

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

**Third Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament
(1995)**

Parliament, which adjourned on 27 July, was prorogued by proclamation dated 17 August. By proclamation dated 17 August, it was summoned to meet on Tuesday 26 September, and the third session began on that date.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 September 1995

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. G.M. Gunn) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.15 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of Her Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 2.15 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from Her Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where Her Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

INTELLECTUALLY DISABLED PERSONS

A petition signed by 32 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to fund and provide appropriate accommodation, care and support services to people with an intellectual disability was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

LIQUID PETROLEUM GAS

A petition signed by 180 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to legislate to provide LPG gas to country motorists at the same price as it is available to city motorists was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

KING GEORGE WHITING

A petition signed by 123 residents of South Australia urging the House to grant a total exemption to the Upper Spencer Gulf region with regard to the increase in the minimum legal length of King George Whiting was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

EUTHANASIA

A petition signed by 69 residents of South Australia requesting that the House maintain the present homicide law, which excludes euthanasia, while maintaining the common law right of patients to refuse medical treatment was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the joint sitting of the two Houses for the choosing of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of the Hon. B.J. Wiese, to which vacancy Mr Paul Holloway was appointed.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1995.

Ordered that report be printed.

REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the statement of the Register of Members' Interests for the year ended 30 June 1995.

Ordered that report be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the twelfth report of the Public Works Standing Committee on the Main North Road

upgrade which has been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. Dean Brown)—

- Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1994-95
- Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1994-95
- Public Employment, Office for the Commissioner for—Report, 1994-95
- Public Employment, Office for the Commissioner for—Workforce Information—Report, 1994-95

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

- Evidence Act 1929—Report relating to Suppression Orders 1994-95
- Summary Offences Act—
 - Dangerous Areas, Report on
 - Road Blocks, Report on
- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Bills of Sale—Requirements as to investments
 - Consumer Credit—Revocation and Variation
 - Consumer Transactions—Exempt Transactions
 - Fences—Exemption—Land used for Drainage Purposes
 - Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Installation Contracts
 - Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas—
 - Town of Gawler
 - Port Pirie
 - Public Trustee—Commission and Fees
 - Real Property—
 - Certification of Instruments
 - Land Division
 - Residential Tenancies—Water Rates
 - Subordinate Legislation—Postponement of Expiry
- Rules of Court—
 - District Court—Various
 - Magistrates Court—
 - Landlord and Tenant—Forms
 - Retail Shop Leases
- Economic and Finance Committee—Response to Fifteenth Report—Inquiry into the Disbursement of Grant Funds by South Australian Government Agencies

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

- Adelaide Casino—Report, 1994-95
- Asset Management Task Force—Report, 1994-95
- Budget Outcome—1994-95
- Casino Supervisory Authority—
 - Third Annual Report (under the Gaming Machines Act 1992) on the Performance of Functions of the Casino Supervisory Authority
 - Tenth Annual Report on the Operation of the Adelaide Casino
- Department of Treasury and Finance—Report, 1994-95
- Functions of the Casino Supervisory Authority, Report 1994-95
- Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Report, 1994-95
- Police Superannuation Board—Report, 1994-95
- South Australian Asset Management Corporation and its Controlled Entities—Report, 1994-95
- South Australian Government Financing Authority—Report, 1994-95
- State Government Insurance Commission—Report, 1994-95
- State Supply Board—Report, 1995
- State Supply Board—Gaming Machines Act 1992—Report on the, 1994-95
- Superannuation Funds Corporation of South Australia—Report, 1994-95
- Regulations under the following Act—
 - Lottery and Gaming—
 - Trade Promotion Lotteries
 - Trader Offences

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

- Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report, 1994
- Remuneration Tribunal—Report and Determination No. 2 of 1995—Members of the Judiciary, Members of the Industrial Relations Commission, the State Governor, Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and Development Court and the Employee Ombudsman
- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Industrial and Employee Relations—Notice to be Given by Association
 - Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—Prescribed Notices

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

- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Harbors and Navigation—Exclusion of Vessels, Oil Platforms
 - Passenger Transport—
 - Conduct of Passengers
 - Various
 - Public Corporations—Hills Transit
- Economic and Finance Committee—Response to Fourteenth Report on Compulsory Third Party Property Motor Vehicle Insurance
- Economic and Finance Committee—Response to Fifteenth Report on the Disbursement of Grant Funds by South Australian Government Agencies

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

- Waterworks Act 1932—Regulations—Definition of Commercial Purpose

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

- Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Declaration of Hospitals
- Public Works Committee—Response to Report on Port Lincoln Hospital Redevelopment Stage 2

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

- Development Act 1993—Amendment to development Plan, Report on
- Development Act—Regulations—Adoption of Housing Code

Corporation—

By-Laws—

Brighton—

- No. 1—Permits and Penalties
- No. 2—Foreshore
- No. 3—Moveable Signs
- No. 4—Garbage Removal
- No. 5—Restaurants and Fish Shops
- No. 6—Bees
- No. 7—Public Conveniences
- No. 8—Caravans
- No. 9—Tents
- No. 10—Streets and Footway
- No. 11—Poultry
- No. 12—Inflammable Undergrowth
- No. 13—Parks and Reserves
- No. 14—Vehicle Moveable

Burnside—

- No. 1—Permits and Penalties
- No. 2—Vehicle Movements
- No. 3—Street Conduct
- No. 4—Street Traders
- No. 5—Garbage Removal
- No. 6—Height of Fences Near Intersections
- No. 7—Drains
- No. 8—Park Lands
- No. 9—Fire Prevention
- No. 10—Caravans
- No. 11—Lodging Houses
- No. 12—Creatures
- No. 13—Library Services
- No. 14—Burnside Swimming Centre

Mallala—

- No. 8—Animals and Birds
 Mount Gambier—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Moveable Signs
 No. 3—Taxis
 No. 4—Council Land
 No. 5—Fire Prevention
 Noarlunga—
 No. 5—Dogs
 Port Adelaide—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Moveable Signs
 No. 3—Council Land
 No. 4—Garbage Removal
 No. 5—Caravans and Camping
 No. 6—Restaurants and Fish Shops
 No. 7—Inflammable Undergrowth
 No. 8—Creatures
 Salisbury—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Moveable Signs
 No. 3—Garbage Collection
 No. 4—Council Land
 No. 5—Fire Prevention
 No. 7—Animals and Birds
 No. 8—Bees
 No. 9—Caravans
 District Council—
 By-Laws—
 Streaky Bay—
 No. 2—Council Land
 Tumby Bay—
 No. 1—Bees
 No. 2—Camping Reserves
 No. 3—Council Reserves
 No. 4—Dogs
 No. 5—Fences and Hoardings
 No. 6—Foreshore
 No. 7—Fuel Pumps
 No. 8—Garbage
 No. 9—Moveable Signs
 No. 10—Parklands
 No. 11—Poultry
 No. 12—Traders
 Roxby Downs
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Taxis
 No. 3—Street Traders
 No. 4—Garbage Disposal
 No. 5—Caravans and Camping
 No. 6—Council Land
 Murray Bridge
 No. 2—Council Land
 No. 3—Taxis
 No. 4—Moveable Signs
- By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—
 Rules of Racing—
 Racing Act—
 Bookmakers Licensing Board—Principal
 Harness Racing Board—
 Age Limit to Drive Horse
 Handicapping
 Powers of the Stewards
 Economic and Finance Committee—Response to Fifteenth Report on the Disbursement of Grant Funds by South Australian Government Agencies
- By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—
 Citrus Board of South Australia—Report, 1994-95
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Fisheries—Ban on Net Fishing
 Meat Hygiene—Standards/Codes of Practice
- By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Border Groundwater Agreement Review Committee—
 Report 1993-94

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. R.B. Such)—

Daylight Saving Act—Regulation—Summer Time
 Economic and Finance Committee—Response to Fifteenth Report on the Disbursement of Grant Funds by South Australian Government Agencies

BUDGET OUTCOME DOCUMENT

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

That the budget outcome document for 1994-95 be printed.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I wish to make a ministerial statement and, in doing so, recognise that in past years, when the budget was released in late August, the outcome for the previous year was included in the budget documentation. This year, for the first time, the budget was introduced before the end of the financial year. The 1994-95 budget outcome document, which I have just tabled, in the main, presents and analyses the outcome for 1994-95 against the 1994-95 budget tabled in Parliament in August last year. The original budget forecast an underlying deficit in the non-commercial sector of \$275 million. When we tabled the 1995-96 budget, the estimate was \$265 million.

I am now pleased to report to the House that the actual underlying deficit for the non-commercial sector for 1994-95 was \$239 million—a \$36 million dollar improvement on our original estimate and a confirmation that the Government's budget strategy to restore the State's finances is on track. Debt is also under control, with the public sector net debt at 30 June 1995 standing at \$8 500 million—an improvement on forecasts and a reduction in real terms. In addition, the State's contingent liabilities have decreased by \$6.5 billion during 1994-95.

Turning to the key items which have influenced the final outcome for 1994-95, I indicate that capital outlays were down by \$123 million, which can be accounted for by delays in programs, including the Adelaide Airport upgrade, vehicle purchases and the manufacturing modernisation program, as well as higher than expected debt repayments. Partly offsetting this was an increase in current outlays of \$93 million due mainly to increased funding for past superannuation liabilities which, in part, were balanced by an improvement in operating income of some agencies and by delays in agency current commitments on various State and Commonwealth programs.

In the area of revenue and grants, total receipts for the non-commercial sector exceeded budget by \$71 million, of which \$56 million reflected higher than expected levels of Commonwealth grants. The balance was due to higher State-owned source revenues. During 1994-95, net proceeds from the sale of Government businesses amounted to \$361 million, which have been applied to debt reduction. Indeed, if we adopted the presentational techniques of some other jurisdictions, we would be highlighting that the total public sector was in surplus in 1994-95 by \$86 million. However, this would not be a true picture, as we have consistently maintained that the proceeds from the sale of Government businesses must be put towards debt reduction and not to the day-to-day running of Government—a position that would not be sustainable.

I now refer to the matter of State trading enterprises. Total dividends in 1994-95 of \$210.4 million were slightly up on

the estimate of \$209 million in the 1995-96 financial statement. The book values of EWS assets as at 30 June 1995 were some \$382 million lower than anticipated in the 1995-96 financial statement, due largely to the revaluation of above-ground mains on replacement cost. Current valuations for above-ground assets had previously been based on factoring up historic costs using a construction cost index which had resulted in a progressive over statement of replacement cost. The asset base of the Ports Corporation was \$27.5 million down on estimate due mainly to the temporary deferral of a planned revaluation of land.

In the 1995-96 budget, the public sector work force reductions for the three years to 30 June 1995 were estimated at 9 200 full-time equivalent employees. This was against planned reductions over the same period of 9 800 FTE employees. I am pleased to report that the actual outcome for the period shows reductions of 9 700 FTE employees, exceeding the work force reduction estimate published in the 1995-96 budget, and only 100 FTE employee reductions lower than our original plan. I would be pleased to provide Opposition members with a more detailed briefing on the budget outcome should they so desire. It should be emphasised that, whilst there was an improvement in the budget outcome for 1994-95, the underlying deficit previously forecast of \$114 million for 1995-96 remains the likely outcome. As members would be aware, wage escalation presents the greatest threat to this result.

