide adequate stock protection in their own right.

### POLITICAL DONATIONS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: Last week the Leader of the Opposition asked three questions relating to financial donations to the Liberal Party. In part, the information upon which the Leader based his questions was contained in a document released publicly by the Australian Electoral Commission three weeks ago. That document was the annual disclosure return to the commission by the South Australian

Division of the Liberal Party. The document properly records and faithfully reports all the information the Party is required by law to keep and to disclose.

The Leader of the Opposition chose to wait until he had the privilege of this Parliament to use this publicly available information. His questions implied that certain donors to the Party and the Government, and in particular me as Premier, are involved in some improper conduct. That is what the Leader infers to the media and to the public by the manner in which he asks his questions. Of course, he does not have the courage to make the allegations directly or outside the privilege of this House. He does not have the courage to make the inference outside the privilege of this House. All he does is ask loaded questions without making direct allegations.

On Wednesday, the Leader attempted to link a financial donation to the Liberal Party by the Clipsal company and Government assistance to that company to establish a factory in Strathalbyn to create 90 jobs in an important regional development in this State. As the Minister for Business in the former Government, the Leader of the Opposition would have known that Clipsal was in receipt of assistance from the former Labor Government to establish factories at Murray Bridge and Nuriootpa. The assistance—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Just wait.

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The assistance given by the former Labor Government was more attractive to Clipsal than that given by the Liberal Government. The assistance given by this Government was supported by the Economic Development Authority. It was recommended by the Industries Development Committee of this Parliament. The Labor members of the committee supported the financial assistance. None of these facts was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition in his questions. In raising the matter of financial assistance given to Clipsal, the Leader drew attention to an article published by the Public Service Association written to give the impression that Clipsal had received a \$2.5 million grant for this project. Clipsal has received nothing of the sort. The Housing Trust—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence is out of order and I suggest that he not continue to interject.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I stress that Clipsal has not received a \$2.5 million grant for this project. The Housing Trust is building a factory at a cost of \$2.5 million and Clipsal will rent it on normal commercial terms. Augmentation of the water supply to support the project has been provided. When the factory is opened, Clipsal will receive some payroll tax concessions. I repeat: this arrangement is not as attractive for Clipsal as that provided by the former Labor Government to the same company.

The Housing Trust land and factory assistance scheme, which has been used to support the Strathalbyn factory, has resulted in the development of 128 other factories over a very long period of time in this State. One of the attractions of this scheme to private industry is that it can result in the fast track development of that Housing Trust factory.

In summary, Clipsal is receiving no more assistance than has been provided by a number of former Governments—Labor as well as Liberal—to a wide range of companies to support job creation and regional development in South Australia. The day after this inference of improper conduct by me in relation to Clipsal, the Leader of the Opposition

asked about a donation to the Liberal Party by Catch Tim Limited.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has been given leave to make a ministerial statement. I therefore expect the House to hear the statement without further interjections.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Last Friday, the Leader of the Opposition encouraged some journalists to speculate that this donation had also been given by Mr Robert Gerard of the Clipsal company. Some journalists attempted to contact Mr Gerard on Friday but he was interstate. Mr Gerard contacted me over the weekend. He had been made aware of the Leader's behaviour and that, while the Leader himself was not willing publicly to allege improper conduct involving the Government and Clipsal, he was backgrounding journalists to this effect.

Mr Gerard has asked me to make clear to this Parliament that he has no association with Catch Tim Limited. He has asked me to make this clear to the Parliament because he is concerned that, if this sort of behaviour of the Leader continues, it will discourage other companies from seeking assistance that is legitimately available to companies to invest in South Australia. It will damage the establishment of new industries and new jobs in South Australia. This assistance has been provided on a bipartisan basis, with proper scrutiny of and accountability to this Parliament, for more than 40 years. Clearly, the Leader now wants to threaten—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Spence to order for the second time. He is out of order.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I am telling the public that I know nothing about Catch Tim Limited and that Mr Gerard has no association with that company. Clearly, the Leader now wants to threaten the job creation and industry development efforts of this Government. By drawing into his net the Clipsal company, the Leader of the Opposition seeks to smear a company which strongly supports many sporting and other activities in the community as a result of its manufacturing operations in South Australia, which directly create 2 150 jobs and earn millions of dollars in income for South Australia each year.

Obviously, the Leader has trawled through the Liberal Party's publicly available disclosure document in the hope of being able, under the privilege of this House, to make a series of allegations against companies such as Clipsal which are proud South Australian corporate citizens. He wants the people of South Australia to believe that any financial donations to the Liberal Party somehow are rotten and associated with attempts to influence the Government to favour the donors. He cannot bring himself to admit the fact that many people and companies supported the Liberal Party because they wanted to get rid of a Labor Government which was destroying South Australia.

Will the Leader of the Opposition also make his allegations against the Western Mining Corporation or SANTOS? These companies have a number of things in common. They have significant business operations in South Australia. At times, they require Government decisions to assist their operations. They have made financial donations to the Liberal Party—and also to the Labor Party, as the publicly available records clearly show. Yet the Leader wants the public to believe from the way he is pursuing this matter that all corporate support for the Liberal Party is made in an attempt

to buy favours. Of course, absent from the Liberal Party's disclosure return is any financial support from the trade union movement.

Talking about investments, how is this for an investment? The Leader of the Opposition talked about investments. I contrast that with the more than \$468 000 of membership and affiliation fees reported by the Labor Party. There is no itemisation of this amount in the Labor Party's return, but no doubt most of this money comes from trade unions for affiliation fees. In return for this financial support from trade unions at the last election, this Labor Opposition is opposing the Government's legislation to end compulsory unionism, which effectively will force some of the hard earned money from individual workers to be given to the Labor Party. It now opposes the WorkCover legislation, because the union movement demands that it take this position. If ever money speaks in the way alleged by the Leader of the Opposition, it speaks in the Labor Party.

There is absolutely no possibility that this Government can be influenced in the way Labor is influenced by financial support because, first, the South Australian Division of the Liberal Party conducts its fund-raising according to strict guidelines. Those longstanding procedures ensure the integrity of both the Party organisation and its parliamentary representatives. The South Australian division fully complies—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition is out of order. He has had a fair go.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —with the Federal Party's fund-raising code, which separates parliamentarians from the receipt, processing and application of donations. No parliamentarian is present or has any access to the meetings or records of the State Finance Committee. There is no coercion to donate to the Liberal Party, unlike the Labor Party's call on funds of union membership without those members having any say whatsoever in how their money is spent. In relation to matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition last week—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I highlight to the House the fact that the decision to assist the Clipsal company with its Strathalbyn development was made last year—long before the company's financial donation was made public three weeks ago by the Electoral Commission. No member of the Government would have had any knowledge of that donation when the decision to assist Clipsal was made. No member of the Government had any knowledge of the donation by Catch Tim Limited until it was disclosed by the Electoral Commission. The Leader now says that I should disclose the name of the person who signed the cheque. I will not go behind the firm rules of the Liberal Party to do so. Such action would amount to the very behaviour that the Leader by his question purports to condemn: involvement by members of Parliament in fund-raising activities to the extent that Government decisions can be influenced by knowledge about donations.

No member of the Government, including the Minister for Industrial Affairs, knows the names of the companies that have tendered to WorkCover to contract out WorkCover claims management. Decisions related to this matter will be made by the WorkCover Board and not by the Government. The new Liberal Government was elected to restore integrity to Government and to attract new industry and jobs to South

Australia. That is what we are doing and what we will continue to do.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Liquor Licensing Act—Regulations—Dry Areas—Wallaroo—Berri.

Supreme Court Act 1935—Rules—New Commencement Date.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Statement of Consolidated Account for December 1994.

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

Response to Public Works Committee Report—Seaford 6-12 School.

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

Response to Public Works Committee Report—Hindmarsh Bridge on Port Road.

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

Corporation of the City of Glenelg—By-law No. 4—Streets and Public Places.

By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—

Investigation into Drugs in the South Australian Prison System, January 1995.

### STATE FINANCES

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I refer to State finances and wish to detail developments since I brought down the Government's first budget in August last year and the impact of those developments on the budgetary outlook for the next few years. The 1994-95 budget adhered to the targets set out in last year's May financial statement, aimed at arresting the decline in the State's financial position under the previous Government and beginning the process of rebuilding the local economy. To this end the Government is committed to eliminating the underlying budget deficit in the State's non-commercial public sector by the end of its first four years in office.

In the budget statement we set a target of work force reductions in the budget sector of 4 300 full-time equivalents in 1994-95. By the end of December last year budget sector agencies had advised that the projected full year net reduction was 2 700 full-time equivalents. Agencies had also identified other savings initiatives. However, in view of continuing budget pressures from rising interest rates and wages, Cabinet determined that it was necessary to reinforce the work force reduction targets originally set down in last year's budget. Accordingly, agencies have been advised that they must make greater effort to achieve the original work force targets.

However, I emphasise that this does not require agencies to go beyond the target of 4 300 for 1994-95 announced in the budget. At the same time these work force targets do not take into account savings which are required to fund the two non-supplemented \$10 per week increases under enterprise bargaining, nor work force losses from contracting out

proposals other than those that have been identified to this point.

Unlike the previous Government, which continued to deliver outdated or unnecessary services without question, this Government is focusing on overall outcomes. By the very nature of this Government's budget targets, agencies are being presented with the challenge of providing high quality services in core areas, considering policy changes that will increase efficiency of operations, and ceasing functions that may no longer be regarded as essential. This approach, I stress, merely enforces the intent and integrity of the original 1994-95 budget plan. Together with a carefully managed program of asset sales, this approach will ensure that the State's debt is cut in real terms and that debt reduction is sustainable over the long term.

The 1994-95 budget provided yet another clear signal of the Government's determination to solve the State's budget and debt problems—problems inherited by this Government and foisted upon the State's households and businesses by the collapse of the State Bank, the failure of the former Labor Government to manage State finances, and sustained cutbacks in the level of Commonwealth financial assistance to the State by the Hawke-Keating Government. The task confronting the Government in the 1995-96 budget has been made much more difficult by the Commonwealth's irresponsibility on the fiscal and wages fronts. Since the State budget last August, more rapid economic growth has been accompanied by higher interest rates and wages pressures.

The Federal Government has been leaving it to the Reserve Bank to raise interest rates as the sole means of preventing an even more disastrous deterioration in the current account deficit. In fact, since we returned to office in late 1993, long-term interest rates in Australia have increased by around 3.5 percentage points. These sorts of increases, as a result of the Federal Government's economic mismanagement, not only impact on the State budget but affect ordinary South Australians—and affect them in almost all areas. High interest rates have dampened the housing market and the job outlook for those working in the building industry. Small, medium and large businesses are all forced to reconsider their investment decisions—decisions that affect job growth and prosperity for all South Australians.

The Federal Government's failure to adjust its own fiscal policy will mean that the State's 1995-96 budget will be forced to absorb an even higher interest burden. The 1995-96 State budget will now have to be framed taking into account a non-commercial sector interest burden that is \$65 million higher than expected at the time of last year's budget, and a massive \$110 million higher than was anticipated at the time of the May 1994 financial statement. Fifty per cent of the non-commercial sector's additional interest bill is directly the result of the \$3.5 million blow-out in State debt caused by the State Bank and SGIC losses during the reign of our predecessors. As a consequence, our interest bill this year is some \$360 million higher as a direct result of the Bannon-Arnold Government's incompetence.

The Federal Government is supporting a wages policy that allows wage increases totally unrelated to productivity improvements. This policy places further pressure on State Government work force levels, a situation that could have been avoided if we had been allowed to implement enterprise bargaining in the Public Service without the influence of a centrally determined wage increase, which puts a floor under any wage increase offered by an employer. The Government has made an offer to public sector unions in an attempt to get

enterprise bargaining moving and to provide some reward for the cooperation of our employees in the fundamental reform of the public sector that is now under way.

The Government has been negotiating in good faith with the unions for a fair and affordable outcome in this area, and recently offered employees a \$15 per week wage increase with two further productivity-based increases of \$10 per week over an 18-month period. However, the Government will strenuously oppose campaigns by particular unions to gain bigger pay rises than have been offered. Our policy is based on wage increases based on productivity gains, not on chasing increases granted in other States. I stress that the Government will not provide additional funding for the cost of bigger increases awarded as a result of these campaigns and, therefore, the result could only be putting more pressure on the jobs of members of these renegade unions.

The underlying budget deficit targets for the 1994 budget year and the 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98 forward years, which were decided upon by the Government and published with the 1994 budget, clearly commit the Government to putting the total non-commercial sector of the budget into surplus by 1997-98. We remain on track to achieve this target.

To sum up, I have today provided a brief outline of progress to date in implementing the very necessary budgetary changes required to secure the State's financial position. The additional interest and wage burden will not cause the Government to alter its financial targets as set out in the budget. I table the Consolidated Account figures for the three months ending December 1994.

## PRISONS, DRUGS

**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 have just tabled the report of the investigation into drugs in prisons in South Australia. The investigation, by Mr Arthur Grant, a former Northern Territory Assistant Police Commissioner, commenced on 20 October 1994 and was completed on 27 January 1995. The investigation resulted in 46 recommendations for improvement to existing programs, systems and procedures to reduce the incidence of drugs in prisons. Copies of the report have been given to each of the Police Commissioner and the Correctional Services Chief Executive Officer for their respective actions to be taken with priority. As one recommendation in the report details matters relating to particular staff who may be unreasonably prejudiced by its release, details of that recommendation have been withheld from the copies of the report I have tabled.

Some of the major findings of the investigator are as follows. A sample of 10 per cent of current prisoners' assessment files revealed that some 70 per cent of prisoners have experienced drug abuse before entering the prison system on their current sentence. Anecdotal evidence suggests that inmates are pressured into drug use when in prison. Because prison is virtually a cashless society for inmates, other means are devised for payment for drug deals. These include TAB and bank accounts, phone cards, tobacco, selling on commission, debt collecting services and favours (sexual or otherwise).

The demand for the supply of drugs and the subsequent high levels of drug abuse amongst prisoners severely impedes the effective management of prisons and prisoners. It

frequently represents a very real threat to the safety and well-being of officers and prisoners and influences the politics of prison. Drugs make the prison environment more aimless, unstable and dangerous. Prisoners are demotivated, bashed, intimidated and demeaned by its effects. A significant number of incidents occurring in prisons are drug related, including violence to self, other prisoners and custodial officers, theft and prison escapes.

The investigator concluded that there is no definitive technique for assessing prison drug use in South Australia but that there are a strata of perceptions. Correctional executives estimate that as low as 30 per cent of the prison population use illicit drugs, general managers suggest 45 to 50 per cent, and custodial officers and others in positions close to the problem, including educational officers, social workers and prison drug unit staff, believe 75 per cent to 85 per cent. Inquiries and observations made by the investigator suggest the Adelaide Remand Centre and Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier prisons have a lower incidence of drug use than the other four correctional centres. The investigator found that the overwhelming opinion of persons interviewed during the course of the investigation was that the primary source of drug entry into prisons is through the medium of contact visits. This opinion, he found, is substantiated by reports of drug related incidents and the number of prisoners suspected of being under the influence of drugs on the night of, and the day following, contact visits.

The investigator reported that there is always the potential that, while the demand for drugs prevails and the cash rewards are attractive or other forms of coercion exist, there will be some staff involved in the trafficking of drugs. However, it should be stressed that the investigator also reported that the indication is that the involvement of prison officers in the importation of drugs into South Australian prisons is minimal.

The investigator found that current procedures for the identification of visitors exposes the present system to blatant abuse. He further found that the virtually unrestricted use of telephones by prisoners for the purpose of making outgoing calls is excessive and incongruent with the concept of imprisonment. The investigator supported the changes proposed by this Government to implement a controlled telephone system in prisons.

It is important to note that the investigator commented that the illicit use of drugs in prison is a significant problem in all western countries. He stated that this indicates that the traditional security measures used in these jurisdictions is not an effective means for the prevention of entry of drugs into prison. He found that this is particularly true of perimeter security measures, as they have not been designed to block the entry of drugs but rather to prevent prisoner escapes and ensure prisons are not breached by persons seeking to free or harm an inmate. As an example, the investigator illustrated that at Cadell Training Centre there is no physical barrier to prevent contraband or an outside agent from entering a prison property. In most other institutions, however, drugs have to be projected over a perimeter enclosure. Often this is achieved by placing the drugs inside a tennis ball and throwing or hitting the ball over a fence or wall.

The investigator had the opportunity to examine this Government's changes instigated to the Prison Drug Strategy. While endorsing the philosophy now being followed by the department, the investigator identified concerns regarding the effectiveness with which the strategy is being implemented.

These claims have been drawn to the department's attention to be rectified as a matter of priority.

The investigator identified particular culture problems among staff at some institutions, notably Yatala Labor Prison. He raised concerns about the adoption of a 'them and us' mentality by certain prison officers. Drug counsellors, social workers and support staff fall into the 'them' category, who the investigator claims have reportedly been victims of inappropriate, unprofessional and unsolicited verbal aggression from some prison officers. He claims that this hostility manifests itself into a lack of cooperation by prison officers and attempts to undermine programs designed for the rehabilitation of prisoners. The investigator highlights boredom caused by a lack of work as encouraging the use of drugs as a means to cope with stress, depression and anxiety of personal life.

The investigator also had the opportunity to examine some of the new work programs proposed for South Australia's prisons and endorsed the direction being taken by this Government. He expressed concern about the method of prisoner assessment and highlighted the urgent need to redesign the present system of assessment and classification for prisoners. Previously I have announced that new members of the Prisoner Assessment Committee are to be appointed shortly and that new directions are being given to that committee by me, as Minister.

I take this opportunity to place on the record my thanks to the investigator, Mr Arthur Grant, and to the staff who supported Mr Grant in his investigation. Mr Grant's extensive investigation and findings will be invaluable to the Government in tackling the enormous problems faced in combating drugs in prison.

## QUESTION TIME

### POLITICAL DONATIONS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier ask the Attorney-General to investigate whether the Liberal Party's entry reporting the donation of \$100 000 by Catch Tim Ltd to that Party's campaign complies with the Commonwealth Electoral Act in accurately revealing the name and address of Catch Tim Ltd? Section 314AC of the Commonwealth Electoral Act requires donations above \$1 500 from companies to be declared with details of the true name and accurate address of the company. Inquiries in Hong Kong reveal that the Liberal Party's biggest donor, Catch Tim Ltd, is not known at its address. We have been told that the Premier does know the identity of Catch Tim.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Why don't you tell the Parliament—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —and why won't you tell the people of South Australia?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! First, the honourable member clearly was commenting at the completion of his question and explanation. Secondly, he cannot impute improper motives to any member. The honourable Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** We are used to this rather sleazy behaviour of the Leader of the Opposition. Let me make it quite clear to the House: I have no knowledge

whatsoever of any donor to the Liberal Party, except for the official publication by the Australian Electoral Commissioner; and, of course, as that is under Federal—not State—legislation, it is quite inappropriate for the State Attorney-General to pass a legal opinion on it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition has continued to interject after he has asked his question, and the Chair has been most tolerant. I suggest to the Leader that he no longer continue that practice.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** If anyone is to pass a legal opinion on the legitimacy of any of the returns, whether it involves the Liberal Party or the Labor Party, it should be up to the Federal Attorney-General, because he is the appropriate Minister in this area. I suggest that, if the Leader has a complaint, he go off and talk to the Federal Government. It is not up to the State Attorney-General, because this declaration is required under Federal law. As I indicated this afternoon, the Liberal Party has apparently complied fully with that requirement under the law, because the Federal Electoral Commissioner has apparently been satisfied. I reiterate: the behaviour of the Leader of the Opposition on this issue, in trying to throw some allegations—

**The Hon. S.J. Baker:** He was trying to throw it over to Clipsal just a while ago.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Exactly! He was trying to drag down Clipsal last week. He actually told journalists, 'This money has come from Gerard Industries or Mr Gerard.' That is what he was out there telling journalists last week. Some of those journalists actually rang Mr Gerard on Friday shortly after this statement had been made by the Leader of the Opposition. He does not say that on television, because he knows darn well he would be taken through the courts and well and truly cleaned out for every dollar he has. He privately briefs people and tries to smear someone by implying improper action, and it just highlights the nature of the person concerned. I stand in this House and can proudly say that I have absolutely no information on any donor to the Liberal Party, except for that which came out only three weeks ago in the official declaration.

### OLYMPIC GAMES

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** My question is directed to the Premier.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr LEGGETT:** What action has the Government now taken to fulfil its commitment to ensure South Australian companies are well placed to win contracts from work associated with staging the Sydney 2000 Olympics?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I am delighted to report that the South Australian Government is probably the leading Government in Australia, after the New South Wales Government, in moving to make sure that we maximise the benefit for this State from the Olympic Games being held in Sydney in the year 2000. It is so important that we have effective representation in Sydney. We are establishing an office in Sydney, and Mr Phillip Meyer will be General Manager of South Australia's Sydney 2000 Olympics Office. Mr Meyer has a very significant background, first, in bank

and banking contracts and also in project finance. Having actually done consulting work already for the Olympic Games Committee in Sydney for the year 2000, he will bring to that position, first, an intimate knowledge of the Olympic Games and what is being organised; and, secondly, plenty of background and knowledge of the people in Sydney who will be letting the tenders, which are so important to win work for South Australian companies.

First, we are trying to identify for South Australian companies contract work, which involves construction work or supply contracts. Secondly, we are making sure that we attract to South Australia a significant number of the tourists who will visit Sydney in the year 2000, coming to South Australia either on the way to Sydney or immediately afterwards. The number of tourists who will visit Australia in the year 2000 will be enormous. Thirdly, we want to make sure that we maximise the number of training events and the use of our sporting facilities leading up to the 2000 Olympics. In particular, we are expecting that soccer preliminary rounds for the Olympics can be played in South Australia. We also believe that there will be a substantial demand on our other facilities, such as our cycling track, which will be ideal for preliminary training for the Olympics Games in the year 2000. So, South Australia is in there and is far more effectively putting forward its representation than any other State except for New South Wales.

### BUDGET TARGETS

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** My question is directed to the Treasurer. Given the Treasurer's statement to this House, can he now confirm that the Premier was incorrect when he told a radio interviewer this morning that Cabinet would 'stick to the job targets we put down in the budget last year'? Both the Premier and the Treasurer have been interviewed today about the leaked budget document which shows plans for further public sector job and service cuts exceeding those of last year's budget. On radio this morning, the Premier said that the Cabinet would stick to the Government's original job targets. On a news bulletin, some nine minutes later, the Treasurer confirmed 'there will have to be some further cutting' in line with his leaked memo of 8 February this year.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Playford has something wrong. I will explain to him what was said in the statement, both in the House and earlier today. Quite simply—and I have consistently said it since October—the budget targets have to be met, and we all agree on that. I also said that Federal Government policies have made life very difficult for South Australians and for our budgets. I know that the Minister for Health is trying his hardest in respect of this situation. Every other Minister in the Cabinet is doing their darnedest to reduce the costs of government and to live within the targets that we have set, while at the same time enormous pressures are being placed upon us by the Federal Government both in its wages policy and its economic/fiscal mismanagement, which, of course, has led to the blow out in interest rates.

We have said consistently that targets were placed in the budget papers at the very beginning. We had the May statement and, of course, the budget statement itself. Both documents were basically consistent in saying that there will have to be a reduction of about 4 300 full-time equivalents in the public sector. That has been our consistent stance. We said to the agencies, 'In dollar terms this is where we want to finish at the end of this financial year.' The agencies have

come back with their final figures and we are falling far short of our employment targets in the budget papers, as the former Treasurer would understand. We are now saying that those targets have to be met. It is simple: we have to get the savings from work force reductions otherwise we will have an ongoing responsibility. That is completely consistent with what the Premier and I have said, and I believe that it is consistent with the information provided to the journalists in this town.

We have consistently said that we will reposition the budget, which we are doing, and we are looking at every measure to ensure that we hit those budget targets. Of course, the original work force targets have to be met in order for us to be able to sustain our position. That is quite clear. There is no difference of opinion and we are getting on with the job.

### CENTRAL LINEN SERVICE

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Will the Treasurer inform the House of the Government's position in relation to the wages claims by employees who have not accepted the Government's pay offer of \$15 plus two further rises of \$10? I am aware that some unions in the public sector are involved in industrial action in support of their pay claims and that this is causing some disruption to service deliveries.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** This is a matter of considerable seriousness. I am disappointed to report to the House that Central Linen, which is an agency under my portfolio, is causing difficulties for public hospitals in this State. It is disappointing for me because I have visited the premises and congratulated the staff on the improvements they are making towards achieving best practice. The targets set at the beginning of the year in order to get back to a best practice situation before further productivity improvements involved getting the cost of linen from \$1.70 per kilogram, on average, down to \$1.50 per kilogram by the end of this year, and that was largely achieved. However, that is still 25¢ a kilogram above the standard in the private sector. So, there is still a long way to go, but we are working on that situation.

It is fundamental that there be no wage pressure on those outcomes, otherwise the cost of linen will escalate and our capacity to have the most effective linen service in the country will be put at great risk. That is why I am disappointed that many of the employees at Central Linen have followed the lead and the dictates of the Miscellaneous Workers' Division of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union in pursuing their claim for a \$20 per week wage rise straight away plus \$48 in the next two years. That is inconsistent with our stance on the wages policy and is wildly inconsistent with our getting back to a best practice position. I think that every member would endorse our aim of being the best at whatever we do.

The unfortunate outcome is that there have been three separate incidents at Central Linen that have prevented linen supplies going to the public hospital system. We are now talking about essential services, and they are being placed at risk through the bloody-mindedness of certain individuals in the union and at the linen service. Many employees at the service want to work; they do not want to have any part of this campaign. Yet, we have seen a process of intimidation by the union that has resulted in linen services being put at risk. The workers have not yet signed off that they will stop the stupidity and get on with the job.

We as a Government will not stand by and allow this situation to continue, whereby our linen services and therefore our public hospital service delivery are placed at risk. I know that the majority of workers at Central Linen are hard-working, decent individuals who are being dictated to by a union that is out of control. It is about time we got some responsibility. I reiterate to the House that, if the wages of Central Linen employees were compared to award wages in the private sector, members would see that those employees are getting about \$50 a week more than their counterparts in the private sector. They are getting about \$50 more and they want another \$68 a week on top of that. That is not on; they can make their own choices. However, the Government will not tolerate this sort of bastardry by the union movement.

### TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Will the Premier explain how the Government can make the cuts to the Department of Transport announced by the Minister for Transport today without sacrificing road and vehicle safety, customer service, the integrity of computer data and the privacy of individuals? The Opposition understands that staff representatives are being told right now that the Department of Transport will be facing a staff cut of 1 300 as a result of the outsourcing of major functions. A report prepared by the Department of Transport in February 1993 indicates that outsourcing of the functions of the Motor Registration Division of the department would result in an increase in cost to taxpayers of \$12 million over five years. The Opposition has been informed that the staff as a whole will not be told their fate until 5.15 p.m. today, almost three hours after the Minister for Transport made a public announcement.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The Minister for Transport is looking at contracting out a number of functions of the Department of Transport, but before the final decision is made on any proposal it must comply with certain standards that the Government has put down. These standards include the fact that there must be a significant cost saving to the taxpayers of South Australia and a better and more efficient delivery of service, because, after all, the Government is providing essential core services to the public of South Australia, and it will want to do that as efficiently as possible.

So the Government has put down a whole series of overriding criteria that must apply to any contracting out. Some areas that are being looked at include the bitumen plant which, quite appropriately, can be conducted very efficiently by the private sector. It will not be contracted out to the private sector unless there is a specific cost saving. As the honourable member knows, we have already achieved a significant saving of \$5 million a year to taxpayers by the contracting out of Modbury Hospital but, more importantly, the people of the north-eastern suburbs will get better medical and hospital care as a result of that outsourcing. We are well down the path towards outsourcing information technology and will save the taxpayers of South Australia over \$100 million, but again, very importantly, we will attract a whole new industry to South Australia, and we have shown the same sort of initiative with the management and operation of the EWS.

I stress again that three important criteria must be met: first, there must be substantial net cost savings (that includes everything); secondly, there must be an improvement in the standard of delivery of service; and finally, and more importantly, we need to be able to look after the Government

employees who are involved. We have done that in all the contracting out that we have done: we have specifically arranged for people to be offered jobs with the contractor who takes on the service. In fact, the clear evidence is that, in most cases, those former Government employees will work under better conditions than if they had stayed with the Government. It is a voluntary decision on their part. The Government pays them an incentive to move across to the contractor. Any net savings must take into account any incentive paid to employees to go across to a contractor. We are looking for a win situation as far as taxpayers are concerned, a win situation in terms of the quality of service that South Australians get, and a win situation for the Government's own employees.

### MEAT INSPECTION

**Mr KERIN (Frome):** Will the Minister for Primary Industries assure the House and consumers that the new meat inspection services, which will come into effect from 1 March this year, will ensure that meat consumed in South Australia and approved for export from this State is of the highest standard?

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter as he has at least one abattoir in his electorate. I think it is fair to say that a most insidious campaign has been run in the past few weeks by the Federal Community and Public Service Union, with I believe the full knowledge and support of the Opposition, to try to undermine public confidence in the meat industry not only in South Australia but in Australia. In the past few days two or three television programs have handled the truth with gay abandon in much the same way as does the Opposition. At the bottom of that is Mr Ford, a member of the Federal Community and Public Service Union, who has made some quite wild claims and allegations.

The Federal Minister for Primary Industries (Senator Collins) stated what the meat industry is worth to Australia. At present it employs 30 000 people and it is worth \$5.6 billion. In South Australia, it represents 20 per cent of our gross agricultural commodities and is worth half a billion dollars. This industrial campaign is all about trying to ensure that this union gets more members. They are forgetting about the public and what they are doing by undermining confidence; all they want is to make sure that they have more members to inspect meat. Effectively, what Senator Collins said regarding their allegations was 'Put up or shut up.'

This insidious campaign, which has been started on the national scene, is occurring at a time when the American Meat Surveillance Authority is in this country inspecting all the abattoirs of the second biggest meat exporting nation in the world. To hell with that! These people are trying to undermine the whole situation by saying that there is a link between the union's lack of members and the current tragedy that has taken place in South Australia. On a television program last night they tried to say that one case of food poisoning that occurred in the United States was linked to the standard of meat hygiene in Australia. If that is correct, it is a slur on the members of the union, because they do the inspecting. However, there is no correlation whatsoever, and there never has been, between meat hygiene and any problem that has occurred in the United States.

They also allege that we are about to deregulate the meat industry. That is completely incorrect. For the first time in South Australia's history we will have quality assurance

programs and independently audited inspections of all smallgoods factories, boning rooms and premises that have not previously been regulated. Before, it was open slather; now, this Government is making sure that everyone, including the chicken industry, will come under a quality assurance program with independent audit inspection by SGS, which is accredited in 140 countries as an official inspector of food processing.

