

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 12 August 1993

The PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I bring up the minutes of evidence of the committee on the regulations under the Firearms Act concerning fees.

DINGO CONTROL

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Transport Development): I seek leave to have incorporated into *Hansard* without my reading it a ministerial statement on behalf of the Minister of Primary Industries on the matter of Diesel the dingo.

Leave granted.

I have received correspondence today that Mrs Jones, the owner of Diesel the Dingo wishes to have her dingo placed in the Northern Territory and has requested an extension of time until August 20, 1993 to allow this to be undertaken.

Last week I intervened in this matter to ensure that the dingo was not destroyed, but instead that a humane option be found to place the dingo in a wildlife park or that an alternative acceptable placement be made interstate.

I am pleased to accede to the Jones' request for the dingo to be transported to the Northern Territory and all the proper precautions will be taken by the officers of the Animal and Plant Control Commission to facilitate this.

I am disappointed that the Jones family have not taken up the generous offer from three SA wildlife parks—one in Whyalla, one in Mount Gambier and one in the Adelaide Hills—to take Diesel in and reintegrate the dingo with its own kind in a safe and controlled environment.

I am aware that the Animal and Plant Control Commission has successfully overseen two cases where illegally kept dingoes have been integrated at local wildlife parks—both Urimbirra and Cleland—so that not only were the dingoes safe and happy, but their former owners have been able to visit them from time to time.

I believe with cooperation and respect for the laws as they stand a satisfactory compromise has been reached.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Public Sector Reform a question about public servant speaking engagements.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This week I have been approached by two constituents who have expressed alarm at the latest example of the Arnold Government's money grabbing attitude. I have been advised that the Government has decided that from 1 July 1993 some public servants will be charging fees for speaking engagements at seminars or meetings.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Who'd want to hear 'em?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: An interesting interjection! One constituent, who was a member of a community group, was advised by a staff member of the Equal Opportunity Community Commission that a fee would have to be paid for a guest speaker from the commission. I have also been advised that, at a recent Rotary speaking engagement, the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, Ms Josephine Tiddy, advised

members that the Government had decided that fees would have to be charged for speaking engagements by some public servants. Ms Tiddy indicated that the going rate would be \$100 for a 20 minute speech and \$1 000 for a day's work at a seminar. Some cynics have already—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —said to me, 'Where will Mr Arnold stop? Next he will be charging fees for speeches by him and other Ministers.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Obviously, the Ministers in this Chamber are quite happy with this policy.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Well, you suggested it.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, the cynics suggested it. One can only hope with the Premier it will not be a charge by the minute. My constituents have expressed great alarm to me about this latest move by the Government to pay for the State Bank disaster. Both groups have advised me that they will not pay the fee, and the Equal Opportunity Commission will therefore lose the opportunity to explain Government policies and programs in this important area. If this policy is to be spread across all departments and agencies, then there is soon likely to be widespread anger in the community. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Can the Minister of Public Sector Reform confirm the statements made by the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, Ms Tiddy, that fees for speaking engagements by some public servants will be charged from 1 July 1993?

2. If so, which category of public servants or officers will be charging fees for speaking engagements, what will be the fee levels, and how much does the Government estimate it will collect in 1993-94 from such fees?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The simple answer is that I cannot confirm statements made by Ms Tiddy. I do not know of any general Government policy which involves public servants charging for lectures or speeches that they might give. It is true that as part of the budget process the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity had to find some means of bringing in extra funds to her office, and I will certainly be exploring with her whether or not this is the way that she has chosen to do it.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Do you support it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It does not sound like a very bright idea to me, as a general policy.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: How much would you pay to hear the commissioner?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not think it is appropriate for me to comment on that.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There is certainly no policy across Government that this should be the case, unless it is a policy that I have not heard of, which is always possible, I suppose.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not know about that. Obviously commercialisation is a very important aspect of the Government's policies and, where possible, Government agencies are expected to raise money by the commercial exploitation of their skills. But, as the honourable member says, it may be carrying it too far to charge for the speaking engagements such as has been outlined apparently by Ms Tiddy.

To repeat, as far as I am aware there is no general Government policy on this topic. I do know that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, as part of the budget, has the obligation to try to ensure that funds from outside are earned by her commission, but I was not aware that this was her particular way of doing it. However, I will certainly chase up the matter and bring back a reply.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As a supplementary question, if the Minister ascertains that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity is charging such fees, is the Minister for Public Sector Reform, or the Attorney-General, whichever hat he cares to wear, in a position to overrule that decision by the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, and would he do so?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: First, I think it is important to ascertain the facts of the matter. The honourable member has made certain statements in the Parliament. I think it is important that I check exactly what the position is. I will check with Ms Tiddy to see what she has in fact said about the matter and not what has been reported to the honourable member about what she said. Then I will examine it. The Minister is in a position—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You are leaving the option open?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There may be some circumstances where it is appropriate for a public servant to charge for a lecture or something of that kind.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, I am not going to speculate on the circumstances. There may be some circumstances where it is appropriate. I do not know of any general policy, as I said before, but I will check what it is that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has said in this case, and then I will bring back a reply. In that reply, I will address the questions that the honourable member has asked.