I turn now to the major business enterprises under my control and the annual reports which have just been tabled. SGIC recorded a \$53.5 million profit after tax for the year ended 30 June 1995, representing a 45.8 per cent increase on \$36.7 million profit after tax in 1993-94. The 1992-93 result was a \$22.6 million loss. All business segments contributed to the strong profit result as follows: compulsory third party insurance \$33.3 million; life insurance \$8.4 million; health insurance \$700 000; and general insurance \$11.1 million. The turnaround in profit over the past 2½ years is due mainly to SGIC's shift out of peripheral, poorly performing businesses and its concentration on core businesses. As part of this process the investment portfolio has been restructured along more prudent lines. In addition, efficiency and customer service have been improved by implementing a total quality management program. SGIC's profit performance in the future can be expected to build from this solid base. It is now well placed to attract strong interest from potential buyers.

As members would be aware, the operations of the compulsory third party scheme will be retained within Government under the newly formed Motor Accident Commission (MAC) with the new SGIC Holdings being contracted to manage claims and investments for three years. One area of concern which is noted in the Chairman's overview in the SGIC annual report is that a trend is emerging of higher accident rates and higher costs for the future care of accident victims. This is currently being investigated prior to any recommendation being made to the CTP Premiums Committee by the Motor Accident Commission. The current rate for a standard car is \$186 per annum for a vehicle based in the city. It should be noted that there have been no increases in CTP premiums since 1988. Contrast this with New South Wales where two years ago the premium for a standard car was approximately \$200. Now the premium is around \$368 and is rumoured to be heading towards the \$400 mark.

I turn now to the Lotteries Commission of South Australia. All sectors of the gambling industry in South

Australia experienced a volatile year following the introduction in July 1994 of gaming machines into hotels and clubs across the State. It had been expected that there would be a consequential marked fall in the commission's net sales during 1994-95; however, by actively addressing the challenges posed by gaming machines, the decrease in net sales was only 6.3 per cent on the previous year to \$248.3 million. The Lotteries Commission generated an operating surplus in 1994-95 of \$74.9 million, which is only a 5.3 per cent reduction over the previous year. This amount has been distributed to the Hospitals Fund and the Recreation and Sport Fund. The commission has completed a five year corporate plan which, through solid planning, forecasts sustainable growth for the coming years.

The newly established Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia (SFMC) reported a \$77.3 million net profit for the final year of operations for its antecedent body, the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust. The result represents a return of 5 per cent on funds under management. The return was below expectations and was affected by a significant write down on the ASER investment. The general introduction of gaming machines into hotels and clubs in South Australia, together with the opening of competing casinos elsewhere in Australia and the region, has had a damaging impact on revenues at the Adelaide Casino (a major element of the ASER investment) and has resulted in a lowering of the Casino's future profit expectations.

In this area, the partners of the ASER group have made a number of key changes in a bid to address this decline, most notably with the appointment of a new Chairman, Mr Stephen Gerlach, the early termination of the technical and management agreement with Genting and some capital expenditure to improve the gaming environment for patrons. Other changes are planned for the current financial year in a restructure designed to restore value to the partners. The return on funds under management, excluding the ASER write down, was 7.5 per cent. Total assets under management increased by \$423 million to just under \$2 billion during the year. The continuation of the Government's policy to progressively fund the State's public sector superannuation liabilities was largely responsible for this substantial increase.

In its first year of operation, the South Australian Asset Management Corporation (SAAMC) has exceeded all its targets in winding down the residual operations of the former State Bank, and in doing so achieved a profit after tax of \$66.8 million (unaudited). When it commenced operations the SAAMC had total assets of \$8.44 billion; 12 months later in an orderly process the balance sheet has been cut by more than half with total assets as at 30 June 1995 standing at \$4.03 billion. Subsequent to balance date, one of SAAMC's highest profile assets, the Myer Centre, has been sold for a price of \$151 million.

Over the past 12 months, the Asset Management Task Force has rapidly progressed its review of State assets earmarked for sale—playing a crucial role in the Government's debt reduction strategy. A number of assets have been sold, including Enterprise Investments, the Northfield Laboratories, State Clothing, offset equipment from State Print, the *Island Seaway* and, most notably, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia. Looking ahead, the sale process for SGIC and Austrust is under way and, over the next 12 months, another major asset, Forwood Products, will also be sold along with many other smaller items deemed as not essential to the core business of Government.

South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA) reported an operating surplus of \$120 million in 1994-95 compared with \$246 million (before abnormal items) in 1993-94. SAFA's performance was in line with the budget estimates. Reductions in SAFA's capital of \$721 million in 1993-94 and \$962 million in 1994-95 have been the main influence in the lower operating surplus. Capital reductions are consistent with the thrust of the Commission of Audit's recommendations made in April 1994. The capital reductions are an integral part of making SAFA's operations more transparent and returning it to core activities.

It is also relevant to note that, during the past year, SAFA incurred book losses of \$157 million as a result of debt management strategies implemented for the purpose of minimising the long-term cost of borrowings for SAFA's clients. Over time, it may be expected that these book losses will be offset by book gains, such as occurred in 1993-94 when \$77 million worth of book gains arising from debt management activities were incurred. SAFA adopts an accounting policy whereby material accounting gains and losses resulting from debt management transactions are amortised over the life of the financial instruments transacted but not over a period exceeding 10 years.

The effect of this prudent policy is to smooth the impact of book gains and losses on the common public sector interest rate charged to SAFA's clients. This debt management policy was adopted by SAFA after my Government came to office and discovered that SAFA's overall debt profile was running at about .7 years (or about nine months)—an incredibly low figure and one which left the State massively exposed to interest rate rises. This was not prudent policy. SAFA has advised that no other Government finance organisation in Australia has or had a portfolio exposure this short. Indeed, the Auditor-General noted in his 1992-93 report:

... a high reliance on short-term debt could cause difficulties when raising new borrowings concurrently with rolling over existing debt, especially when there are disruptions in the market or market confidence.

The Auditor-General added:

Short-term rates are also subject to greater volatility, which can cause budgetary problems from highly indebted borrowers.

The Commission of Audit also expressed concern about the interest rate exposure when it reported last year and suggested that it may be appropriate to lengthen the portfolio. Taking this advice into account, this Government decided to replace this inappropriate policy of the previous Government by establishing a debt portfolio with an average duration of 2.75 years, which 'smooths' out the impact of interest rate movements and makes responsible budget planning possible and not one exposed to the whims of the financial markets and policies of the Federal Government. This is of vital importance.

Our new policy provides agencies and departments with much greater certainty in their financial planning by helping to insulate them from the impact of significant rises in interest rates in external financial markets, which if passed on would force reappraisals of budget strategy and severely hamper the smooth delivery of services. A pleasing feature of the past year was the improvement in SAFA's borrowing margins in the second half of 1994-95 relative to those of the Commonwealth and other State Government borrowers. The finer pricing of SAFA's securities is attributable to a number of factors, including, importantly, South Australia's improved financial position.

In concluding, I would like to offer my thanks to the employees within Government and the various agencies who have assisted in the Government's achieving a better than forecast budget outcome for 1994-95. However, there is no room for complacency with the budget strategy being threatened by inflated wage claims and, despite our debt levels stabilising, we are still paying out more than \$700 million a year in interest costs—about half of this as the result of the mismanagement of the former Government. We remain confident that the changes now being implemented across the public sector, as the Government redefines its spending priorities, will pay long-term dividends through ensuring that the State has an economic and skills base which will continue to attract development and importantly sustainable jobs growth.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I bring up the annual report 1994-95 of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

BLAIKIE, DR D.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier still maintain that he has a clear and accurate recollection of the events surrounding the sacking of Dr David Blaikie even though a Supreme Court judge and the Government's own lawyer in the case acknowledge that the Premier's recollection in court was not the truth and was not a true recollection? In his judgment, Justice Olsson found that the Premier's recollection of events was 'mistaken'. The judge went on to say that Mr Moss, the Government's lawyer in the case, 'very properly conceded that to be so'. The judge said that he 'unhesitatingly preferred the evidence of other witnesses to that given by the Premier under oath and in court.' Was the judge wrong?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Once again the Leader of the Opposition is trying to defend incompetence. Incompetence in this case—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. We are commencing a new session. Members are entitled to ask questions and Ministers are then entitled to answer them. I will not have members asking follow up questions by way of interjection.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the incompetent management of the Health Commission as we came to Government. Here was a Government agency spending \$1 400 million of taxpayers' money and wasting much of that money while the waiting lists were blowing out. We know the extent to which, during 1993, the management of the Health Commission was totally inadequate. As the new Government, we moved in and did what I thought was appropriate for any new Government, which was to replace the incompetent management.

I point out that Dr Blaikie himself acknowledged the right of the Government to change the management of any

Government agency, particularly where it was dissatisfied with the management of that agency. That was clearly the case. We gave the warning before the election. We made it quite clear that there would be changes, and the Health Commission was one of the areas targeted for change. I make it quite clear to the House that I acted for the benefit of all South Australian taxpayers, because I would not allow incompetence at the management level of the Health Commission to waste tens of millions of dollars.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You swore on oath.

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If I had my chance again I would do exactly the same thing and replace Dr Blaikie as CEO and Chair of the Health Commission; no other responsible new Government could do otherwise.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

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

Mr Cummins interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have a very clear recollection of my meeting with Dr Blaikie, and I stand by the evidence I gave to the court. I asked Dr Blaikie to step down as CEO because his management of the Health Commission was losing and wasting millions of dollars within the Health Commission. It was therefore appropriate that that action was taken, as it was with a number of other Government agencies. I believe that the steps I took, together with replacing other CEOs, were appropriate to protect the broad interests of South Australian taxpayers and to do something about the people on the waiting lists.

Look at what this Government has achieved in that area. We have halved the number of people waiting more than 12 months for elective surgery. We significantly reduced the waiting lists and did so by achieving significant new efficiencies within the Health Commission. That is the sort of inefficiency that existed under Dr Blaikie. Why did he not introduce casemix? Why did he not take action to make sure that the hospitals stuck to their budgets? Why did he not take action to make sure that something was done about reducing those waiting lists? That is why I acted to remove Dr Blaikie, and I stand by that action.

GOVERNMENT ROAD SHOW

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): What was the outcome of the South Australian road show that the Premier led to Sydney and Melbourne last week? What information about South Australia's competitive edge did the Premier provide to company executives who participated?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The road show was a stunning success in promoting South Australia, particularly to key decision makers in Melbourne and Sydney. It was interesting to see South Australia presented as a State now changing very significantly under the new Government; where a number of major new achievements were being made and where we had strategies to put in place a significant expansion of our economic base. Unfortunately, the dark days of the Bannon-Arnold years of Labor were still in the minds of many people in New South Wales and Victoria. It was important that we started to change those perceptions in the minds of people in those States. Last week, we were able to take to Sydney and Melbourne a road show that presented a very different picture of this State.