The quality assurance program will ensure that management and the work force will be involved in quality control from the time the product enters the factory until the time it leaves it, when all the programs will be audited and inspected officially. For Mr Ford to say that if his union's inspectors had been involved they would have had some effect on the Garibaldi issue is absolute nonsense. They would not have picked that up, and everyone knows that. It is about time that this union, which is running this industrial campaign, stopped using the public to undermine confidence in the meat industry in not only this State but also nationally and started to understand that the public in Australia will not put up with that.

It is interesting to note Mr Ford's background. Mr Ford and his union were represented on the committee that was set up six months ago to provide quality assurance programs for South Australia. In fact, Mr Ford was also a member of the regulation subcommittee. He sat there for six months supporting what we are doing in South Australia. He supported the fact that industry in South Australia was overwhelmingly behind what we are doing. Now he is trying to run federally and in this State an insidious industrial campaign to undermine confidence in this State and the nation. It is about time it stopped.

### PUBLIC SECTOR WAGES

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Will the Treasurer clarify today's Public Service wages policy and its impact on jobs in the light of the leaked memo of 8 February which says that wage rises will cost further jobs? Last year's May financial statement outlined a two year wage freeze, and no provision was made for wage rises in the budget. Then, on 17 November, the Government announced a wage rise offer of, at that time, \$12 a week, which would be supplemented by Treasury and not linked to further job cuts. By January, the offer was \$35 a week. Now, the Treasurer's leaked memo refers to work force reductions which agencies need to take into effect in relation to wage increases under enterprise bargaining.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I can understand that members opposite are confused: that was the state they were in when in government and it has not changed. If the honourable member reads the budget papers, he will see clearly the targets set down. We set a target of zero for the first and second years and 2 per cent in the two out years. The wages situation has been forced on us and precipitated by some of the actions that took place not only in the Federal Industrial Commission but also by the Prime Minister who said, 'The worst is all over; we can take home the bacon.' And look at where our current account deficit and interest rates are now. If we want to look at precipitous action, we should look at that item. We laid down quite clearly that we are interested in getting the most efficient and effective public sector and Public Service and, if there are wages pressures, it will be jobs.



Regarding the pressure placed on us by the Industrial Commission's saying that there is a safety net to the whole system of \$8 plus \$8 plus \$8, we did not have a bargaining position left because, if we did not go into enterprise bargaining, we were left with simply paying out \$24 for no return. An agreement was reached at that stage that we would bring forward the 2 per cent from the third year of the four year cycle and plug it into the forward estimates. We have done exactly that and we are seeing the flow on.

We need to understand that that covers the \$15: it does not cover the \$10 plus \$10, which, it has been clearly said, have to be accompanied by productivity improvements. So, the \$10 plus \$10 must see productivity improvements. We have said that from the beginning. I do not understand why there is any misconception or misunderstanding about that situation.

### KANGAROO ISLAND

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of any action taken by the State Government to address issues on Kangaroo Island arising from the significant increase in the number of visitors to the island during the summer?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I was surprised this morning to read in the paper the comments of Mr Penley (General Manager of Sealink) and John Karran (who is also from the island), because on Saturday morning, as part of a pre-organised program and for the second meeting in two weeks, we sat down to look at the issues created on Kangaroo Island by the sudden influx of day trippers to the island. The most important issue to consider is that the Kangaroo Island Tourism Board has a positive program whereby it wants to attract long-term visitors and people interested in the eco-tourism destination. Clearly, that is the policy the Government supports.

With the introduction of *Super Flyte*, which has introduced a whole range of new day trippers to the island, we have competition on the island for Sealink and for a whole range of things. Competition is not the issue: the problem is that, with another 30 000 visitors to the island, the infrastructure problems have become apparent, and that involves the roads, the general infrastructure in terms of accommodation, and simple things such as the lack of toilets and the question of shop opening hours and so on. Nearly 1 000 people per weekend go to the island and many of the shops are closed. There is a general lack of coordination of the whole tourism development program because of the sudden influx of 25 000 new visitors.

One of the principal reasons why we went to the island on the weekend was to sit down and discuss those issues. I was surprised to see those sorts of statements in the paper today when the meeting was attended by representatives of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the South Australian Tourism Commission, Kingscote and Dudley councils, Tourism Kangaroo Island, the Kangaroo Island Development Board and the Department for the Environment and Natural Resources. People representing all those bodies were at the second meeting in two weeks to discuss the very issues referred to in that article. It is the Government's view that Kangaroo Island is one of the most important tourism destinations not only in South Australia but in Australia, and the general direction of the Tourism Commission Board on Kangaroo Island should result in its being a major eco-tourism development and destination in South Australia. We will be working continually with people on the island to

ensure that we end up with the best tourism destination in South Australia.

### POLITICAL DONATIONS

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Was the Government's decision to intervene and support Foodland by engaging Queen's Counsel to oppose the application by the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Union for Federal award coverage influenced by the donation of \$10 000 by Impeach Pty Ltd to the Liberal Party election campaign? The list of donations made to the Liberal Party shows that an amount of \$10 000 was given by a company called Impeach Pty Ltd. The principal activity of Impeach Pty Ltd is listed with the Australian Securities Commission as being the trustee company for the Foodland Promotions Unit Trust.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. The Chair does not want to have to speak to certain members again.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Is it not amazing that the honourable member opposite should get up and talk about our intervening? This was the very group of independent grocers in this State with whom the previous Government got the SDA to do a deal to ensure we had five nights of shop trading in this State—the very group that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition turned his back on—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It was the very group that you tried to force to get into the agreement with the SDA—the very group that they tried to force into the five day week. The very reason we sat down with the Foodland group was that it came to the Government and said that it was being stood over by the Shop Distributive and Allied Union and it was trying to force it into the Federal union—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is out of order. He has asked his question.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** When we came to government, we said to every small business association in this State, 'If you are stood over by any union, in particular by the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Union, and if you are prepared to go to court, we will stand alongside you.' That is the first time a Government has been prepared to stand alongside small business people in this State in order to protect them. In relation to the slimy allegation from the honourable member opposite—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Go outside and say it. As I said the other day, I would love to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is completely out of order.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** As I said the other day in this House, like the Premier, I had no idea until the list was published who were the donors. As a matter of fact, the only reason I know that Foodland was a donor is that the Deputy Leader was clever enough to look it up and tell me today.

### WATER FILTRATION

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** Will the Minister for Infrastructure advise the House of what benefits filtered water will bring to the Barossa Valley, the Mid North, the Adelaide Hills and the Riverland following his announcement of plans for water filtration to these regions? Thirty-four thousand people in 31 country communities anxiously wait for positive information as to when they might look forward to clean filtered water. Consecutive Labor Governments promised to deliver clean water but failed. It proved to be just a mirage.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Well might you ask, 'Where is the Leader of the Opposition in the middle of Question Time today?' I guess there is another good news story coming. I can understand that he is so embarrassed about good news stories constantly coming from this Government that he wants to go out of the Chamber when they come to the fore.

I am pleased to inform the House that the Government has made a decision to proceed with the filtration of water supplies for the Barossa Valley, the Mid North, the Adelaide Hills and the Riverland with a program of approximately \$100 million that will commence forthwith. The Government has decided to call for expressions of interest for the private sector to build, own and operate these water filtration plants, which will be phased in over the next few years, the first project coming on stream, hopefully, by 1997—the earliest we can bring them on stream by the time we undertake negotiations with the private sector, the design of the plants, the purchase of the property upon which the filtration plants will be located and the construction and subsequent commissioning of those plants.

They are particularly important because, for too long, a number of people in the near metropolitan area and outer metropolitan area have had to put up with unfiltered water, and the reputation for that water in non-metropolitan areas has worked against the tourism potential of South Australia in the Barossa Valley and the like. In addition, clearly, there have been health concerns. Many of the areas are prime tourist destinations and have key growth for value adding in primary produce such as processed food and beverages. To undertake value adding in these primary products you must have a water source that enables you to do so. Once these schemes are in place, that can be delivered. Filtered water is safer water: it means fewer disinfectants, less colour, less odour and fewer impurities.

Clearly, the decision by the Government to fast track it through the build-own-operate scheme means that, instead of its being in the year 2000 and beyond, as under the capital works program of the former Administration, these people will get filtered water some 2½ years from now. It also fits comfortably with the Hilmer report and the subsequent legislation proposed by the Federal Government regarding Hilmer.

In summary, this \$100 million program delivers benefits all around: filtered water to 100 000 South Australians; the generation of new business in the State's expanding water industry; opportunities for further expansion in the food and beverage sector; and a boost to tourism and health.

### TAFE CUTS

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training

and Further Education, or whoever happens to be representing that vacant space.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations is representing him.

**Mr CLARKE:** Will the Minister rule out cuts to TAFE programs, particularly in country areas, in the second semester of this year or in 1996? The Opposition has been contacted by TAFE students and lecturing staff who have expressed grave concern that massive cuts to courses totalling millions of dollars are being considered by the State Government. They have informed the Opposition that programs targeted include hairdressing, business studies, building and furnishing trades, and textiles, clothing and footwear, with country areas likely to be hurt the most.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** I will refer this important question to my colleague and obtain a considered reply for the honourable member at the earliest opportunity.

### INFECTION CONTROL

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Following the announcement of the joint AMA and ADA infection control program, will the Minister for Health inform the House whether he considers that the infection control measures being implemented in South Australian surgeries are sufficient?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the honourable member for her interest in this very important matter which, clearly, has enormous import for the community. Members might well have noted that the Australian Medical Association and the Australian Dental Association have combined to introduce into their surgeries a new infection control assessment program on a voluntary basis. I congratulate both the AMA and the ADA on this program, because it has been hailed as an Australian first. Doctors and dentists will not be compelled to undergo assessment, but the belief is that most medical and dental practices will comply with the program to attain official certification, and I believe that the pressure of the marketplace will make sure that people do just that. Of course, it is important that each doctor and dentist practise appropriate procedures, because it does not matter how many certificates are on the wall: what is important is that every process these dentists and doctors perform is done with the appropriate infection control mechanism.

The South Australian Dental Service also has an infection control program, which was developed by an infection control committee established about three years ago. It is based on the broad guidelines of the National Health and Medical Research Council for viral infections in dentistry, the Standards Australia guidelines and the Health Commission infection control guidelines. Certainly, they are consistent with the Australian National Council on AIDS guidelines. The South Australian Dental Service itself has employed qualified infection control officers for several years, and there are experts on infection control and transmissible disease on staff.

In relation to the general matter of infection control in Adelaide at these practices, infection control, I am pleased to say, is already at a very high level. A pilot survey of 23 practices in Adelaide last year indicated that existing infection control standards were very high. Clearly, the Government has a great interest in that and, indeed, has been part of developing the program. As Minister for Health I have a personal commitment to see this program working successfully, and last Thursday evening I attended a joint meeting

held by the AMA and the ADA. I am told that there were between 300 and 400 registrants and a large number of participants who simply could not get into the meeting hall itself. It was standing room only, so they were given a special briefing on the checklist procedures and certification process. It is important that I relay to the House that there was a palpable sense of enthusiasm for this new infection control procedure.

It is very important that we recognise that there is simply no value in compulsory certification, for a number of reasons. As I have said to the House before, there is a three month window period between infection and when tests become positive in the first instance but, secondly, as I said, it does not matter what certificates are on the wall, each procedure must be done appropriately. I wish the AMA and the ADA a great deal of success in this Australian first, and I assure the public that the South Australian Dental Service is also a participant in striving for excellence in infection control mechanisms.

### HOUSING TRUST RENTS

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations rule out further increases in Housing Trust rents in the forthcoming budget? The Treasurer's leaked memo of 8 February to chief executives of departments refers to cuts in Government support to the trust of nearly \$15 million over the next two years and opportunities for increased recovery of costs of provision of services by the public sector. The memo refers to a loss of only 80 jobs in this area.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** As the honourable member would know, the Housing Trust each year has a CPI adjustment. Other than that adjustment, I have no proposals before me for any increases in Housing Trust rent structures.

### POLITICAL DONATIONS

**Mr BASS (Floreys):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Is the Minister aware of any financial support given to the Labor Party by the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is warned for the second time. The honourable Minister for Industrial Affairs.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** A few minutes ago we heard the Deputy Leader complaining about a \$10 000 donation from Foodland to the Liberal Party to fight the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association. Looking at the published list, I think members will be interested to see 'Shop Distributive Association, Kent Town, donation Labor Party, \$10 000'. There is also a further very interesting donation—it is probably headed for the bagman of the Labor Party—'Michael Atkinson, Shop Distributive and Allied Association, \$4 678'. Then there is another reference involving the Spence Sub-branch, one payment in February of 1994 and the other in December 1993, amounting to \$2 200. So, the bagman for the Labor Party, the member for Spence, has got \$6 878 from the SDA. It really makes a mockery of the nonsense being carried on by the Deputy Leader when here we have the very union that the Deputy Leader is having a go at directly influencing the campaign of a member of Parliament and giving it to the Labor Party. I think this speaks for itself.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had ample warning.

### STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources with reference to the Government's proposed catchment management authority. Can ratepayers be assured that the funds levied for stormwater management by their local councils will be used exclusively for projects in their own catchment area?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I indicate very clearly to the honourable member that that is the case and that is the whole purpose of the legislation—to have ownership within each individual catchment. While I am on the subject, and I thank the honourable member for providing the opportunity, contrary to some of the statements that have been made by the Opposition regarding this legislation, the feedback that the Government has had at this stage is extremely positive. People are absolutely fed up with rhetoric with regard to the important work that needs to be carried out in cleaning up our waterways in the metropolitan area. Our waterways in the metropolitan area and in this State have been ignored for decades, particularly on the part of the previous Labor Government. The people of South Australia, particularly in the metropolitan area, are calling for positive action and asking the Government to take that action.

We are putting in place a mechanism to enable specific individual programs to be funded, not a mechanism to raise funds in general. We are talking here about cleaning up water in the catchment—the same water that goes into reservoirs from which people drink—and the concern that there is regarding our marine waters at present. We are also talking about an opportunity to remedy a life and death situation facing many of our waterways. We have to ensure that our waterways provide clean water in the long term for future generations of South Australians. That is exactly what we are doing in the legislation, and when it is introduced I look forward to the support of the Opposition.

### DICKY SEATS

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport in another place. Is the Government taking any action to ensure that dicky seats installed into the rear compartment of station wagons and other vehicles after the point of manufacture are manufactured and installed to a safe standard, and if not why not; and what action is the Government taking to check that existing dicky seats already installed after the point of manufacture are, in fact, safe? It has come to my attention that some, but not all, of these seats that carry small children are not manufactured or installed to any standard at all. Also, I understand that the State Government has no power to enforce manufacturers or installers to meet any safety standard. Further, they cannot penalise or stop them if they continue to manufacture or install to an unsafe standard or, indeed, recall any unsafe product.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The safety, health and welfare of young children in motor vehicles is obviously of prime importance to the Government and the reason the honourable member has asked his question. He has raised a series of specific issues related to this question which I will refer to the

Minister for Transport, and I will bring back a considered reply.

### ADOPTION

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services. Will the Minister confirm whether or not he has received the committee of review's report on adoption and, if so, when will it be available for public comment? I have received a number of inquiries from constituents asking when the committee's report will be available for public comment. I am informed that the committee of review was to have had its report and recommendations ready for the Minister at the end of September 1994, and I am further informed that the Minister received the committee's report in October 1994. At this stage nothing has been heard or seen of it. As the report will affect a large number of people involved in adoption, we are anxiously awaiting a response.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I have received a copy of the report, which is an extremely important one. The Government came to office with a policy which clearly spelt out that we would be looking to amend legislation dealing with adoption, and that is my intention. I am still considering the report and hope that in the near future I will be able to release it publicly.

### OLYMPIC GAMES

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the Minister provide the latest information to the House on efforts to maximise the benefits to South Australia through sporting initiatives leading up to the Sydney 2000 Olympics? I am aware that the South Australian Government is committed to ensuring that the State benefits to the greatest extent possible from the staging of the Olympic Games in Sydney. I have read with interest about the success of the recent visit to Adelaide of the United States women's hockey team.

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, Standing Orders do not allow for questions to be asked twice in Question Time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** That was asked earlier—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not need assistance on my right. The honourable member is taking a frivolous point of order. The honourable Minister for Recreation, Racing and Sport.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** It is quite clear that members opposite do not want to hear a little more good news about what is happening around this State.

**The SPEAKER:** I suggest that the Minister answer the question and not comment on the point of order.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** The member for Colton is absolutely correct in his assessment that this State Government's aim is to maximise the benefits from sport and particularly from the Olympics 2000 coming up in Sydney. Indeed, the United States women's hockey team has just completed a two week training camp staying at Del Monte, with matches almost daily against the Diet Coke Suns and the SASI teams. The team was lavish in its praise of Adelaide and the organisers, saying that they are already planning a return trip and they would encourage other American teams to do so. We have plans to help them spread the word, and it

is hoped that this will be the first of a long line of international teams of athletes and events attracted to Adelaide in the lead-up to Sydney 2000.

Members will recall that a round of the World Cup in track cycling will be held at the Superdrome in July this year and would have noticed recent media announcements about pre-Olympic soccer tournaments to be held at the Hindmarsh Stadium. In April, Hockey SA will host some of the preliminary rounds and the final of the Four Nations Women's Hockey Tournament, which features South Africa, China, New Zealand and our own world champion Australian team. In May, two of the six men's hockey test matches against England will also be held at The Pines.

I am pleased to announce another hockey initiative with a bid to host the 1997 Champions Trophy Tournament in Adelaide. The Champions Trophy involves the top six men's hockey countries in the world and is a prestigious event regarded in hockey circles as being behind only the Olympic Games and World Cup. It is estimated that on this occasion it will bring another 2 000 visitors to Adelaide. Bidding will be a two-stage process with the first task being to secure the right to bid on behalf of Australia. The International Events Unit of my department will assist Hockey SA to prepare the first stage bid for submission to the Australian Hockey Association.

This should indicate to members opposite that it is important that South Australia identify with Olympics 2000 and make every effort within our departments, particularly in Recreation and Sport (which I believe is doing a magnificent job) to ensure that we do our bit in maximising sport and the opportunities that will come to Australia through Olympics 2000 in Sydney.

### GEPPS CROSS HOSPITAL

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Minister for Health. On what basis has the Government now decided to consider the option of a greenfields site development for a new hospital at Gepps Cross to serve the northern and western regions of Adelaide? The brief of the consultants working on the amalgamation of the Lyell McEwin and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals reveals that they have been asked to prepare a concrete clinical service plan for each campus and appropriate clinical service plans arising from a greenfields site development option.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The member for Elizabeth has got the story slightly wrong again. In fact, we are making no commitment to a greenfields site whatsoever. However, as I have said on occasion after occasion and shall continue to repeat until members opposite are sick of it, we will insist that we explore every avenue to provide the most appropriate services at high quality cost efficiently, and we will continue to look at every option to do just that.

### MINISTER'S TRAVEL

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** Can the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources inform the House of the reasons for his forthcoming overseas trip and the benefits it will bring to South Australia? In particular, will the Minister refer to his attendance at the United Nations World Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen and to the invitations he has received, including those to participate in a National Family Policy Conference and major environmental programs in the United States of America?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I thought the House would be interested to know what I am going to be doing over the next couple of weeks. The trip I will be taking has vital relevance right across my portfolios including Environment and Natural Resources, Family and Community Services and the Ageing, particularly in keeping this State abreast of changing attitudes and practices internationally in both family related issues and the environment.

As members would realise, both issues now are high on international agendas. Social and environmental reform have become key areas where the Government has increasing responsibility. How we deal with issues of the family, keeping families together, the implication of new laws and attitudes, family rights, and so on, are all matters of importance, and I will be considering these matters while at the United Nations World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen, Denmark. I will attend the summit as part of the Australian delegation comprising Commonwealth and State representatives along with business and non-government nominees. The summit is seen as being highly significant in national and international terms and is one of six conferences which have been called by the United Nations. It is a key forum to enhance and build strong communities in social responsibility not only in the Government sector but also within the community in terms of finding ways to tap into its own resources and support networks.

In the United States I will be investigating major environmental and conservation issues, and exploring the issues of green jobs, climate change and environment protection. There are many vexing questions about the State's national parks system: whether we have adequate resources to manage them; whether our resources are placed correctly; and so on. I will be undertaking a fact finding mission to see how the experiences in the United States can relate to South Australia. I have accepted an invitation from Utah to join Government and community organisations to study initiatives which are in the forefront of family and community policy in the United States.

In 1990, as a Fulbright Scholar, I visited the United States as a guest of the American Government specifically in regard to environmental issues. It think it is vital to maintain the links, especially when key environmental programs in the United States can be beneficial to South Australia. I will look at nature conservation and development programs in parks through tourism in California, Denver and Chicago. The Chicago Zoological Society has invested heavily in South Australia through programs at Culperum near Renmark and the Brookfield Conservation Park near Blanchetown. The opportunity is there to strengthen the links and interest for further funding opportunities.

The fact finding visit will enable me to gain first-hand knowledge of major environmental programs in the United States which have a positive impact on economic development, including the environmental technology initiative and renewable energy in Boston and Washington. While in Washington DC I will be meeting with the United States Environment Protection Authority with regard to environmental protection and management, the development and exporting of green technologies, the management of climate change, recycling and alternative energy sources. I will be meeting with the World Resource Institute, the National Parks Association and the Global Environment Facility in the United States Department of Agriculture, particularly regarding salinity management.

The visit will provide valuable information to progress major initiatives in the Environment and Natural Resources portfolio including best practice environmental management, environmental technology innovation, nature-based tourism development and renewable energy. I can understand why members opposite would like to be joining me on the trip!

---

## TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development):** I table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Transport in another place today.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** I rise today to talk about Catch Tim.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Tourism is out of order, as is the member for Wright.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I challenge the Premier to tell this Parliament who Catch Tim is. I challenge the Premier to tell us the identity of Catch Tim's directors and financial backers. I challenge the Premier to tell us what interest Catch Tim has in South Australia. I challenge the Premier to tell this Parliament why Catch Tim has made this donation to the Liberal Party.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Peake will not interject nor will the member for Mitchell. The member for Florey.

**Mr BASS:** After listening to the Leader's comments, I believe he is casting aspersions on the Premier that he is deliberately misleading this House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The Premier is in a position to object if he wishes.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I challenge the Premier to give an assurance to this House that the Commonwealth Electoral Act has been complied with in accordance with the law—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —to establish the true identity, the true name and the true address of the Liberal Party's largest donor. The law of Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this is a deliberate attempt—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is obvious that one or two members would like an early minute, and they are going the right way to be named. The Chair will not tolerate any further disruptions which are a deliberate attempt to frustrate the proceedings of the House. It has been a rowdy Question Time, and the Chair has been tolerant. The Chair's patience is exhausted; it is no longer prepared to accept any further unruly behaviour.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The law of Australia is quite clear: the law of Australia now requires all political Parties to reveal accurately the sources of major campaign donations. The public have a clear legal right to know who is behind the \$100 000 donation from Catch Tim to the Liberal Party. The Premier must reveal the names of the directors of the company and who signed the cheque for the Liberal Party's biggest ever single campaign donation. He should also reveal what interest this company has in South Australia and why it made such a huge donation. The Premier claims that he does not know.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I refer to Standing Order 128, regarding irrelevance or repetition.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he is the last person who should talk about members getting thrown out, because in the past week he has run particularly close. I cannot uphold the point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is entitled to considerable latitude in speaking to a grievance debate.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Premier claimed that he does not know. It is certainly not hard for him to find out. All he has to do is pick up the telephone and ask his campaign director.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** They want to waste time; they want the minutes to tick away; they know that this is a deliberate attempt to stop debate.

**Mr VENNING:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is the custom of this House for the speaker to address the Chair. In the last half of the honourable member's speech he has not been addressing the Chair at all: he has been addressing the camera in the gallery.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he not delay the process any further. It is up to the Chair to ensure that all members address the Chair.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Premier says that he does not know about Gerard's donation, yet Gerard Industries authorised and printed most of the Liberal Party's campaign literature. How can the Premier possibly tell this Parliament that he did not know that Gerard was bankrolling his campaign, written and authorised by Gerard Industries?

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

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** I rise on a much more sombre note. I draw the attention of this House to a very disturbing but well reported article in the *Sunday Mail* of 19 February 1995. The article, headed 'Outrage over our binge butchers', refers to the carnage on our roads involving young people who are drunk. We all love our children, and we want the very best for them. We would all like to see them perhaps even make hundreds on their test debut, although that belongs to a select few, or perhaps to play netball at top level. But, more importantly, we would settle for much less—to have our children in good health. Many people in South Australia, some of whom I know, are grieving now because one or more of their children are dead as a result of alcohol related accidents. There is nothing more tragic than to officiate at any funeral, which I have done—there is something very final about them—which involves the death of a young person as

a result of an alcohol related car accident. This is an unbelievable waste of human life.

The survey in the *Sunday Mail* mentions that most of the young people on the road who are involved in accidents are usually young single males under 26 years of age. The statistics show that, for the percentage of drivers and motorcycle riders killed with a blood alcohol content over the legal limit for the past 10 years, South Australia exceeds the national level and exceeds it very significantly. There is only one year when South Australia was below the national level—1991. In 1993-94 it is impossible to judge. Our statistics in South Australia were very high, but the national figures are unavailable.

The article also states that 50 per cent of drink drivers are responsible for up to half the road deaths on Australian roads. We have just over 2 000 road deaths annually. I know that is far less than in South Africa, where I heard that they have up to 10 000. However, 2 000 is 2 000 too many. Of course, it is not just the driver who is under the influence who is killed: it is invariably the innocent driver, who is driving along the road minding his or her own business, who actually cops it. Last year, 30 per cent of the drivers and motorcyclists killed on South Australian roads were over the blood alcohol limit. As I mentioned, in 1993 our State hit a record high, when 51 per cent of all drivers and riders killed were drunk.

It is particularly alarming in the Northern Territory, where over 70 per cent of those killed on the roads are drunk. The experts, such as they are, rank the following people at risk: young people, a very high 54 per cent; drink drivers, 42.9 per cent; young women, 21.1 per cent; Aborigines, 19.2 per cent; and remote area residents, 11.8 per cent. Heavy and binge drinking is socially accepted, tragically, and it is encouraged by celebrations with alcohol promotions. There are happy hours and free drinks. It has reached a stage where people are expected to drink just to show that they are really with it, that they are heroes and mature adults. Of course, free drinks are offered at various functions, particularly to women.

A report found that football players drink between 12 and 24 schooners of beer in a session as a part of the tradition of mateship. We also know that, following the introduction of random breath testing, drink driving deaths fluctuated from 44 per cent to 51 per cent in 1984, and our lowest drink driving rate was 29 per cent in 1991. Of course, it is one thing to show outrage but what really is the answer? Do we tighten the laws on alcohol? Do we have random breath test blitzes on licensed premises? Do we change the content of alcohol advertising? Obviously the ads—and they are very impressive, I might add—are brilliantly marketed and especially targeted at young people. Like any responsible Government throughout Australia, I know that this Government is very aware of the seriousness of this matter. We all have a responsibility to our young people. It is our job to point them in the right direction.

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

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** On 2 August last year, the Minister for Health announced the amalgamation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital. His press release states:

I believe this amalgamation will ensure the future of health care in the northern and western regions of Adelaide and will address the long recognised need for a higher level of services in the northern areas.

It is absolutely true: it has been long recognised that health services in the northern area need upgrading. We know that the demography of the Adelaide area shows that this is the fastest growing area and this is where the population will be; and we also know that there are particular health needs that are not being adequately addressed.

We also know that there have been specific problems in the north in relation to getting particular specialist services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, and that people have had to travel long distances and wait for long periods to get services such as kidney dialysis, orthopaedics and ear, nose and throat treatment. In some ways this announcement was good news for the north. However, a number of concerns were raised at that time as well. One of these was the haste and lack of process and consultation that was undergone before this announcement was made.

I will revisit this to refresh our memories. This press release was made on 2 August, which I believe was a Monday. Three members of the Lyell McEwin board first heard about this on the previous Friday. A meeting was hastily called with the Minister for Health and board representatives for the very day on which this press release was finally put out. This proposition was hurriedly put to the representative group of the Lyell McEwin Hospital board. The board members were put in a very difficult position because it was made quite clear to them that, if the much needed upgrading of services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital were to take place, the hospital would have to amalgamate with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Those people were in a bit of a bind and at that time gave in principle agreement to this occurring. They did it knowing full well that they knew little of the details and, therefore, they were very concerned about this. Later in the week there was a full board meeting at the Lyell McEwin Hospital at which those same concerns were reiterated. Again, the board gave in principle agreement to the proposal but registered its concern about the fact that it had no details.

Since then, a steering committee has been set up to investigate this whole amalgamation. When things started to bog down, the Government appointed some consultants to conduct an in-depth study of the amalgamation. Imagine the surprise on the faces of the Lyell McEwin Hospital board members when about two weeks ago the consultants came to their meeting and revealed to them that not only were they talking about amalgamation of the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital but that they were also being asked to consider an entirely new option of a new hospital being built at Gepps Cross. All of a sudden, at this late stage, another option was thrown into the ring.

My question is: why did it take so long for this to be revealed? If, as the Minister says, all options need to be examined—and there is nothing wrong with that—why was that not put on the table in August? Why did it not appear in the Minister's press release in August that a number of options, including a new hospital at Gepps Cross, was being considered? Why was it not until the consultants arrived at the board meeting to give feedback to that group that all of a sudden they were confronted with the fact that there was another option which they had not heard about and which certainly was not discussed with them when their in principle agreement was obtained? I know that people in Elizabeth are concerned.

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

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** Today I wish to explain further a question raised earlier about the dicky seats that are installed in the rear compartment of station wagons. These seats are for those people like myself who have a large family—and I have four children—and who want to put extra seats in the very back compartment of station wagons and other vehicles, including panel vans. I wish to refer to the safety of these seats. I do not want to cause mass panic, but I want at least to raise the issue.

It has come to my attention that the manufacture and installation of these seats is meant to be covered by Vehicle Structures Bulletin No. 5, which is a Federal Office of Road Transport bulletin established some years ago. The standards therein have not been adopted by this State Government or any other State Government but, rather, are voluntarily adhered to by members of the industry and, in particular, by members of the Motor Traders Association. If someone goes to a member of that association and asks for a dicky seat to be put into a vehicle then, because the dealer is a member of the Motor Traders Association, they will manufacture and install the seat in accordance with bulletin No. 5.

However, it has come to my attention that a number of people are manufacturing and installing these seats who are not members of the Motor Traders Association and therefore are not manufacturing them to that standard. I wish to point out and clarify that the seats manufactured on-line by GMH and Ford have no problems. I am specifically talking about seats manufactured and installed after the point of vehicle manufacture. If you went to a caryard, purchased a station wagon and asked that the caryard arrange the installation of a dicky seat, that is where the problem can occur. It has come to my attention that there is no checking procedure in respect of the manufacture or installation of these seats at factory level. There is also no checking procedure for their manufacture or installation at the caryard.