STATE BANK

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the State Bank Royal Commission.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Yesterday in the House of Assembly the Premier said on several occasions that the State Bank Royal Commissioner was able to consider the conduct of the former Premier and other members and officers of the Government under term of reference No. 4 relating to the institution of civil or criminal proceedings. The original terms of reference for the royal commission, which were set in March 1991, required the Royal Commissioner to report:

... whether any matter should be referred to an appropriate authority with a view to further investigation or the institution of civil or criminal proceedings.

Under this term of reference the matters to which I have referred and which the Premier said could have been addressed by the Royal Commissioner could have been so investigated.

However, the Government amended the terms of reference in September last year just after the former Premier gave his evidence to the royal commission. I do not think I need to relate in detail the new terms of reference 3, 4 and 5. In essence, Mr President, they limit the obligation of the Royal Commissioner to receiving and considering the reports of the Auditor-General and, in the light of that report and other material he considers it appropriate to receive in relation to the matters the subject of the report of the Auditor-General, inquire into and report on whether other investigations should

be made or proceedings issued. The Auditor-General's reports relate primarily to the bank board and the management and do not include any reference to the Government. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Does the Attorney-General agree that the Premier's interpretation of the royal commission's terms of reference is wrong and that the terms of reference do not now permit the Royal Commissioner to consider whether the Government or any member of the Government was involved in a conspiracy to cover up alleged illegal conduct by executives of Beneficial Finance—the issue that has been raised in the House of Assembly?

2. In the light of the Premier's view that the terms of reference are wide enough to allow this investigation and report, will the Attorney-General now give a specific reference on the matter to the Criminal Prosecutions Task Force or extend the term of reference No. 4 of the Royal Commissioner to encompass that position?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Opposition is having a bit of fun on this issue at the former Premier's expense and no doubt they are enjoying themselves in the process. But they would hardly be doing what I thought was constructive. The terms of reference, as I understand them, enable the Royal Commissioner to examine whether or not there is evidence or suggestions of illegal activity or activity which may give rise to civil proceedings, and he is able, under term of reference 4, to report on those matters.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Whoever may be involved.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is my understanding of the position and always was the position. The term of reference 4 clearly was a catch-all term of reference in the original terms of reference, which is now term of reference 1. Term of reference 4 was a catch-all term of reference to enable under the original proposals the Auditor-General's report to be received by the Royal Commissioner, for the Royal Commissioner to carry out his inquiries and, under the original scheme, the Royal Commissioner was to have all that information before him and then make recommendations on term of reference 4.

It is quite obvious that one of the references of the Royal Commissioner dealt with the relationship between the Government and the bank, and dealt with the activities of public servants and in particular the former Treasurer. He gave evidence for two weeks before the royal commission, for goodness sake! So he was before that royal commission. His activities were examined by that royal commission extensively. Once the Auditor-General had completed his inquiry and the Royal Commissioner had completed his inquiry into those matters he, under the original terms of reference, was then to give his final wrap-up report on whether or not there were matters that required further investigation or criminal prosecution or whether there was any civil action that could be taken.

That was term of reference 4. That term of reference has become, in effect, term of reference 1 of the new royal commission headed by John Mansfield, but it was not the intention of the Government to change the structure of the royal commission, and I do not believe that it has. I am happy to look at what the Premier said yesterday in the light of the honourable member's question and bring back a more considered reply on it. But it was not the intention of the Government, when things went wrong in the timing between the royal commission and the Auditor-General, with Mr Mansfield's term of reference to somehow or other drop off pieces that were originally intended to be dealt with.

Mr Mansfield's terms of reference were intended to deal with those matters that were originally in term of reference 4 of Mr Jacobs' original terms of reference. That is as I understand the position, and if that is the position then I believe the Premier has provided the correct information to the House of Assembly. However, I do not have in front of me exactly what he said, so I am happy to check that. But that is the position as far as the intention was concerned, that term of reference 4 was the catch-all to enable those matters to be examined. I remember when I announced the terms of reference there was great agitation about whether criminal matters would be looked at and so on, and I made it quite clear that they would be. That is what the public expected. That was in the original terms of reference, and it is the current position.