One of the key items of the road show was what is known as the 'world competitiveness report', which takes the 41 developed nations of the world and ranks them on competitive features in a range of different areas. We took the State of South Australia and injected it into those 41 developed nations of the world. It was interesting to see where South Australia currently sits under this new Government in those areas. The areas where South Australia ranks in the top five amongst those developed countries are as follows: low cost of accommodation, abundant natural resources, low population density, high life expectancy, high labour force participation, very high literacy rates, openness to other cultures (which is extremely important if you are to get into the Asian markets), high quality of life generally, low inflation, low labour costs and—and this is a very unique feature—lots of computing power. In fact, we were about third in the world in terms of the use of computers and the availability of personal computers to people.

South Australia ranked first in the world in two crucial areas: affordability of housing and quality of living. In those two areas South Australians can hold their heads high and say that they are the best amongst the 41 developed countries of the world. We ranked second in another area which I do not think we often give ourselves credit for: unit labour costs for manufacturing industry. That shows that South Australia is a very competitive location in which to establish new manufacturing industry and other industries such as information technology.

It was interesting to see that, immediately after the road show, a large number of business people and key decision makers came to me and complimented South Australia on the superb road show. In fact, the advertising people from interstate who attended said that we had now set a whole new standard in terms of presentation from any agency. We brought together the unique features of an IBM think pad, a CD-Rom and visual and audio presentations in a one hour spectacular which highlighted the changes taking place in South Australia, our very competitive location for new industrial and other developments, and the opportunities available in this State in terms of a skilled labour force, which has and has had an excellent industrial relations record for many years.

I will provide the House with an example of the sort of response we have received to the road show in the form of a letter from a key business person in Sydney, who I will not name because it is probably inappropriate. The letter states:

Congratulations on an excellent multimedia presentation on the benefits of doing business in South Australia. Comment from other guests was very supportive and we all agreed it gave us a new insight into your State and reminded us of some of the unique benefits the State offers, particularly from a marketing and communications viewpoint. While we are not in a position to relocate to South Australia, we now have a greater awareness of what your State has to offer. I wish you and the State every success.

Frankly, that reflects the overwhelming view of the people who attended the road show. I take this opportunity to thank the media from South Australia for participating in that presentation. The media paid most of the cost, the three private television stations, all the commercial radio stations, the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* having come together in a unique exercise. People interstate said that it was the first time ever that they had known all the commercial media to come together in one presentation and the first time they had known of the Government joining with the private media in

making a formal presentation on their State. Listening to that presentation, I was proud to be a South Australian.

In Sydney last Tuesday we opened the new South Australian office. It will be a key feature not only in the lead up to the 2000 Olympics but also in helping present South Australia to the State of New South Wales. Importantly we are looking for commercial opportunities, contracts, and so on, going into the Olympic Games and putting in the infrastructure. We are looking for the opportunity to work with New South Wales to attract a significant increase in tourism, particularly in the year 2000, and we want to attract to South Australia some of the many sporting teams that will be looking for training locations from 1997 through to the year 2000 in the lead up to the 2000 Olympics. We were the first State in Australia to open an office for the 2000 Olympic Games, and that in itself has received a great deal of attention and drawn the support of the New South Wales Government.

The other point worth noting is that Mr Mal Hemmerling, former CEO of the Grand Prix in South Australia who put on 10 excellent Grand Prix events in this State, has now been selected as the CEO organising the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney.

BLAIKIE, DR D.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

Given that the Premier stands by his recollection of events involving Dr Blaikie, will the Government or the South Australian Superannuation Board appeal against the decision of Mr Justice Olsson, which found in favour of Dr Blaikie and said:

The Premier's memory of what transpired and was said to have taken place simply cannot be reconciled with the evidence of either Mr Schilling or Mr Foreman, the Commissioner for Public Employment.

On 14 September the Premier told the *7.30 Report*:

The Government is considering appealing the decision handed down this morning.

Premier, you are not under oath; you can tell the truth now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows full well that the last part of his question was comment and therefore contrary to Standing Orders. If members wish to carry on in such a way, other sections of Standing Orders will be used. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We all know the performance of the Labor Party in this matter. When the Labor Party had Marcus Clarke to get rid of, how did it shut him up? It paid him \$1 million! It cost \$1 million in hush money for the Labor Party to shut up Marcus Clarke. The former Labor Government, having got this State into a disastrous financial position, then decided to try to buy silence from those who would have pointed the gun at the Labor Ministers and finished their careers completely.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Then there was Bruce Guerin. When you cannot work with the head of the Premier's Department, what do you do? You do not say, 'That's it—we terminate your contract': you send him off to a university for five years and guarantee him the full pay of the head of the Premier's Department, no matter what that might be, for the next five years, and—there is more to come—at the end of that time still allow him to come back into the public sector on his full pay! The extent to which the Labor Party literally threw away millions of taxpayers' dollars simply to buy silence from those whom they wanted

to get rid of is incredible. This Government takes the hard decisions and, if we think someone is unsuitable as a CEO, we will terminate that person's contract. I did this immediately after the election and I will do so again whenever I think it appropriate. As far as the appeal is concerned, that matter is still under consideration.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson may be terminated from sitting in the Chamber.

MYER CENTRE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Treasurer inform the House of the reasons for the Government's agreeing to the sale of the Myer Centre—the worst single investment of the former State Bank? After the Treasurer announced last week that the Myer Centre had been sold to a Queensland-based company, Intro International, for \$151 million, there was some criticism that the Government should have held on to the property in the hope of a better price.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I was somewhat bemused by the statements made by the member for Playford and thought that he had had a severe loss of memory. I remind the House that the total all-up cost of the Myer Centre to the point of agreement of sale was \$1 066 million, and who is responsible—Labor! I know that the present Leader of the Opposition was one person who was urging for that project to go ahead because at that time the then Premier was desperate to get up one development in this State when nobody wanted to know about this State. The Leader of the Opposition is right up there with them in terms of the disaster that occurred.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The total cost of on-the-ground changes made there was \$557 million dollars, with accumulated interest right through the process of the project, which came about a year late and doubled the cost, and that is why \$1 066 million in total was the accumulated cost of the project. No-one opposite can ever feel comfortable again about the disaster visited upon the State as a result: \$900 million worth of losses directly attributable to the former Premier, the former Government, including some advisers who now sit on the opposite side.

When the member for Playford, the trainee Treasurer, says, 'Why don't you hold it?', I inform him, if he wants a briefing on what returns are currently coming from that property, that \$151 million is a very good price, given the returns capable of being earned from that property. If we held it for another year, we would need to add on another 10 per cent, amounting to \$165 million that we would have to get next year simply to keep pace with the holding costs associated with that property. There must be some realism in the understanding of the drama, the trauma and everything else visited upon South Australia simply because of that decision. I can well recall the comments made by the Audit Commission, namely:

The project was beset with difficulties from the outset. The most telling factor in this whole disastrous chapter is that the viability of the project was highly questionable and, indeed, questioned from the start.

At the same time as this highly questionable project was being undertaken we had all these smelly union mates on site causing great delays in the project.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I know that, despite the controls that existed, 1 100 lined up for WorkCover and I understand that some remain on it. I got chapter and verse what occurred in terms of the rorts by the union officials and employees on that site. If I wanted to go back through the records, I could give the details to the House again. All up there was a total of \$80 million which, if you look at the interest cost, probably meant that another \$160 million was added to the cost of the project simply because the former Government could not control industrial affairs and was willing to put a project further in jeopardy due to the activities of their union mates. In future I expect them to stand up for South Australia and not for smelly activities.

SCHILLING, MR M.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier say why the former CEO of the Premier's own department, Mr Michael Schilling, is still on full pay of more than \$2 000 a week three months after he was sacked by the Premier and when the Premier had assured the House that Mr Schilling was entitled to no more than four weeks notice? On 4 July the Premier announced that he had terminated Mr Schilling's contract. On 27 July he assured the House that Mr Schilling was entitled only to a four-week notice period and would continue to be paid for only a couple more days. Did the Premier accurately and truthfully inform the House? Was Mr Schilling still being paid?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, Mr Schilling's contract did only require four weeks' notice, and so I accurately reflected that to the House. Mr Schilling's contract was terminated—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will tell you why. The reason Mr Schilling is where he is at present is simple indeed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: His contract was terminated under the Public Sector Management Act and, when that Act went through the Parliament, Labor and Democrat members voted for it and, as part of the discussions that occurred with the Government, specifically asked for that provision to be included.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In the discussions with the Government they stipulated that, if the legislation was to get through the Council, we had to include a three month termination clause in the Act. So, it was the Labor Party members in the other House who specifically asked for that to go through as part of the legislation. In the discussions we had with them, to make sure we got the legislation through, the Government agreed to include that provision, which was not in the original legislation. I can inform the House, first, that Mr Schilling received notification of termination of his contract from me in a letter; and, secondly, that it took effect from 1 August 1995. The contract is now being terminated under the Public Sector Management Act as supported by the Labor Party members of the Upper House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to members that they contain themselves.

HEALTH SYSTEM

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Does the Minister for Health agree with some publicly expressed views that the health care system in South Australia is in crisis and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I do agree that there were a number of headlines to that end in the paper. Headlines including 'Hospitals' cash crisis', 'Funding crisis hits hospitals' and 'Hospital cash cuts "may cost lives"', and so on, make good reading if you are trying to sell a few papers but they are actually short of the mark. Let us be clear: the articles did not focus on health care delivery: at issue was hospital finance.

As we look to the future, despite all the tidings of woe, the hospitals coped particularly well last year which, as everyone realises, was the first of a three year strategy by the Government to help get South Australia's finances back in order. In fact, so well did the hospitals cope last year that the health sector returned \$35 million to the taxpayers of South Australia. In the 12 months to March, the level of services increased by 4 per cent; the activity increased by 4 per cent despite giving the taxpayers of South Australia a \$35 million dividend. Waiting lists fell by 10 per cent. As the Premier said in answer to an earlier question, the number of people waiting more than 12 months for their operation (that number was escalating under the previous Government) fell by 50 per cent in 12 months. The latest figures show that metropolitan hospitals have increased their activity overall by 7 per cent. Clearly, that is not a health crisis.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the member for Giles, the former Treasurer, would know from his short stint as Minister for Health during which no changes were made to the system, the hospitals do their best to make their case seem better so that, hopefully, they will get more money. For instance, on 21 September last year—12 months virtually to the day that the headlines to which I referred were published—we opened our paper and saw 'Extra \$7 million sliced from QEH budget' and the article stated:

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital management says it has been dealt another \$7 million cut in the recent State budget, the third 'drastic' . . . cut in three years.