In addition, the State Government has no power to recall the seats if there is a problem with them. In other words, if one seat is found to be faulty in a batch the Government has no power, to my knowledge, to recall the rest of those seats. In other words, the child's safety is totally dependent upon the Motor Traders Association and the volunteer code that it has adopted. If the person selling, installing or manufacturing the seat happens not to be a member of the association, no standard is applied.

I have with me a Motor Traders Association report on the manufacture and installation of a seat in February of this year—as recently as two weeks ago—in which seven or eight problems are identified. One of the main problems of great concern was the fact that the seat had three positions for children to be seated but only two seat belts. A person buying the vehicle could easily seat three children in the rear of the vehicle when there are only two seat belts. That immediately raises some concerns for the third child.

There is also no age or weight specification on the seat as required by VSB No. 5. The seat may well have been designed for a child only 10 kilograms or 20 kilograms or five or six years of age but, because that is not indicated anywhere on the vehicle or on the seat, someone of greater age or weight could use the seat and therefore place themselves in danger. The parent would not know that if it is not properly identified on the seat. The seat belts themselves did not retract properly and in some instances caused severe pressure on the neck because they were in the wrong position. The catch that held the seat in place simply did not work.

Some of the caryards said that they were selling one manufacturer's product but installing that of another. Some were installing seats and sending out compliance plates at a later date. Of course, some did not have compliance plates at all. All in all, the installation of these seats really needs investigation. I am pleased to see that the Minister has agreed to take some action in this regard. I do not believe that we should test every single installation. That would put an added cost onto the industry. However, I do believe that there should be random inspections to ensure that safety standards are being met. We certainly need the ability to recall faulty products.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** I want to speak on a very vexed issue; that is, the question of net fishing. My first ministry was as Minister of Fisheries. I can assure the House that any Minister of Fisheries has a hard row to hoe. However, we are fortunate at this time in having a Minister of Fisheries who does appear at least to know something about the issues. I am confident that, after reading my speech, he will know a great deal more about them and will act accordingly. I certainly hope so.

The area that I specifically wish to speak about in the few minutes available to me is Franklin Harbor. I think all members would know that over the years this has been the source of a great deal of controversy. A very large number of people is interested in the outcome of the present review of net fishing in South Australia. I was very disappointed, as were many people in the Cowell district, when the recommendations of the Netting Review Committee came out. The recommendation that concerns me particularly is recommendation 10, which states:

That the two resident net fishers be provided with the option to forgo access to King George whiting in all areas of Franklin Harbor (Marine Area 20) and be permitted to use a 3 cm haul net in the restricted areas for approved species other than King George whiting.

That recommendation is a great disappointment, because it is absolutely contrary to the submission that was made to the review committee by the District Council of Franklin Harbor, which I think is in the best position to know what is most appropriate for its area. I have held the view for a long time that this area is more suited to local government than State Government provided the basic resource is respected and the local councils make their decisions within the framework of overall Government policy which, irrespective of which Party is in government, is to protect the resource. Competition for the resource is fierce everywhere but particularly so in a place such as Franklin Harbor, which has a large tourist component and a community that wishes to target certain species.

I believe that the net fishing industry is an important industry to this State, but it will survive only if it learns to co-exist with recreational fishers, the tourist industry and, particularly, the wishes of local councils. It will be hard on one of these net fishers, in particular, if this recommendation is not agreed to by the Minister, but the Minister must consider the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people of that district. I stress to the Minister that it is his decision not the decision of the Netting Review Committee. He has the authority, as I am sure he well knows, to make a decision that is contrary to the recommendation of the Netting Review Committee. I urge the Minister to make a decision that is contrary and to ban all net fishing within Franklin Harbor. That is the only way in which the issue will get off the Minister's table and off the agenda of the District Council of Franklin Harbor which, I may say, is a very responsible

council. It has been plugging away at this issue for about a decade, it has not gone over the top with its statements and everything it has done has been done in a responsible way.

I know that with fisheries the question is not how many you can please—you certainly cannot please everyone—and it seems that as a Fisheries Minister you cannot please anyone but, as I said, the Minister has some backbone and he has some integrity and respect in certain areas, so I urge him to come down on the side of the District Council of Franklin Harbor and many other people, including me, by rejecting recommendation 10 of the Netting Review Committee.

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** I rise to speak briefly about the motion which I will debate on Thursday and which seeks the support of this Parliament for AFL matches to be played at the Adelaide Oval. I will not debate the matter, but I want the Parliament to be aware of a number of issues. I was not going to buy into this matter, but accusations were made in the newspaper by both the South Australian Cricket Association and the South Australian National Football League, and two surveys were carried out amongst the sporting community of South Australia. I thought to myself, 'Who is speaking on behalf of those people?' The *Advertiser* survey showed that 68 per cent of people want to see football played on the Adelaide Oval; another survey showed that 75 per cent of people want to watch football played at the Adelaide Oval. What I do not want to happen on Thursday is to have this motion debated on a political basis. Those people surveyed are members of our electorates, whether it be Elizabeth, Port Adelaide, Colton, or the eastern suburbs: the majority of people are asking for the game to be played at the Adelaide Oval. So, I want this debate to be totally non-political.

Last night, the member for Hart said on the 5AA Graham Cornes and Ken Cunningham show that it would not be financially viable for football to be held at the Adelaide Oval because of the financial commitment that would have to be made. The Bradman stand was erected by the cricket association without any assistance from football simply to provide better spectator facilities. The cost of \$11 million was not guaranteed by any Government. The association has made a commitment to erect lights at a cost of \$5 million irrelevant of whether or not football is played at the Adelaide Oval. The environment of the ground will be preserved by making sure that the towers are retractable so that they do not spoil the amenity. The new grandstand will rely on football and will cost about \$14 million, but we must remember that the cricket association will not get its income only from matches played at the Adelaide Oval: it is part of an international body that derives its income from the Australian cricketers playing on the international arena. So, whether they play in Pakistan or, as they will soon, in the West Indies, the profits from the tours will come back to the association. The Government will not have to give the cricket association a grant or act as guarantor.

I really cannot see why the member for Hart is opposed to football being played at the Adelaide Oval. On Thursday, I intend to show why football at the Adelaide Oval will generate more dollars for the SANFL and either one of its licence holders, how it will benefit the State's economy, why the public of South Australia want it there as well as at West Lakes, and the benefits to the sporting public of South Australia. Also on Thursday, I will revive some of the old memories which have been swept under the carpet but which need to be revived in the mind of the sporting public to



provide a better and more open picture of what is going on in the arguments between the two bodies at present.

In the end, whatever decision is made, it will be made by the people. And the power of the people will shine through, because the people, when they decide to fight for something they believe in, do a very good job. All I want this Parliament to do on Thursday is to listen to everyone's debate and make a sensible decision based on what is best for the sporting public of South Australia and, most importantly, for the game itself.

**Mr MEIER:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

### CATCHMENT WATER MANAGEMENT BILL

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the management and use of catchment water; to prevent or reduce flooding; to make consequential amendments to the Local Government Act 1934 and the Water Resources Act 1990; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Well before the 1993 State election, the Liberal Party recognised that the management of metropolitan stormwater left a great deal to be desired. This situation was, and is, most obvious in the case of the Patawalonga, which has been described as the most polluted urban waterway in Australia. With the Patawalonga's present reputation, it is barely credible that in the memory of many South Australians the Patawalonga was used for Australian water-skiing championships.

In our Environment and Natural Resources policy, we made our strongest commitment to rectifying this situation. The Government undertook to:

- commit \$4 million to ensure a permanent solution to pollution of the Patawalonga boat haven;
- fund the installation of a series of trash racks to remove gross pollution from the catchment area;
- discuss ways of minimising pollution with the 11 councils of the catchment; and
- seek financial support from the Federal Government by having the project recognised as one of national importance.

All of these things we have done.

Of the \$4 million, \$500 000 million will be spent through the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations by the end of the financial year on dredging the Patawalonga basin and design work for both a flushing system for the basin and wetlands in the vicinity. A further \$1.5 million will be spent by 30 June this year on design and construction of works and measures such as trash racks and silt traps in the catchment.

We have assisted the steering committee of Patawalonga councils by funding a facilitator to assist in consideration of issues such as the membership and staffing of a catchment board and in developing a catchment management plan. We have not merely sought but have been successful in obtaining from the Federal Government recognition of the scale of the Patawalonga's problem through the granting of \$9 million of Federal funds under the Building Better Cities Program.

Our concern for this issue is not restricted to the Patawalonga. Our policy commits us to pursue a compre-

hensive program to solve the problem of water quality in the River Torrens, restore its visual and recreational appeal and emphasise this important Adelaide tourist attraction. Some important work has already begun in both the Torrens and the Patawalonga catchments. Constituent councils of those areas formed two steering committees in early 1994, and the enormous amount of work accomplished during the year can be seen, amongst other things, in the 'Year of the Torrens' project.

The Government's acknowledgment of, and congratulations for, the time and effort represented by those achievements go to Mayor Colin Haines and the Patawalonga Steering Committee, and Councillor Rosemary Craddock and the Torrens Steering Committee. In spite of the efforts of the two steering committees, it became apparent by late 1994 that the Government needed to do more to speed up the process and at the same time to facilitate the involvement of the many councils in each of these catchments. Local government has a wealth of experience in stormwater management, but this is a multi-faceted problem which is best managed on a catchment-wide basis.

With the Catchment Water Management Bill the Government proposes to establish small but powerful boards which will harness the energy of the community, the expertise of councils, and the legislative backing of the Government to clean up our waterways and develop stormwater as a resource. The Torrens and Patawalonga Boards will be formed by 1 July 1995, and will immediately commence work on catchment water management plans. These plans will aim first at improving the quality of catchment water, but they will address also other catchment-wide issues such as flooding, recreational amenity and wetland environments. The plans will establish an ongoing schedule of works (for example, trash racks and wetlands) and measures (for example, community education and water quality monitoring programs).

Draft catchment water management plans will be developed and upgraded each year by the boards in close consultation with the constituent councils and other community groups and individuals. The cost of the proposed works and measures will be shown in the plans. The works and measures will be funded through a small levy on land in the catchment area.

The Government is presently focusing on the Patawalonga and the Torrens because this is where the problems are most evident. It is also where the councils have shown great initiative over the last year in working together and with the Government. However, the Bill is broadly drafted and may be applied to catchments from Gawler to Sellicks Beach if the same problems and the same opportunities arise.

The Government is committed to devolving as much authority to communities to manage their own affairs as is reasonably possible. This model of water resources management, with local boards being empowered with authority and adequate finance, and being required to consult extensively with local councils and the local community in the performance of their functions, will provide the sort of community education and participation that is essential in achieving such an aim.

In line with the Government's commitment, this Bill is being introduced today. However, it will be on the table for further consultation to take place, both within the Government and with other interested persons before the Bill is debated. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

*Clause 3: Interpretation*

Clause 3 defines terms used in the Bill.

*Clause 4: Act binds Crown*

Clause 4 provides for the Crown to be bound.

*Clause 5: Constitution of catchment areas*

Clause 5 provides for the constitution of catchment areas by proclamation.

*Clause 6: Vesting of works, buildings, etc., in board*

Clause 6 enables the Governor, by proclamation, to transfer the use of works, buildings, equipment and other facilities from a council or controlling authority to a board.

*Clause 7: Variation and revocation of proclamations*

Clause 7 provides for the variation and revocation of proclamations.

*Clause 8: Recommendation by the Minister*

Clause 8 sets out the procedures that the Minister must follow before recommending the making of a proclamation.

*Clause 9: Exclusion of the South East*

Clause 9 excludes that part of the State to which the *South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992* applies.

*Clause 10: Establishment and nature of boards*

Clause 10 provides for the establishment of catchment water management boards.

*Clause 11: Common seal and execution of documents*

Clause 11 provides for the use of the common seal of a board and the execution of documents.

*Clause 12: Membership of boards*

Clause 12 provides for the membership of boards.

*Clause 13: Presiding member*

Clause 13 sets out requirements in relation to the presiding member.

*Clause 14: Nomination*

Clause 14 relates to nomination of members.

*Clause 15: Term of office of members*

Clause 15 specifies the time at which the term of office of a member expires.

*Clause 16: Conditions of membership*

Clause 16 provides for conditions and termination of membership of a board.

*Clause 17: Vacancies or defects in appointment of members*

Clause 17 provides for vacancies and defects in appointments of members.

*Clause 18: Procedure at meetings*

Clause 18 sets out procedures at meetings of a board.

*Clause 19: Meetings to be held in public subject to certain exceptions*

Clause 19 requires that meetings be held in public except in specified circumstances.

*Clause 20: Agenda and minutes of meeting to be provided to Minister and councils*

Clause 20 requires a board to provide agendas and minutes of meetings to the Minister and the constituent councils.

*Clauses 21 to 24*

These clauses are standard provisions dealing with duties of members and their liability for breach of those duties.

*Clause 25: Functions of boards*

Clause 25 sets out the functions of boards. Most of a board's functions will be contained in the catchment water management plan.

*Clause 26: Powers of boards*

Clause 26 sets out some of the powers of boards. A board cannot establish permanent works on private land unless it acquires the land or an easement over the land (subclause (3)).

*Clause 27: Sale of water by board*

Clause 27 enables a board to sell water. The water must meet certain quality standards prescribed by regulation or under the *Environmental Protection Act 1993* in relation to water disposed of to an underground aquifer or be water that would otherwise be wasted by disposal into the sea.

*Clause 28: Diversion of water to underground Aquifer*

Clause 28 requires a board to enter into an agreement with the Minister administering the *Water Resources Act 1990* if it wishes to take water from an aquifer into which it has disposed of water. A board cannot expect to re-take the same quantity of water it put into an aquifer because a certain amount is lost and because part of the surface water that it puts into the aquifer would have found its way there in any event.

*Clause 29: Board's responsibility for infrastructure*

Clause 29 sets out the board's responsibility in relation to its infrastructure.

*Clause 30: Entry and occupation of land*

Clause 30 enables the board to enter and occupy land. Clause 57 provides for compensation in relation to the entry and occupation of land by a board.

*Clause 31: By-laws*

Clause 31 enables a board to make by-laws that a constituent council or controlling authority could have made if its functions had not been taken over by the board.

*Clause 32: Representations by Minister administering Waterworks Act 1932*

Clause 32 enables the Minister administering the *Waterworks Act 1932* to make representations to a board in relation to water pumped into a watercourse, channel or lake by the Minister.

*Clause 33: Staff of board*

Clause 33 provides for staff of a board.

*Clause 34: Board may undertake building or works on behalf of council*

Clause 34 enables a board to undertake works on behalf of a constituent council or other person.

*Clause 35: Exclusion of functions and powers of councils, etc.*

Clause 35 excludes the functions and powers of a constituent council or controlling authority that relate to the same subject matter as a board's functions or powers.

*Clause 36: Water recovery rights subject to boards' functions and powers*

Clause 36 provides for the interaction of the Bill and the *Water Resources Act 1990*.

*Clause 37: Preparation of plans*

Clause 37 provides for the preparation of catchment water management plans.

*Clause 38: Amendment of a Development Plan*

Clause 38 sets out the action that a board must take where it has identified amendments that should be made to a Development Plan.

*Clause 39: Consultation*

Clause 39 provides for consultation on the preparation of a plan.

*Clause 40: Approval of plan by the Minister*

Clause 40 provides for approval by the Minister of draft plans.

*Clause 41: Preservation and enhancement of natural resources*

Clause 41 requires a board and the Minister to have regard to the effect of a plan on the State's natural resources when preparing the plan.

*Clause 42: Annual review of plans*

Clause 42 provides for the annual review of plans.

*Clause 43: Time for preparation and review of plans*

Clause 43 provides for the time frame for the preparation and review of plans.

*Clause 44: Initial and comprehensive plans*

Clause 44 allows for the fact that it may not be possible to prepare a comprehensive plan within the six month period prescribed by the previous clause.

*Clause 45: Time for implementation of plans*

Clause 45 enables a draft plan to be implemented with the consent of the Minister and the constituent councils.

*Clause 46: Availability of copies of plans*

Clause 46 provides for the availability of copies of plans to members of the public.

*Clause 47: Contributions*

Clause 47 deals with the contributions to be made by constituent councils.

*Clause 48: Payment of contributions*

Clause 48 sets out the time within which contributions are to be paid.

*Clause 49: Imposition of levy*

Clause 49 enables councils to impose a levy on landowners to recover the contribution payable to the board by the council.

*Clause 50: Basis on which levy imposed*

Clause 50 provides that the amount of the levy will be determined on a basis set out in the regulations.

*Clause 51: Valuation of land*

Clause 51 is a provision dealing with valuation of land.

*Clause 52: Imposition and recovery of levies*

Clause 52 provides for the imposition and recovery of levies.

*Clause 53: Accounts and audit*

Clause 53 requires a board to keep accounts and to prepare financial statements. The Auditor-General must audit the accounts and financial statements of a board.

*Clause 54: Annual reports*

Clause 54 provides for the preparation of an annual report.

*Clause 55: Councils to have regard to management plan*  
Clause 55 requires constituent councils to have regard to the management plan.

*Clause 56: Immunity from liability*  
Clause 56 provides for immunity of members and employees of boards and other persons engaged in the administration of the Act.

*Clause 57: Compensation*  
Clause 57 is a compensation provision.

*Clause 58: Interference with works*  
Clause 58 makes it an offence to interfere with the infrastructure for which a board is responsible without its consent.

*Clause 59: Offences by body corporate*  
Clause 59 is a standard provision relating to offences by bodies corporate.

*Clause 60: General defence*  
Clause 60 is a defence provision.

*Clause 61: Regulations*  
Clause 61 is a regulation making power.

*Schedule 1: Transitional Provisions*  
Schedule 1 provides transitional provisions.

*Schedule 2: Consequential Amendments to Other Acts*  
Schedule 2 makes consequential amendments to the *Local Government Act 1934* and the *Water Resources Act 1990*.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

### HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS) BILL

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for various matters relating to the public administration of housing and urban development within the State; to provide for the creation of certain bodies to facilitate development within the State; to repeal the South Australian Housing Trust Act 1936 and the Urban Land Trust Act 1981; to make related amendments to the Housing Improvement Act 1940; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** 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.

There is a consensus within Government and the community that public enterprises should provide value for money and accountability. This is particularly relevant in the aftermath of the State Bank losses and the legacy of debt the State has inherited. Public enterprises must adapt to current demands to provide services that will be valuable and relevant in the future. This Government takes a whole-of-government approach to the development of State, which in turn demands a whole-of-portfolio approach to the matters entrusted to this portfolio. This reformist approach to housing has been endorsed by the National Housing Ministers in conference and is being vigorously pursued by the Federal Government.

In contrast to those ideals, the Government has inherited a group of autonomous bodies, some established as long ago as 1936.

Each of these was working to a specific charter. Each was working diligently towards its goals. Each measured its efforts against its charter, using resources at hand, as was seen by it to be appropriate.

The blindspot was a lack of an overall plan of action, of co-ordination between the agencies; of recognition that the agencies were complementary players in the delivery of a complex range of housing and urban development services to the community.

Those delivery agencies were each producing their own product, with more regard for the production than its use. Process became the end rather than the means and a focus on overall outcomes was not clearly apparent.

The Planning Review, instigated by the previous Government, had terms of reference that constrained it to a review of metropolitan strategy and relatively minor revision of the development control legislation.

That Review took it upon itself to criticise the lack of strategic direction at the centre of government, the lack of coordination

between the operating agencies and the disjointed mass of often contradictory legislation that controlled the development process.

It proposed a radical new system, in which a clear policy direction would be set by the Premier and Cabinet and published as the Planning Strategy.

That policy would be used as a guide to change the rules for assessment of development proposals as well as the outcomes for Government programs to service and facilitate urban development.

In Opposition, we supported the thrust of these recommendations but we were less pleased with the results of their implementation.

As a result of this, a Cabinet committee was established immediately after the election, which recast the Planning Strategy into a useful and practical form. The strategy was a clear statement of our policies for Metropolitan Adelaide and was applied by the Development Act which came into effect on January 15th 1994.

That initiative was followed very quickly by a review of the Country Planning Strategy, which had been ignored by the previous Government. The Country Strategy is being addressed by an inter-departmental taskforce, which for the first time integrates economic, physical and social strategy on a regional basis.

The second main avenue that has been addressed is the actual operation of the Development Act. While it promises the benefits of an integrated system, those benefits have yet to be delivered.

The Government will therefore be introducing a Development (Review) Amendment Bill to amend the Development Act as a first stage in overcoming some of its shortcomings. We will also work towards a quick and certain system under which one proposal would simply require one application and receive one approval.

That will be a refreshing change from the current web of about 100 Acts of Parliament each controlling independently one aspect or another of development. This current situation gives "red tape" a whole new meaning.

The third main avenue of our concerted efforts to promote economic growth through physical development is in the Government's own services.

You have heard of the proposals to improve effectiveness of basic service delivery, power and water, introduced to this Parliament the Minister for Infrastructure.

Similarly, public transport has been put on a new footing by the Minister for Transport. There are other initiatives by other Ministers—all, I stress, aiming at the fulfilment of the overall plan which brings me to the subject of this current Bill.

This Bill is to bring together the housing and development functions of the Housing and Urban Development portfolio in a way that is efficient, visible and accountable.

The intention is to have no redundant functions, no duplication, clear responsibilities and to achieve the best result for our limited resources.

The changes proposed are motivated by the need to provide the specialised services of those agencies in a way that contributes to the economic wellbeing of the State and assists in reducing the massive debt that we inherited from our predecessors.

The State Bank demonstrated that a Minister cannot escape responsibility for things under his or her control, no matter how far 'off the balance sheet' the mistakes occurred. This Bill ensures that with responsibility comes accountability. It provides for full Ministerial accountability and rationalises roles and hence skills in agencies, reducing duplication and obtaining economies of scale.

This portfolio reorganisation was proposed by the Ministerial Review carried out in early 1994 by consultants Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu and the SA Centre for Economic Studies.

Their reports recommended that the community services provided by the portfolio, the government businesses and the regulatory functions should be separated from each other.

They recognised that this principle needed refinement in light of the desired outcomes, and made specific recommendations based on a study of the individual agencies in the portfolio.

The Consultant's report "Organisation Structure, Governance and Management Arrangements" was accepted by the Government as the basis of the reorganisation and a team of senior staff given the task of putting it into practice.

The reorganisation was overseen by an Implementation Steering Committee comprised of Board Chairmen of the affected agencies, the Director of the Office of Public Sector Management and the Assistant Crown Solicitor. It was chaired by the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements) Bill is the legislative vehicle for the reorganisation of

the portfolio. It is based on the concept of full accountability and responsibility of the Minister for the activities of the portfolio.

The Bill places the Minister in control of all the Crown assets in his or her portfolio, making that clear by disbanding the current administrative arrangements that lock those assets into agencies established under separate Acts of Parliament.

It enables the Minister to set up, in place of those agencies, new statutory corporations which will hold the relevant assets on behalf of the Crown.

The corporations would be in a position analogous to wholly owned subsidiaries of a conglomerate group. Each corporation would have its own Board, which would be responsible to the Minister for the operations of the corporation.

The functions allotted to each corporation will be gazetted and the criteria for performance of its tasks would be set out in agreements between the Minister and the Board of the corporations.

While it is not necessary to specify it in the Bill, the Department is to include a head office function, which will assist the Minister in setting broad strategy, operational policy and legislative directions as well as overall portfolio budgeting and allocation of resources.

The statutory corporations that would be created or brought under this arrangement at the inception of the legislation are:

South Australian Housing Trust, to manage public housing. It would have two divisions operating individually as businesses:-

SAHT—Housing Services, to manage housing services to public and private tenants;

SAHT—Property Manager, to own, maintain and trade in public housing;

South Australian Urban Projects Authority, to develop major projects and realise on surplus real assets;

HomeStart Finance, to provide financial assistance to home buyers.

Others may be envisaged, for example, to undertake a specific project (like the Glenelg foreshore development).

The Bill provides for full accountability and reporting by each corporation, the clear identification of community service obligations and for dividend and tax equivalence payments, in the light of Commission of Audit recommendations.

The Bill repeals the South Australian Housing Trust Act 1936 and the South Australian Urban Land Trust Act. It provides transitional arrangements which, amongst other things, preserve the rights, remuneration and conditions of all employees, whether employed under the GME Act or any other industrial agreement or determination. Arrangements for enterprise bargaining will also be available.

The Bill gives the Minister powers to create, modify or disband the statutory corporations. In comparison, the Public Corporations Act and its intended successor put these powers in the hands of the Governor.

The powers are put in the hands of the Minister because it is intended to build a strong and cohesive portfolio, with the statutory corporations acting, not as individuals with their own objectives, but as operating parts of an integrated group. The functions of these corporations are closely related, with none of them being truly commercial in nature.

The Government has a clear policy for urban development, published as the Planning Strategy. The activities of the various parts of the portfolio are aimed, together, to work towards the attainment of that policy. The intention is that they should do so in the most efficient and rational manner, and in a way that opens them to scrutiny, for the Minister, the Government and the people of the State.

The adopted arrangements allow for separate reporting of the operational corporations, with the attendant visibility of performance. However, it stops short of the complexity of quasi-independence and internal trading that has characterised some private sector group structures.

It is expected that both the operating environment and the commercial maturity of the corporations will change over time. It follows that the current structures are not necessarily permanent as they represent a current balance between practicality and administrative ideals. It is intended to further reform the structure of the entities in response to those influences.

For that reason, the Bill confers powers on the Minister to change the structures in response to future circumstances. A relevant example is the forthcoming agreement on national competition policy.

The Bill provides for dividends and tax equivalents to be paid by the statutory corporations, in accordance with Commission of Audit recommendations and in consultation with the Treasurer.

Performance agreements will specify these dividends and tax equivalents as part of overall portfolio budgeting and resource allocation.

All of the statutory corporations will deliver some Community Service obligations and these too will be clearly specified in the performance agreements.

Tax equivalent payments are to be paid direct to the Treasurer by the quasi-commercial corporations, such as HomeStart Finance. Further definition of the trading enterprises will be done through Treasury, in accordance with Federal—State government agreements, when those are finalised.

Dividend payments by the corporations will be approved by the Minister in consultation with the Treasurer and paid to the portfolio account or, if appropriate, to Consolidated Revenue. Capital adequacy and debt-to-asset ratios are to be examined and defined with Treasury involvement and agreement.

The portfolio will agree with Treasury on long term recurrent funding and its implications on the draw of Taxation Equivalents and Dividends to fund community service obligations of the portfolio.

The Bill makes the South Australian Housing Trust directly responsible to the Minister. It changes the current arrangement that the Trust Board, while bound to comply with a direction of the Minister, can estimate the cost of complying with such a direction and the amount, if certified by the Auditor-General, must be paid to the Trust out of moneys to be provided by Parliament. That power has, in the past, proved to be an effective brake on Ministerial control of the Trust.

It has been conclusively demonstrated that Governments can not escape responsibility for the actions of their agencies, no matter how far those agencies are theoretically removed from Ministerial direction. Hence, accountability must be matched with the responsibility and the agencies, including the Trust, be made directly responsible to the Minister.

The Trust is held in general high regard by its customers and other public housing authorities. It commands a very high proportion of South Australian residential tenancies. It is therefore proposed to retain the external corporate structure and its name. That will provide continuity and retain the goodwill of the Trust.

To accord with the national agreement on public housing, the Trust's operations are split into two divisions which will deal with each other on a supplier-customer basis. They will account separately for their operations to the Board and for the information of the Minister and Treasurer. The Bill will allow for a further degree of corporatisation at a future stage, should it be practical to do so.

The rationale for this change is that changing circumstances have removed the opportunity for the SAHT to operate entrepreneurially and the Community Service moneys distributed by it have amplified and resulted in a substantial debt.

The Bill brings together a number of quasi-autonomous agencies, each of which has a set of existing powers essential to its operations.

In general, the development activities of the existing agencies are to be concentrated in a new South Australian Urban Projects Authority (SAUPA).

This means that the various powers to develop and deal with land, concentrated by the Bill in the hands of the Minister, will be used on his or her behalf principally by SAUPA.

It is Government policy not to compete with private development. SAUPA will carry out Government input to projects which would not, in pure market terms, be viable in their own right. Usually, the Government of the day wants to promote such projects because they are a catalyst to economic growth, like Technology Park and the Airport upgrading, or correct a problem and unlock opportunities, like the Patawalonga or Port Adelaide Centre projects.

SAUPA will not be allowed to initiate projects in its own right, but simply manage them at the direction of the Minister, often at the request of other Ministers. SAUPA will also have the task of realising on surplus assets, many of which require remedial or packaging work to maximise returns on the public capital they represent.

The purpose of this agency is to bring together Government's urban project management skills to:-

- separate the policy decisions from the operational tasks;
- provide maximum transparency of purpose and costs; and
- achieve economies of scale by having all urban project management skills in one agency.

It is intended to present a separate Bill to the Parliament to integrate Housing Cooperatives and Associations, within a new South Australian Community and Cooperative Housing Authority (SACCHA). This is necessary to regulate the Associations and to secure the substantial public investment in housing under their control. That Bill will ensure that the operation of SACCHA can be regulated in the same manner as a statutory corporation under this measure.

HomeStart Finance will be re-established as a statutory corporation under this Bill which, by virtue of the transition arrangements, dissolves the existing company. No changes to the operations of HomeStart Finance are contemplated.

It has been determined that the function of providing advice to assist the Minister in:

- corporate strategic planning;
- resource allocation, budget and funds management;
- performance evaluation and management;
- policy development; and
- inter-agency and government liaison

should be added to the existing functions of the Department, rather than through the creation of a new organisation. This proposal is consistent with the recommendations of the Audit Commission and the Hilmer report. Being an administrative action, it requires no mention in this Bill.

The reforms are aimed towards improving the financial performance of the portfolio. The intention is to progressively eliminate the net draw of the portfolio on the Consolidated Account.

In the 1994/95 financial year establishment costs will be incurred in putting the new arrangements into effect. These will be accommodated within the budget of the portfolio.

Following the intended legislative change, Boards with a maximum membership of six people each are proposed. Individuals of national standing within the business and finance community will be sought for the commercial boards.

These arrangements are consistent with the national approach to public housing reform and urban development initiatives adopted by the Federal Government and other States. South Australia is leading the way in the provision of public housing and the reforms to development and investment area. These new arrangements will underscore and strengthen our position and provide a new flexibility and quickness of response to changing circumstances in the future.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1  
PRELIMINARY

- Clause 1: Short title*
- Clause 2: Commencement*

These clauses are formal.

- Clause 3: Interpretation*

This clause defines various terms used in the proposed Act.

Central to the scheme implemented by the Act are the "statutory corporations" which are defined to mean bodies corporate established under the Act.

PART 2  
THE MINISTER

- Clause 4: Ministerial powers*

This clause sets out the powers of the Minister under the Act. Subclause (3) provides for the making of proclamations transferring assets, rights or liabilities to the Minister or from the Minister to the Crown or an agent or instrumentality of the Crown.