So, if members are making any allegations, I think they should go to the appropriate forum and make them. They are having two bob each way. They called for a royal commission to be established and the Government established it. An extensive inquiry was carried out by the royal commissioner; an extensive inquiry was carried out by the Auditor-General and it is still going. It is not finished; Mr Mansfield is still completing his final terms of reference.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute, I will get to that. I find it extraordinary that members of the Opposition, having called for a royal commission, getting a royal commission, having had some \$35 million worth of taxpayers' money spent on those inquiries, now decide that they do not want to know about the royal commission; they want to come into the Parliament and make the allegations.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well that is what you have been doing in the House of Assembly.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That's nonsense.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You can't say it is nonsense because I pick up the paper and I read that in the House of Assembly—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:—you are making allegations about potential criminal activity on the part of the previous Treasurer. Now that really is over the top. You have a royal commission; you called for a royal commission; \$30 million worth of taxpayers' money has been spent investigating it; however, when it suits you, you forget the royal commission, you forget the Auditor-General and you come into the Parliament. Why do you come into the Parliament? It is because you know you can get a better run in the media out of it, you know you can try to embarrass the former Treasurer and you know that you can try to embarrass the present Government. That is all it is about. It is not about getting to the truth of the matter and you know that as well as I do. You have avenues available to you. You were represented before the royal commission, at great cost to the taxpayers of this State—\$1 800 a day for your Queen's Counsel.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am making the point about you being represented because you had the opportunity to put to the royal commission whatever matters you wanted to put to it in relation to this issue. You were paid to do it. You were paid by the taxpayers of this State to do it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Attorney-General will address his remarks through the Chair and not personally to the member.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You were paid by the taxpayers of this State to put whatever you wanted to the royal commission about these matters.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There is a royal commission still looking at the matter; there is still term of reference 4, which you know. So, the royal commission is not concluded. The royal commission specifically says in term of reference 4 that those matters were to be looked at, taking into account what was heard in the royal commission itself and what was heard before the Auditor-General. All you are trying to do is come into the Parliament without any genuine concern about pursuing this issue and attempt to have a go at the former Treasurer and the Government on a political basis.

That is fine, but the public—and I would have thought the media—need to know that you have had since early 1991, when these inquiries were established, the capacity to put these issues before authorities that were established—inquiries that were—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: We did.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If you did—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If you did put them before the royal—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You said you did. You said that you put them before the royal commission.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Oh, you put them before the royal commission.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, then there is still a royal commission proceeding.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order. The Hon. Mr Griffin has the opportunity to ask further questions.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There is still a royal commission proceeding. So, the honourable member comes into the Council and asks whether the Government will refer it to the task force. Obviously, he is trying to say 'Oh, yes, we will refer it to the task force,' and then he will have a nice headline to say 'Government refers former Treasurer for prosecution' or some equally bizarre headline that you are no doubt looking for the media to give to this particular topic. Well, the Government is not going to let you off the hook in regard to that matter. You can rest assured of that. If you want to make the allegation there is a mechanism whereby you can do so, and you make it—either to the royal commission or, if you consider there is any illegality, appropriate authorities are set up in this State and federally to deal with it, through the Australian Securities Commission or the police.

Do not try to have it both ways. If you have allegations to make you have had two and a half years to make them to the proper inquiries. If you still have not made them, there is a royal commission still proceeding, and there are still the authorities that have the responsibility in our community for the investigation of such matters.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have a supplementary question, Mr President. In the light of the Attorney-General's

indication that he will give some further consideration to the issues that I have raised, will he also seek from the Royal Commissioner an intimation that the Royal Commissioner regards his new term of reference No. 4 as being sufficient in scope to deal with the matters in the way to which the Attorney-General believed the Royal Commissioner has the scope to do so? Secondly, if the Royal Commissioner or the Attorney-General's own considered advice is that what I have been putting in relation to the limitation on term of reference No. 4 is correct, will he then consider broadening the term of reference to encompass the matters which the Attorney-General says the Royal Commissioner in his belief has scope to investigate?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Mr President, I was being cautious when I said I would look at the matters. I certainly will look at them, but as far as I am aware term of reference 4—the catch-all term of reference—enables the Royal Commissioner to look at those matters which have been raised in the Auditor-General's report or the royal commission hearings. There was never any doubt, as far as I am concerned, about that. What I see happening here now is that the Opposition have got themselves in a bit of a spot, so they are trying to say that the terms of reference to the royal commission do not cover it.

However, as a matter of caution, Mr President, as I said, I will look at what the Premier has said. I do not think there is anything in what the Opposition is currently saying on this matter, and in any event—and this is the central issue—if they have any allegations to make about anyone involved in the State Bank or Beneficial Finance, then they can make those allegations to the Royal Commissioner, or they can make them to the appropriate authorities. They do not have to come into the Parliament and make the allegations unless, of course, they are seeking to curry some political favour out of the allegations.