In other words, that was going on under the previous Government as well. Members whose electorates surround the Queen Elizabeth Hospital may get a copy of their monthly review, and they will see on the inside front cover board notes of each month's meeting: at the last meeting, on the board's own figures, activity increased last year by 7.3 per cent and the actual deficit—despite this sort of stuff in the paper—'extra \$7 million', 'budget crisis', and so on—reported in the board's papers was only \$200 000. It was \$200 000 down out of \$115 million or \$120 million. In essence, that is a tiny percentage. Indeed, the hospital deserves to be congratulated.

When we are looking at a hospital crisis, it is important to note, as I said before, that there is no suggestion that any of the care is suffering and, indeed, anyone reading the most recent editions of the *Advertiser* last week would have noted that immediately next to stories about cash crises were articles about how well hospitals were coping. There was a terrific story in there from someone who had been in a renal ward time and time again, and this person actually said how much he enjoyed the new system of looking after patients, which is to get them over their acute problem and then discharge them from the hospital to the home, which is much cheaper and exactly what the patients want. No-one wants to

be in hospital and, of course, that is what is now available. The simple fact of the matter is that the hospitals are coping particularly well and patients are getting the care they need and, importantly, are asking for.

SCHILLING, MR M.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's answer to my previous question, remembering his assurances to the House in July, what advice did the Premier seek on the liability of the Government and of the State Superannuation Board before terminating Mr Schilling's contract of employment, and why was this matter not settled in July? On 4 July—almost three months ago—the Premier told the House that the termination conditions in Mr Schilling's contract were 'quite specific' and would be negotiated over 'the next week or so'. 'They are in the contract', the Premier said, 'and are quite clear in terms of the basis on which any payments would be made.' That is quite a different story from what we have been told in answer to my previous question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Schilling's contract is quite specific: four weeks' termination notice had to be given, and I stand by everything I said earlier.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: It's wrong.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The contract is quite clear: four weeks' termination provision had to be given, but there was an overriding factor involving the amendments to the Public Sector Management Bill. When the legislation was being considered in another place, the PSA, the Labor Party and the Australian Democrats specifically asked to have discussions with us and said, 'We won't let this legislation through unless you agree to certain amendments.' We sat down and negotiated those amendments, one of which was to make sure that a minimum of three months' notice was given under the Act. In terms of what advice was received, I received the advice on several occasions; in fact, the termination letter was actually drafted by Crown Law, and all my advice came from Crown Law.

TRAVEL AUSTRALIA BRITAIN SEMINAR

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of the outcome of his recent visit to Jakarta for the Travel Australia Britain Seminar and of the promotional progress being made by South Australia in the lucrative Asian tourism markets?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: One of the most important goals for South Australia is to develop the Asian tourism market. One of the biggest and most important trade fairs in Asia is the Travel Australia Britain Seminar (TABS). This year was the last seminar in which Britain will be involved: it will become purely and simply an Australian trade fair into Asia. I was proud to walk into the seminar and see the South Australian Travel Bureau that had been set up, which involved 15 South Australian individuals from 11 organisations. It was impressive to see them dressed up in the R.M. Williams gear, which was manufactured in South Australia. That sent a specific message, selling the Tourism Commission and its new wine logo. It was a very impressive stand, and it made me proud to be South Australian.

It became apparent that 27 million Indonesians have incomes higher than the average income in Australia. So of

190 million Indonesians, 27 million are available to the Australian market. We also found out from the travel certificates that, in the past five years, there has been a 500 per cent increase in the number of Indonesian visitors moving around the world. As Australia is so close, they see it as a huge opportunity for them and for us. It was also interesting to note that the Indonesian traveller is the second highest spender in the world, spending about \$3 500 per visit wherever they go. That is a high figure relative to that for the general tourist.

The main reason for being there is that South Australia had the biggest increase in Asian tourism of all the States of Australia: it had a 51 per cent increase in tourism visits out of Asia. The overall increase in South Australia was 22 per cent and the national average increase was 12 per cent. This Government is making sure that the economic opportunity of tourism is sold to our near neighbours, and Indonesia will be one of the big opportunities for us in the future.

SCHILLING, MR M.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier still stand by his statement to this House that, following his sacking, Mr Michael Schilling's total pay-out, including superannuation, will be less than \$200 000? On 5 July, the Premier told the House that Mr Schilling was 'eligible for less than one year's salary' under his contract and, therefore, would be eligible for a payment of less than \$200 000 after the Premier had sacked him. Like Dr Blaikie, Mr Schilling is a member of the old State superannuation scheme.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I said to the House before—and I stand by what I said—Mr Schilling's contract is quite specific: he is entitled to no more than a pay-out of 12 months' salary under that contract. We have all known for some time that the Superannuation Act, on which the Deputy Leader ended up, is unsatisfactory when it comes to retrenchment because, even though the person may be only in their 40s or 50s, once they are retrenched, they get the same superannuation pay out as though they had carried on in the public sector right through to the age of 60.

I throw out a simple challenge to the Labor Party, the Leader and the Deputy Leader: are they prepared to support the Government to stop the rotting of the Superannuation Act by people who are retrenched or whose contracts are terminated because of unsatisfactory performance in the public sector so that that level of payment is not made as currently required under the law? Most people would agree that it is an outdated and unsatisfactory procedure that someone who is retrenched—particularly when they are on the sorts of executive salaries we are talking about—should be able to continue to receive their full superannuation, even after they have been retrenched. If the Government brings an amendment into the House, I ask Labor Party members—and it is a challenge to them now; they can nod their agreement without interjecting—whether they will support amendments to that Act. Equally, will you support—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—amendments to the Public Sector Management Act so that these people on huge salaries in the executive level of Government are not required to be paid an additional three months, as you asked for in the Upper House? There is a challenge to the Labor Party: support those two legislative changes so that these excessive, greedy grabs

for money, from people whose employment contracts are terminated, do not continue into the future. I look forward to the support of the Leader and the Deputy Leader on that basis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the first day of the new session, and the Chair has been particularly tolerant.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Those sorts of comments will not assist the honourable member. I suggest that the Deputy Leader just take a breath, because he is aware of the Standing Orders.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development advise the House of the current level of staffing within the multifunction polis and what achievements have been made in the past 18 months? Recently, allegations have been made in the media concerning the investment in the MFP and the level of salaries being paid to its staff.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As background, I point out to the House that information was supplied to the Economic and Finance Committee about 10 days ago on a confidential basis. The MFP gave to that committee information before details were tabled in this Parliament on the condition—as ordinarily ought to be the case in any event—that that information would be treated confidentially by the Economic and Finance Committee. I was somewhat concerned and alarmed to read details of that released to the *Advertiser*, on page 1. But, in relying on a leak from a source not determined—but one might have a fair idea—the fact is that they did not get it right, because that might have spoiled a good story.

Let us put on the record some of the real facts in relation to this matter. First, the MFP's annual budget last financial year was \$36.276 million—not \$21.9 million—and it was fully expended, unlike the member for Playford's claims at the close of the Economic and Finance Committee meeting on its last occasion. I invite the member for Playford to clearly read the balance sheet before drawing inaccurate conclusions such as that. The other point I make about this article is that salaries accounted for 5 per cent of the MFP's budget last year, not 10 per cent, as was reported in that article.

The article claimed that 13 staff were now receiving over \$100 000 in salary packages compared with three in the previous year. Six—nearly half that number of staff—were engaged under contract by the former Government (not this Government) and were included in the figures this year because as at last year's report they had not completed a full financial year. The CEO, Mr Kennan, was one of those appointees. I am advised that the former Government appointed Mr Kennan on a five-year contract in May 1993—six months before the election campaign that members opposite would care to forget about. Six months before that they made that contract for Mr Kennan and six of the 13 that the member for Playford now talks about publicly in the paper. A further three staff members changed remuneration arrangements which resulted in their total package being different and including them in the list.

I say to this House: what hypocrisy from the member for Playford who is reported as saying that he was frustrated and angry at not being able to question the enormous explosion in executive salaries when his own Party appointed half those

people to the MFP during its term in office. I invite the member for Playford to talk to his Leader, who was the Minister responsible for the MFP during the period we are talking about. Perhaps they could collaborate a little, unlike the obvious state of play on the other side of the House at the moment, and then perhaps he might get some of the facts accurate.

Another point has been totally overlooked in this article in the *Advertiser*, as reported from this anonymous source—obviously, perhaps, a member of a committee—and it is this: MFP Australia, like any other Government agency, has had to reduce—and I stress that it has had to reduce—its employment numbers by 10 per cent. Staffing numbers are currently 50, and during the last quarter of the last financial year five positions were discontinued, two of which are in the category which the member for Playford is now angry and frustrated about but about which he did not show any anger and frustration in 1993 when the Government of which he was a member entered into these contracts that we have inherited. These contracts are for three and five years, and they have a right of renewal for a year at their conclusion. That is what we inherited. These executive salaries and arrangements that are now in place are not of our doing: like the Remm Centre and a range of other things, they are a carry-over from the poor administration of the—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Deputy Leader should be a little patient, because he will have egg on his face when the full details of the contract are eventually explained to this House—have no fear about that. I point out the hypocrisy of the member for Playford, who was actually the Chair of the Economic and Finance Committee at the time these contracts were signed by the former Labor Administration. So, the plot thickens even further. What hypocrisy to come into this House and enthusiastically support the misinformation that is being peddled in the media to set a perception. I ask the member for Playford, as the Opposition has conveniently forgotten, rather than trying to get a second rate headline, to look at some of the real achievements that are now coming to the fore with MFP Australia. I refer to the environmental clean-up work being done at Barker Inlet, Range and Magazine Creeks, and the Australia Asia Business Consortium, to mention only two. The simple fact is that, if the member for Playford wants to play with a straight bat in relation to the MFP and executive salaries, which does not seem to be happening at the moment, let him get all the facts, be totally honest and apply some integrity rather than hypocrisy to his replies.

EMERGENCY SERVICES MINISTER

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Minister for Emergency Services continue to enjoy the full confidence of the Premier or will he be moved to a new portfolio at the mid-term reshuffle? The longest ever police pay dispute has now escalated to include firefighters and ambulance officers and the passing of a motion of no-confidence in the Minister. The Police Association has now called for the Minister to be sacked. On 24 August, the Premier publicly rebuked the Minister and said, 'It was necessary to concentrate on resolving the industrial issues involved.' Only CFS volunteers and his own staff are not in conflict with him.

The SPEAKER: That is a comment. The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, I always find it amusing how predictable the Opposition is. Each day, in the three or four minutes before Question Time, I jot down what I think the first five or six questions across the House will be. Lo and behold, every day in every Question Time, out come the predictable questions. It would appear that members opposite do not have a brain in their head in terms of political nous and trying to develop issues.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Like your honesty before—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The second important lesson for members opposite regarding Question Time is that after being a little bit original they should check their facts. Unfortunately, the shadow Treasurer did not bother to check the facts because this morning the firefighters were ordered by the Industrial Commission to go back to work and to lift all bans. So, he ends up with egg on his face when he talks about the continued dispute with firefighters.