- Clause 5: Functions*

The functions of the Minister under the proposed Act include—

- to promote the housing sector and provide public housing, and housing finance or assistance, in accordance with Government policy;
- to initiate, undertake, support and promote the development of land and housing in the State;
- to promote planning systems and facilitate planning and development;
- to ensure that new developments are well-planned and serviced, and to improve the amenity of existing communities;
- to develop and implement strategies to improve housing and urban development;
- to respond to community interest and contribute to informed debate on development within the State;
- to manage property within the Minister's portfolio, and enhance the financial resources of government;
- to promote the effective, fair and efficient allocation of public resources;

- to promote co-operation between the public and private sectors in respect of housing and urban development;
- other necessary or incidental functions.

- Clause 6: Delegations*

The Minister may delegate powers or functions under the Act.

- Clause 7: Advisory committees, etc.*

The Minister may form advisory and other committees.

PART 3  
STATUTORY CORPORATIONS  
DIVISION 1—SAHT

- Clause 8: Continuation of SAHT*

This clause provides that the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) continues and is deemed to be a statutory corporation under the Act.

DIVISION 2—FORMATION OF STATUTORY CORPORATIONS

- Clause 9: Formation of bodies*

This clause allows for the formation of statutory corporations or subsidiaries by notice in the *Gazette*.

A notice forming a statutory corporation—

- must name the body;
- must provide for the constitution of the board;
- must specify the body's functions;
- may limit the body's powers;
- may specify procedures that will be followed if the body is to be dissolved;
- may make any other necessary provision.

The clause goes on to provide for variation of the matters specified in the initial notice, dissolution of a statutory corporation and the transfer of assets, rights and liabilities of a body that has been dissolved.

DIVISION 3—MINISTERIAL CONTROL

- Clause 10: Ministerial control*

A statutory corporation is under the control and direction of the Minister.

DIVISION 4—BOARDS

- Clause 11: Appointment of boards of statutory corporations*

This clause deals with appointment and removal of a member of the board of a statutory corporation.

- Clause 12: Allowances and expenses*

A member of a board is entitled to remuneration, allowances and expenses determined by the Minister.

- Clause 13: Disclosure of interest*

This clause provides for disclosure of personal or pecuniary interests by a member of the board of a statutory corporation and the effect of disclosure or failure to disclose on a contract entered into by the board.

- Clause 14: Members' duties of honesty, care and diligence*

A member of a board of a statutory corporation will be required to act honestly at all times, and to exercise a reasonable degree of care and diligence in the performance of official functions. It will also be an offence to make improper use of information acquired by a member of the Board through his or her official position.

- Clause 15: Validity of acts and immunities of members*

A member of the Board will not be personally liable for an honest act or omission in the performance or purported performance of a function or duty under the Act. The immunity will not extend to culpable negligence.

- Clause 16: Proceedings*

This clause provides for the proceedings of the Board. Each member present at a meeting will have one vote on any question arising for decision.

- Clause 17: General management duties of the Board*

The Board will have various management duties relating to performance standards and improvements, management structures, and reporting.

DIVISION 5—STAFF, ETC.

- Clause 18: Staff, etc.*

The Minister will determine the staffing of a statutory corporation after consultation with the CEO and the statutory corporation. The staff will, unless the Minister determines otherwise be appointed and hold office under the *Government Management and Employment Act 1985*.

The statutory corporation may, with approval, engage agents or consultants.

A statutory corporation may make use of services, facilities or staff of a government department, agency or instrumentality.

DIVISION 6—COMMITTEES AND DELEGATIONS

- Clause 19: Committees*

This clause provides for the establishment of advisory and other committees by the board of a statutory corporation.

*Clause 20: Delegations*

The board may delegate a function or power conferred on it.

DIVISION 7—OPERATIONAL, PROPERTY AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

*Clause 21: Common seal*

A statutory corporation will have a common seal.

*Clause 22: Specific powers*

This clause sets out various powers of a statutory corporation. These are essentially the powers of a natural person, although the approval of the Minister, or authorisation by a notice under Division 2, is required if the statutory corporation is to deal with shares or securities of another body or borrow money. In the case of borrowing money the Minister must also obtain the concurrence of the Treasurer.

Subclauses (2) and (3) provide that a statutory corporation must not establish a trust or partnership or joint venture or other profit sharing scheme unless—

- the Minister has approved the scheme or arrangement; or
- the other party is a statutory corporation; or
- a notice under Division 2 provides that the prohibition does not apply to the statutory corporation.

*Clause 23: Property to be held on behalf of Crown*

A statutory corporation holds its property on behalf of the Crown.

*Clause 24: Transfer of property, etc.*

This clause provides for transfer of assets, rights and liabilities of a statutory corporation to or from the Minister, to another statutory corporation, to the Crown or an agent or instrumentality of the Crown or, in prescribed conditions and circumstances to another person or body (provided that the person or body consents to the transfer).

*Clause 25: Securities*

A statutory corporation may issue securities, or a mortgage or charge, with the approval of the Minister. Before giving approval, however, the Minister must obtain the concurrence of the Treasurer and a liability incurred with the consent of the Treasurer is guaranteed by the Treasurer.

*Clause 26: Tax and other liabilities*

This clause is based on section 29 of the *Public Corporations Act 1993* and essentially provides that the Treasurer may require a statutory corporation to pay tax equivalents. The opportunity has been taken to ensure that tax equivalence can be applied to specific divisions of a statutory corporation and that the Treasurer has sufficient power to apply relevant taxation principles without necessarily applying the Commonwealth taxation law strictly. For example, the clause enables the Treasurer to determine an income tax equivalent liability on income measured according to conventional accounting standards where that is considered likely to give a similar result as a strict application of the provisions of the *Income Tax Assessment Act*. In respect of wholesale sales tax equivalents, the provision is intended to enable the tax payable by a corporation on its taxable purchases to be calculated and collected directly from that corporation whereas under Commonwealth taxation law, the tax payable would normally (*i.e.* in the absence of Commonwealth WST exemptions available to State owned entities) be collected from the vendor.

*Clause 27: Dividends*

This clause is in similar terms to section 30 of the *Public Corporations Act 1993* and allows for the payment of dividends or interim dividends by a statutory corporation that is involved in a commercial operation where the Minister and the Treasurer consider that this is appropriate.

*Clause 28: Audit and accounts*

The Board will be required to keep proper accounting records and to prepare annual statements of accounts. The accounts will be audited by the Auditor-General on an annual basis.

DIVISION 8—PERFORMANCE AND REPORTING OBLIGATIONS

*Clause 29: Objectives*

The Minister may, after consultation with a statutory corporation, prepare a performance statement for it. A performance statement will set goals and objectives for the statutory corporation and will be reviewed at least once a year. If the statement sets financial targets the Minister must also consult with the Treasurer.

*Clause 30: Provision of information and reports to the Minister*

The Minister may require information or reports from a statutory corporation.

*Clause 31: Annual report*

The Board will be required to prepare an annual report for the Minister. The report will be tabled in Parliament.

PART 4

MISCELLANEOUS

*Clause 32: Acquisition of land*

A statutory corporation may acquire land with the consent of the Minister in accordance with the *Land Acquisition Act 1969*.

*Clause 33: Power to enter land*

A person authorised by the Minister may enter land provided that the occupier of the land has been given reasonable notice. It is an offence to hinder a person exercising a power under this section.

*Clause 34: Satisfaction of Treasurer's guarantee*

A liability of the Treasurer under a guarantee under this Act is to be paid out of the Consolidated Account.

*Clause 35: Effect of transfers*

This clause makes it clear that the transfer of an asset, right or liability operates despite the provisions of another law and the transfer of a liability from a body discharges that body from the liability.

*Clause 36: Registering authorities to note transfer*

This clause provides for the registration of transfers effected under the Act where necessary. Subclause (3) provides that the vesting of property by proclamation or notice under the Act is to be exempt from stamp duty.

*Clause 37: Offences*

A prosecution for an offence may be commenced within three years or, with the approval of the Attorney-General, within five years.

*Clause 38: Regulations*

The Governor may make regulations for the purposes of the Act.

SCHEDULE 1

*Repeal and Amendments*

This schedule repeals the *South Australian Housing Trust Act 1936* and the *Urban Land Trust Act 1981* and makes consequential amendments to the *Housing Improvement Act 1940*.

SCHEDULE 2

*Transitional Provisions*

This schedule contains the transitional arrangements applicable to the measure, including the following:

- the members of the board of the Housing Trust cease to hold office;
- Homestart is dissolved;
- the property, rights, powers, liabilities and obligations of the Housing Trust (except its rights, powers, liabilities and obligations as a landlord), Homestart and the Urban Land Trust vest in the Minister (unless otherwise vested by proclamation);
- the South Australian Housing Trust fund and the South Australian Urban Land Trust Fund vest in the Minister.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

**ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST (TRUST MEMBERSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

This is a Bill to amend the provisions of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act 1971 relating to the composition of the Trust.

The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust consists of eight trustees, of whom six are persons nominated by the Minister for the Arts, one is a person nominated by the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and one is a person nominated by the Adelaide Festival of Arts Incorporated.

In September 1994 the Adelaide Festival Board was established to exercise powers delegated to the Minister for the Arts for the operation and management of the Adelaide Festival, a role previously undertaken by the Adelaide Festival of Arts Incorporated.

The Adelaide Festival of Arts Incorporated has changed the Association's name to the Friends of the Adelaide Festival

Incorporated as a consequence of the changed role of the Association from manager and presenter to supporter of the Festival.

One of the purposes of this Bill is thus to include a nominee of the Adelaide Festival Board in lieu of the Adelaide Festival of Arts Incorporated as a trustee of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. The other purposes are to amend the Act to clarify that the eight trustees are appointed by the Governor and to ensure that at least two trustees are men and at least two are women.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 6—Composition of the Trust

This clause amends section 6 of the principal Act so that—

- (1) trustees are appointed by the Governor.
- (2) one trustee is a person nominated by the Adelaide Festival Board, instead of the Adelaide Festival of Arts Incorporated.
- (3) at least two trustees are men and at least two are women.

**Mr QUIRKE** secured the adjournment of the debate

### GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY (AUTHORITY AND ADVISORY BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### DOG FENCE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 February. Page 1556.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** The current situation in respect of the budget in South Australia is where we see considerable stresses within the State Government's finances. As we have seen in Question Time today and on other occasions, the Government has sought to pass the buck for much of this on to Federal fiscal measures and, in particular, on to interest rates. It has sought to blame a whole range of its own deficiencies on others. The Government has now been in power for some 15 months and has brought down its first budget, and we are now well into that budget. As I will show in a moment, we are in the lead up to the next budget, which will come down in this place in something less than four months from now.

But it appears that the deterioration of the present budget is not because it was badly cast; not because it did not take into account what was, to anyone, obvious problems with that budget; it is because it is someone else's fault. In fact, we spent the first half of 1994 in this Chamber being told that it was all our fault. We used to listen here to one Minister after another: irrespective of what the problem was, it was always our fault. Whether there was a budget problem of one kind or another or a gaol break, it was always our fault. That line has changed somewhat, although it has not changed much for the Minister for Correctional Services; it is still all our fault. He has not caught up with the rest of them yet. The rest of them are now blaming the Feds for it. Pretty soon, they will have to start looking at themselves.

One of the problems with this budget is that it did not have built into it the necessary flexibilities that would have ensured, particularly during the course of this financial year,

much less stress on the budget than has been the case. It was pretty clear when the budget was being cast that the situation with the cheapest money that was available in early 1994 would not continue. That point needs to be made here. If anyone thought that the historic rates at the beginning of 1994, the cheapest rates that were available for more than 30 years, would continue when there was an improving economic cycle, and particularly so in other States (and I will have more to say about that in a moment); if anyone built that into the calculations and said, 'We will have the same rate of interest from now forward through this budgetary period', I suggest those advisers who gave that advice were not worth feeding.

Anyone out there who did not know had only to consult some of the basic financial advisers, who were already warning people that they should not assume that the historically low rates of interest that were available in the first half of 1994 would continue. In fact, advice was being given then to householders who were contemplating mortgages or remortgaging properties, to make sure they locked in those interest rates for as long as they possibly could. That is the first point. We now find day in and day out that the Treasurer says that he was not aware that these changes in interest rates would take place. If he was not aware, then he must have been on a different planet when all the pundits made very clear, and anyone with any economic ability at all realised, that there would be a movement in the interest rate cycle; that that movement would take place in the normal course of events as it always has; and that those rates of interest that were the lowest right back into the early 1960s would not continue in the same vein. That is the first point that needs to be made.

The second point is what passes for wages policy around here. We heard from the members of the Government in early 1994 that there would be no wage rises throughout the public sector in South Australia for two years. They went to elaborate lengths on this, including a measure by which members of Parliament would experience a wages freeze for a length of time. The Premier made that announcement on several occasions, and I remember exactly at that point somebody saying to me, 'I will bet you that the only group around here who will have the wage freeze will be the politicians.' And what do we find? The budget is brought in and we go through the Estimates Committees procedure; we find out that there is absolutely no flexibility built in there for the budget; no wage rises but a wage freeze—the whole bit. But then we come in here in November and find that an offer has been made across the board of \$12 for everyone working in the Government sector.

Of course, we find that the politicians do have the pay freeze: so be it. That \$12 subsequently became an even larger offer as time went by. The Opposition always took the view that to lock out completely, within budgetary terms, any pay rise during this 1994-95 budget was totally unrealistic. We said that in here; we said it in Estimates Committees; we said it out there in public. What is more, it was going to be almost impossible to contain some pay rises, because of movements not only in other States and at the Federal level but also because in some instances there had been no change to the wage structure for some years in certain sections of the public sector. What we have found since then is that we now have a break out. We now have a change in that philosophy, and we now have a situation where there is considerable stress on the budget.

These sorts of measures should have been built into it, and they were not. Now we find that the Government is putting, I presume, the preliminary touches to a budget that will be coming down in this place in nearly four months time. One of the first documents to come off the back of the semi-trailer is one that I would like to read into the record. Under the heading '1995-96 Budget—savings/work force measures', it states:

On 30 January 1995, Cabinet considered the budget outlook for 1995-96 and the forward years. As part of that process, Cabinet approved revised underlying deficit targets for the period 1995-96 through 1997-98 and a package of measures to achieve these targets. This package included increased aggregate work force reductions/expenditure savings measures for non-commercial sector agencies and increase dividend levels from certain commercial sector agencies.

I will come back to that in a moment. It continues:

The consequent expenditure savings/dividend targets for 1995-96 and the ensuing two years, including the further work force reductions to be achieved by 30 June 1995, have now been determined for agencies within your portfolio(s) and are detailed in the schedules attached. The schedules also provide details on indicative consolidated account allocations and proposed work force levels. You will recall from Cabinet discussions that, in order to preserve the overall integrity of the Government's debt reduction and budgetary adjustment strategy, there is no room for any slippage on these savings/dividend targets. I also wish to stress that:

- the expenditure savings/dividend targets are additional to measures already agreed to for 1995-96 as part of the 1994-95 budget and built into the no policy change estimates for agencies;
- the expenditure savings relate specifically to recurrent spending as Cabinet is still to consider savings options on the capital side of the budget; and
- the further work force reductions to occur by 30 June 1995 are additional to the reductions already planned by agencies for 1994-95 and the forward years (as advised to Treasury and Finance earlier this financial year) and are to be the principal measure by which agencies achieve their revised financial savings targets.

The revised work force reductions are considered minimal as they take no account of any work force reductions which agencies might need to effect in relation to the two non-supplemented \$10 per week increases under enterprise bargaining, nor work force losses from outsourcing proposals other than those identified to date. Further details on agency work force levels and planned reductions will be provided by the Commissioner for Public Employment to chief executive officers later this week.

Bilateral budget meetings are to be scheduled with all Ministers during February/March 1995. The agenda for these meetings will be how Ministers/agencies plan to achieve these revised targets. I will take part in some of these discussions—

I bet the Treasurer will take part in some of them—

In these bilateral discussions, we need to cover all possible savings opportunities, including:

- increased efficiency in operations;
- cessation of activities considered to be a low Government priority—

I will return to that in a moment, too—

- policy changes that reduce expenditure, but maintain the effective level of service delivery; and
- the recovery of costs for the provision of services by the public sector.

To meet the 1 June budget presentation deadline, it is important that these bilateral meetings conclude by no later than the third week of March 1995. Officers from the Department of Treasury and Finance will contact your office shortly to schedule a meeting with you. For any further information, please do not hesitate to contact—

and it goes on to list a few of the officers concerned with this process. I deal with a couple of the issues raised in this memo, which is under the hand of 'Stephen Baker, MP, Deputy Premier and Treasurer'. First, dealing with 'increased dividend levels from certain commercial sector agencies', I

long remember sitting in this place listening to the Opposition going on about the cash cows around the place such as ETSA and EWS. I long remember listening to all of the arguments that the past Government and indeed the Government before it, the Bannon Government, were milking South Australia through increased electricity tariffs; that they were taking too much from ETSA; that water rates were too high, etc. I remember the water rate problem because it went on in this place for about 15 months.

Indeed, if you strip away the rhetoric of one person in particular in the other place, who liked to use 5 000 litres or whatever it was a day, if you take all that out of it, what the Opposition always used to say was that the people of South Australia were paying too much for these basic services, that the Government was soaking people. As to the reference in the memo to 'increased dividends levels from certain commercial sector agencies', I bet that that will not be an increase in the cost of hunting permits in the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. I would put money on the fact that that will be an increased dividend from ETSA and EWS; in other words, we will see water rates and electricity tariffs increase. Wherever the Government can put up charges we will see that happen.

Of course, that will reinforce the argument at the Federal level that we need some of those Hilmer efficiencies. In fact, Treasurer Willis has made it quite clear that the whole of the Australian public is paying through the nose for State monopolies right around the countryside. He estimates that something of the order of \$22 billion is overcharged in any one year by the various State agencies. I will make the prediction that by the time this Government gets through with it that figure will increase considerably in South Australia. This memo makes it quite clear that we will see electricity tariff and water charging increases and increased charges for a whole range of other Government services, and that the cost of those services being borne out there by all of our constituents will grow in 1995-96.

Another matter of concern is the statement, 'There is no room for any slippage on these savings dividend targets.' It is the wage policy of this Government all over again; in other words, you had better not fail on this. What happens if you cannot meet unrealistic targets? On reading this document, I suspect that some of these targets are totally unrealistic. What we will see is the absolute debacle that now seems to be happening in relation to road transport. I do not want to comment too much on that, as one of the other speakers on this side who may have read the Minister's statement in another place this afternoon will be better able to comment.

However, it appears that we are about to see significant changes in the Department of Transport, the principal architect of apparently being the Deputy Premier, and, quite frankly, I do not know how other departments will be able to cope with the sorts of pressures being applied. We see here today changes in road transport and we will see very significant reductions in the work force, the level of service and all the other things that we have seen over generations in that particular agency. That is in direct response to the sort of situation to which I have been referring, including that outlined in this particular memo. Other speakers may develop that point further, but I want to address a few other issues which arise from this memo. It states:

The revised work force reductions are considered minimal as they take no account of any work force reductions which agencies might need to effect in relation to the two non-supplemented \$10 per week increases.



Already we have seen a downsizing of the public sector in South Australia of some 8 per cent over the past two years. The previous Government managed to achieve about half of that reduction; this Government has achieved the other half. If fully implemented, it will mean a reduction fairly close to the figure that already has been achieved. That is the sort of figure we will be looking at—a reduction of somewhere between another 6 per cent to 8 per cent across the whole public sector. No doubt some agencies will be able to transfer certain functions to the private sector—you can ‘outsource’, which is where many of this Government’s policies seem to be directed—but in some departments that is not possible. To lay down these targets, in my view, will make them almost impossible to achieve. On the next page of the memo we find a couple of interesting comments. The first is:

The recovery of costs for the provision of services by the public sector.

This amounts to the complete introduction of the user-pays principle. There is no other way to view the words in this document, which is a Government document signed by the Deputy Premier. Members should be well and truly aware of where this is going and what it will mean. It will mean full cost recovery. For example, those persons who appear in the Adelaide Magistrates Court and who want a transcript—they cannot take in a recorder and record the proceedings because that has no status before the court—will need to pay the full cost for each page of transcript. I am told that the current charge is \$8 a page; and I am also told, by the Courts Services Department, that it costs \$11 to produce that page (and I will not comment on how that cost is arrived at). The public will have to realise that, if this dictum is followed all the way, in future that is what the charge will be.

This will occur in a range of other areas as well. For many years there has been an agreement in this place and in the community that we achieve social equity through the taxation system. It is obvious to members on this side of politics that if full cost recovery is introduced it will fall not only on those who can least afford it but on persons who cannot afford it. One of the real problems with full cost recovery, with the user-pays principle, is deciding who is the user—and we have argued that position many times in this House. One of the other comments in this document is:

The cessation of activities considered to be a low Government priority.

I am not sure what those activities entail. I would like the Government to spell out those activities before they are stopped. I would like the chance to debate some of those activities in this House. I bet that some of those activities involve the provision of extra staff to schools, particularly schools in Labor electorates. I will put money on the fact that some of the activities to be stopped are relied on by some sections of the community. I will bet that one of those activities is something similar to the Para Districts Counselling Service, which was set up some 30 years ago and which this Government does not rate too highly. The Government decided it was not going to be funded any longer under one line and no-one else was going to go pick it up, so it fell between two schools, which is a convenient way of dealing with the problem.

I will bet some of these activities which are to be stopped because they are a low Government priority will be social justice measures that persons out there, particularly persons represented by people on this side of politics, need. I suggest that a number of members opposite who just happened to

fluke a win at the last election will find it very difficult to turn up to their electorate offices and explain to their constituents the activities of this Government when it goes about with a scorched earth policy in a whole range of areas.

I think it is appropriate to make a few other remarks about the budgetary position in South Australia. First, there is no doubt that a debt reduction strategy on both sides of politics is essential. There is no doubt that the sale of many non-core assets—not all—is a good idea. On this side of politics we believe that the State Bank should have been dragged to the auction block long before now. I have said in this place, as have other members, that the State Bank of South Australia should have gone down the road of a trade sale 12 months or more ago. Because we had this dopey idea of a float—a strategy that was always flawed—we have lost at least eight to 10 months in the preparation of the sale of that asset.

The Opposition did not argue about the sale of SGIC because we were satisfied with that. However, we wanted to see safeguards and a few other things put in place because unfortunately we have dealt with this crowd and we want to see proper parliamentary scrutiny. That includes not only the Government; I am talking about organisations such as the State Bank and SGIC. The idea that they will be cloaked from parliamentary scrutiny for the next six to 12 months, or however long it takes before they are sold, does not appeal to me one bit. Unfortunately, I have dealt with them before. They were the conditions—and I think they are eminently reasonable—that we placed on the sale of those assets.

We have no problem with a debt reduction strategy through certain targeted specific asset sales. However, we have a problem with the way this Government has built an inflexible budget, now finds itself in a corner and is panicking—and this document is clear evidence of that—so that in 1995-96 we will see millions of dollars and thousands of employees slashed from the public sector. Had the State Bank been sold by now, millions of dollars would have already gone into the budget and funds would have been applied to the reduction of debt.

The situation is not really as bleak as the Deputy Premier tells us, because one measure for which I am sure he is very grateful, although he did not vote for it, is gaming machines in South Australia. I find it rather amusing that every time I go to a function in the hotels and clubs I see the Deputy Premier. Not only did he not vote for the measure when it came before the House but he was quite vociferous about it at the time. The reason he attends these functions and smiles is that he is about \$75 million a year better off as a result of gaming machines in South Australia.

It is not all doom and gloom. I will make another prediction: we will never hear the Deputy Premier get up and thank the former Labor Government for bringing in that measure and making his budget somewhat easier. I understand that the potential for that \$75 million to rise to, say, \$90 million next financial year is good. It is estimated that this year the turnover for those machines will be about \$1.5 billion. The percentage of Government tax will be quite considerable for not a lot of effort, because the entire cost of collection of this revenue is handled by the industry. I might add that I supported the proposal when it was before the House, and so did a majority of members. Those funds are feeding into the budget, so it is not all doom and gloom.

I want to finalise my remarks by raising what is the fundamental or key issue. If you have travelled to Sydney, Melbourne or Brisbane in the past six to eight months, you would be impressed with one thing once you get off the

plane: there is a feeling that things are happening. There is no doubt that there is a large amount of new investment, and there is a lot of credibility in the economy which does not occur in South Australia. We now see some interest rate increases because the Federal Government believes the economy is moving too quickly, and it is probably right. However, it is certainly not moving too quickly in South Australia. It may be moving too quickly in New South Wales and Victoria, and it may be growing too fast in Queensland, but that is not the case in South Australia.

If we look at all the indices in South Australia, we see that the processes and procedures are such that we can honestly say that there really has been no recovery here at all. We have not seen a recovery that is running with too much steam, and we are not seeing the level of economic activity that is occurring in other States. I would have thought that the State Government in South Australia would propose a two pronged strategy to deal with those problems. The first one, which the Government is approaching through Minister Olsen, is to snare as much investment as possible in South Australia, for example, through Motorola, Australis and a number of other projects, some of which are considerably smaller. Other investment, for example, in the motor vehicle industry, are indeed welcome in this State. We would like to see this process continue. We have no argument with the Government with respect to that level of economic activity. However, we are concerned that the budget and the Government's share of expenditure in South Australia is being screwed down through the floor.

This year it appears that we will have a horror budget, which will not provide the climate for increased economic investment that the Minister has done so much work to attract to South Australia. If this memo is a sign of where we are going, there is no doubt that we will see the Government in South Australia add to the problem rather than being part of the solution. In fact, we will see a downturn in economic activity in South Australia which will be much greater than that of other States. We can go on about interest rate hikes and about this, that and the other, but, the way this document reads, the contribution of the South Australian budget in 1995-96 will be such that the level of economic activity in this State will drop alarmingly.

All of us in this House have made our home in South Australia, have families in South Australia and want to see this State prosper. The tragic news is that, if we are not careful, we will create a climate in this State where we will see an outflow of persons, particularly those with considerable talent, to other States and overseas. Indeed, they will probably have to—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** We'll be left with the likes of the member for Custance, whom I would prefer to have exported instead of some of the other brains around the place. We will be left with the likes of the member for Custance in this State instead of some of those persons we would like to keep in this economy. We all need to generate a level of economic activity in this State such that our children and the next generation make a suitable living and have a rewarding career in this State. One of our principal concerns is that the Government seems to be turning down Government activity in this State to a level that will pose a number of problems for our future economic development. We have no argument with the measures to bring in investment; and we have no argument with the measures that are in clear evidence from the Minister to attract new investment to South Australia.

However, the other side of it is that we find a budget that is full of doom and gloom.

The Opposition is quite happy to support the passage of the Bill. It is not the wont of the Opposition to frustrate the Government's economic program. I am simply raising certain concerns, and no doubt other members will raise concerns of their own. My principal concern is for the well-being of the South Australian community. Indeed, many of our constituents will find the 1995 budget to be very unpalatable.

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** No wonder Alex Kennedy wrote the headline 'Besieged Rann is taking the rap for his lacklustre team', which appeared in the *City Messenger* of 22 February 1995. That article was quite damning on the performance of the Opposition, as follows:

Since the start of the year, Opposition Leader Mike Rann has been accused in the media of being both too tough and menacing in his approach to the job, and then too soft and weak.

The same comments are to be heard at Labor gatherings. The criticisms are more a measure of how uncomfortable Labor is in its new role as the underdog, and what a ghastly no-thanks position being State Opposition Leader is, than they are about Rann himself.

**Mr Brindal:** She's got to get one right occasionally.

**Mr BECKER:** As the member for Unley says, Alex has to get one right occasionally. Alex is not too bad. I will not repeat what I said to her when I first met her. The Minister at the table had a very good press secretary in those days, and Alex came in and worked jolly hard to support the then Leader of the Opposition, John Olsen. She has summed up the Leader of the Opposition extremely well. The Leader of the Opposition's performance in this House in the past two weeks has been quite pathetic, and no wonder. We should look at his track record as a journalist. When he was in New Zealand he wrote an obituary about a mayor of a city, or certainly a prominent citizen.

**Mr Brindal:** Had he died?

**Mr BECKER:** No, the person hadn't died. It was very embarrassing for the paper to print the article. The journalist was one Mike Rann, but it would not have worried him. He is doing the same thing to his own political Party. I cannot see the Leader of the Opposition being a long-term prospect if this State Government is to have any competition at all. I am a little disappointed at the honourable member who just resumed his seat, the shadow Treasurer for the Opposition, because I would have expected a much more analytical appraisal of our budget and our budget performance, if he is able to do that. The fact that he was unable to do so means that our Treasurer is doing a jolly good job.

The worst job that anyone could have in this country is Treasurer of South Australia. That is no reflection on my Party or on my Government. The current Treasurer inherited one of the toughest and most challenging treasuries in Australia. Of course, his job has been made extremely difficult because of the lack of cooperation of Canberra. We know about the performance and behaviour of the Prime Minister of this country. We know that, given his unforgiving and unrepentant nature, he will make it extremely difficult for any Liberal State, let alone a State such as South Australia that is battling to get back up after 20-odd years of financial mismanagement by previous Labor Administrations. It is a tough task.

It is all very well for some people to ask us, 'Why don't you do what Kennett did in Victoria?' We cannot do what Kennett did in Victoria, because the situation is entirely different. Our economy in South Australia, as I have said on

many occasions, is finely tuned. One has to be extremely careful in the decisions that one makes and keep in mind the impact of those decisions. It is important that we kick start industry and commerce, and we have done that. Again, the Minister at the bench—the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development—has worked extremely hard to ensure that new business and industry is being attracted to South Australia and that we are supporting and encouraging local industries to continue to expand and develop in this State.

It is all very well to be able to say that we have part of the Galaxy TV company coming to South Australia creating about 1 000 or 1 200 jobs. It will involve huge capital investment and great opportunities for South Australia. It is great that we have Motorola coming in and expanding. It is wonderful that we have Transition Lenses coming into South Australia in the high tech field, because we have proved that we can compete in this area against any Asian country. It is ironic that the tough competitors at the moment are Ireland and Taiwan, but we can more than match what they are offering companies to establish businesses.

South Australia has the opportunity; it has the lifestyle; it has the city and its size; and it has the location. In fact, it has everything going for it. Now, of course, we need to be able to get behind commerce and industry to ensure that they expand and develop in the interests of South Australia.

I believe that that is being reflected in the current budget figures and that it will be reflected in the budget that we are about to consider for 1995-96. I have been harping on for over 20 years that we need to bring down our budgets well before the commencement of the new financial year. On this occasion we will do that in about May. Hopefully, the Bill will have been passed, at least in the House of Assembly, before 1 July 1995. Gone should be the days when a budget is finally passed by late October or early November. It is ridiculous to expect a bureaucracy to undertake its spending programs in the short period that is left in the financial year. Departments have only about seven months to deal with those expenditure programs. At least we are heading in the right direction in terms of starting to frame the budget, albeit not a very nice document to have to prepare at all.

I cannot understand why Canberra has allowed this ridiculous situation of climbing interest rates to develop or why it has allowed housing loan and personal loan rates to go up while at the same time small business is affected. No-one can understand it because it simply does not make sense. I do not believe that the economy is overheating; I do not believe that the economy is starting to gallop away and that we need this stop-start, turn on-turn off type of economy controlling commerce, industry and people's spending.

Of course, we must encourage people to save. But we are not going to be able to do it if Governments take huge slabs out of the earnings of the average worker. That is where we fall down on occasions. We fall back to the easy solution of socialist economics whereby the Government rules and controls everything and takes everything and then, of course, dictates the lives of the people.

I am disappointed that the shadow Treasurer did not point out that we are up for about another \$360 million worth of interest because of the State Bank debt and that we are facing a \$65 million to \$70 million shortfall in the future budget because of the impact of interest rates. That money has to be found somewhere. Sure, we can follow the Labor Party policy, which is very clear—to increase taxes and charges rather than cutting programs. However, when we look at the

programs that the Government controls and when we look at what has been going on over the years, we see clearly that we have been over staffed and have had a bloated bureaucracy.

I remind Jan McMahon, the Secretary of the Public Service Association, that she does not employ any more people than are required in that office. Why should the State Government employ more people than it requires? If the unions are not prepared to employ surplus people and be over staffed, why should the State Government? Ms McMahon is very knowledgeable about small business and what it is like to own and operate a small business. I can assure the House that she does not employ anyone she does not have to employ.

I would have thought that the Opposition would analyse the figures made available today in the Consolidated Account for the half year ending December 1994. It gives a fair indication of what is happening. If we look at the receipts side, particularly in the area of taxation, we see that the Government expects to collect \$1 785 442 million. That is a considerable sum of money. If members were to look at the receipts for the 31 December 1994 of approximately \$853 million, they would think that we were not doing too badly. However, it is unfair to make a comparison and to assume that about double that figure is what we are likely to receive. The receipts in some areas are not consistent month by month. One cannot simply say that every month we will get 'x' amount, because that can vary due to many intangibles.

One area in which it looks as though we may exceed expectations is gambling. The Treasurer budgeted to receive \$157 935 000 and already we have received \$80 million; \$13 million was received in December. The increased revenue from gaming machines in licensed premises reflects a faster rate of installation of machines than was anticipated at budget time. This has been offset by a fall in the revenue from casino operations. Even so, gambling is making a very sizeable contribution to State taxes, coming in at about 9 per cent of the total budget figure.

The other area of increase is payments in lieu of taxes. Commonwealth income tax and State tax from entities such as Primary Industries (forestry), the South Australian Timber Corporation (Forwood Products) are to be received in the second half of 1994-95, and \$23 147 000 should be reached; to date we have received just under \$1 million.

Other areas of interest include: the debits tax, for which we budgeted to receive \$58 500 000, and we have received \$29 622 000; and stamp duty, which reflects mainly real estate sales and for which we budgeted \$422 800 000, and we have received \$202 481 000. That figure will fluctuate depending on a whole range of sales and business transactions. Whilst it appears that it may be slightly down, the period that is coming up can often be the better period. Financial institutions duty seems to be running at about budget at \$73 100 000. If you ask anyone in business or the average citizen, they will say it is a curse of a tax, but unfortunately it is necessary: \$73 million goes in financial institutions duty. You pay to put your money in and you pay to take it out, and that is pretty rough. The Australian banking system has disappointed me since I left that august profession in the way it has looked after the average citizen in this country. We will expect continued income from that source.

In the recovery from superannuation, we expected to receive \$440 760 000, and the recovery from employer accounts for Government contributions to superannuation will increase in the second half of the 1994-95 financial year; we will receive a lot more than we have received to date

(\$139 133 000). There are large contributions from State undertakings and business enterprises, statutory authorities or quangos. We expect to receive \$308 357 000, but we have received only \$6 million so far. The contributions from these organisations, such as ETSA, the Urban Lands Trust and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, will come in in June 1995.

With respect to payments, the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development budget is \$71 million. Up to the first half of the year we have already paid out \$41 342 000; because funding for public libraries is fully advanced in the first half of the financial year, that figure is thrown slightly out of kilter. One of the biggest expenditure items in the State budget is the Department for Education and Children's Services, which has a budget of \$950 920 000. An amount of \$505 460 000 has been spent already. That reflects in the main leave loading for the year paid to the teaching work force during December 1994. Whilst our budget runs on a financial year from 1 July to 30 June, the education budget runs on a calendar year. So there is a lot of turnover at the end of the calendar year, and leave loadings and so on come in at that time. There is pay in advance for employees who take recreation leave and an extra pay period in relation to superannuation and PRT payments. There are 14 payments to 31 December 1994 out of a total of 26 payments for the year. I well remember Don Dunstan often lampooning us because we would ask what had gone wrong with education or the Public Service, and we would be reminded that there was an extra payment in the quarter or half year that did not necessarily show up when the budget was framed.

The budget allocation for the Department for Family and Community Services was \$145 776 000. We have already spent \$102 million to 31 December 1994. Again, that reflects the processing of grants and concessions for organisations and recipients, for example, the Home and Community Care Program and pensioner concessions, in the first half of the financial year. In other words, as I said, there are large variations during these periods which make it extremely difficult to say exactly how the current budget is going and what impact it will have on the framing of the new budget. As I said, it will be tough. The budget allocation for the Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing was \$10 993 000. For the first half year we have already spent \$11 583 000. The current three year agreement provides for the agency to access its funds for the year on 1 July. Additional above allocation reflects funding approved by Cabinet for the Azzuri Soccer Club. An allocation such as that can throw the budget right out of kilter for the time being and make it look as though it is a little wobbly, but it is not necessarily so.

The budget allocation for the Passenger Transport Board was \$148 679 000, and at the end of December \$97 624 000 had been spent. That reflects the January payment to TransAdelaide drawn one month in advance. Again, it puts pressure on the budget when, unfortunately, you have to make these allocations to assist various organisations and authorities. The budget allocation for the Housing Trust was \$49 299 000, but in the first six months \$15 812 000 had been spent. The reason for this is debt repayment in relation to Commonwealth loans due to SAFA in June 1995. So it looks as though it is well under budget at present, but in June 1995 there will be a catch-up period.

The budget allocation for the Deputy Premier and Treasurer was \$1 207 million. To the end of December we have spent \$543 596 000. That is reflected in the timing of interest rates. Three payments were due in the last half of the

financial year compared with two payments in the first six months. So, again it paints a very different picture. What I am trying to demonstrate is that at the end of December 1994 there was a deficit in the Consolidated Account (that is, the current and loan accounts) of \$381 166 000. It is difficult to compare like with like when there is such a wide variation. That is why it is a very challenging task to predict what is required to balance the 1995-96 budget when interest rates show such an unsteady performance as they are at present. The allocation of \$600 million under this legislation will carry the Public Service through and make the payments for the State until the new budget is brought in and has been dealt with by the Parliament. By doing that, we provide the opportunity to continue the payments.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** As Leader of the Opposition, I support the reading of this Supply Bill—obviously, it is legislation to allow the appropriation of money for the purpose of funding Government services—but I want to make clear that, while the approval of Supply might be unexceptionable, this Labor Opposition considers the Government's policies to be economically irresponsible and socially divisive, certainly policies to which this Opposition takes great exception.

In the first 15 months of this Government, in spite of a whirlwind national economic recovery, this State has fallen behind and continues to do so. Regardless of the Premier's efforts at a boastful, blue mist disinformation campaign in the media—only these days swallowed by a few of them—the facts are that the most significant achievement of this Government is that it has engineered pitiful levels of economic growth despite the rhetoric and falling levels of unemployment in the midst of a booming national economy.

At the same time, the Government's policies have failed every basic test of fairness and equity. The Government's services, which should provide the basis of a strong social fabric, are being destroyed at a time when the ordinary people, the people whom the Government claims deserted Labor at the last election because we had deserted them, most need those services. They said at the last election that only a Liberal Government could contain and control the menace of debt, yet in the first Baker budget, in spite of all the service and job cuts and broken categorical promises, the total budget outlay fell by only .3 per cent, the net real debt increasing not falling over 1995 and 1996. Although the Treasurer's May 1994 financial statement forecast a budget deficit of \$410 million, after only four months the budget later projected a higher deficit of almost \$448 million.

Even this diluted target could only have been achieved if the assumptions and settings of the September budget had been sound, but they were not sound. We told the Government so at the time, and now it is clear for everyone in the community to see. We said that the provision in the budget for a 1.5 per cent increase in interest rates was insufficient. That is what we said, and the Government is already in deficit on this account by around \$40 million—or will be once the full effect of the rise is felt. It is no good whingeing about how much pain the Federal Government is causing the State Government's budget when every commentator in the country at the time the last budget was being set in concrete was forecasting interest rate rises in excess of the Baker budget and when, as everyone in this House knows full well,

the Federal Leader of the Opposition, John Howard, would do the same but only more so if he were in the job.

In an act of even more colossal naivety, this budget made no provision for public sector wage increases for this and the following financial year. The Industrial Relations Commission always made clear that any group of workers unable to strike an enterprise bargain with their employers would be eligible for a safety net payment. It made clear over a year ago that the State could not unilaterally impose a wage freeze, and the State Government became the first employer in Australia to be forced by the Industrial Relations Commission to bargain in good faith. The Treasurer has the temerity to again attack the union movement over enterprise bargaining today. Now that the Government has had to accept reality and make a pay offer, the budget is in further disarray over interest rate rises. The only thing saving the budget this year is that so many unions have rejected the Government's offer in favour of seeking Federal registration with the prospect of a greater impact in the 1995-96 year as more substantial wage increases will be possible under Federal awards.

It is hard to imagine who advised the Treasurer and how the Treasurer of this State could ever believe that the State Government could unilaterally impose a wages freeze. That is not competent economic management. It was an extraordinarily incompetent move based on extraordinarily incompetent advice. We knew well before this morning's *Advertiser* headline that much worse was to come in the 1995-96 budget, a budget that will choke off even more of the possibilities for economic growth and top even the Government's last budget for its disregard of the battlers in our community. The pain will, at the broadest level, be inflicted in two ways: fewer community services for those low income earners who depend on them; and a lower rate of economic growth generally as the full impact of these cuts is felt at the same time as the national economy is growing more slowly.

I will say something about how you killed off a real economic recovery in a moment, but for the time being let me remind the House of a few examples of how this Government has shown South Australia's battlers how much a State Liberal Government really cares. Let us remember that at the last election the Liberals promised an increase in education expenditure, but the Government is actually now cutting funding by at least \$40 million over the next three years. The Liberals promised increased health expenditure, but cut \$35 million in the last budget with at least \$33 million to be cut over the next two years. The \$3.3 million cut to school card included tougher conditions for eligibility and a cut in benefits for all cardholders at a cost of \$200 per child per year in transport costs. Increased charges for basic services such as gas, water and electricity will absorb a greater proportion of the total income of the poorer sections of the community as will, of course, increased Housing Trust rents for pensioners in aged cottage homes. These measures hurt the workers and battlers.

Despite all this, it is far from clear that all this slash and burn will leave our debt position any better in three, four or five years. The Government seems not to understand that we can have effective debt reduction and stabilisation only as part of a broader economic strategy. Unless we take the measures to promote growth and investment, we will continue to lose population to other States. In the process our tax base would fall, and our debt levels would remain high and perhaps uncontrollably high. We can resolve our debt and

other liability problems only by having a credible strategy for growth.

We will not solve the problems by making the whole South Australian economy smaller. We will only create greater inequality and division under these policies, and it is highly questionable how the Government's policy will even deliver significant reductions in debt, despite its claims. We look like experiencing a low growth, high unemployment economy in South Australia and that is a tragedy. Yet it is exactly low growth and high unemployment that the Brown Government is delivering. The main areas of growth appear to be in the delivery of hype and misinformation. I reiterate my pledge today that this Labor Opposition will be a patriotic Opposition that seeks to put South Australia first. That is why last week we supported the SGIC moves and why we have supported a range of measures before this Parliament that in many ways would be controversial for a Labor Opposition to support. We have done so in the State's interests.

We have at times taken great pains to point out that many of the things the Government is doing are clearly in opposition to its mandate, the promises it made. A Government that could have won the last election without making one single promise chose instead to promise the earth. To every group that knocked on its door, it promised to deliver not cuts but increases. Whilst we will be a patriotic Opposition, we will certainly not be one that hides the truth from the public, however much this Government may wish us to do so.

Let us listen to what the Premier said. On 13 December last year, flushed with the Christmas spirit and *bonhomie*, he spoke to BOMA and said:

There is a spring in the step of business, a boost in consumer confidence. Things are looking so good; we've had a huge jump in the number of people pouring back into the job market.

He continues:

I said we would aim for 4 per cent annual employment growth and we have exceeded that at 4.5 per cent, and that is ahead of the 3.9 per cent national figure. We had the worst forecast of any State 12 months ago, and now we are out there with the best and they have started their recovery before us.

That is what the Premier told BOMA and apparently what the Premier believes, according to some people in the Public Service who say he has become completely addicted to his own press releases and hype. But what are the facts? The September quarter State accounts show that for the year to September 1994 South Australia had the lowest growth rate of any mainland State. In seasonally adjusted terms, South Australia grew at 1.7 per cent compared with the national economic growth of 6.4 per cent. Not the BOMA speech, not the BOMA hype, not the BOMA blue mist of disinformation, but the real truth—the figures and the facts. We grew at less than one third of the national rate. It is not just that we had the lowest rate of mainland growth: the second slowest growing mainland State was Victoria. How much did Victoria grow over that period? Was it 2, 3 or 4 per cent? While South Australia languished at 1.7 per cent, Victoria—the second slowest growing mainland State—grew at 5.4 per cent, certainly well in touch with the national rate.

**Mr Quirke:** Four times.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Yes, four times. It is not just that the other States have caught us up; rather, our relative position appears to be worsening. South Australia is the only mainland State not now exceeding growth levels occurring in 1992-93. In fact, South Australia has not yet even recovered to these former levels, in spite of the highest rates of national growth for a decade. This contrasts with our

performance during 1993, supposedly in a period in which nothing could happen in South Australia because, as we were being told, the State Labor Government was sapping business confidence, when our growth rate of 4.8 per cent was certainly well in touch with the national economic recovery.

No greater disgrace has there been than the Premier's hopes on jobs. The Premier says we are topping the charts for job growth: that is completely wrong—a complete deception; not true. In the 13 months to January 1995 national employment grew by over 298 000 in seasonally adjusted terms, or at 3.7 per cent. This brought unemployment down from 10.6 to 9 per cent with an increasing participation rate. Over the same period, the first 13 months of Liberal Government in this State, the rate of employment growth has been just one tenth, or 0.33 per cent, of the rate of national job growth; only 2 100 jobs were created in seasonally adjusted terms in the first year of the Dean Brown Government; not the 12 000 he promised, not the 15 000 he boasted that he had personally created in South Australia.

As a consequence, South Australia's labour market participation rate is certainly falling, not rising, and there is net interstate migration out of South Australia. The jobs disinformation campaign came to a head earlier this month with the release of the January job figures. They showed the fourth consecutive fall in the numbers of people unemployed. The participation rate has also fallen consistently since December 1993, reflecting just how few job opportunities there are. What was the claim of the Premier and his Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education? They were to be congratulated on unemployment falling to a shade under 10 per cent. That is what they promised. That is what they said in this Parliament and outside; it was good news.

Anyone who is not a complete economic illiterate knows full well that the fall in unemployment is simply a reflection of just how poor a rate of job creation has been occurring in South Australia over the past 13 months. That decline in unemployment was due entirely to the fall in the participation rate, and the Premier knew it, and that is why he did not have the guts to make the announcement in Parliament and duck shoved it over to the hapless Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Let me just point out that that decline in unemployment was due entirely to the fall in the participation rate and, if the participation rate had stayed at its July 1994 level, the current unemployment rate in South Australia would be around 11.4 per cent. If that is a success, as claimed by this Premier, I feel sure that everyone in this House would hate to see his failures.

Even if we use the trend data that the Premier prefers, South Australia's labour force still fell by 5 000 jobs from September. In trend terms, the South Australian labour force grew by a pathetic 1.2 per cent; nationally it grew by 3.6 per cent. The Premier has claimed that 11 200 jobs have been created in trend terms under his Premiership. In the 13 months to January, the work force grew by a mere 7 500 in the trend terms that he prefers. The Premier appears not to realise that, with this State's share of national population, South Australia needed to see a growth in employment of over 22 000, not 7 500. In seasonally adjusted terms, the South Australian work force had to grow by 23 300 just to keep pace with the national recovery, with national jobs growth.

I was most interested to listen to the Premier's response to a Dorothy Dix question from the member for Light on 7 February. The Premier referred to increases in overtime worked, in manufacturing activity levels and in job vacancy

adverted. As a professional economist, surely the member for Light understands that this merely reflects the fact that South Australia has largely missed out on the national recovery. For example, let us look at overtime worked. The Premier is right to say that, in the year to November 1994, average weekly overtime per employee grew by 12.3 per cent and that this was above the national figure. But it is nothing to boast about. Increases in overtime worked are early signs of recovery during which firms rebuild their stocks in expectation of increased activity and demand. As this process gathers momentum, firms will take on new workers.

Overtime figures are lower in other States because their firms have already made use of increased overtime and have had to take on more full-time and part-time workers. As a consequence, employment has grown and unemployment has fallen. To date, South Australia has missed out on a real and substantive national economic recovery. Just as we approach the position of most other States of a year or more ago, the national economy is slowing. South Australia's recovery is stillborn. Exactly the same point applies to the other key indicators cited in the Premier's boast.

The Opposition has called for a State recovery summit to bring together the Government, the Opposition, the Democrats, big business, manufacturers, unions and small business to chart a course of action that is real—based in reality, not based in hype and disinformation. It is very interesting that the Premier says he will not do so, because he knows that at any such summit he would actually have to sit there and listen to the real statistics, not the bravado or the blarney. We can expect certain of these indicators to improve a little over the coming few months. We certainly hope so; we all want that to happen.

We all want recovery to lock in, but it will not do so by boasts, bravado and PR hype. One day, hype has to collide with reality. I repeat that this reflects the fact that we have missed out on the period of rapid recovery and now face the effects of a more slowly growing national economy.

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

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** There are some members in this House who could not fail to be impressed by the contribution just made by the Leader of the Opposition. It was an astounding and outstanding contribution, and I am quite sure that, if you were a new member in this House, preferably one who was a member of the Labor Party and certainly one who had not lived in South Australia at any time prior to the last election, you might have put some credence in the words just spoken by the Leader of the Opposition. Unfortunately, if you have any reading level above the age of five; if you have lived in this State for more than the past 12 months; if you are a member of the South Australian public, then that speech would have to rate as one of the biggest amounts of drivel ever delivered in this House.

That it came from the Leader of the Opposition is, in fact, quite stunning and, I believe, should go down as a permanent reminder of the type of product we can expect from the current Opposition Leader. I am genuinely disappointed for him. I recall that, when we were in Opposition and our Leader spoke, every member of the House was present. I note that, as the Leader spoke, the numbers were in continual decline. At one stage he had three listening to him; for the last half of the speech he was lucky to muster two. When the Leader of the Opposition cannot command a fifth of the

audience from his own backbench, one wonders how much of South Australia he can be talking to.

To deal with latter things first, the Leader of the Opposition suggested a State recovery summit. That may or may not be a good idea. Certainly, if the Government and the Ministers of the Government decided to get together with big business, small business, Government groups and all sorts of people to try to plan an additional recovery strategy—and I say ‘additional’ because the Government already has a recovery strategy—that would be laudable. However, for the Leader of the Opposition to come in here and suggest that the Opposition should be part of a summit recovery program is extraordinary. That is like the Vandals who sacked Rome asking to be part of the subsequent reconstruction program.

It is just amazing that the Leader of the Opposition, having completely mucked up South Australia, should say, ‘We now want to be part of the recovery process.’ That came from the Leader of the Opposition, who had difficulty hearing the length of the Cabinet table. Quite clearly, he could not hear the Premier of the day—and he is no orphan, because none of the Ministers could. The Premier of the day sat at one end of the table and everybody else caught selective deafness. I have been privileged to go into the Cabinet room, and I do not believe that any member of the Government benches would not have great success in hearing the complete length of that room, let alone the length of the table. But something was wrong in those days because the Leader of the Opposition—

*The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** As the Minister points out, the former member for Unley did not know what went on around the table, and that was the case with a number of other former Ministers who no longer grace the benches opposite. Perhaps that was part of the problem. I do not mean to continually berate the Opposition, but I find it very difficult to come in here and listen to a lecture on the Supply Bill and a lecture on economics from members of the former Government, which put us in this position. Like all my colleagues, from the Premier through to the Ministers and every member of the back bench, I have great difficulty in coming to terms with the fact that certain promises we made at the last election can no longer be kept. We are not running away from that fact: it is true.

Unfortunately, at the time, the then shadow Treasurer, our shadow Ministers and the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, all believed the set of figures which were published by the previous Government. We were not here for more than two minutes before we realised that even those figures presented by the previous Government were not accurate and, as a result, some of our promises had to be broken. I am not proud of it—and I am sure the Premier, the Ministers and the backbench are not proud of it—but faced with that situation on coming to government some hard decisions had to be made. You cannot keep promising when there is no money to deliver.

That is what gets under my skin in terms of the Leader of the Opposition’s speech. We do not have an entire farm to sell: half the farm was sold in the past four years. But rather than selling half the farm responsibly to pay off debt, to lower debt and all the rest of it, for what purpose was it sold? It was sold to bolster recurrent expenditure, to pretend that the problem was not as bad as it was, and to deliberately mislead and fool the people of South Australia so that they did not realise what was going on. The shingle was up: business as usual. Behind the shingle the Government was conducting a

frantic fire sale to obtain all the money it could as quickly as possible to make it appear that the situation was not as bad as it was. That was the strategy, and I am sure every member of these benches deplores that because valuable assets were sold—perhaps too cheaply and too quickly—and they were sold for the wrong purpose. They were not sold to recover debt or to improve the situation but to hide what was going on.

It worries me when I hear the Leader of the Opposition, more converted than soil on the road to Damascus and more righteous than the Apostles, telling the Government what it should do when he was one of the perpetrators of the problem in which this Government finds itself. The Leader claims that the Opposition will not hide the truth from the public. I totally applaud that because I know that this Government will not seek to hide the truth from the public. The Premier has said from well before he was elected that this will be an honest, accountable Government. I applaud the fact that the Opposition is changing its spots. It has clearly committed today not to hide the truth from the public. That is a big leap forward for some members opposite.

I do not include all members opposite in that. There are people opposite whose honesty I never doubted and whose sincerity I admire. It is not to them that I direct my remarks; it is to those who sat on the front bench in the former Government and told this Parliament things that, in the light of 1995, clearly appear not to have been true. I suggest to this House that not only did they perpetrate that charade on this House in its entirety but they also, I believe quite sincerely, perpetrated this same charade on members of their own Party who did not have the same access to the Cabinet room that they did. For those people I feel some compassion—some of them are no longer here—it was not entirely their fault. They did not have the responsibility that others had, but they paid the penalty nonetheless.

The Government has a very tough job to do. I know that this Government will not shirk its responsibility. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to be constructive, he should not come in here and contribute three decent minutes out of a 20 minute speech; he should try to get it up to 10 decent minutes or even 20. The three decent minutes, as the member for Light will know, was when he appeared to be learning some form of economics. It appears that the Leader of the Opposition is going to school. If members carefully examine the last three minutes of his speech, the Leader of the Opposition appears to have learnt something. We should all applaud that, because one day the honourable member might reach the stage where he can make an important contribution in the debates, but not before he learns a few of those basic lessons. He certainly proved, as did his other colleagues on the front bench, that he knew nothing about economics for the entire 10 years of the Bannon Government. That the honourable member is learning is excellent, but let him not come here and make contributions until he has learnt a little bit more, because his contribution today very adequately demonstrated that the Leader of the Opposition, as yet, does not know enough to be able to contribute to debates such as this.

The Leader of the Opposition said of our Premier, ‘If that is a success, we would hate to see his failures.’ Again, I must object. How can anybody associated with the losses of the previous Government come in here and talk about anybody else’s failures? I find it the height of hypocrisy that the Leader of the Opposition can say, ‘The trendline appears to differ from that which the Premier has put forward; therefore it is not as good as he thinks.’ If that is not churlishness, I do

not understand the meaning of the word. If the Leader of the Opposition wants his Party to be a patriotic Opposition, I suggest that he does not come in here calling the Premier, the Treasurer and Ministers complete economic illiterates; instead, he should make an honest effort to make a valuable contribution. In fact, the Leader should stop playing the trite sort of political games that were a hallmark of his ministry for so long.

Here is somebody who stands up and talks about hype and misinformation. You might correct me if I am wrong, Sir, but I seem to remember that, just after we all came back here, South Australia lost the Grand Prix. I remember that the current Leader of the Opposition was the Minister in charge of the Grand Prix. I also have formed the impression that somewhere along the line the people of South Australia, no less than the people in this Chamber, were fed a whole lot of hype and misinformation about the continuation of the Grand Prix after the election.

How can the Leader come in here and say those things? Also, he appeared to try to make some virtue of the fact that our wages bill is under control because so many unions have rejected rises in favour of Federal registration, and he went on to say 'because they think they will get more money'. I am sure that that is true. I found it extraordinary that the Institute of Teachers could issue a press release saying that it understood that the Minister was limited to offering a wage increase of only \$15 a week and, therefore, it would not accept the offer because that would take money out of the education budget of this State; and, because it did not want to deprive the children of this State, it would seek a Federal award. That is fine. But what will happen if the Federal award gives them \$25 a week?

I challenge the President of the Institute of Teachers to tell the people of South Australia that, no matter what award teachers are given in the Federal jurisdiction, the institute will accept only \$15 a week because it does not want to deprive the children of this State. Having been here for five years, I am cynical enough to believe that the institute's approach is: because it did not get enough out of the State system, it will get more out of the Federal system. I believe that, if it can obtain a rise of \$25, \$30 or \$35 a week, the Institute of Teachers will put up its hand and say to its members, 'Look what a good job we have done; look how much money we have got you'—and too bad it comes out of the education budget. In fact, the Institute of Teachers probably will be the first to organise demonstrations against class sizes having to increase, classrooms not being painted or any one of the horrendous measures which might need to be taken in the event that teachers' wages blow out.

I am not knocking teachers getting extra money. I believe in the arbitration system. I believe that the labourer deserves his hire. Whatever the award, I believe that they will be entitled to it—and the same applies to nurses or any group of professionals. I even extend that to politicians and say that we deserve our hire as well. I am not arguing the principle that the labourer deserves his hire: I am arguing the cant and hypocrisy that I see among certain professional group leaders who say that they are doing this as an act of magnanimity towards the people to whom they have a responsibility—in this case the children—when in fact they are not. Like every other worker, they are seeking the best deal for themselves. There is nothing wrong with that, except that it is an exercise in hypocrisy; and, if it is an exercise in hypocrisy, let them admit what they are doing and not pretend that they are doing something else. The Leader of the Opposition also spoke

about the pain of the battlers in our community. That is one thing of which I am tired. I cannot stomach the fact that members opposite seem to think that they have an absolute—

**Mr Leggett:** What members?

**Mr BRINDAL:** When members are sitting opposite, and those few who do sit opposite think that they have an absolute right to care and compassion. I can tell you, Sir, that many members sitting on this side of the House care about the 'battlers' (as the Leader of the Opposition styles them) and care about those in society who are less fortunate. It is true that perhaps some aspects of the Bill do not help them as much as we would like, but that is a problem that we would not wish to place on them—it is a problem foisted on us by the current financial resources of this State.

I object very strongly to members opposite saying that they have some sort of absolute and exclusive right to every cause and every deserving person in this State. If they do, fine; then I and a number of other members will send all our problems to members opposite and they can fix them for us. I know that you, Sir, in your electorate deal with a great many problems from people in Housing Trust homes and with all sorts of needs. I am sure that the members for Florey, Hanson, Peake, Hartley and Light, and every other Liberal member, try as hard as any member opposite to exercise compassion and concern for the battlers.

Members opposite want to talk about compassion for the battlers, but the former Government wasted billions of dollars on horseracing syndicates, merino studs and a whole plethora of things. We might as well have taken that money, ripped it into shreds and flushed it down the toilet. There are no extra bridges, schools, roads, hospitals or infrastructure. There is nothing to show for that money. It was squandered completely. It was not taken out of my pocket or the pockets of the members for Hanson, Elizabeth or Florey: it was taken out of the pocket of the people of South Australia. The battlers whom the Leader of the Opposition now so vocally supports were robbed of billions and billions of dollars by the State.

If their pockets are empty, members opposite should not look across to this side of the Chamber and blame the 'horrendous bluebloods who sit over here and care for nothing except their leafy eastern suburbs electorates' (to quote the rhetoric of the Opposition); let them look to their own front bench and say, 'Why did you cost this State so much money? Why did you so badly mismanage this State as to leave us with this enormous debt?' Members opposite should put some of the blame where it belongs—with them. Members of my Party were in Opposition at the time, and we sometimes question our role in the whole fiasco. The member for Peake asked questions, but I am sure that sometimes he asks himself whether he asked enough. We all question our role. We do not run away from our responsibility, and neither should members opposite.

In closing, I say to the Leader of the Opposition that he is in danger of becoming like a blast furnace. Blast furnaces produce a lot of heat and hot air to create, first, pig iron, which is the lowest grade of iron and which needs refinement; secondly, carbon dioxide, which is largely useless; and, thirdly, slag. At present not only is the Leader of the Opposition acting like a blast furnace but he is producing rather too much slag. I suggest that he concentrates on a little more iron.

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

*[Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.]*



**REAL PROPERTY (WITNESSING AND LAND GRANTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

This Bill makes amendments to the Real Property Act to remove the current proof provisions and to replace them with a new system of witnessing documents.

For many years the office of the Attorney-General, the Registrar General's Office and many Electorate Offices have received complaints that the short form of proof for Real Property documentation is causing considerable inconvenience and hardship to individuals who are not 'well known' to one of the functionaries authorised to witness such documentation in this State.

If a Real Property instrument is to be executed within South Australia only the following are authorised to witness the document; the Registrar-General, any Deputy Registrar-General, or a Notary Public, Justice of the Peace, Commissioner for taking Affidavits in the Supreme Court or Proclaimed Bank Manager. These people can only witness Real Property documents if the person whose signature they witness is well known to them.

Individuals who are not 'well known' to one of the above functionaries must be advised to execute the long form of proof pursuant to section 268 of the Real Property Act, 1886. This section provides for the signature of a person to be witnessed by anyone to whom he or she is 'personally known', and for the witness to then appear before an authorised functionary who must certify that the witness is a person who is known to the authorised functionary and of good repute, and that the witness declared that the person whose signature had been witnessed was personally known to the witness. While this is a method of resolving the problem of getting a Real Property instrument witnessed, it is a complex process and it is unfortunately often the case that individuals have been inappropriately advised and are put to considerable inconvenience when trying to have documentation witnessed.