The other interesting point is that, if members opposite wished to put a fair and reasonable case in relation to these industrial disputes, the first thing they would do is stand up and say, 'Over the past four or five years the police have actually received six pay increases.' Let us look at these six pay increases that the police have received. On 2 September 1991, they received a weekly increase of \$13.50 for a constable and \$16 for a sergeant; on 17 September 1991, they received \$13.80 for a constable and \$16.40 for a sergeant; on 3 February 1992, they received an increase of \$13.80 for a constable and \$16.40 for a sergeant; on 1 July 1992, they received an increase of \$11.10 for a constable and \$16.40 for a sergeant; on 16 November 1994, they received an \$8 per week increase for both constables and sergeants; and on 20 July 1995, they received an \$8 increase under the safety net provisions for both constables and sergeants.

The first observation I make is that the police must have had a pretty good secretary in 1991-92, as he seemed to be able to achieve wage increases for them without making a ripple on the surface. In those days, the police secretary achieved four pay increases in just 12 months. I point out that the misinformation that has been handed around that the police have had no increase whatsoever since 1991 is not correct: they have had six increases.

The honourable member asked me whether I have confidence in the Minister for Emergency Services. The answer is 'Yes.' As I have indicated already, unlike the Labor Party, I am not about to carry out a reshuffle. We have seen what has happened with the Labor Party over the past day or so. It is reshuffling, or you could call it recycling. This morning, it recycled Paul Holloway, a defeated candidate at the last election. He failed there. Let us—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the opening day. The Chair has been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Order 137 will be applied rigorously if members ignore the Chair. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is aware of that, as are the member for Hanson and the member for Peake.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Labor Party has recycled one of its failed candidates at the last election—he was a member of the failed team. Just last Sunday it decided to

recycle Michael Wright for the seat of Lee—a failed candidate at the last election. What happened to the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Mawson contain himself.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am wondering why an announcement has not yet been made about the winner of the Lee preselection for the Labor Party. Where is Ms Chesser, the preferred candidate of the Leader of the Opposition? He was openly beating his chest before the preselection about his preferred candidate, and what has happened to her? She has disappeared, and why? Because the Labor Party knew that, if it did not put Michael Wright up, it would have the AWU really causing trouble within the Labor Party. It has become the slave of the AWU, and if anyone wants evidence of that they have only to look at the result last Sunday. There were pleas from members within the Labor Party that they wanted more women, and the Leader of the Opposition said, 'Here is our preferred candidate.' What happened to her? She went down in a screaming heap.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Even the member for Giles this morning acknowledged that he is past his use-by date and is about to go as well.

CONTAMINATED SITES

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources explain how he intends to handle the increasing number of assessments now being called for on suspected contaminated sites?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The matter the member for Light has raised is important because there has been a significant increase in the amount of interest in this subject. There has been a large increase in assessments carried out and, in the future, it is the intention of this Government to have these assessments of contaminated sites in South Australia undertaken by independent external environmental auditors. New levels of environmental awareness and also new standards being sought by health and environmental agencies have meant an increase to about 100 a year in the number of contaminated sites being assessed by the State.

These assessments are currently being carried out by Environment Protection Authority staff on land that has a history of possible contamination. We are, of course, talking about sites such as old service stations, railway yards, manufacturing sites, land fills, and so on. So, from 1 November this year, assessments of contaminated sites in South Australia will be undertaken by independent external environmental auditors. The move to outsource the assessments will help speed up the processing of the increasing number of reports being forwarded to the EPA. Auditors now will be required to evaluate the environmental quality of a site and assess the extent and type of contamination and whether any clean up is required.

They will also provide recommendations on how the clean up should be carried out. The approach South Australia is adopting is similar to that of New South Wales and Victoria and fits in with moves towards adopting national practice and standards. Finally, it is also appropriate that the environmental audits be undertaken externally to satisfy requirements of the public in ensuring that any assessment is seen to be independent of Government. This matter has been raised on

a number of occasions, and I am pleased to say that these new procedures will soon be put in place.

OUTSOURCING CONTRACTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the Auditor-General's concerns about proper disclosure and breaches of the law, will the Government comply with the recommendations of the Auditor-General concerning the proper disclosure to Parliament of the EDS contract and the water outsourcing contracts? The Auditor-General suggests a range of changes to improve accountability and transparency; to improve disclosure to Parliament; and, most seriously, to prevent actions by Ministers and agencies that are contrary to law. The Auditor-General's Report recommends a balancing of the Government's legitimate commercial interests with the rights of this Parliament to be informed about what is going on. In fact, the Auditor-General's Report states:

The suggested approach is to establish a legal framework in which a summary of all arrangements entered into that extend over more than one financial year and are over a specified minimum dollar value be required to be tabled in Parliament.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition has taken some conclusions of the Auditor-General in one area and tried to imply that they cover other areas. He just did it. He took the section where the Auditor-General talks about Executive Government action and the rule of law and related it to the EDS and water contracts. In fact, the Auditor-General has not in any way criticised either the EDS contract or the water contract. With the full support of this Government, the Auditor-General has looked at how one makes sure there is transparency in respect of the contracting out of Government operations. In fact, he had my full support to look at the internal revenue service of the United Kingdom.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: He does not need your support; he is independent. He reports to Parliament, not you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He had my full support because he discussed it with me. I encouraged the Auditor-General to look at large overseas contracts that involved the contracting out of Government services, such as the internal revenue service. In fact, the Government had previously looked at that as part of the outsourcing of its data processing, and so the Auditor-General went to England. In fact, the subject was discussed during the Estimates Committees when the Shadow Treasurer asked a series of questions. Again, there appears to have been a breakdown in dialogue between the Shadow Treasurer and the Leader. The Leader should realise that many of the points he raises today were clearly covered in the Estimates Committees.

The Auditor-General in his report has highlighted the fact that it is important to ensure there is full transparency of contracts which are part of the contracting out of Government operations. I support that, and this Government supports that. I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that it is pretty shabby to stand up and throw a net over the entire Auditor-General's Report, and any subject touched in it, in the way that he did and try to imply some sort of improper action.

TAFE COUNTRY STUDENTS

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What recent developments have occurred between the

University of South Australia and TAFE that will assist country students in the future?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: This is a tremendous breakthrough in the delivery of programs for people in the country. In conjunction with TAFE, the University of South Australia will be offering degree programs, initially in the Riverland and the Barossa, starting with a Bachelor's degree in accountancy. It represents a huge improvement in terms of access for country people who generally have only half the participation rate in universities compared with city people. This Government is not prepared to sit back and allow that situation to continue. To the credit of the University of South Australia it has come on board and TAFE will deliver its programs in our centres in those two regions.

In addition, in an arrangement with the Spencer Institute (which covers the Iron Triangle and Eyre Peninsula) and the University of South Australia, we will allow the university to use our electronic facilities and learning centres to deliver a range of degree programs. For the first time people in many country areas in South Australia will have access to university programs. I have already signalled to Flinders University and the University of Adelaide that I expect them also to be involved in the delivery of programs to our country people. They are universities for all South Australians, and all South Australians have a right to access programs which they offer.

TAFE has 60 locations throughout the State. I have offered those sites to the universities as well as our electronic classroom network, which is the largest in the world, to assist in the delivery of programs. We are world leaders in terms of what we are offering, and this is a major breakthrough for people in rural South Australia. The member for Chaffey will be pleased that part of the initial program will be in his area, but I look forward in the near future to offering programs to a variety of locations throughout South Australia covering a range of degree options.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Treasurer agree with criticisms made by the Auditor-General in his report, released today, that graphs claiming to show a cut in Government expenditure through the budget are misleading and do not meet adequate standards of financial reporting? The Auditor-General's Report inquired into the financial information on page 2.8 of Financial Paper No. 1 claiming that the present Government's financial policy was resulting in big outlays compared with the previous Government's policy. The Auditor-General found that a budget graph was misleading, was not based on verifiable data and that the Treasury had not 'been able to find the worksheets used at the time.' The Auditor-General further points out that Treasury could not provide figures substantiating the claim made on page 2.8 of the budget paper and said:

The effect of the material published was to convey an incorrect view of the matter that it represented.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I entirely agree with the Auditor-General's views about the graph. The graph was inappropriate in that the curve was too steep, and that was brought to the attention of Treasury. If anybody wants to look at it, they can see what the old one was and what the new one is because of the addendum and they can then use a line of sight. I do not think that any of us here could pick it. However, once it was brought to our attention we agreed that it was misleading. It has been reworked, and I think that it now reflects a more

accurate picture. I was more than happy to have the matter sorted out.

MAGILL TRAINING CENTRE

Mrs HALL (Coles): My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services. What is the future of the Magill Training Centre, and are there any plans to close it down? A number of my constituents have contacted me about the possibility that the centre is to be relocated and the current property turned over to residential development. Given the particular interest that Rostrevor College has in the continuing use and maintenance of the oval and the specific interest that the Black Hill Pony Club has in the use of the land and facilities in the area, will the Minister outline the plans and possible timing for this project?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The future of the Magill Training Centre has been under question for some time. I know that the previous Government was considering its future. I am aware of the correspondence and representation that has been made to the member for Coles concerning the future of this land. I can assure the member for Coles that I have received the same representation. The future of the Magill Training Centre needs to be determined as a matter of urgency. Because of its age, location and the need to achieve economies of scale, the facility could well be relocated. As members would be aware, the land is very valuable for real estate in the future.

The member for Coles mentioned Rostrevor College. I have received a deputation from Rostrevor College, of which she was a member. I am very much aware of the contribution that the college has made to that land in the past, particularly the oval, which it has maintained very well over a period of time; and I have indicated to the Black Hill Pony Club that I will give it consideration in any decision that is made.

One option being considered is to collocate the facility with the other site at Cavan. This would provide more flexibility within the system, provide a more streamlined financial approach and release the Magill site for alternative use. I am aware that tremendous interest is being expressed in the Magill site and that we need to make a decision. I hope that we shall be in a position to make a decision on the future of the Magill centre by the end of the year.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier believe that Parliament should have sufficient time to examine fully the Auditor-General's Report, and will he honour his earlier undertaking for 'a one-day discussion' on the report and that the Government would consult the Opposition? On 20 June the Premier told the Estimates Committee that there needed to be 'special provision for discussion of the Auditor-General's Report,' and he referred to the possibility of 'a one-day discussion.' The Premier also promised that the Deputy Premier 'will be in touch with the Opposition to discuss that matter.' Following correspondence initiated by the Opposition, the Deputy Premier, without consultation, has simply told the Opposition that there will be only a three-hour evening session of the House set aside to debate the Auditor-General's Report with limited opportunities for direct questioning of Ministers.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I realise that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is a new boy to this place, but he

has the next two weeks in the Address in Reply debate. I think the period is half an hour each.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You will have enormous opportunities over the next two weeks to debate the detail. As I said, there will be a specific opportunity to debate the Auditor-General's Report, and that will be after the Address in Reply debate. There will be plenty of chances and an enormous opportunity to debate the matter. In fact, the next two weeks effectively provide an opportunity for the Opposition to say whatever it likes about the Auditor-General's Report.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There will be 50 questions for the next five days. I point out that there is the Address in Reply debate, and there will be a specialist debate in about a fortnight or three weeks.