In Victoria since 1955, there have not been any special requirements for witnessing of instruments pursuant to the Transfer of Land Act, other than the witness is an adult and disinterested in the transaction.

In New South Wales since 1979, the only requirements are that the witness be an adult, personally known to the signatory and not a party to the dealing.

The Registrar General has been in contact with both the Lands Titles Offices in New South Wales and Victoria (where the volume of conveyancing transactions is considerably more than that in this State) and advice has been received that cases of forgery or fraud are not of any greater number than in our own experience. Nor has there been an increase in fraud or forgery since the relaxation in witnessing requirements.

The requirements in Western Australia are that the execution of documents must be witnessed by a person who is not a party to the transaction and the witness must provide his or her name address and occupation. Tasmania also has a general witnessing requirement.

The Registrars of Title from all States and Territories agreed at their Conference in October, 1991 that moves toward interstate uniformity would be appropriate and the witnessing of documents is one area where this could be achieved.

This Bill therefore provides for the replacement of the current proof provisions with provisions which allow any adult person to witness a signature where the party is known to or identifies himself/herself to the witness. The Bill does not specify the means by which evidence of identity may be obtained but such evidence could be obtained by reference to current passport, photo drivers licence or other identifying material. Such material would not of course be necessary where the witness personally knows the executing party. The witness must be an adult person who is not a party to the instrument. The witness is required to supply full name address and daytime contact phone number to be printed legibly under the witness's signature.

Provision is made for the Registrar General, at any time require the witnessing of an instrument to be proved in such manner as the Registrar General thinks fit.

A substantial penalty is imposed on a witness for attesting an instrument without knowing the executing party personally, and having no reasonable grounds on which to be satisfied as to identity. The penalty also applies where the witness knows or has reasonable grounds for suspecting that the person signing is not a party to the instrument or does not have authority to sign on behalf of a party.

The Bill also contains some technical provisions relating to the manner in which land grants are registered. These provisions will allow for the electronic registration of land grants under the Crown Land Act in the same way as ordinary titles are now registered electronically.

Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

These clauses are formal.

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation*

This clause amends the definition of 'certificate' contained in the principal Act so that land grants issued under the *Crown Lands Act 1929* will not fall within that definition after commencement of the Bill. This means that land grants will no longer be subject to the requirements contained in section 49 of the Act relating to folios in the Register Book.

*Clause 4: Insertion of s. 66A*

This clause inserts a new section 66A in the principal Act requiring registration of title to land where a land grant has been lodged in the LTO. Because this section requires the Registrar-General to register title, the provisions of section 51b (allowing electronic registration of title) and 51c (requiring issue of a certificate of title) will also apply to land that is the subject of a land grant.

*Clause 5: Amendment of s. 112*

This clause consequentially amends section 112 of the principal Act to remove references to registration of the grant and substitute references to registration of the certificate.

*Clause 6: Substitution of ss. 267 to 269*

Clause 6 repeals sections 267 to 269 of the principal Act and substitutes the following sections:

*267. Witnessing of instruments*

New section 267 provides that instruments must be witnessed by an independent adult who either knows, or is satisfied as to the identity of, the party executing the instrument. Subsection (4) allows the Registrar-General to require verification of the execution of an instrument whether or not there is reason to suspect that it has been improperly executed.

*268. Improper witnessing*

New section 268 provides an offence for improperly witnessing an instrument, punishable by a maximum fine of \$2 000 or imprisonment for six months.

*Clause 7: Repeal of eighteenth and nineteenth schedules*

This clause is consequential to the repeal of sections 267 to 269.

**Ms HURLEY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**SUPPLY BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion). (Continued from page 1688.)

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** I support the Bill. Supply Bills are to provide appropriation for the early months of the financial year until the Appropriation Bill is assented to. This year, the Treasurer's statement and the new budget will be brought down in June rather than in August. Of course, as a response to that, the Estimates Committees will be held in July, thus there is a need for about two month's worth of appropriation to ensure that services continue smoothly until the budget is debated and passed.

This Bill involves just on \$600 million, and that does not include any interest payments on our debt. I remind members that we are currently paying some \$800 million in interest each year, which tends to make the amount of money in this Bill appear somewhat small. Appropriation Bills, Supply Bills and budgets are also affected by Federal Government

policy, particularly with regard to the impact of its interest rate policy over the past six months. To this date, a 1 per cent rise in interest equates to an additional interest Bill of \$80 million. We should just consider what we could do with \$80 million in terms of hard decisions and the cuts we are having to make because of the State debt.

It would appear that, while Rome burns—or perhaps I should say while Australia burns—Emperor Keating remains firmly seated within the Lodge, oblivious to all that is burning around him.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr BUCKBY:** That's quite true. The point is that economists and business—and small business—throughout Australia have continually reminded Mr Keating and the Treasurer of the need not only for monetary policy, that is, interest rate changes, but also for reduced Federal Government expenditure, in other words, a change to fiscal policy. However, as Australia burns, nothing is done. In fact, the Prime Minister said that he was quite satisfied—and this is not a direct quote—that nothing need be done until the May budget.

Of course, we continue under the pressure of interest rate rises and we now have a slackening of and reduction in economic activity to the stage where building activity in this State and right across Australia has slowed to a halt. I was talking to a surveyor this afternoon about the effect of the recession on his business and other surveying businesses in South Australia. He told me that, because of the Australian recession, many companies in South Australia had become bankrupt or had moved interstate. He said that it was only in the past year, under a Liberal Government, that there was some light at the end of the tunnel where people could see that the State was starting to move again and his business had slowly started to improve.

There has been a lack of action on the Federal side. As I said, for some time economists and business have been telling the Federal Government that there needs to be a cut in Federal Government spending. Finally, it would appear that Mr Willis, the Federal Treasurer, has suddenly realised that what economists and businesses were saying to him might actually have been true. It is a pity that Mr Keating did not hear that message back in 1989-90 when business was telling him that interest rate rises to solve an expanding economy were not the way to go. However, blindly on he went and so we went into the recession that we had to have. We have now come out of that recession with the hope of growth. That growth has been very short lived, because we are back into interest rate rises and the same old policy that did not work in 1989-90 and will not work now.

The Federal Government has made much of micro-economic reform. In the mid 1980s the Federal Government talked about microeconomic reform, how it would bring in microeconomic reform and what a boon it would be to the Australian economy. We have not progressed very far, but we have progressed a little. The increased productivity that has been gained on the wharves is brought to our attention every now and again, but what a low base we came from. There was a need for it and there is a need for more microeconomic reform, but suddenly it has dropped off the agenda because it is all too hard; this Federal Government will not attack it.

I now turn to the Audit Commission report, which made some interesting observations. It stated that the South Australian and Australian economies appeared to be somewhat similar: it also states that there are important differences between the South Australian and Australian economies. In

South Australia, we are focused more on manufacturing, agriculture and community services, such as education, health and aged care, whereas the Australian economy does not have such a major focus. As a result of that, over the past 20 years Labor Governments in this State, apart from between 1979 and 1982, have continually focused on increasing community services but they did not balance the argument. There was a focus on community services rather than a balanced approach of, 'Let's lift business, mining and agriculture along with community services so that one can pay for the other and so that we can afford the community services that we are providing to the community.'

There are many community services which were needed and about which I do not argue. However, the point is that in the end someone has to pay. We are \$8 billion in debt and some hard decisions have to be made. This Government is now being criticised for the hard decisions it is making, but those decisions have to be made because basically we are broke—not to the stage of being bankrupt, thank goodness. However, the point is that the decisions have to be made. While the Opposition criticises, were members opposite back in Government I can assure you that those hard decisions would still have to be made. The decisions we are making would have had to be made by the Labor Party; there is no way around it. I do not step away from our making those decisions at all. It would appear that the Opposition either refuses to or does not understand that we cannot go on spending. It is no different from any household budget.

**Mr Brindal:** Or not capable.

**Mr BUCKBY:** As the member for Unley has said, perhaps they are not capable of understanding that. However, like any household budgeting, we cannot continue to spend more than we earn. We came into Government with a \$350 million current debt, expanding each year, and one would believe from the rhetoric that we hear from the Opposition that we should do nothing about that; that we should go blindly on; that we should not be cutting any services such as education; and that we should continue adding to that debt as we go along.

**An honourable member:** But we mustn't raise taxes.

**Mr BUCKBY:** No, we must not raise taxes. As a result of that, if we are limited to not raising taxes—and the Opposition has said that we should not be raising taxes—where do we go? The only way to go is to look at reducing costs. That is what the Audit Commission recommended.

The other difference between the Australian economy and the South Australian economy is the contribution of the mining sector; the national economy attracts a much larger proportion of mining revenues than does the South Australian economy. In relation to the finance sector, members will find that head offices are predominantly located in Melbourne and Sydney, not in Adelaide.

I compliment the previous Government for commencing aeromagnetic mapping. We were behind every other State because of the refusal of the previous Government to identify mining as an area through which we could increase the economic activity and finances of this State. But we did get under way eventually and that is now paying great benefits to this State. This Government is continuing that program and the increased exploration activity that is occurring in this State is as a result of that program. That was a good move on the part of the previous Government.

We also have the sectors that historically have been important to South Australia. I refer, in particular, to agriculture and manufacturing. They have been poor perform-

ers over the past 10 years. Again, it is difficult to see how the Federal Government cannot understand that when you raise interest rates it affects those sectors. You automatically have a flow-on effect, because when business starts making decisions about whether or not it will invest one of the critical things it looks at is the interest rate. It will make decisions in relation to whether the investment is viable or non-viable. Yet, the Federal Government continues its policy of targeting interest rates as a means of solving our problems.

The A. D. Little report, which was commissioned by the previous Government, advised the Government at that stage of the need for restructuring and diversification of the manufacturing base. The previous Government was very slow to move. We now have a Government that is looking to be export competitive. Against that need to develop export competitiveness we have this huge backdrop of debt. As I said, the structure of our economy is heavily aimed at community services.

The impact had even greater effect because, owing to the recession, more people were applying for concessions and needing emergency assistance. As a result, South Australia suffered more through the recession than any other State. This represents a lack of foresight by the previous Government, which did not seek to maintain and have a balanced view. It did not ensure that along with community service improvements business also was helped and adjusted along the way.

As I said, the Opposition criticises this Government for the hard decisions that we have to make. The member for Unley referred in his speech to that criticism, and I do not have to remind you, Sir, of things like the State Bank, 333 Collins Street, the Remm building, Scrimber, and Beneficial Finance; and I could go on to explain why we have to make these decisions. In the Auditor-General's 1993-94 report he raised the question of accrual accounting and stated:

Urgent attention needs to be given to resolution of issues that are seen to be a barrier to reporting the position of all the State's assets and liabilities.

Again, this Government is criticised for saying that the full picture of the State debt was not available to it. It is true that the information was not available to us and the Auditor-General has agreed with that. That is why the Audit Commission was established as soon as we came into government, to look at the full level of contingent liabilities owed by this State.

As a result of that we were able to identify the true level of State debt and the real problem that we were in. That problem had been covered up by the previous State Government. The Auditor-General makes the point in his report that in the 1993-94 budget no reference to contingent liabilities was made by the previous Government and, in effect, they were not cited within the budget. As a result, the true state of our financial situation was not available.

We would far rather not have to make the hard decisions confronting us, but the fact is that we were given a mandate in December 1993 by the South Australian public to make those hard decisions in order to get out of the problem of State debt with which we are currently confronted. We cannot say, 'Let's not attack education or health.' They are the two areas of highest spending by the Government. If we leave education and health out of any cuts, where do we go? Do we gut every other department at that stage? What else do we do? Cuts have to be across the entire level of State expenditure in all departments.

This Government has a challenge for the future to get this State back on track, to correct the inefficiencies and inabilities of the previous Government and, once again, to return South Australia to a viable economy. We cannot do that without making some hard decisions. We all recognise that as does the South Australian public but, unfortunately, the Opposition will not or cannot recognise that.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** As an economist, the member for Light may not appreciate some of the subtleties of the art of accounting. He claims that the incoming Government suddenly discovered that the budget situation was much worse than it thought, but if anyone in South Australia had been asked what they thought the Government would say when it got in the answer would have been that it would say, 'Things are much worse than we ever thought, and we'll have to make further cuts.' In fact, we have had a series of half truths. The member for Light says that the Opposition maintains there should be no increases in taxes when, under no pressure, the Government during its campaign stated that it would not increase taxes. In fact, it offered to increase funding in a range of areas, which the member for Light has now targeted. He says that it is impossible to do anything about the economy without decreasing funding.

During its campaign, this Government said that it would increase spending on education and health, that it would work miracles to make everything right, that it would not do what was being done in Victoria, but time after time this Government has done exactly what the Victorian Kennett Government has done. All these nice blandishments are all very well, but I assure members opposite that they are not fooling their constituents, pragmatic, sensible people who know about the tricks of accountancy. They are not fooled by these sweeping statements and half truths.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** Most of the people in my electorate are working hard trying to survive.

**An honourable member:** As they are everywhere.

**Ms HURLEY:** Exactly. It is the duty of this Government to give them some help, not continually to squash them. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that this State was in difficulty and that some hard decisions had to be made. In fact, the former Government in statements that it made before the election said so. During the campaign it fully addressed this issue. It did not promise increased spending or miracles; in a constructive way, it addressed the budgetary and debt problems that we were experiencing without throttling the economy so that we would end up behind every State in Australia, something which this Government seemingly is attempting to do.

**An honourable member:** And we still have a deficit of \$320 million.

**Ms HURLEY:** The deficit is there and will stay there for some time, but that does not mean that we have to throttle the economy in order to address it. We are behind the rest of the country. Other States have taken steps to take advantage of the recovery. Again, in a typically negative fashion the member for Light dwelt on the negatives of the Federal situation. This country is in the process of recovery. A number of leading indicators show that we are in a relatively healthy state compared with OECD countries, but this State has not been able to take advantage of that recovery during the past year.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** Whether or not it is the recession we had to have, the recession happened; it was part of a world recession that happened. The rest of the country is out of that recession: South Australia is not.

**The Hon. G.A. Ingerson:** Whose fault is that?

**Ms HURLEY:** This Government has been in power for the past year; it is this Government's responsibility to hook on to the coat-tails of that Federal recovery and make the most of it. Tonight I want to talk about how the budget has affected people in outer suburban areas and, in particular, the people in my electorate.

**Mr Brindal:** Which is your electorate?

**Ms HURLEY:** My electorate of Napier.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** My friend and mentor. I will see you tomorrow.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! The other speakers were given a fair go; I would appreciate it if the House would give the member for Napier a fair go.

**Ms HURLEY:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. As a fellow northern suburbs member, I am sure you can understand what I am about to mention. There is a high proportion of families in my electorate—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** I suggest you listen carefully to what I am about to say in relation to how this Government's actions are having a negative effect on what is happening within families. My electorate has a particularly high proportion of young families because it contains a number of newly developing areas, and also a high proportion—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** A very good breeding ground. It contains a high proportion of Housing Trust areas where many families are on lower incomes or on some form of benefit. In fact, many of those families are on a single income. They have moved to the outer suburban areas to take advantage of cheap land prices so that the wife, for example, can stay at home and look after the children, and the family can survive on a single income. Despite this Liberal Government's rhetoric about families, it is making every effort to destroy families and make life much more difficult for them. Previously we heard much about the provision for a family impact statement and how it was going to affect every decision that came through the Cabinet. However, we have not heard much about it subsequently, because almost every decision that has come through Cabinet seems to have impacted adversely on families.

**Mr Brindal:** Which ones?

**Ms HURLEY:** Let us take, for example, education. As I said, my electorate comprises many young families who are affected badly by what is happening in the education system. I want to read briefly from a letter written by a constituent from the southern suburbs, which have a similar situation to that of the northern suburbs; they are outer suburbs containing young families. The letter is addressed to the school council and states:

I am sending this to you in the hope that you and the other parents from your school will join me in informing the Government that we are not prepared to stand by while the standard of our children's education is decimated. You may be unaware of all the intended cuts, as they are not being publicised and Education Department staff are forbidden to make them known. Apart from the fact that there is no more free bus travel—

**Mr Brindal:** Who bagged that? The previous Labor Government got rid of that: not this Government.

**Ms HURLEY:** For the benefit of the honourable member, who says that he has a lot of families in his electorate, this refers to free bus travel for holders of school card, which was abolished by this Government. The letter continues:

School card is reduced by \$10 and the school dental service is no longer free to secondary students. \$40 million is being cut from the public school budget over the next four years, while an additional \$52 million is being given to private education. These cuts have serious implications for the standard of education for our children.

And I can assure members that these are the sentiments of a large number of families in my electorate. I seriously question this Liberal Government's commitment to public education. During the period that the previous Government was in office, the now Minister for Education and Children's Services consistently attacked public school education but did not do so in relation to private education, and that is the feeling not only among the parents in my electorate but also among the teachers and the students: that there is no commitment to public education by this Government.

They are seriously concerned about their future. Education is very important to people in my electorate, particularly those on lower incomes who see education as the only way that their children can possibly make their way in the world and improve their situation. They find that their schools are being cut all the time. They are extremely concerned about this situation.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** Would you like to take a point of order on this?

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Sir, the member for Napier just imputed that the Minister was acting with bias; in other words, she is impugning improper motives. It has consistently been the ruling of the Chair that to impugn improper motive has to be done by way of substantive motion.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The point of order is bordering on being frivolous. The Minister is here: had he been concerned he would have stood up.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** On a point of order, Sir, I object to the comments that were made because I do not believe they were fair and reasonable and I ask that they be retracted.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not consider that it is unparliamentary. I would ask the honourable member to withdraw her comments. Is the honourable member prepared to do that?

**Ms HURLEY:** No, Sir, I do not believe that I impugned improper motives. Another serious issue affecting people in my electorate is that of transport. We have already seen an increase in fares, again affecting particularly the people for whom it hurts most: pensioners and people who use transport in off-peak times.

**Mr Becker:** Do you?

**Ms HURLEY:** Yes; but most of the people in my electorate who use transport in off-peak times are young mothers who go to do their shopping and so on. The people who can least afford it are worst hit. The Elizabeth area is on top of the list for having its bus transport services tendered out. In spite of the bland assurances from the Minister, people in my area are extremely concerned about what will happen as a result of that. First, in relation to cost, the problem with outer suburbs (and there are members opposite who represent outer suburbs) is the distance involved in travel. Like the member for Spence, I do not believe that private operators will be prepared to go to outer northern suburbs as far as

Gawler for the same fare as to Regency Road or Gepps Cross. The cost for people in outer suburbs under a system of private contractors will increase.

**Mr Kerin:** There is no difference whether it is public or private.

**Ms HURLEY:** The frequency of travel is a major problem. For many of these services people are just moving into the areas, which are sparsely populated. It is important for these people to have public transport. It is important for people looking to buy in the area that they know that public transport is available. I do not believe that private tenderers will have the frequency of services such that they will put on additional services as new areas develop. It will simply not pay them to do it. People in the outer suburbs are extremely nervous about what will happen to transport, partly because they have already seen the difficulties involved with paying increased transport fees now, particularly the school card holders who have to pay for extra transport. Many families in my electorate have three or four children. They have to pay additional fares for all those children. It is difficult for them to keep up their schooling and education. Families are feeling the pressures in a big way.

These small charges are adding up, and now we have increased water charges—and this Government is planning to privatise that, with the possibility, as demonstrated overseas, that water costs will increase markedly as a result. In all of this, the Housing Trust tenants in my area were ignored. When the new water rating system was introduced, Housing Trust tenants were not mentioned. The Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations was not able to give an answer about how the new water rating system would affect Housing Trust tenants.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member to order—first, for interjecting, and, secondly, for interjecting out of his seat.

**Ms HURLEY:** Housing Trust tenants have been ignored, neglected, not involved, and just forgotten about in this new water rating system. Now we have a system where those subsidised tenants who need it the most will be hit the hardest because they must pay more for their water. Not only that; it will be a retrospective payment because it will be from their last billing period. We have increased charges in education, transport and water. I come now to the major issue of employment. We have heard the Leader of the Opposition talk about the fallacy of the way that the job situation has been touted by the Premier, that in fact the Premier has not properly represented the situation in relation to general trends and participation rates.

Many of the jobs that are available are casual or temporary jobs with poor working conditions. People are afraid to take holidays in case someone else takes their job. They are afraid to take sick leave; they are not able to stay at home when a member of their family is sick. People are working in factories under appalling conditions, in casual or temporary jobs, or in fast-food outlets where they are underpaid, for example. This Government has then grossly exacerbated the situation by progressively attempting to take away their WorkCover insurance. This is an appalling situation where people have no safety net; they feel no support from the Government, and their living and working conditions are being progressively attacked.

The message I am receiving is that those people believe this Government does not look forward to a future for this State, that the Government is simply cutting back. It is like

a snail retreating into its shell, putting up the shutters and hoping the rest of the world will go away. This Government wants to cut back, to cut off, and not propose any constructive solutions to these problems. As I said before, other States have taken up the challenge. Indeed, even in Kennett's Victoria, where so many services and community facilities have been slashed, positive developments are happening. Some urban renewal programs are under way in Melbourne, which programs have not even been talked about here in Adelaide or South Australia.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** No, I am talking about the improvement in the city centre. What is happening in Adelaide? We are stuck in this lull and no-one seems to have any solutions about how to get out of it. This Government is not leading; it is cutting back and back.

**Mr Meier:** What is your plan for Adelaide?

**Ms HURLEY:** You are in Government. This is your budget; it is your responsibility. You who promised so much during the election campaign—we are now asking you to deliver. The people of this State are asking you to deliver on your election promises, and it is not happening.

**Mr Rossi:** Have you ever heard of patience? Be patient.

**Ms HURLEY:** If we are patient any longer this State goes down the plug hole and nothing is left. This Government prefers to blame the Federal Government. With this negative, carping attitude, it always has to blame someone: the previous Government or the Federal Government. It is never its own responsibility; it is never the consequences of its own actions.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** This is what is happening. It blames the Federal Government for interest rate rises and it blames the former State Government for its debt. It will do anything but take responsibility for this State into its own hands and show some leadership and vision. This was always a criticism of the Bannon Government; that there was no vision. It was a criticism that the then Government recognised and tried to do something about, but members of this Government prefer to see themselves as penny-pinching bookkeepers who are cutting back on the bottom line and hoping to achieve something in that way. They will not achieve anything in that way, because they will simply be left behind all the other States and the rest of this country. To buy in a couple of small industries is simply not good enough.

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

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I want to comment about the previous speaker, the member for Napier. I compliment the honourable member for having made reasonable progress in the time she has been here but, like the member before her (Hon. Terry Hemmings), it was great rhetoric and not a lot of substance. I am very pleased with the new Government's progress so far. We have made some very difficult decisions—and all members have highlighted that—and the people are still with us. Whether or not members opposite like it, with the previous speakers (the member for Playford and then the member for Napier) criticising us, the people are still with us, in the same percentages as when we were elected on 11 December 1993. We would have made further substantial progress in respect of the State's economic position if it were not for the Federal Government's increase in interest rates.

I heard it said both this afternoon and tonight that we are blaming someone else. The member for Playford went on

about our carping and blaming someone else. Most people in this House know what it is like to run a house on a budget, and many of us would know what it is like to run a deficit. When you buy a house, you look at the interest rate and work out what you can afford. You negotiate the purchase of the house and then put the mortgage payments in the back of your mind until, suddenly, the interest rate goes from 6 to 15 per cent. Imagine what it does. Imagine what it did to farmers back in the late 1980s when they bought farms. The banks encouraged them to take out loans. They were throwing money at farmers (particularly the State Bank), then suddenly interest rates went from about 5.5 up to 20 and 22 per cent.

No wonder the farmers had to walk off their properties and have lost them. The Federal Government is pushing interest rates up in an attempt to solve its problems, but it should be tackling them in a different way. It ought to look at what we are doing here in South Australia, that is, cutting Government spending. Our budget has blown out very much because of the Federal Government's policies. We cannot avoid that: it is the senior Government here in Australia and we have to pay the same price as it does. Interest rates, as in any household budget, blow holes in our budget. We pay \$360 million in interest. That is \$1 million a day. When members get up in this House and harp on about the current Government trying to do certain things, I want them to remember that \$1 million a day: 50 cents in every tax dollar we raise we are paying straight out the door in interest. That is absolutely wasted.

We should ask the farmers who have lost their properties; they know what interest rates do. The Federal Government's increases in interest rates certainly are affecting South Australia. Members know what the housing rates are doing at the moment. Real estate prices are flat, if not falling, and the building industry is certainly suffering in the few short weeks since the Federal Government has lifted the interest rates.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** You have just arrived: you haven't listened. Go back out where you came from. Why cannot the Federal Government follow our Government's good example here? When we look at the debt situation, it is quite staggering. The debt in South Australia is \$6 000 for every man, woman and child. That totals \$24 000 a family. The national average is \$10 000, so when that is added to the State figure it is \$16 000 for every person in South Australia. That is everybody. If this State were a farm in 1987, it would have been sold, because the ability to pay back that sort of debt is almost beyond our reach. If we cannot maximise asset sales, and if we cannot obtain increased royalties from our minerals and get Roxby Downs into double overdrive, we will not—

**Mr ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. Would you ask the speaker with the floor to address the Chair rather than the Labor backbench?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I do not think the member for Culance is only replying to interjections from the member for Torrens. I understand that she has the call next, so she will have her opportunity. If the member for Spence wishes to make a comment, I suggest he adds his name to the list of speakers.

**Mr VENNING:** I respect your ruling, Sir, but I crave your indulgence. I have to look over the Labor backbench to look at you because of the decimation they have suffered. I am over here with the Labor Party, but to look at the Chair I have to look right over the top of the member for Spence. Unless I walk into the middle of the House, I cannot do anything but

look over the Labor benches. It is a bit of a rabble, and there are not many of them. That was a totally frivolous point of order. The honourable member might as well not be here.

This State owes a massive amount of money. We had to take some fairly drastic action in our first budget. It is a pity that much of that work has not been as effective as we would have liked because of the interest rate increases. In discussing Supply, I note the difficult decisions we have had to make, particularly with respect to hospitals. As we all know, that is a very difficult area. The health area is in trouble Australia-wide. Health is a problem—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I will talk about that if you give me a chance. We have to encourage the private health system in this country on a self-help basis. We have to encourage people to be privately insured, and tax incentives will solve the problem. I also note we were able to save \$5 million by outsourcing at the Modbury Hospital. I know that the cuts to the health area are certainly biting deep, but what can you do when you have to prune a budget and your key areas of expenditure are health and education?

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I would like to hear from members opposite. If we cannot make cuts in health and education, members opposite should tell me what else there is to cut. They are the major areas of State Government expenditure.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart also has the call later on.

**Mr VENNING:** Let Opposition members get to their feet and tell the House if we are wrong. I do not like to see cuts being made in health and education, but they are the two key areas of Government expenditure. We have no choice. It was the previous Government that ran up the debt. We have the responsibility of trying to fix it up, and we are well on the way. With respect to education, the cuts to teacher numbers is biting as hard in my electorate as it is in any other. Students in my electorate have a lot of difficulty achieving their curriculum choices. In Adelaide, if a student is not offered the subjects of their choice, they get on the bus and go around the corner to another school. However, when you live on the other side of Morgan, it is a little different. When you lose staff, you lose subject choice, and it is very difficult.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I do not back away from the decisions that have had to be made. They had to be taken because the previous Government ran us into huge debt. Nuriootpa High School, the second largest high school in South Australia, has had a staff cut of over three. That cut will really hurt, but we wear that because we are all taking a share of the burden. What worries me is that people are showing a preference and what they think of the State school system. How are they doing that—by placing their children into private schools when they can afford to do so. I do not believe that is good because the State needs to have a dual education system and needs to have the options there for those people. As members, we cannot deny that people are voting with their feet. Some people put themselves through tremendous hardship to get their children into a private school. It tells us that the Government has a problem with its education system. Kindergartens are the same: I have had many letters from constituents from almost every community in my electorate who are upset about the cuts in those areas.

Another area that is a great favourite of mine, although not as important as education and health, is roads. I congratulate

the Government, particularly the Minister for Transport (Hon. Di Laidlaw), on the turnaround in road building—both begun and forecast. I very seldom stand up in this House and not mention the favourite road, that is, the Morgan-Burra Road—I still have some stones in the House if any members have forgotten how rough it is. Why has it been so long? Some members have driven along this road: one would think this was a back track to nowhere. I have driven on roads in Victoria in recent days, and even the back blocks of Victoria have bitumen roads. They might be single lane in many instances, but they are bitumen. Here we have a major road that is still unsealed.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** The Morgan to Blanchetown Road, yes, I know it has been sealed. Under the previous Government that was funded through the local roads program—it was nothing to do with this Government. I applaud the road for being there. But we see a road from Spalding to Andrews, but we did not see a road from Spalding to Burra. However, work is being done up there at the moment. We are three kilometres from linking the historic town of Burra to a reasonable road network. Who would believe that Burra was connected by dirt roads? I know it is territory of the member for Frome, but I did start my representation with that area and I will always have it close to my heart. I will fight to the end to get that sealed road from Burra to Morgan, although, at the moment, I still have half of that road.

This Government will go down in history as the Government that tackled the road because that issue has been going on for 30 years. It is well known what a colleague of members opposite did, and I refer in this respect to the late Hon. Bill Quirke—I do not think he is any relation to the member for Playford. He came to Adelaide—

**An honourable member:** He's not.

**Mr VENNING:** He is not a relation, I understand. He came to Adelaide on three different occasions to get that road for the people and spoke to the Minister. He always went home with something else and, God bless his soul, the member for Stanley in those days had another agenda.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Yes, he did a full turn: he finished as an Independent and a Liberal. The politics behind this road goes back a long way, and I want to make sure that this Government fixes it so that we can have this major corridor in South Australia's north sealed from one end to the other. At the moment all the trucks are using other roads and all the other roads are falling to pieces. I will work in conjunction with the member for Frome to see that completed. I also hope we see an upgrade of an alternative road from Tanunda to Lyndoch and Gawler. Members would have seen pictures the other day in the paper: to ride on this road today—a major road from Tanunda down to Lyndoch to Gawler—is totally unbelievable. It is barely the minimum width, and huge, magnificent trees grow right on its verge. In fact, as the member for Light would know, in most cases the verge posts with the reflectors on are outside these trees. So, if you are driving while following the posts you will hit a tree, and as some of these trees are right on the corners that is a serious problem. We have had some fatalities there, and it really is a problem that we need to address shortly. Also, another shocking road in the north (and the member for Frome will back me up here) is the road that goes from Tarlee to Clare and Gulnare—

**An honourable member:** That's shocking.

**Mr VENNING:** It is absolutely shocking for a major road. When one sees the men and women out there patching the patches it really is ridiculous. I purchased a new car six months ago and I can bottom it on that road: on a bitumen road one can bottom a car.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** It is a Falcon, but I will not worry about that matter. I turn now to water. I welcomed very much the announcement today by the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. John Olsen) that the Government is seeking expressions of interest. I really am impressed with that, because the previous Government promised to put in a filtration plant in the Barossa Valley and Mid North straight after they finished the Myponga complex, which was finished nearly 3½ years ago. However, the work force was disbanded and the Barossa forgotten. That was blatant politics. We will not win any votes by putting in a filtration plant there, because most of the people there are our supporters, anyway. But the idea of fair play means that these people are entitled to clean water.

**Mr Foley:** Have you tasted our water lately?

**Mr VENNING:** It's not the taste so much as the appearance of it. Your water is clean and filtered. When you go into a Barossa Valley motel you are not sure whether the person before you has flushed the toilet, such is the colour of the water: it has a terrible stain. When you go into a three star motel in the Barossa, they always provide a jug of clean water for you to drink. This is 1995 and this is the Barossa Valley, our tourist jewel. At long last, 34 000 of our Mid North, Barossa Valley and Yorke Peninsula residents will have a chance to have clean water, as Adelaide does, and it is high time. The Government will call for expressions of interest from private sector companies this week to build, own and operate the Swan Reach filtration plant.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** We heard all these promises from the previous Government and it did not deliver. The honourable member should watch: by 1997 this will be there. It is on the record; it will be there in 1997. I have confidence in the Government and Minister Olsen that we will deliver the goods. I am very confident about that. Some 34 000 people in 31 communities have water that is raw—straight out of the Murray River. I know that the member for Hart was up there skiing the other day; I noticed that he closed his mouth in case he took a bite of it. How would you like it coming through your taps? And we have to pay the same price for that as everybody else does. It is quite a disgrace. People in Adelaide would not tolerate it, and why should the country communities have to do so?

The Government's initiative to privatise the reading of ETSA meters is a very good move which certainly will save us a lot of money in the long term. Another thing that is a big positive for the Government is the *Super Flyte* fast ferry to Kangaroo Island. I am very impressed with the progress made there. It was a very game gamble; the Government helped with a guarantee and it is under way. We are looking at other projects, such as the Cowell to Wallaroo ferry. I know the member for Goyder is very keen on that project, but it needs to be considered and judged on its merits. If it means development for our State, particularly in the regions, we should go along with it.

I also note progress in the council amalgamations. It is amazing how with some encouragement there is a lot of progress. We know how difficult it is: if we had control of the Upper House it would be a lot easier, but we do not; nor do we have the legislation in our favour. So, we have to deal

with what we have. I am very happy with the progress that has been made thus far. In fact, the District Council of Kapunda (where my office is located) and the District Council of Light are on their way down the amalgamation track, as will be many others, and we are certainly encouraging that.

Selling non-essential Government assets is not a happy thing for any Government to do, but we have no choice; we have to maximise the opportunities. I hope that when we are able to sell SGIC we will get the maximum dollar for it, because it will go a long way towards paying our massive debt. Outsourcing will be a big part of this in relation to contracting, getting better services, maintaining the asset in the Government's hands and getting somebody else to operate it more efficiently than we do at present. Finally, I congratulate the Government on its very good progress in its first 18 months. I have much pleasure in supporting the Supply Bill.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** I have listened to some amazing contributions—

**Mr Brindal:** That's a very good word.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Thank you. However, I will say that I disagree with most of the comments that have been made, apart from some that have been made from this side. I am going to start back to front. I will mention something now that I was going to refer to later in the hope that the Minister will stay. I am concerned about much of the cost cutting activities that have been taking place under this Government, particularly where the Government is attacking those who can generally least afford to pay, and that is in the area of public housing. I believe this is a purely ideological attempt by this Government to destroy the system. It is being placed in a position where an attempt to cut costs is reducing the effective management of the Housing Trust.

I will demonstrate by means of an example. The Housing Trust may be called to a tenant's home to assess the repair of a damaged bath. The inspector will assess the damage and make a report and the cost of the work may go to the specified limit. There is a specified limit, so let us assume that the repair of the bath goes over that limit. In that event, the asset management team is called in to assess what is already known to be defective. What sort of process is that to deal with a situation that could be and should have been handled by housing managers? It is an absolute waste of money and another delay in repairing trust property. We are seeing a Government which is hell bent on cutting costs and which fails to see the unproductive nature of its so-called reforms. Members should go and find out what the tenants are talking about. It is those who can least—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Generally not.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** That's right; it just stays as it is.

**Mr Venning:** What is your choice?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** To fix the bath. At least people are entitled—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! The honourable member is not helping by responding to interjections.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I am sorry, Sir. It is terribly encouraging. I must now say something into which I will go in greater depth on another day. One of the biggest injustices that I have witnessed is the blatant attack on education. I am talking not about education in general—I believe that we have not debated this area properly—but about the Centre for

Hearing Impaired Children—CHIC. CHIC provides a service to a portion of the community who have special needs. I am talking about children who, in my day, were described as deaf but who in these days are referred to as hearing impaired. What is the Government doing to our hearing impaired centres and hearing impaired children? It is now saying that they do not need principals with specified skills—people who know what hearing impaired people need—and they are being chopped out of the system. For example, we have had Townsend House. I am now going to talk about the Klemzigg Centre. The Government is saying that we do not need—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Well, if you would like to come with me, I will take you and show you. My brother-in-law is deaf, so I know what hearing impaired people need.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** That's fine. So we are going to take these people out of the system and assign the principal position to an ordinary school principal. I am not denigrating the school principal, but I am saying that we need someone with special skills. As one concerned parent has explained to me, children at CHIC can never acquire the dominant language. The member for Unley would know this to be true: they never acquire the dominant language, and they are isolated in a very serious way. Indeed, it is more difficult for them than it is for migrant children. So, I ask—and, as I said, this is no reflection on the ability of school principals—who would be most qualified to administer in a CHIC centre? The answer simply must be someone who has those special skills, the special understanding of the needs of hearing impaired children.

**Mr Brindal:** Are you talking about an educator or an administrator?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** You're just wasting my time, although I've got plenty. I was always under the impression that specialisation is the best productive resource that we can have. What is even more difficult to fathom is this Government's determination to—how can I put it?

**Mr Brindal:** Anyway you like.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:**—yes, okay—ram these so-called cost cutting measures—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:**—and I've got you on the brain—through with little or no regard for those who are most affected. You are just not caring about them. The Government says that there is full consultation, but that is not what the outcome produces. For instance, the words 'confusing' and 'divisive' are those that really were relayed to me about the whole process. There is a general feeling in our community that the amalgamation of CHIC into a mainstream school system is just not really in the interests of our students.

By way of example, I cite a young adult who was hearing impaired. This is a very sad tale which I first ran across during the by-election, and I have worked my way through it until just recently, when there was a most unfortunate circumstance. This young man was deaf. He had undertaken a course in naturopathy and was doing quite well. The great difficulty was that he lived independently from home. That was his choice, and his mother was quite happy with that. However, he had a great deal of difficulty during lectures. He had to rely on the support of the society for hearing impaired people—and I am not sure what they call that today—his mother and his friends to assist with the lectures, because obviously he had difficulty hearing.



He was an independent person and actually felt rather deprived in a way. He was embarrassed about the fact that he was replying upon support from others. We attempted to get some financial assistance for him so that he could pay to have an assistant to help him through his lectures. We tried through State and Federal Governments. I say with great shame that, according to both State and Federal Governments, he did not fit any criteria and could not get any financial assistance. We were asking for only a very small amount, just to help with an assistant, and we could not get it.

Unfortunately, the young man became so frustrated with that and other problems that he took his own life. His mother was distraught. I feel quite sad about it, because it is an absolute outrage that, unfortunately, we do not give real service to our special groups. In that case, there should be no more cuts in that area and, if we cannot find the criteria to assist people in those circumstances, we should damn well make it, because those people with a hearing impairment and others have real needs. I now refer to WorkCover, the blow out and how it could be reduced. We have heard how happy this Government has been to reduce all the rights for which workers have fought so hard.

**Mr Brindal:** What about the increases?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, I will refer to that later. The Government keeps using excuses to serve its own needs in introducing this heartless and draconian legislation. It must be happy to have such excuses, but I think the Government is incredibly deceptive. If the Government is really genuine about reducing the cost of WorkCover there are many other methods by which it could go about it. It does not need to tear the heart and soul out of our workers, but that is what is happening with this legislation. People who earn an honest day's living in providing for their families are very productive members of our community. The Government talks about creating jobs. Thank heavens it is, although I suspect that its figures are somewhat coloured because at the rate it is slashing jobs it really needs to do something. As far as WorkCover is concerned, the manner in which our workers are being treated is absolutely appalling.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** This is the Government of excuses; every day another excuse. Look, a worker might do better by being an android, because if you lose an arm or a leg you just whip off the old one and whack on a new one; you can do it all in the tea break. No disruption to productivity, and it could happen without the services of WorkCover.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** What tea break?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** That's right, the Government is probably taking the tea break away. One might actually be lucky to be an android.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** You would not have an android in the union: you would have it as an extension of the Government. If the Government is really serious about reducing this debt then why has it not examined all avenues in its endeavour to cut costs? Perhaps it does not want to do it. I think the exercise is really just to rip the system apart, blow it up, diminish it and it will be gone—what a great way to go! The Minister has already said that 12 per cent of doctors said that they believe too many doctors are writing health certificates. Has the Minister checked that out and would he care to check out a little scenario that I raise?

**An honourable member:** Would you like the Minister to listen?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** It would be nice for the Minister to listen because I would like him to check this out if he is not too busy. I have been contacted by a fellow who had an accident in his work vehicle. I would like to nominate this bloke for a medal because he had an accident in a work vehicle right out in the sticks on a dirt road that he knows very well. In seven years he has seen a vehicle on it only once, so it is not a very well used track. The truck rolled over, he crawled out of the truck and tried to upright it. He could not do that so he crawled back inside, tried the two-way radio, which did not work, and decided that because he was a diabetic he had to do something quickly.

He decided to walk to the nearest station where tea and coffee would be served and where he could get some sugar because that is what he needed. So, he walked 12 kilometres in 40 degree heat. Along the way the police picked him up and he was hospitalised. He was examined and given insulin, which he administered himself. At 12 o'clock observations were carried out and at 6 a.m. he was given some breakfast, in bed I would hope after such an occurrence. His doctor checked him out and he discharged himself because he felt that he was okay. For that wonderful night's stay in hospital, including two observations and insulin—which, as I said, he administered himself—he got a bill. This is WorkCover as well.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** This is overnight?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** This was an overnight stay. He actually had a shower as well. The Minister should listen to this. He got a bill for \$4 489.

**An honourable member:** You're joking.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** No, this is absolutely genuine. His employer—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Listen: for \$4 000 I could stay in some palatial palace in Sydney and have a spa and goodness knows what else.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** That would include the flight over. That was the bill. If that is true (and it is, because here is the document) and the employer is not going to pay—there is no dispute between the worker and the employer—I would like to know, if the Minister has investigated the cost of the blow out of WorkCover, has he come across such things? If the Minister has, why has he not done something about it? If he is allowing these charges to continue but is telling us that he has to cut benefits to workers, why has he not done something about this? If he really got into the system and fixed this then—

*The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** This is the Government of excuses: every day we hear another excuse. You have been in Government for over 12 months and if you say that these are a problem—

*The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I will give it to you later. If you say this is a problem, why have you not fixed it? It is an outrage. Every time this sort of Bill comes in something else is being taken from the workers. I am absolutely amazed.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, it is an outrage.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** It is absolutely true. If the Minister is really genuine about reducing the costs he should address this issue before ripping everything away from injured workers. Why does he not get his teeth into this problem and

do something about it? If he can reduce accounts like this then there would be no need to do what he is doing to the legislation.

**Mr VENNING:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I have been very patient with the new member, but I have two points of order. The first is relevance and the second is a display in the House.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker):** The debate is generally wide ranging. We are dealing with \$600 million for Supply, and I accept that members do tend to stray all over the place. As the honourable member has pointed out, it is not proper to display documents in the Chamber.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I apologise. I thought you meant that I made some form of physical display.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Please address the Chair.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I really do not have anything else to say, except that a \$4 500 bill for an overnight stay is still being allowed to continue. That the Minister has not stopped that in the past 12 months is an outrage. It is a disgrace that he has not rectified problems such as this and yet is ripping benefits off injured workers.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** I want to continue a theme I raised last Thursday when speaking on the question of country magistrates and, more specifically, the removal of country magistrates by this Government. I refer to the failure by this Government to stop the Chief Justice and the Chief Magistrate removing resident magistrates from country areas, the only reason being that magistrates apparently do not like living in our provincial cities. I was asked by a journalist today why I was persisting with this question.

**Mr VENNING:** Mr Acting Speaker, I ask you to rule on relevance. The honourable member is talking about country magistrates, but what has that got to do with Supply?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The honourable member has only just commenced his remarks, and I am interested to hear what he is leading up to. We should allow him to develop his argument.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** As all members (apart from the member for Custance) would realise, magistrates are paid for by the State. I should not have to explain that to someone who has been here for so long, but the antics of the member for Custance over the past 10 minutes make me wonder. We had the previous speaker, the member for Torrens, outlining a huge rip-off, which brought from the member for Custance inane grinning, laughter, semi-hysteria and a ridiculous point of order.

The member for Custance does not understand that when we are talking about courts or the Courts Administration Authority we are talking about the spending of public money, which is covered by Supply. It is fundamental; it is something that people should understand in their first few days in Parliament. It is not a matter for stupid points of order, hilarity, and the like. Members have to find their own way in this place but, from time to time, we get a real lulu and we seem to have one here.

I was asked today by a South-East journalist why I was persisting with the question of resident magistrates in the country. Obviously, he was not someone who had lived for a long time in the regions, otherwise he would not have needed to ask the question. I answered him, obviously, that someone in the metropolitan area would not understand: it involves only one person, so why would one person matter! My response is that it does matter—it matters a great deal.

Every public servant, every job, whether or not it is a public servant, particularly involving professionals—every position—ought to be fought for absolutely to the ultimate by everyone who has any regard for country areas at all. True, what is happening in country areas does not yet impinge on the metropolitan area. It certainly does not impinge on the consciousness of people because they do not understand the position.

Certainly, I was pleased to read a series of *Advertiser* articles by the Rural Editor, Nigel Austin. I referred to him mistakenly as Nigel Hunt the other day when I referred to this article and, of course, it should have been Nigel Austin. He explained graphically why everyone in the House and why everyone who genuinely cares and wants to do something about the situation of non-metropolitan South Australia ought to read his reports and attempt to understand the position. I live on Eyre Peninsula, which is probably the hardest hit area of the State, particularly in terms of the rural downturn.

Other members represent country areas that have quite significant problems, too; some have quite horrendous problems, while others in better country do not have quite as many problems. However, Eyre Peninsula seems to be coping it all. Even if I did not have an electoral responsibility because I live in the area, I would be very upset. I would like to see this article on the Library's reading list in the hope that all members would read it, and I suggest that to the Librarian. The article in the *Advertiser* of 9 and 10 January is extensive and obviously has been written by someone who knows his subject.

It would be impossible for me to go through the whole article in the short time available to me, but I hope that by reading a couple of paragraphs I can paint a picture for those people who do not understand out of ignorance or do not care, or who have their own problems and seem to think everyone else should sort out their own. If that is their attitude, I hope that if I read a couple of paragraphs of this article it will make them stop and think. The article states, in part:

The human tragedy is written all over the faces of many of the people. On some farms, children, barely in their teens, are working far too hard. On others, young men who left school early to work from an early age, missed out on childhoods and have aged before their time. The joke that leaving your farm to your son is the worst form of child abuse rings true all too often.

Children especially reflect the severity of the crisis. Sixty per cent of schoolchildren in country South Australia were on school card as 1994 ended. Eligibility for the card generally reflects a weekly family income of less than \$426, somewhere near the Henderson poverty line. The number of country children on school card at Government schools has more than doubled in four years to 37 111 out of a total of 62 124.

So, half the children in country areas are on school card, and to be on school card is not easy: you must be very close to or below the poverty line. That gives a very small indication of what is occurring. Regarding not my electorate but that of the member for Eyre—I know the honourable member will not mind my quoting this—the article states:

A farmer in the Ceduna area says maybe 50 farmers between Ceduna and Streaky Bay have left in the past three years. Property after property has been sold out and amalgamated. Some farmhouses lie empty, a few have tenants, the original owners long gone. The hard work of clearing the land has, for an increasing number of families, been to no avail. The land in parts of the Far West is little better than worthless; prices have dropped by up to 70 per cent in the past five years. The cheapest properties in Australia for decades have been given away at depression prices.

Farms of 2 500 hectares on the Far West Coast have sold for \$75 000. Even some who bought in at rock bottom prices, thinking they could do no wrong, came unstuck as the income dried up. Old men, 70 years and more, hang on grimly and hope for a return to

good seasons and a triumphal escape from the purgatory which grips their land. They say they cleared the land and their kind fought and died for it in wars. They won't give it away without a fight. 'It's ours, we've worked day and night for it and we deserve some reward for our effort', one old-timer says.

If this referred to a deli that was going broke in the metropolitan area because of a bad business decision or location, etc., I would say, 'Well, that's capitalism; that's the system they support.'

That is the market working: get rid of the inefficient; get someone to buy the assets cheaply, and make a go of it. It is not the system I support particularly, but that is the system that 99.9 per cent of Australians support. So, it is hard to weep for people who support that system and then become victims of it. We have a huge difference in rural areas because, to start with, they are at the mercy of the weather and that is probably one of the few things in life we can do nothing about. How can you say to someone who has been caught by a particularly bad run of weather that is quite outside what you would normally expect, over and above the devalued price that one would pay for that property, 'Tough luck, sell it to someone else, off you go, that is the market working and it has been nice knowing you?'

That is the approach, incidentally, of many people on the Right in this country. In one way, I respect the strength of their views. They carry the same principles through from whatever industry it is to the rural industry. However, that presents an enormous social problem and I think it is one that Australia, to date—not just South Australia—has not really made up its mind about. Does it want the rural parts of this country populated or does it not? If it does not, let it say so. Let us have the debate; let it come to that decision and say to all these people, 'We do not want you, you are not viable, up the road we may help you with a Housing Trust house somewhere in Adelaide or in one of the rural towns if you are lucky.' By and large, they disappear to Adelaide, the family disperses and the properties get bigger. They do not get more viable; they only get bigger and become a bigger millstone around the neck of the people who take them on, and they wear them down even more.

So, if the country collectively and politically has decided that, that is okay. However, I do not believe that it has, because I do not believe that sufficient people have even considered the issue. I am not suggesting for one moment that everything that this Government does is wrong. Obviously, that is not the case. I have had to make hard decisions in my time in Government and members opposite will have to make some and carry on making them. However, in the decision-making process of this Government and in the last budget that it brought down, and in its activity in implementing that budget—which gives rise to the Supply Bill today, in case the member for Culance is not aware of what we are talking about—I have not seen anywhere any recognition of the social problems that are occurring outside the metropolitan area. There is no recognition whatsoever.

While I was sitting here listening to the member for Torrens, I made a very brief list of Government departments that are being depleted in country areas, and they include: ETSA; EWS; the Department of Transport; the Education Department; the Health Commission; the Department of Primary Industries—one that I thought would have had some understanding, but in the main they are a pack of economic rationalists who think that a farm is no different from a deli in Unley—Fisheries; and the courts, and a lot more pain is to

come in relation to the courts. I understand that Naracoorte and Kadina courts are going to close.

It is only one or two people, so people say that it does not really matter and that it is necessary restructuring, but if you take every one of those decisions collectively, you will understand why some towns on the Eyre Peninsula cannot even field a football team these days. It is not the worst thing in the world not to be able to field a football team, but it is a very good indication that the young people are going, if they have not already gone, and that the population has declined to the extent where some of these communities no longer are viable. That should make the economic rationalists happy because that is the market working: pulling people off the land that they say is not productive; if you cannot make a dollar, get out. That is the prevailing ethos of people in Government today.

It is not just the State Government but also the Federal Government to a great extent. We hear all the blathering of the State Government on the Hilmer Report: what it will do to rural communities is quite devastating. The Federal Government is promoting it and saying that it will force it on the State Government. If the State Government does not want it, tough, it will be forced on it and then we will see what happens to rural communities. My plea is for people to at least start discussing it and come to some decision about what they want. If they do not want the areas populated, do not let us go through the process of death by a thousand cuts, as we are going through at the moment. It is absolutely killing these communities. Rather, say, 'We do not want you, this is the way we will get rid of you, we will do it as humanely and quickly as possible and it is for the greater good of the nation'.

If that is what the majority of Australia wants, fair enough and let us get on with the business of reorganising. However, I do not believe that if the picture is put to the people of Australia that that is what they want, that they want ever growing cities becoming unbearable to live in or that the overwhelming majority of people who come to this country want to locate themselves in not always the best of circumstances in Sydney or Melbourne. I do not believe that in putting the question to the people of Australia, that that is the decision that they will come to.

I did not want to finish on a discordant note, but I wish to quote another paragraph in this article headed 'An air of desperation' by Nigel Hopkins. It states:

Some believe that past Labor State Governments were more sympathetic than the present Government. Some traditional Liberal Party supporters on the peninsula say they will think carefully before giving their vote to the Liberal Party at the next State election.

I doubt whether that is the case. I know these people and have lived with them for 30 years. The chances of them not giving their vote to the Liberal or National Party—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The same as you getting a majority in Whyalla: it is not going to happen. That people are prepared to put their names to that kind of comment is an indication of the desperation that is evident out there. My plea is a simple one: I am appealing to those members opposite who live, work and represent people outside the metropolitan area to do a little bit of collective work within the Party room. It is not necessarily right to do it here publicly, but they must stop this incessant, constant eating away at Government services outside the metropolitan area. It is not just making it a little bit tougher for people but is having a profound effect on those communities. I appeal to members opposite: even

if you do not do it publicly, do it privately within the Party room and let us see if we can stop or at least hold the line on the numbers of people that the Government can keep in those areas.

I have some suggestions, as it is not good enough to simply criticise. Over the next few weeks during grievance debates I will be outlining a couple of suggestions. I do not have time to outline it at the moment, but I am strongly in favour of enforced farm debt mediation. At the moment it is being introduced in New South Wales. I want to look at how it works. If it is successful there, it is something that I will be looking at and, as a private member, introducing into this Parliament.

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

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** I support the second reading of the Supply Bill. In so doing, I wish to address a number of problems facing the Government in the formulation of the forthcoming budget. I would like to look at some of the speeches made by members opposite when we debated the Estimates Committees last year. I wonder what will happen in the next couple of months when the member for Playford challenges the Leader of the Opposition. I would like to look at the speech the Leader of the Opposition gave today compared with the speech he made in October 1994. In that speech, the Leader of the Opposition warned the Government that it did not allow sufficient parameters in its budget. He said that the Government did not allow sufficient parameters with regard to wage increases, and it did not allow sufficient parameters with regard to growth factors and inflation.

In his speech, the Hon. Mike Rann, Leader of the Opposition, said:

So, I have made a commitment to be a positive Opposition Leader leading a positive Opposition and making positive contributions to debates about ideas instead of petty bickering.

I have to smile a little when I compare that comment with other speeches given by the Leader since that day. The Leader further stated:

I did not see clauses about airports in Brisbane, Cairns, Coolangatta, Darwin or Perth. We were able to get special recognition or breakthrough on Adelaide, because we negotiated and got down to the hard yakka, locked away in closed rooms.

They slugged away and arrived at a decision, but what decision has been handed down by the Federal Government in relation to Adelaide Airport? Not a thing; not a word; not a whisper. All that has happened is some hard yakka by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and the Minister for Transport—both members of the Government. Obviously the hard yakka the Leader of the Opposition was talking about did not relate to Adelaide Airport. The statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in that speech were just as false then as they are today. I read the rest of his speech in relation to the Estimates Committees and the budget as formulated. As an aside, it is good to see that the member for Ross Smith is here today.

I read the rest of the contributions from the Opposition, including the member for Ross Smith, and nowhere throughout those speeches during September and October 1994 did the Opposition query the parameters set down in the budget. Not one member of the Opposition queried the inflation factor; not one of them queried the growth factor; and not one of them queried the increase in wages as set down in the budget. However, members opposite stand here now and say, 'We told you so.' Not one of them put forward an alternative

budget for the State. All they did was sit and whinge about the cuts that had to be made. I can understand the member for Giles giving his farewell speech, because he obviously does not want to get into a heavy economic debate. I would have thought more of the member for Hart, a person who supposedly ran a small business previously—

**Mr Becker:** Marineland.

**Mr CAUDELL:** Marineland, obviously.

**Mr Becker:** He got rid of that.

**Mr CAUDELL:** Unfortunately, he got rid of a few other things as well, including the State Bank. At no stage did any members address the budget. The member for Playford tonight said that, historically, interest rates are the lowest they have ever been. But then we have a look at the figures. In 1960, unemployment was 2 per cent, and unemployment now is 10 per cent; real interest rates in 1960 were 2.4 per cent, and now they are 9.4 per cent. The member for Hart does not need to leave, because he made those same statements. Perhaps the member for Hart would like to know what the real interest rates are. In 1995 the real interest rates for overdraft are 9.5 per cent plus, because then you have to add on the factor that is allowed for by the banks; so, the bank adds another 2 per cent to that interest rate and you are up to 11.5 per cent. Then we get down to the next interest rate and add on the percentage, depending on the profitability or otherwise of your business.

The bank says, 'Your business last year lost \$14 000, therefore we will add another 2 per cent on top of that just to keep a watch on your business, to make sure that everything is okay.' In fact, the real interest rate payable by many of the businesses around Adelaide is somewhere in the vicinity of 13 to 14.5 per cent. For the mums and dads at home who have a bankcard, the real interest rate is 16.5 per cent: no phoney figures that the member for Hart may wish to show up later and say, 'In fact, the real interest rate is only 4.5 or 7.5 per cent.' The real interest rate is the interest rate that affects the back pocket and chequebook of the business, and the member for Hart knows that is correct.

If we look at the interest rates that affect the budgets of business, of the household and of the State Government, it is well documented that the debt left behind by the previous Government has left the present Government in a financial dilemma. The interest associated with that debt amounts to \$1 billion. It is no secret that for every increase of 1 per cent in interest we are looking down the barrel of an extra \$80 million in costs per year. However, if we look at that debt in real terms as it affects my electorate, the interest associated with that debt means that 10 000 Housing Trust homes cannot be built.

Members opposite, including the group that is led by the member for Ross Smith, have left a legacy to this State in that, because of their inactivity, we cannot build 10 000 Housing Trust homes. All their crying and their moaning about cuts to education, to health and to public housing is just a smokescreen, because the interest bill that they have left behind to service the debt of this State is equivalent to 10 000 Housing Trust homes. Even more poignant is the fact that that 1 per cent interest rate increase that relates to State debt in real terms means that the Housing Trust can build 800 fewer homes each year. Members should think about it: 800 fewer homes each year as a result of a 1 per cent increase in the interest rate.

That is the legacy that the previous Government has left behind, and the member for Napier has the hide to stand up here and say how we have made cuts to the Housing Trust,

how we have made cuts to the public sector and how we are forcing increased costs on the unfortunate people who have to rely on public housing. When we look at who the real criminals are in this whole plot, we see that they are those who have left to this State the legacy of a debt so high that we cannot jump over it, so high that we cannot walk past it, and so high that no longer can we build 800 homes per year because of a 1 per cent increase in costs.

That 1 per cent increase has been brought on by the Federal Government, which says that it needs to increase the interest rate by 1 per cent because that will reduce our Current Account deficit and bring into play a reduction in growth, steadying it down nice and slowly. If we look at that and at the economics behind the Federal Government's moves, we see that as a result of that 1 per cent increase in interest rates the ACTU is now saying, 'Because of the high cost of interest rates, we will have to back out of our enterprise agreements and push for an increased wage for the people whom we look after.'

Following on from that, the Housing Industry Association is saying that it is a bitter pill associated with that 1 per cent interest cost, and all of a sudden we see around the streets of the electorate many houses for sale, with poor unfortunate families suddenly finding themselves in the situation that they were in back in 1990 where they can no longer afford the repayments on their homes. All of a sudden homes are not selling and people are finding themselves in a predicament. When homes are not selling, the income is not coming into the State coffers.

Then we have pressure on business as a result of the increased costs. When you have increased costs placed on business, no longer will they employ extra people. Because of the wages push from the ACTU due to the interest rate increase, we get a vicious circle. Then we see a lack of investment by business, so we no longer have the spending of capital associated with the process. Also, we have a reduction in production, as a result of which we have an increase in imports, and—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr CAUDELL:** It is obvious that the camel is still in South Australia, and we would love to see the southern end of the camel heading north! But obviously we have the same circle—

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr CAUDELL:** He looks like an Afghan camel driver at the best of times! We have the same circle of history as when Keating made his great statements that 'It was the recession we had to have,' 'We are about to come to a soft landing,' 'We are about to increase interest rates, just so we can put a nice little steadier and land accordingly and not end up as a third world country.' As I said, we have had a reduction in house sales and business investment, which ends up as a reduction in employment and a reduction in the budget incomes.

The impact is not only on the private sector but also on the public sector. The pressure of the budget means a reduction in the outgoings and in the provision of services. All this is the result of a Federal Government policy to increase interest rates and control an economy which was left in tatters by the previous Government, which was advised by the next Opposition speaker, the member for Hart. He was the adviser to the former Government, the guy who left the yellow markers on the policy statements, the guy who left the yellow tags out there so that all could see his nice firm handiwork.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr CAUDELL:** We will take some nice little bets later on. The member for Hart, who will speak next, is the one who left the deep impression on this State, who left the \$1 billion worth of interest and the \$80 million worth of interest costs every time it goes up by 1 per cent. That 1 per cent interest cost, as I said, leads to 800 fewer homes in a full year. If we think about the flow-on effect, we realise that those 800 homes reflect into 4 000 fewer jobs that are available in this State as a result of that 1 per cent interest cost. Perhaps the member for Ross Smith would like to go back to the ASU and tell them why there are 4 000 fewer jobs in the South Australian economy. There are 4 000 fewer jobs because of the previous Government's poor financial management in this State.

Then we have the situation where the Federal Government is about to look at tax increases. Then, as a result of the tax increases, we are going to have wage increases associated with the ACTU. I refer to the statements that have appeared in the *Australian* in the past couple of days as follow:

Australia's major public sector union has backed the push by metal workers unions to reopen wage negotiations if the Keating Government proceeds with tough austerity measures in the May Federal budget.

It goes on to state:

The CPSU's joint national secretary. . . said yesterday meetings of 60 000 members would consider a recommendation seeking a Government commitment for an 8 per cent wage rise over two years. . . The Maritime Union of Australia said yesterday that wage deals have been finalised with the major companies, providing scope for the final 4 per cent increase in 1997 to be revised upwards if there is a sharp rise in inflation. Building industry unions in Victoria will also have a 4.5 per cent wage rise backdated to 1 January this year, after agreeing to a number of trade-offs sought by employers.