BUILDING CERTIFICATION

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Is the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations reassessing the outcome of Government changes to allow private certification of buildings? There have been indications from some councils that the new system does not give sufficient protection to new home builders, particularly in view of the dropping of the requirement for private inspectors to have insurance cover for up to 10 years.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The short answer is 'Yes'. Discussions are going on with my officers and people in the industry. We have not as yet made a decision. The feedback that we are getting is that it is the way to go, but if the scheme can be improved the Government is happy to consider it.

BANK ACCOUNTS

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): My question is to the Treasurer. What is the State Government's response to calls by the Federal Treasurer to amalgamate existing taxes on bank accounts? In a recent report the Prices Surveillance Authority has urged the States to merge the financial institutions duty with bank account debits tax.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the member for Norwood for his very important question. I am sure that the shadow Treasurer would agree that the State can ill afford to give away money, particularly when we consider that FID and BAD taxes resulted from decisions taken at Commonwealth level. The former Treasurer will clearly understand that the FID tax came about as a result of the Commonwealth Government's reducing grants to the States, which it did in quite dramatic form. Over the past 10 years we would have lost between \$350 million and \$400 million per annum in grants had they stayed in the same relationship as existed in the early 1980s.

The Federal Government has taken \$350 million to \$400 million off this State and made life very difficult. At the same time as this was happening FID was allowed for the broadening of the tax base and to allow the States to recoup some of the revenue lost to the Commonwealth. The BAD tax was a Commonwealth tax that was handed over to the States. Again, that was the result of changes taking place to reduce the amount paid to us in grants.

So, we inherited the tax and the Commonwealth gave us less money again. When the Federal Treasurer, who has had trouble sorting out the banks, tells them, 'Well, you have to

do the right thing about charges; now it is time for the States to come to the party', I do not think anybody in this House would wish this Treasurer to change his mind on these taxes unless, indeed, the Commonwealth gave us full compensation for any changes. I am sick and tired of the Commonwealth blaming the States, not repairing its own ship, taking more money from the States and placing more pressure on them. It does not operate as an effective business in the Federal arena. If the Commonwealth wants to deal with the banks in that way let it reimburse the States, which lose out of any reconstruction. I am all in favour of reconstructing FID and BAD but not at the expense of the revenue of the State, because that means we have to increase other taxes elsewhere, blow out our deficit and our debt or further reduce employment. I am sure that nobody in this House wants any of those outcomes. I hope that in the dealings the Labor Opposition has with our Federal counterparts the message can be made quite clear: if Mr Willis wants it, Mr Willis can pay for it.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That for the remainder of the session Standing Orders be so far suspended as to provide that:

(a) At the conclusion of the period for questions without notice the Speaker may propose the question 'That the House note grievances'. Up to six members may speak for a maximum of five minutes each before the Speaker puts the question.

(b) The motion for adjournment of the House on Tuesdays and Wednesdays may be debated for up to 20 minutes provided it is moved before 10 p.m.

(c) The motion for adjournment of the House on Thursdays—
 (i) may be moved later than 5 p.m.;
 (ii) may not be debated.

Motion carried.

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 refer to the Premier's credibility, memory and honesty as determined by a Supreme Court judge. If a Supreme Court judge cannot believe what the Premier says in court under oath, how can the public believe him inside or outside Parliament? A lot has recently been said about people in politics who cannot remember things. I want to talk about someone who maintains that he has a clear and accurate memory of events that occurred 18 months ago when he sacked the head of the Health Commission, Dr David Blaikie. Of course, I am speaking about the Premier—the unreliable witness in a Supreme Court case. The Premier presented an affidavit and was the star witness in the case *Blaikie v. The Superannuation Board*. I understand that the Premier became involved against the best advice of Crown Law and other key advisers. They knew that the Premier would be found wanting under cross-examination and under oath and with a judge under the wig. But the Premier, inspired by arrogance, first supplied a statement and then took the stand.

The Premier's problem is that a Supreme Court judge did not believe his evidence or his recollections. The Government lawyer in the case acknowledged that the Premier was mistaken, and neither of the Crown's other witnesses, the

former head of the Premier's department, Mr Schilling, or the former head of another Government department, Mr Foreman, supported the Premier's version of events. You can imagine what would happen if people on this side of the House were found by a Supreme Court judge to be an unreliable witness: the media would be camped outside their house waiting for judgment day.

It was even acknowledged that if another CEO, Ms Sue Vardon, had been called as a witness she would have been yet another witness to tell a different story of events from that recounted by the Premier. But today the Premier maintains that he has a clear memory of events. However, he has not said whether he will announce an appeal to the case, even though he did so on the *7.30 Report* to try to put a bit of a gloss on the case. The Premier has the clearest recollection of what did not happen when he sacked David Blaikie. Justice Olsson's judgment stated:

As the oral evidence unfolded it rapidly became apparent that there were significant divergences in factual detail which arose between the applicant (Dr Blaikie) and the Premier. In the event I unhesitatingly prefer the evidence given by the former to that given by the latter.

What an amazing indictment on the Premier, the head of Government, of this State. Justice Olsson said:

I simply conclude that he [the Premier] is mistaken as to some aspects which occurred at the time. Indeed. . . counsel—

Mr BASS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. This case may be subject to appeal and, as I do not think the time in which to lodge an appeal has run out, I ask you, Sir, to rule on whether the matter is *sub judice*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The situation is that the matter is not *sub judice* until such time as an appeal has been formally lodged.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can understand why the member for Florey wants to stop debate; we know that he wants to replace Wayne Matthew on the front bench. Let me again quote Justice Olsson:

I simply conclude that he [the Premier] is mistaken as to some aspects which occurred at the time. Indeed. . . counsel for the respondent very properly conceded that must be so.

So, even the Government's own lawyer—the Premier's own counsel—admitted that the Premier's evidence was not true. He did not tell the truth; he did not have true recollections. How extraordinarily humiliating for the chief of Government of this State. In fact, the events surrounding the sacking of David Blaikie have been completely reworked in the Premier's mind. Perhaps the Premier is a bit half Joh, half Ronald Reagan. The judge said that the Premier's memory reflected 'some aspects of what he had in mind rather than what he specifically said to the applicant at the time'. We get used to that every day in this Parliament. Day after day we see the reworking of the Premier's memory in this House. Further, Justice Olsson said:

I am also of the impression that some aspects of his evidence may have been influenced by a degree of *ex post facto* reasoning. This is particularly so as there were important matters of detail testified to by him in the course of his oral evidence which found no expression at all in his affidavit sworn on 18 May 1995.

The Premier, in love with his own testimony, did not tell the truth. If the Premier does not tell the truth under oath in court in front of a Supreme Court judge it is no wonder that so many of us doubt whether he tells the truth in the electorate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Leader that in making his final comments he was in the area where he should have moved a substantive motion if he was to make personal criticisms of a member.

Mr VENNING (Custance): South Australia grieves the loss of one of its most prominent citizens, a prominent farm leader and most successful farmer. Allan Edward Glover died tragically yesterday, aged 61 years of age. He was a larger than life person whose influence spread everywhere, and South Australia, particularly rural South Australia, is in shock at his sudden passing. Allan was one of the finest ambassadors the Eyre Peninsula ever had. Not only was Allan a very successful farmer of great wisdom but also he was a very generous man, helping his fellow farmers and country folk, particularly during the recent rural crisis. He was a very successful and generous man of great influence.

Allan was born in Yeelanna in 1934 and lived there all his life. He was educated at Cummins Area School, married Rhonda and had four children—Peter, Marilyn, Steven and Lisa. He started grain production on the family property in Yeelanna in 1950. He was a justice of the peace and a life member of the Yeelanna Agricultural Bureau. At his death, Allan held the position of Chairman of the Grains Council of Australia's Coarse Grains Committee, a position which he held since 1993. He was until his death Chairman of the South Australian Farmers' Federation grain section, a position which he held with great distinction since 1992.

Allan was also Chairman of the Deep Sea Port Investigation Committee and had held that position since 1992. He was a member of the South Australian Advisory Committee on Barley Quality and a member of the Barley Research Committee of South Australia from 1981 to 1991. He was a member of the South Australian Farmers' Governing Council from 1990 until his death. He was a member of the South Australian Farmers' Federation Executive Committee from 1994 until his death. He was a member of the South Australian Farmers' Federation Insurance Agency Committee in 1994.

So, South Australia is shocked at the loss of such a contributor as Allan Glover. He leaves a huge void that will have to be filled. The Farmers' Federation has lost a pivotal executive member. Allan Glover was a thoroughly good bloke, very friendly and helpful and always ready to seek and to give advice. Allan had many friends, and I was honoured to be one of them, as was the Speaker, the member for Eyre. Often late at night AG would ring me to see what was the state of play, either in this House or on the farm, or to get an opinion about his Farmers' Federation work. Often the fax would go late at night—two or three o'clock in the morning—and it would be Glover with the latest. He has been a tremendous help to me in this House. He was a fearless lobbyist for his beloved West Coast, his farmers and for country folk in general.

The issue of deep sea ports was close to his heart and, as he was Chairman of that committee, I can only say what a tragedy it is that he will not be here when the committee reports to the House in a few weeks.

South Australia mourns the loss of a very prominent West-Coaster, a gentleman and a farm leader. I, along with thousands of other South Australians, was absolutely shocked that Allan Glover was tragically taken. When the news came through yesterday I had to stop in my tracks and sit for a while to consider how we will miss this man.

I am sure that all members of the House will join me in offering his wife Rhonda and their four children—Peter, Marilyn, Steven and Lisa—and their families our sincere condolences. Allan Glover is gone, but his memories and his mark will be long with us.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I wish to raise an issue that deeply concerns me, parents and many in the community. We are angered that the Government is again attacking those who can least afford it, and the issue is the planned reduction in SSO numbers in the education system. Let us look at exactly what these invaluable staff do in the education system. There is the maintenance of accurate school financial records, and I think that even members opposite would agree that it is vital to the smooth and efficient running of any institution, and that is no less so for schools.

SSOs have the computer skills and appropriate qualifications to enable them to have a dramatic input into the system. Who would be doing this work if they go? General maintenance of the school system and records, the control of goods incoming and the maintenance of a safe and clean school environment are all functions of the SSOs. Who will be doing that if they go? Classroom support staff and first-aid management are vital to the safe running of schools, as is the background operation of school laboratories, and who will do that work if they go?

They provide secretarial and clerical services for principals, assistant principals and deputies. They respond to inquiries from students and, in the case of two schools in my electorate, both hearing and hearing impaired students. They also respond to inquiries from parents and members of the public. They maintain and constantly upgrade biographical profiles of hearing impaired students, and this is a vital application in the Klemzig and Windsor Gardens schools in the Torrens electorate.