It is an ongoing stale of litany. Today's *Age* states:

Further policy problems loom for the Government. One is the area of industrial relations, where employers will continue to push for changes to the law covering union involvement in the workplace bargaining. The ACTU, on the other hand, wants the legislation to remain intact. This will need deft handling if the Government is to avoid being caught between conflicting interest groups, as it has been during the logging row.

We have this ongoing situation in relation to the policies of the Federal Government and we must wonder how it develops its wages policy. I can foresee that possibly Brereton is around the barbecue and obviously saying to the troops, 'Shall we throw another shrimp on the barbie? For every shrimp on the barbie we will allocate that as the extra 1 per cent in wages that will occur.' As I said, there is the Transport Workers Union with its extra 15 per cent, and especially the oil industry, where the Transport Workers Union has held out for the favoured—those who are already earning \$50 000 or \$60 000, as the member for Ross Smith is aware.

In my final three minutes I would like to take time to reflect on how the Federal Government's indecision on its own health policy is having an impact on South Australia's health policy. I wrote to the Federal Health Minister on 4 January 1995 and to date I have not received a reply. Obviously, the Federal Minister is still trying to make up the policy—making it up on the run. Perhaps she has not got back from the barbecue and is still throwing a few shrimps on the barbie.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CAUDELL:** I wrote to the Federal Minister as follows:

Could you please confirm details of the current Federal Government's policy in relation to private health insurers/ pharmaceutical expenses incurred by customers during their stay in hospital? How has the cessation of rebates for medication and the setting up of preferred hospitals and medical practitioners affected customers of private medical insurers?

On behalf of a constituent I wrote:

It would be appreciated if your department could investigate this matter with a view to having the insurer and the private hospital re-examine the expenses in question with respect [to] premium health cover terms.

The letter was in relation to a constituent who had premium health cover but could not get reimbursed for his pharmaceutical cost because the hospital was not a preferred hospital as set down by the Federal Health Minister. While people are faced with this dilemma with regard to private health insurance, not knowing what is going on, it puts further pressure on the State hospital system, requiring extra funds to be made available in the health system, funds which, unfortunately, are not there because the member for Ross Smith and his mates were too busy out the back at the barbie counting shrimps rather than watching the economy to ensure that things were in order.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning):** Order! There is too much noise in the Chamber. The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Hart.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** You can certainly tell that the last speaker, the member for Mitchell, is a boss, because he opposes wage rises for workers. That has been the Tory, conservative line for the past 20 years. It is the rhetoric of the new Federal Leader of the Opposition, John Howard; it is the rhetoric of the Premier of this State; and it is the rhetoric of the marginal member for Mitchell. The bosses in the coalition have opposed every wage increase for the past 20 years. Anyone who knows anything about economics understands the swings and roundabouts in the economy.

*Mr Wade interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Elder had best take note of my contribution tonight. If you want to be back here in three years, you had better learn a lesson. Workers in South Australia are watching the corporate sector achieve record profits in many cases and, if we read any financial page in any paper, we know that that is a fact. The reality is that the workers deserve a wages dividend in moderated form; they deserve an increase in wages as a dividend from the profit-growth experience. As an ex-bank manager, the member for Peake could answer the question: who in this Chamber could deny a bank teller a wage increase, as we see the big four suck record profits out of this economy? If the members for Mitchell, Elder and Reynell and the other marginal members really want to come into this Chamber and say, 'No wage increases for workers', I wish them good luck at the next State election.

I will give another piece of economic advice to my colleague the member for Mitchell, who again gets up in this House and tries to give us the impression that he is some sort of economic guru. He is an economic illiterate. He tried to tell us in here tonight that the real interest rate was the overdraft rate. My six year old in primary school knows full well that the real interest rate is not the overdraft rate: the real rate of interest is the difference between the 90 day bank bill rate and the prevailing rate of inflation. Just a little lesson to my colleague the member for Mitchell: do not come in here and try to give us an economic lecture when you cannot work out what a real rate of interest is. Enough on the member for

Mitchell, but his ill-informed comments cannot go uncorrected.

**An honourable member:** When are you going to get onto the Bill?

**Mr FOLEY:** I am on the Bill: don't worry about that. This State budget has a very poor outcome; it is a sloppy budget. The Treasurer of this State, the member for Waite, has failed his first test. To think that the Treasurer in his very first budget, with all his rhetoric, certainly when he was in opposition, and with all the preparation he had to be the State Treasurer, failed the test. He has had to re-crunch and rework his numbers, and that is an embarrassment not just to the Treasurer but also to the Government, because we all know that the Treasurer and this sloppy Cabinet took the most over-optimistic Treasury Department forecast for interest rates. For the Treasurer to come in here and attempt to blame the Prime Minister or the Treasurer of this nation for interest rate movement as the reason why his budget is falling down is an absolutely pitiful argument.

We all know the estimates that were put forward to this Cabinet when it framed its budget. This sloppy Cabinet took the most over optimistic interest rate projections so that it could make its numbers balance, and it was caught out. There would hardly be a person in this State or nation who could not predict six months ago that there would be some interest rate movement. The only 13 people who could not predict that—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Fourteen; I will throw in the Under Treasurer. The only ones who did not forecast interest rate movements were in this Government. Plenty of people paying mortgages, real workers to whom this Government will not give a wage rise, knew that interest rates were on the rise, so they fixed their home loans, but not this Government. So do not come here and rave on that the Federal Government is at fault for a blow out in interest rates. They were there to be predicted and the Government should have been smart enough to predict them.

Another area where this Government falls down is wages policy. Again, it decided to whack on a two-year wages freeze without doing its homework and without realising it could not do it, saying that State public servants could not have a wage increase. You blew that one, didn't you? That was another sloppy piece of work. The Government should have thought those issues through before framing its budget. It was sloppy work.

What is the Government trying to do to plug its holes? It is embracing outsourcing with a passion rarely seen before in this State. No sooner can the bureaucracy, the Opposition and the general community get hold of one concept of outsourcing and try to work it through and balance whether this is good or bad policy than the Government has moved to the next area. The Government started with EDS, the computer systems; it then moved to Modbury Hospital; it then went into public transport; it is now into the EWS; and it is going into road transport and motor registration. In 15 months this Government has made generational commitments with too much haste, without decent policy consideration, without decent community debate, and without decent parliamentary scrutiny to work through whether or not this is good policy. All the Government says is, 'Trust us.'

It is a sad state of affairs when the Government embraces policy at such a rapid rate without at least working through one of the outsourcing options and getting its house in order to see how it is done. I fear for the future of this State should

these outsourcing contracts go wrong, because the ramifications will be significant.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** All of us want a future for our children. That is why all of us are here in the Parliament.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Goyder is irrelevant in this debate. Just sit back and nod your head. Fortunately, as I acknowledge, the member for Florey is in the Chamber; he is a fellow member of the Economic and Finance Committee, as is the Chair, the member for Peake. At least we have taken responsible decisions and decided to put in a framework that will allow the Parliament in some part to monitor the performance of the Government's outsourcing contracts. But, even with all the talent available to us on that committee, I fear whether we will have the ability to keep up with the work load as this Government moves forward.

In the past 48 hours we have seen the leaked Treasury document. That is clearly indicating to all Ministers and their agencies, 'We got our numbers wrong and there are things that we have to do to correct them.' I should like to refer to a couple of points in the Treasurer's document. It states:

In these bilateral discussions we need to cover all possible saving options including increased efficiency in operations—

that is a very bland and open statement, but I am not sure exactly what it means—

and cessation of activities considered to be of low Government priority.

Does that not encapsulate what this Government is all about? Whatever the top end of town considers to be a low priority for Government we get out of. We hand it over to private management. The Minister for Housing is in the Chamber with us now. What is his answer to the Housing Trust? Sell it off and lease it back. Fair dinkum, some of the things this Government has done must make dear old Sir Thomas Playford turn in his grave.

*The Hon. J.K.G. Oswald interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** No, if you were listening, you would have heard. What I said was a policy option—

*The Hon. J.K.G. Oswald interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, why don't you listen? Save the docket for downstairs and listen to the contribution. What I said was a policy option this Government is considering is the sale of our State public housing stock and leasing it back. That is what you publicly stated; you cannot deny that. Let us look at another item: the recovery of costs for the provision of services by the public sector. Are we not seeing user pays in all areas of Government? It would be very easy for me to talk about user pays with regard to water. Let us talk about a few other areas where the user pays principle is being implemented. User pays is being implemented in public transport. Right across Government, we are seeing user pays implemented. Who does that affect? It affects the people this Government calls 'a low Government priority'.

As I said before to some of the marginal members—and there are not too many in the Chamber now—you had best work out what is your priority, because what is your priority is not this Government's priority. It is about time that the backbench members of this Government (of which you, Mr Acting Speaker, are a member), the marginal members of this Government, worked out what is a priority to them and started making some noises, because they will not be coming back in three years' time if the Government continues at the

rate it is going. Let us have another look at Government policy, that is, the hypocrisy of this Government—

*The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I won't be in opposition as long as you, I can tell you—with respect to the tax dividend policy of the State's trading enterprise. The former Leader of the Opposition, the member for McKillop, made great mileage in this Chamber and publicly when he criticised the former Government for taking dividends, taking profits, as he called it, a cash cow, ripping money out of the EWS and ETSA. What did we see in this last budget as they started to panic as they could not get their numbers together? They thought, 'There's \$100 million sitting there for us, let's rip it out of ETSA.' A record dividend—

*The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** You can't honestly believe that. You rip this \$100 million out of ETSA. A record dividend! ETSA had never been required to make that contribution to State taxes. This is from a Government whose senior Minister some four years ago made great mileage out of cash cows as a bad piece of Government policy. At a time when Housing Trust tenants have to pay \$50 and the average householder has to pay \$20 dollar a year more for their water, this Government takes \$30 million. Never before has the Government used the EWS—

*The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** It is \$60 million; I apologise.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is out of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** I thank the Minister for Infrastructure for his correction. The dividend from EWS was \$30 million for a half year; in a full year that would be a \$60 million. I have been basing my calculation on a half yearly performance so far, because we are half way through the budget. This is a Government of hypocrisy. As an Opposition member listening to the comments continually coming across from the other side I must say that the mob opposite are hypocrites. I will take the time one day to go through *Hansard* and pull out a few gems from this Government when it was in Opposition.

I reiterate my point that this was a sloppy budget prepared by a sloppy Government that was not able to get the framework in place or have the courage of its convictions to formulate a budget that it believed was the right medicine for this State. It took the over optimistic predictions of the State Treasury and decided to say, 'Well, let's work on there being no or very little interest rate movement.' The members of Cabinet were the only 13 people in the world who thought that, but I will give it to them: they were special in that case. The Government did not allow for interest rate movements in its budget, although everyone knew that rates were going up. There are economic cycles and interest rates do ebb and flow— anyone could have seen that. The Government has factored in no wages growth, and how anyone could have got that so horribly wrong shows poor, sloppy budgetary management and the Government ought to be ashamed of itself.

On the issue of wages policy, the South Australian economy is doing it hard and is not enjoying the overall growth of the national economy—we all know that. I ask members opposite to remember that there are some people who are hurting badly. When the Government frames its budget this time, I ask it to think of the little people and those people who cannot afford to pay more for their basic services. I ask the Government to think of the people who have not had a wage rise in two years. As the Bureau of Statistics, Economic Indicators for South Australia, said recently, wages

growth in this State is at 1.5 per cent with inflation running at 2 per cent. Already, in the course of the past 12 months, the average weekly earnings of South Australians are slipping and not even maintaining the *status quo*. Workers are not out there saying that they want wage increases of a huge magnitude. They are saying, 'Give us a bit of dividend of the growth and the record profits that some corporations are experiencing; give us a break.' On Australian Bureau of Statistic's data, real wages are running at 1.5 per cent against South Australian inflation of some 2 per cent. There has been a wages reduction in this State as this Government has blundered its way through its budgetary policy.

In conclusion, I ask the Government to make a better fist of it next time and to get its numbers right. Even if the Opposition hates or criticises the Government's numbers, even if we cry foul with the numbers, I ask the Government to at least get it right. I do not want the Government to be incompetent and amateurish by coming back six months later and saying, 'Sorry, we did not factor in interest rate movement or wages movement; we underestimated how many TSPs we thought we could get; we did not quite calculate this or that.' At the end of the day there is a well paid Treasury. There are 13 Ministers who should be able to work it out, get the numbers right the first time and bring down a budget that will run the full course. The Government should be able to bring the numbers in on target according to its budget forecasts. I do not want the Government coming back into this Chamber half way through its budget process saying, 'Oops, we made a mistake.' The Government failed on its first budget because it was sloppy; it should get it right the next time.

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr CLARKE:** Just before I enter into this debate, I would like to congratulate the member for Custance on achieving the second miracle that Mary MacKillop was looking for in that he has gone from not having any seat to now becoming *pro tem* member for the new seat of Schubert. This is the second miracle that all Catholics have been looking for with respect to Mary MacKillop's sainthood application.

My contribution tonight is by and large along the lines of a few points that have been amplified by a number of speakers on this side. I think that we need to look at a very mature debate. It is all very well for those of us on this side of the House in Opposition to level criticism at the Government and also for the Government simply to blame the Labor Party when it was the Government for all the woes of this State. If life were as simple as that it would be very easy indeed for all of us in this House. However, we all know that that is not the case.

The fact of the matter is that we have yet to have a mature debate in Australia, let alone in South Australia, in respect of the community's deciding the level of services it wants for its children, as well as its adults—grandparents and the like—as against the level of income that the Government is entitled to take from the taxpayers. That is a debate that, for the past decade or more, at both Federal and State level, has been largely centred around statements that we can provide a Rolls Royce service to members of the community on a Volkswagen budget. We all know that that is a false assumption; that it will not happen. I see the member for MacKillop

here as the deification of the second miracle because he has actually found his electorate.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** And on top of that he has actually visited it, that is true. The fact of the matter is that we have not had a decent debate for very many years in our society in relation to what we as a community want out of Government. We have all sought to try to say, 'We can give you the very best at the absolute lowest price.' We have experienced in South Australia, particularly during the 1960s and 1970s, a situation where we have enjoyed high levels of Government services for the community. We have said that we want child-care centres, and they are justified and have to be paid for. We have all said that the smaller the ratio between teachers and students the better it is for the education of our children—and that is the absolute cornerstone of our future in this State.

We have all agreed to that, yet we do not face up to the fact that that has to be paid for. As a community in South Australia we have said that the provision of water and other services should be subject to a discount or subsidy for domestic users, because that is necessary to keep the cost of living in our State cheaper than it is in other States, and that has to be paid for. On a bipartisan basis we have said that, if we have to provide a railway spur 300 kilometres east or west of an area where an industry wants to establish a factory, as a community we will pay for that because in South Australia we know that if we are going to overcome competition with our competitors in other States we have to do those things to attract and retain industry here in South Australia.

At the same time as we have been saying those things we have also unfortunately made the point that we can do all those things which are noble and which we all support on the lowest possible tax base that we can get away with. But that is not going to be our saviour, because in our society we will have to turn around and say, for example, that we want family and community welfare services and we want children who are subject to abuse—both sexually and physically—to have a safe home.

That requires expenditure and there would not be a member in this House who would support any reduction of services in that area. Unfortunately, this Government, notwithstanding its pie-in-the-sky, hand-on-the-heart approach, is willing to say, 'Of course we support children at risk, but we do not want to pay for it. Of course we support a first-class education system, but we will not support it.' In my view, the only chance we have for survival as a viable State in attracting industry is our intellectual property and resources. Major companies that rely on a domestic market will not set themselves up in South Australia in the future.

We were able to attract industry in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s under a high tariff regime, coupled with cheaper housing and the valuable work that the Housing Trust did in letting out and building commercial and industrial premises for private entrepreneurs. In some instances that won a number of businesses to set up in South Australia. Whether we like it or not, the forces of international competition will not allow us to do that in the future and, at the end of the day, when we are stripped of those sorts of advantages, we will have to attract industry to South Australia reliant on the intellectual properties and skills of the people in our State.

At this time we see our public education system being emasculated. We see our TAFE system being emasculated. Notwithstanding any protestations by the Minister concerned or Government members, we know there is a significant view in the Government that TAFE will suffer a significant



reduction in funding. In South Australia we have already lost millions of dollars of Commonwealth grants through the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) because we have not maintained effort in South Australia. South Australia's only hope in the long term to attract industries is through export. Such industries do not have to rely on or worry about the cost of the price differential involved in transporting goods from South Australia to the Eastern States and, provided we have a port or an airport from which to export, they will come to South Australia.

But those types of industries want a work force that is literate, highly trained and malleable; malleable not in an industrial spirit type of manner such as touching the forelock to the employer but, if an employer requires the work force regularly to undergo training or retraining, we should have a TAFE system that responds immediately to the needs of industry. I have a 13½ year old daughter, and my greatest fear is that when she is 18 I will have to go to the Adelaide Airport and wave her goodbye so that she can get a job in Perth or Brisbane. We must try to bring export industries to South Australia so that children such as my daughter will have a future in this State.

One way in which we can do that is to maximise our efforts and expenditure on primary education, in particular (not enough attention is paid to primary education), secondary education and tertiary education. A number of members on the opposite side would say that we cannot afford that. I say that we cannot afford to ignore it. We must be able to say to industry, both overseas and within Australia, in order to relocate or retain industry in South Australia, that we have a highly educated work force that is fully skilled and trained and an education system that will ensure that, if we cannot provide training immediately, we can put a TAFE college alongside any new industry and upgrade the training of any employer's work force.

That is my fervent belief as far as South Australia is concerned. We do not have the protection of tariff walls any longer, we are too distant from our domestic markets for a number of companies that rely only on domestic markets to settle in this State, we must rely on our export industries and, in particular, the quality of the work we do and the skill of our people. We have done that in the past, and we continue to do it. I cite outstanding examples such as Mitsubishi, General Motors-Holden's, F.H. Faulding and a number of companies in this State that have provided leadership on a world class basis. Our defence, science and technology area in both the private and public sectors in this State is world class. We should not undermine the very foundations of any economic revival in this State by cutting away the training of young people in this State—it is too important.

As politicians, regardless of which political Party happens to be in Government, we must say to the public at large, 'What do you want? Let's have you front up realistically and say to us as your parliamentarians whether you want a first class education or health system and a safe and decent environment in which your family can grow. Do you want a safe environment for your family in terms of crime prevention and the like?' All these things require the expenditure of funds and a decision by the community as a whole as to their priorities. If they are their priorities, they must be prepared to pay for them on the basis that those with the greatest ability to pay must do so, and so on down the line in proportion to family income and the like, because we have spent too much time as political parties at both a national and State

level saying, 'We can provide all these things for you for next to nothing.'

We all know that that is false. We all know that we are telling falsehoods to the community with respect to these issues, and we do not do ourselves any long-term good, because fundamentally I believe that all members in this House who are parents, even though we approach it from a different angle, actually want a future for our kids. I certainly do and I believe that that is true of every member in this Parliament. If we are going to do it, we do not just want to take cheap shots at one another on a whole range of issues, because these issues are extremely complex and not given to easy answers. The way we must go about it is to sit down as a Government and as a Parliament and say to South Australians generally, 'What is your level of expectations, and what are you prepared to pay for it?'

I believe that the people in my electorate, for example, want decent housing, a decent education for their kids and a decent environment. I believe that, generally speaking, the Australian public is made up of a decent bunch of people at heart; that, by and large, politicians have been too cynical about the response of the Australian public, by saying, 'We cannot talk about tax rises, revenue enhancements or anything of this nature because that will be the exit for us out of Government.' I genuinely think that members of the public of Australia—and South Australia in particular—are more intellectually mature than we give them credit for, because they want their kids educated and they want a future for their children. As a father, and as a potential grandfather—God forbid that it will happen too soon—I do not want to end up in a situation where I have to visit my children or grandchildren two or three times a year interstate.

South Australia has a number of remarkable attributes. One of the greatest things we have in South Australia is tolerance. We are a homogeneous society. When I say 'tolerance' I look towards you, Mr Speaker, as you have displayed a great deal of tolerance this year. You have been intemperate in the past but you have displayed a great deal of tolerance this year, and I congratulate you on that. I believe that in South Australia we have not only tolerance but also an intellectual capacity greater than the other States. Because things have been very easy for States such as New South Wales and Victoria—they have had the domestic market, the big manufacturing companies and the financial sectors of Sydney and Melbourne—they have got a bit lazy over the years. They have seen themselves as the centre of Australia and not having to work hard, whereas South Australia has had to combat all sorts of problems with respect to our climate and just the sheer necessity of existing in this State.

We can use that intellectual property but to do that we have to spend the money, and it is about time that we, as politicians, actually said to our community, 'There is no short-cut to a survival in this State. We are going to have to raise revenues one way or another.' However, I do not support the cutting of expenditure for education at all; that is an absolute nonsense. I do not support the cutting of our social welfare services, because how can we survive as a community if we do not provide the necessary facilities to look after those in greatest need? That is what we are about: we, as a Parliament, are about looking after people, and it is about time that we get back to the grass roots on these issues because, if we do not, we will end up like the United States, which has an alienated society where violence runs rampant in the major cities, where millions of American workers are

underemployed and underpaid and where millions of Americans do not have any hope for the future.

That is not the type of society or future we should look forward to in Australia or in this State. We must make every effort in this State to ensure that we never go down that track. We have to ensure that our natural resources, particularly water—the lifeblood of any society—are not privatised for private profit. It is there, a natural resource, to be enjoyed and regulated by society as a whole, to ensure that no family, man or woman is held to ransom because someone in the private sector has control over such a natural resource. It is time that we as a Parliament debated these issues in a far more dispassionate way to ensure that the rights of the citizens we represent are firmly in our thoughts and sights. We in the Labor Party are totally committed to the working class in this State and the people of this State to ensure that their rights are properly represented.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Last evening in Elizabeth I invited residents to come along to a meeting to talk about issues of concern that they wished to draw to my attention and to the attention of other members of the Labor Caucus. I will mention briefly some of the issues they raised, as they are important in this debate. The first issue that came up was education, and the way it came up was interesting. The gentleman who raised the issue began by saying that he had approached the Minister for Industrial Affairs because that Minister had some connection with Elizabeth and his son plays for Central Districts and the Crows. He approached that Minister and spoke to him about the lack of sporting equipment in schools.

This person coached sport in a local school and was continually frustrated by the fact that there was never enough equipment, which made it very difficult to provide opportunities for students. The Minister's answer was that the gentleman could get the parents to pay \$2 or \$3 more a week and use that money to buy the equipment. That was an interesting comment. The gentleman realised that the Minister had no idea of what it was like for many people out our way. An extra \$2 or \$3 a week to pay for sporting equipment has a very low priority in a household struggling to pay the rent and buy food and books for school. That opened up the discussion on education.

A number of people at that meeting had children in local schools, and they mentioned a range of issues that are concerning them greatly. The most common problem was that on school card they now had less money and no transport subsidy, which has also been taken away and, when you put those two things together with the other increases they are facing, it is becoming really difficult. The other point that came up were the headlines that have appeared in the paper over the past few days about the exodus of students from the State school system. This was raised with me a number of weeks ago by a few other people who had heard radio interviews on the same thing. They are saying that people are taking their children out of the State school system and that State schools will be left to deal with the most difficult students, those with special needs and the poorer students. The general belief is that the State school system will be left with the hardest cases and there will be less money to do the job.

This Government must take a long, hard look at what is causing the exodus from the State school system. It is crucial that the Government examines this very thoroughly. Why are people leaving? We have had anecdotal evidence indicating

too much disruption; parents want a more settled environment for their kids; and the Government, whose job it is to run a high quality education system for all students, needs to examine this closely. The interesting thing about the exodus, especially in secondary schools, is that it has never been more marked than at the beginning of this year, and that issue needs to be examined.

I draw attention to some of the things which have happened in education over the past year or so and which I believe have had quite an effect on the system and probably contributed greatly to the current trend. We have seen the commencement of \$40 million in cuts over the Government's first term. The first thing that happened last year was the issuing of TSPs. Of concern was the indiscriminate issuing of TSPs, particularly to principals and deputy principals. These people run the schools; they are the educational leaders on the ground in our schools; and they have a huge wealth of experience and knowledge of education and how to manage schools.

We saw enormous numbers of those people being given packages. That is a very silly strategy, because it leads to a dearth of leadership at the very time you need it most, and that is what has been happening. What happened as a result of that in schools all around the State last year was the step-down effect: the principal leaving and being replaced by an acting principal. All the way down the line we had this stop-gap filling of vacancies. This occurred non-stop in schools from the middle of last year, moving into the most critical time of the students' year. We had this changing of staff and amazing loss of skills, experience and leadership.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms STEVENS:** It has a lot to do with the Supply Bill because it is bound up with the cuts in the education system which caused the TSPs, as the honourable member knows. Because of the shedding of staff in head office, we are not getting the policy analysis; and we are not getting policy coming forward, as we have had in the Education Department in the past. South Australia has been renowned as a leader in education in Australia, and it has taken that lead over many years. We are finding now that these people have gone—again, a loss of expertise. It is the public education system in South Australia that has led the debate on educational issues.

It is not the private system but the public system that has faced the issues, led the debates and set the policy agenda. What we see now is an undermining and shedding of those positions so that we are right down to the basics, with as many students as possible being crammed into the classrooms. So, we have cut away that section of the department that spearheads the policy; that examines the issues; and that looks at the way we should be doing things. This contributes to a whole downgrading of the system. The A.D. Little report, released a couple of years ago, examined strategies and planning for the economic future of South Australia, and it referred to the importance of education.

It noted the importance for South Australia, in particular, where we have many economic challenges ahead of us; and the importance of having a better than average education system, because it is the education system that provides the foundation for the skills and the training that we will need to get us out of the recession that we are in. Instead of talking about averages, which is what the Government's policy has been based on, we need to look at the reality of the situation: that in this area we need to be doing better than average, because we have greater challenges in this State than exist in most of the other States. Those comments—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms STEVENS:** The member for Unley suggests that we still have the best education system. Let him go out and ask the troops. Let him ask the parents. I think that he will see that his view is erroneous. The same comments I have made here in relation to the school system apply to the TAFE system, and I agree with the comments that the member for Ross Smith has made. We get what we pay for, by and large, and again education is the key to the future. We cannot downgrade it. If we do, we do it at our peril.

I move on now to the next issue that was raised last night and that, surprise, surprise, was the health system, particularly mental health. It was interesting to have a discussion last night with people from the community, because people were saying things such as, 'We cannot expect the Government to pay for everything.' It was not everyone waving their hands madly and saying, 'The Government has to do this and that.' They did not do that. They agreed that the time has come where we cannot necessarily have everything we want. They agreed that communities need to take some role in helping each other, but they also said that the Government must take some lead in doing this, particularly in the area of mental health.

This issue has been brought up not only in our local community but also at State level and at national level that the level of funding and resourcing of mental health in South Australia is a disgrace, that it is lagging behind the national average and that it is something about which we ought to be ashamed. I now refer to the Audit Commission document, which this Government has used so closely to determine its priorities, and I quote from one section in the health overview at the beginning of the health section, as follows:

The public health system must become more integrated, more unified and focused on consumers, including especially the needs of socioeconomically disadvantaged groups, if world's best practice is to be achieved.

What we have seen so far in this Government's approach to health does none of those things. The first thing that was noted was that it needed to be integrated. We have seen an amazing array of blunders in terms of the restructuring of the health system. The Health Commission put out a document last year which was so confusing that it had to spend the rest of the year trying to explain it to everyone, because people could not understand what its document meant. As well as that, it spent several months trying to change what it had down as its original suggestion, because it simply would not work. In relation to being integrated, we are nowhere near in terms of actually restructuring our delivery of health services.

We have seen a narrowing of the definition of health. We see the Minister for Health actually saying that health really has nothing to do with things such as relationships, dealing with anger, dealing with conflict or domestic violence—that health is actually only about doctors and nurses and hospitals. So, instead of a broad, integrated view of health, we have a very narrow, focused, medical model that is in the past.

The Audit Commission talked about needing a unified system. We have casemix, which has revealed continual blunders. A significant change was brought on the system without adequate preparation. Huge blunders are caused because casemix was also brought in with massive cuts. Then we have the policy of contestability or outsourcing where we are seeing the Government following the line of, 'Well, if it does not work, let us sell it off to the private sector and it will make it work. Trust us. We know this will work. It will save us lots of money.'

The Audit Commission talked about being focused on consumers. Never before have I seen such unfocused behaviour on consumers, who cannot get near the Minister. The Minister does not want to hear from consumers about what is going wrong. He glazes over when people say there are problems. He comes back with his usual rhetoric about terrible debt problems, great savings and about everything being fine. There is little consumer involvement in what is happening in our health sector.

I would say that, in terms of our health sector, we are in real trouble. We know that we will have this year cuts as large as there have been in the past, and we know that they will bite very hard into the ordinary standards of living we have come to expect in our country.

The next issue that was raised briefly was that of transport. I will only briefly refer to it, as it was mentioned previously by the member for Napier, but it is a big issue in the electorate of Elizabeth. People have to travel a long way, and they have to rely more on transport than do those in other places in Adelaide. Certainly transport and its cost, as well as the service received by the public, are matters of great concern. I have my concerns about what is being done. We hope that the Government's move will be an improvement because, if it is not, we will be in an awful mess five or 10 years down the track.

In conclusion, I will make some general comments in relation to statements I made initially when the budget was first brought down. I said that I had some real concerns about the way in which the Government approached its task and that I thought we had no wide debate, on some of the issues that the member for Ross Smith actually raised, about what is the future that we all see in South Australia. What do we want? What levels of service is it reasonable to expect? What should be the basics and what should be the extras for which we might have to pay? I was really concerned then, and still am, that that debate did not happen and is still not happening.

Instead, we have had a Government racing headlong down one path towards a debt reduction strategy which we know we must have. And I emphasise—a debt reduction strategy is not negotiable, but the nature of the strategy is negotiable. That is where that discussion should have occurred: about what is fair and reasonable; what we want in our society; and how we can make sure that we do not polarise and actually disenfranchise whole sections of our society. We did not have that debate. Instead, always we have the statement, 'It is the debt; we have to do this because of the debt.' One by one, we are seeing it with health, water and transport. We are outsourcing, selling off to the private sector, and we are doing it too quickly.

Again, as the member for Hart said, we have done it in a policy vacuum, and we have done it with little debate and little scrutiny. We are really doing it crossing our fingers and hoping that it works because, if it does not work, I wonder how much effort it will take to try to get back what we have lost. I ask the Government to think about the whole picture, to think about balance, to think about going more slowly and to think about getting it right, because there is too much at stake if it gets it wrong. The people who are going to pay are the ordinary people, the little people, those who can least afford it and the people who can least recover.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations):**  
I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

**Mr EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 10.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 22 February at 2 p.m.