It is a vital role in anyone's terms, and I ask again: who will do that work if there are SSO reductions in schools? In anyone's terms SSOs are crucial to the safe and efficient running of our schools, and I fail to see the reasoning or understand the logic behind the Government's intent to reduce SSO numbers. With cuts to teacher numbers and the associated increase in class sizes, it is pure madness to attack the very core of the running of our schools. If SSOs do not do these jobs, who will do them? However, the question that is at least equally important—and some would argue that it is more important—is who will suffer from the reduction in SSO numbers. The answer simply must be the students. This decision is a direct cut against students because more staff time will be taken up with administrative functions and less time will be spent with students.

As I have pointed out, SSOs are highly specialised and trained in their duties at the school where they work. I have a list of their functions and have visited the schools to see what they do. SSOs are highly skilled people, and to claim that they are only paid volunteers merely serves to devalue their position. Frankly, it is degrading, as is the thinking that these people could be replaced by parents acting in a voluntary capacity.

The Government must come clean on this matter. The Government has banded about a reduction of 250 SSOs, but the actual figure is much higher because that is 250 full-time equivalents. How many SSOs will be removed from the system? I have brought this issue before the House today because there is a great deal of anger out in the community about this decision. It is beyond question that the decision is wrong for the schools in our State.

The Government's actions in this matter serve to demean SSOs in their service to our schools but, more importantly, it is ultimately our children who will once again suffer from the Government's decision. We have seen on the steps of

Parliament House parents and children demonstrating against the Government's actions.

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

Mr BUCKBY (Light): One issue that has concerned me over a period involves contaminated sites in our community, and in this respect I mean sites that have been polluted either through industrial use, perhaps by chemical companies, or old service station sites and the like. I have one such site in my electorate where a constituent is undertaking the purchase of the Lyndoch railway yards. He has undertaken to develop a manufacturing site on the yards but has found contamination from the leakage of diesel oil from trains that have over many years stopped on the site. Of course, it is beholden on my constituent to ensure that the site is adequately cleaned up before he can undertake the building of a business thereon. The District Council of Barossa is fully agreed as to the clean-up and the establishment of a manufacturing site in Lyndoch.

It was with pleasure that I noted that the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton) in Question Time today announced that reporting on contaminated sites will now be undertaken by independent people. As he said, some 100 reports have been issued to the Environment Protection Authority over the past 12 months. As the Government has a certain view on increasing and improving policy in the environment, particularly over contaminated sites and other sites that are currently earmarked for prospective landfills and that type of issue, it is pleasing to note that by contracting out this job to independent assessors it will be much quicker for people to receive a report on the land site that they currently occupy or intend to buy.

The auditors, in their role, must consider the environmental quality of a site and include in their report the type of contamination, whether a clean-up is required and how that clean-up should be undertaken. This is important because, for example, we have seen many times a company begin business on an old site and somewhere down the track, when it decides to build a new building thereon, finds that there is contamination when it is drilling the footings. As a result, the building is delayed and the company must clean up the site before it can proceed. The owner of the site will have to pay for the independent assessment, so reaffirming the policy of this Government of a user pays system where pollution has occurred.

The benefit to the State is that this procedure will be much quicker than that which is currently undertaken by the EPA due to its restraints and the number of staff available to undertake this process. Also, people who purchase a site will be able to obtain an immediate report and assess the cost to clean it up. As I said, this will apply to a number of areas, that is, old petrol stations, railway yards, manufacturing sites and chemical company sites. This is particularly important in relation to proposed housing developments on old industrial sites. A lot of this is occurring now, particularly in the western suburbs of Adelaide where old industrial sites are being converted into housing sites. This assessment will also be undertaken on new school sites.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I refer to Dr David Blaikie. The Leader of the Opposition has already pointed out the serious shortfalls in relation to the Premier's own credibility on that whole unhappy saga. More particularly, I will refer to Dr Blaikie, the person. As

members will recall, the Premier, both in this House and before Justice Olsson in the witness box, seriously defamed Dr David Blaikie and called him incompetent and incapable and said that they were the reasons behind his dismissal as CEO of the Health Commission. Nothing could be further from the truth with respect to Dr David Blaikie.

Initially, he was appointed Acting Chairman and CEO of the Health Commission in July 1991. Prior to his appointment he had been the Executive Director of the Health Commission's Metropolitan Health Services Division for a period of four years and, following a national executive search by an independent head-hunting company, he was appointed to the permanent position of Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Health Commission in September 1991.

I will cite some statistics in relation to his term of office. In 1989-90, the costs of the Health Commission's budget had increased by 5.8 per cent. When he came into office in 1991, he brought it down to minus .5 per cent, culminating in 1993-94 to 2 per cent. Staff numbers in the central office of the Health Commission were reduced by 10 per cent, whereas as at 30 April this year I note under the current Minister central office staffing has increased by 16 per cent.

I want to draw members' attention to a letter of 31 August 1995 signed by Dr Jill Maxwell and Dr Peter Joseph and addressed to the *Advertiser*. These two former Presidents of the AMA say:

The AMA frequently interacts with the commission—that is, the Health Commission—

over a wide range of issues. Over the period of Dr Blaikie's chairmanship, we had the opportunity to closely observe his performance. We were never in any doubt about his grasp of the issues or his ability to deal with them, even though the outcomes of negotiations were not always in our favour. From our point of view he was a very capable Chairman of the commission.

In a letter dated 24 August, again to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, Mr Hugh Kennare, AM, a former Director of the Dental Health Services of the Health Commission and CEO of the South Australian Dental Services Incorporated, who was Dr Blaikie's boss from 1967 until 1984, said:

I considered Dr Blaikie an outstanding performer, an opinion shared by his contemporary administrators of health and hospital services in South Australia, interstate and overseas. He implemented the policies of Liberal and Labor State Governments without fear or favour, but, strong in character, he never demurred from giving me or Government Ministers his considered professional opinion. Dr Blaikie would have been the ideal officer to implement the Brown Government's policies. But 'incapable' definitely not so.

Mr Brokenshire: Who said that?

Mr CLARKE: Hugh Kennare, a former head of Dental Services Incorporated. There were letters of support from his former Ministers, Don Hopgood and Martyn Evans. I draw members' attention to a letter Dr Hopgood received from Rex Jory, the Deputy Editor of the *Advertiser*, who said:

We have received other letters supporting Dr Blaikie and, while I make no comment on the Premier's action, it is clear Dr Blaikie is highly regarded.

I regret only that the *Advertiser* has not yet seen fit to publish these many letters of congratulations to Dr Blaikie for the work he has done and the outstanding service he has performed for the citizens of South Australia in his professional capacity as a public servant since the mid 1960s. It is an indictment on the Premier that he saw fit to traduce Dr Blaikie's name in this House, to defame him in the Supreme Court. However, Dr Blaikie has the final say: it is the Premier who carries the slur on his name of having a

Supreme Court judge find that he was an unreliable witness, where his evidence could not corroborated even by his own employees.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I rise this afternoon full of joy and pride after finding out in recent weeks that one of my constituents (whom, I might add, I had the pleasure of nominating) was successful in winning the South Australian-Northern Territory National Bank of Australia Small Business Ethnic Award for 1995 for manufacturing. Many members in this Chamber might already have heard of this constituent, Steve Maglieri from Maglieri Wines at Douglas Gully Road, McLaren Flat. Mr Maglieri came to Australia from Italy some 30 years ago and has been a great contributor to our magnificent wine industry in the McLaren Vale district for the past 20 years, marketing wines internationally under the Maglieri Wines label, particularly in Germany and Thailand.

He is the largest producer of Lambrusco in the nation by a country mile and works this magnificent winery complex with his wife, Letizia, and his winery manager, who is a son-in-law, Joseph Cogno. It truly is a small business, a family business, and one that excels in excellence. It has been on an expansion program in the past couple of years, and I was lucky enough recently to visit the winery to see the many hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of new equipment and state-of-the-art technology that Mr Maglieri has brought into the region. It is also great to see the number of new jobs that he is creating.

You could not think of a more worthy recipient than Mr Maglieri, because the Maglieri family are not only great in the business area but also magnificent contributors to the district, being very generous sponsors of many community and sporting programs and projects. Mr Maglieri has been a leader in the Italian community in South Australia, as well as being the current President of McLaren Vale Bocce Club Incorporated.

Later this year I will have the pleasure of being able to facilitate an International Year of Tolerance Family Fun Day at McLaren Vale at the Bocce Club. I would like to put on record my appreciation for the support of Mr Maglieri and the committee at the Bocce Club at McLaren Vale and also that of a friend of mine, Mr Steve Liarchos, the President of the Willunga Southern Districts Multicultural Association. We have combined forces and intend to make sure that everybody in the southern region is aware that 1995 is the International Year of Tolerance. That is important, because multiculturalism and development of our ethnic backgrounds is something that in the past has proved to be of enormous importance to the development of South Australia, indeed of Australia as a whole.

Our Government is absolutely committed further to enhancing and developing multiculturalism and ethnic affairs in South Australia, and that is further supported by the fact that we all know that the Premier of South Australia, Dean Brown, could have opted for any portfolio but chose that of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. That reinforces the commitment that the Liberal Government has to the development and support of multiculturalism and ethnic affairs within the State.

Steve Maglieri and many others of the Italian community have done a great job of developing our region. They have supported some of the traditional wine makers and growers who have been there for in excess of a century and clearly now have put McLaren Vale on the international map.

Mr Maglieri receives a financial award—a trip anywhere in the world—but most importantly on 4 October he will be going to the national titles in Victoria and, as a result of some negotiation by the National Bank, that will be videoed via film links through Atlas Industries to 27 television stations in Asia and to every national capital in Australia. What a wonderful opportunity for Maglieri Winery, for McLaren Vale, for the electorate that I represent and for the southern region of this State as a whole, particularly to further enhance and support the great work that the Maglieris of this State are doing to develop the State and to nurture the magnificent opportunities that people from different ethnic backgrounds bring to South Australia.

In conclusion, I wish Steve Maglieri, Letizia, Joseph and the whole family—all the team at Maglieri Winery—all the very best for that competition. South Australia has not yet won the national competition but I am sure that Mr Maglieri will be the first to do so.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs Atkinson, Brindal, De Laine and Lewis.

Printing: Messrs Ashenden, Blevins, Brokenshire, Clarke and Rossi.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I nominate the member for Frome to move an Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening speech, and move:

That consideration of the Address in Reply be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANS FOR TRANSPLANTATION

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

That the committee appointed by this House on 4 May 1994 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Thursday 30 November.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT

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

That the members of this House appointed to the committee have power to continue their consideration during this session.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIVING RESOURCES

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

That the members of this House appointed to the committee have power to continue their consideration during this session.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON RETAIL SHOP TENANCIES

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

That the members of this House appointed to the committee have power to continue their consideration during this session.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr De LAINE (Price): In the time allocated to me this evening I want to discuss a matter which is of importance to all members of this House. About six weeks ago, the *Sunday Mail* published an article on the effect of the introduction of poker machines into South Australia. The article was written by Mike Duffy. As is quite often the case in the print media in South Australia, the article was incorrect in relation to the reporting of how members voted. The article included 'How your MP voted on the introduction of poker machines'. They were listed under three categories: those who voted for the introduction, those who voted against, and the third and very strange category was of absent, abstained, overseas or resigned members. My name appeared in the latter category, and that was obviously wrong.

The article reported a division on a second or third reading of the Bill but, in fact, the division was called on an amendment to the Bill by the member for Ridley. I called Mike Duffy to inform him of his error, and he said that he had just copied an article in the *Advertiser* which had been published after the passing of a Bill a couple of years ago. I pointed out to him that at that time the article was incorrect and that I had contacted the *Advertiser* and asked for it to be corrected. However, in true fashion nothing happened: the *Advertiser* ignored me, and the article was never corrected. That is irresponsible reporting: the *Advertiser* did not have the guts to admit it was wrong.

The fact that Mike Duffy published in the *Sunday Mail* this article on how members voted without checking the facts indicates sloppy and lazy reporting and journalism. I am particularly angry about it not just for myself but for all members of this House. I told Mike Duffy that it was very important that the error be corrected and that if he did not intend to do so I would pay for a correction to be published because it was important to me and to other members of this House. Mike said that that was not necessary, that he would correct the error. I told him that I would fax to him the *Hansard* record of the division, including the names, and I did. During the following week, another article on pokies was published in the *Sunday Mail*, but the previous account was not corrected. So, I rang Mike Duffy again, and he said that he had not received the information. I faxed him the information again, and this time I checked with his secretary to make sure that he had received it, and he had. Subsequently, there was no correction in the *Sunday Mail* about this anomaly. This is irresponsible, sloppy and lazy reporting and journalism.

I raise this matter not only for my own benefit but also for the benefit of other members on both sides of this House. Whether members be backbenchers, Ministers or even the Premier, it is important to us that we are reported accurately out there in our constituency. I can always wear criticism from opponents about the way I vote or think in my elector-

ate, but I find it very difficult to wear criticism from people who criticise me for not doing what I said I did. I and possibly other members of this House have made it known how they voted on this and other issues over the years. I copped a lot of flak when I opposed the poker machine legislation, but I also got a lot of credit in my electorate for taking that stance.

Over the years I have told people how I voted, and it was accepted that I voted against the poker machines, yet they read in the *Sunday Mail* that I was listed in the absent, abstained, overseas or resigned category. So, they ring up my electorate office and ask, 'Where the hell were you? You tell us you voted against the Bill and we find that you were not even there.' I take up this matter on behalf of all members of this House. It is absolutely lazy, irresponsible, sloppy journalism and, to add insult to injury, the reporters of the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* do not have the guts to come out and admit they were wrong and put the record straight. It is particularly bad, and I am very angry about it on behalf of all members of this House.

It is not only this issue that impacts on us as local members. If the media cannot get it right they put us under enormous strain and pressure and make us look fools or liars, when it is the media that are wrong. I can understand the media making honest errors from time to time, but this case is outrageous. In the first place they copied without question an incorrect article from a couple of years ago and, when I pointed out that it was wrong, they still went ahead, even when I offered to pay for an advertisement to change it. I am disgusted with the *Sunday Mail* and Mike Duffy in particular. He should get a bit more responsible and professional; it is very unprofessional conduct. I insist that they make the change, but of course it is six weeks ago. People have rung my office and said, 'You were absent, abstained, overseas or resigned. You are paid by us as taxpayers to be in the House; you told us you were there and voted against the poker machines and here we find that you were not even there.' It is very hard to get the message back to the electorate, especially if the paper concerned will not print a retraction and a correction.

The following week I noticed a letter written by the former Deputy Premier, Don Hopgood, putting his position that he was one who crossed the floor and voted against the introduction of poker machines. They printed that letter. I pointed that out to Mike Duffy and he said that they had printed that letter. I said, 'What about the rest of us?' From memory, about five from this side of the House crossed the floor, including the former Premier, Lynn Arnold, and we have all been pushed into a category of neither for nor against but absent, abstained, overseas or resigned. I take exception to that.

Mr Meier: There were 14 errors altogether. I was paired with the Minister of Education at the time and it was not recorded.

Mr De LAINE: I thank the Government Whip; I accept that interjection quite happily. I remember that when that article appeared in the *Advertiser* there were two other errors which I reported and in relation to which I asked for retractions. One was with respect to the late John Burdett from the other place who, I have always been proud to say, was a personal friend of mine from our working together in the Christian fellowship. The article was outrageous, because it mentioned something about the Hon. John Burdett when in fact he had passed away several weeks beforehand. They would not even retract that, and that made me particularly angry on his and his widow Jean's behalf.

I will not go on any longer, except to point out that I asked for a correction to be made in the same newspaper. It has not happened, so I will pursue the matter further. I will take what action I can to try to counter this unprofessional, irresponsible, sloppy and lazy journalism by Mike Duffy and the *Sunday Mail* in allowing that sort of junk to be printed without any sort of follow up or checking. Even when the error was pointed out—and I faxed the correct record to the newspaper—it did not have the guts to admit it was wrong and print the retraction.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I want to draw attention to the problem we have with credibility or, more particularly, the lack of it in public affairs in this nation at the present time, which is being aided and abetted by Federal Ministers and the Prime Minister—indeed, probably in circumstances where they are part of a conspiracy to deceive the public to achieve their own ends. I note in particular the way in which support has been orchestrated in the form of what appears to be strong and emotive basic support for Dr Carmen Lawrence by those people in the ALP who believe that love-ins, presentations of bouquets, cheers, and so on outside important public venues lend credibility to the views being expressed by those people in the forums which they are attending.

Accordingly, I note the exploitative use of the same phenomena to which Sergeant drew attention in the late 1950s in his authoritative work titled *Battle for the Mind*, wherein he drew attention to people's beliefs and the way psychological conviction can be obtained for those beliefs by emotive means rather than relying on rational or factual information. I want to refer also, in the same context, to the events surrounding the Hindmarsh Island bridge affair in recent times and the way in which the same strategies of crowd manipulation or group attitude have been used to get a public facade of support for the views being expressed by one side of this question.

Rather than being based on fact they are, indeed, based on emotive participation in group activities. At the same time, I want to draw attention to the vilification of those other people who have sought to put what they believe to be the truth on the other side of the question. Indeed, it is sad that this whole affair has resulted in a division of the people who are part of the descendants of the Ngarrindjeri community—that once great tribe of several septes in the lower Murray region, which I represent. Of course, I refer to the manipulators—who are sometimes described in the press as the 'chattering classes'—who have chosen to make a profession out of idiocy.

To boot, they claim the moral high ground as though they were the advocates of truth from the position they occupy. I say to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and to them: if indeed they regard my part in initially exposing the falsehood of the Hindmarsh Island bridge affair in this Parliament, and drawing attention to the substance of the issues involved and refocussing public attention upon that, I cannot see why I should be the subject of such widely reported abuse, or at least attempts to either vilify or discredit me as well as those who also seek the truth.

I took it upon myself to defy those who would be politically correct. I took it upon myself to focus attention upon whether or not there was any truth historically in the so-called women's business, which was allegedly written down and placed in a sealed envelope by Professor Cheryl Saunders and given to Federal Aboriginal Affairs Minister Robert Tickner, whereupon he banned the construction of the bridge for

25 years. God knows why he chose 25 years and not 24 years or 26 years or, for that matter, 24 months or 26 months, or any other time span. He gave as his reason for doing that the so-called secret women's business that was contained in the said envelope, which I have never seen.

I believe that people like Dean Fergie, Val Power and Doreen Kartinyeri need to take a close look at their conscience in this matter. For instance, why is it that Val Power, as a long-time staffer in Aboriginal organisations, quangos and departments, a literate and, by her own claim, articulate authoritative figure in Aboriginal affairs, failed to say anything whatever about that secret women's business at any point in time or attempt to record it until a minute past midnight when she came out to support the position taken by Doreen Kartinyeri, claiming that she knew of this business all along? I believe that Val Power—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I point out that the debate is still the subject of a royal commission. While the honourable member is being very gentle in his comments, nevertheless they are still relevant to matters which are proceeding before the commission and he is reflecting on the character of witnesses appearing before the commission. I will listen to his further debate but caution him on what he says in that regard.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I make no reference to, nor reflections upon, the proceedings currently before the commissioner. I simply comment on those matters which are otherwise being commented upon in the press and widely in the public domain which have been directly related to me and attacks on me and on others—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Comment in the press does not necessarily make the member's comments in this House appropriate. As I said, I will listen to what the member says, but I urge him on the side of caution.

Mr LEWIS: I believe that Val Power has been guilty of a great measure of incompetence in the staff positions that she has held in those various offices from time to time over the years in failing to draw attention to this at any point in the period leading up to the granting of permission for the Hindmarsh Island bridge development to proceed.

If we look at the role of Dr Doreen Kartinyeri, we have to ask ourselves: how is it that in her own biography in 1989 she has said that only a year or so before the death of the people from whom she claims to have obtained the information, as she said in the press, she wrote in her family genealogy she had absolutely no knowledge of the culture of her forebears, yet she now claims to have had the knowledge imparted to her in childhood? How is that so?

How is it also that Dean Fergie of the Adelaide University professes to be an international expert on Aboriginal affairs when, by her own admission in the ABC AM program of Monday 22 May, she acknowledged publicly that she had come to Aboriginal anthropology and the sociology arising from it only during the last year or so after her appointment to the Department of Anthropology at Adelaide University? Is it purely coincidental, for instance, that, like Val Power, many of the people who have taken the positions they have in recent times on this matter are trying to discredit the statements of the late Nanna Laura Kartinyeri and others while trying to support the position that has been taken apparently by Professor Cheryl Saunders and Doreen Kartinyeri?

Why is it that all those people, who have either been close friends or, indeed, long-time members of the Labor Party, are now engaging in activity and public debate purely to shore up the decision taken by Minister Tickner on no evidence

whatsoever to ban the bridge because of a vendetta against the developers? Is it because they pursue an entirely separate agenda to further intensify the debate about the necessity for representatives of what they claim was an Aboriginal nation in this country prior to European settlement and want that to be included in our constitutional arrangements for the next century? That claim, which is a false claim, based on no accurate information whatsoever, gives breath to the desire of those people who advocate Marxism and Marxist structures of government to have their way over the rest of Australia against the interests of a just, free and properly constituted society of people who, until now, have been tolerant of each other and increasingly multicultural in outlook and attitude.

These people seem to me to be a part of the guilt industry. And they do not care that they are building bigotry and prejudice into the framework of the emerging attitudes in

Australian society. It does nothing for the reconciliation process in which we are all engaged at present for them to be pursuing their own Marxist goals in this way. Their goals have nothing to do with the resolution of difficulties in cross-cultural, ethnic and racial differences and understanding which have been identified in this otherwise honest, open and free society in which we live. While we all now seek to further improve that tolerant social order, it seems to me they would rather destroy it through deceit and duplicity in what I regard as a wicked conspiracy.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 27 September at 2 p.m.