TRANSPORT HUB

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Transport Development a question about the transport hub.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: After four years of discussion about developing Adelaide as a transport hub, or a niche market for exports to South-East Asia, the Government has received a feasibility study on the concept prepared by consultants Maunsell Pty Ltd. As the Minister has indicated in this place in the past, this study was conducted in conjunction with two consultative committees established by the Government, a steering committee comprising relevant Public Service representatives and a reference group comprising representatives of the private transport sector in South Australia. I ask the Minister:

1. As I believe that Cabinet has considered a submission based on the Maunsell study, does the Government intend to release this study and, if so, when?

2. To what extent does the Minister believe that the transport hub options presented by Maunsell rely only on optimistic assessments of market research?

3. Will the Minister confirm whether or not Treasury endorses the economic analysis used in the Maunsell study and, if not, say what is Treasury's assessment of the feasibility and viability of the transport hub strategic options?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As the honourable member indicates, the Maunsell study has been going apace

for quite some time, and the work, at least in this stage of the inquiry, is now complete. Recommendations that have been made by the consultants are, at the moment, the subject of examination by appropriate agencies of Government, and as soon as some conclusions as to the next stage of development for the transport hub concept have been determined appropriate public announcements will be made about those intended directions. I believe it is appropriate that information concerning the study be made public, and that will occur at the appropriate time.

As to whether or not the conclusions of the consultants are optimistic, my reply to that is that the factors that would determine whether or not it is worthwhile to continue to pursue the concept of developing Adelaide as a transport hub have been exhaustively studied by the consultants, and I believe that the views expressed by them are realistic.

That is not to say that all work that is necessary to be undertaken in developing the various recommendations that have been made by the consultants has yet to be undertaken. It is important that further work be done on particular recommendations they have made, as I have just indicated, and that work will proceed.

In the assessment of the consultants' recommendations, various agencies of Government have made suggestions as to the need for further developmental work. Treasury was certainly one of those agencies, but it was not alone. I gather, although I have not spoken personally with the consultants recently, that it is accepted that further work is to be done on some areas, but that was to be expected. It was not expected that this particular consultancy would be exhaustive; it was designed to assess the viability of the concept as outlined a couple of years ago and to take the project to its next phase of development. It has done that very successfully, and we will now move to the third phase of development. At the appropriate time, announcements will be made about that third phase and about the further work that will be undertaken by the Government and other appropriate organisations in bringing together the concept for Adelaide.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister confirm that Treasury's concern about the economic analysis used in the Maunsell study is the reason why further work is now being undertaken on this feasibility study; who is undertaking this further work and when is it expected to be completed; and what is the cost of the study to date?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As to the question of the cost of the study, I will provide that information later. What I can indicate is that, first, it would appear that the honourable member has received information from some source or other which indicates to her that the Treasury is not supportive of the Maunsell study. That is not so.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Laidlaw will come to order.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: But, along with other agencies, Treasury and others have raised—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Laidlaw will come to order. She can ask supplementary questions.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:—quite reasonable questions about certain issues within the study. That is not unusual. It happens every day of the week with studies of this sort, and the fact is that the large majority of the issues that were raised initially by Treasury were based on false premises and were answered to the satisfaction of Treasury

officials. The fact that it is agreed that further work must be undertaken on some aspects of developing the transport hub concept is a natural and normal part of the process of developing a project of the complexity of the transport hub concept. There is no suggestion at all that Treasury opposes the development of the transport hub. I make that quite clear.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I make that quite clear to the Hon. Ms Laidlaw and anyone else who is interested in this matter. The fact is that the transport hub project, as confirmed by the consultants' study, is a project that has considerable potential for Adelaide and for the development of the South Australian economy. We will be proceeding with working up that project. At the appropriate time, it will be revealed to the Hon. Ms Laidlaw and others who may be interested in this matter just exactly what the conclusions of the study have been and what the next stage of development will be. I ask members to wait until that occurs. I hope that it will be in the very near future and that it will be seen that this is a project which is worthwhile for South Australia and that we can bring very significant benefits to our State.

HELLFIRE CLUB

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage): I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement on the Hellfire Club.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have been advised by the Liquor Licensing Commissioner that, following a meeting this morning, the licensee of the premises known as Nicholas Nicholby has undertaken not to proceed with the Hellfire Club or any similar form of entertainment on those premises while he is the licensee.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Environment and Land Management a question about the Belair National Park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: A recently opened tavern in the Belair National Park, which replaced one razed by fire almost 18 months ago, has shocked many local residents with its new lolly-pink exterior amidst the park's native vegetation. What has shocked local residents more is the latest revelation that a new road will be bulldozed through the park to the tavern, requiring several gums to be uprooted—a road to replace an already existing road. When we consider the rage which was generated among some local residents when introduced pines were removed and even when non-local native eucalypts were removed, it has been a real shock to some that local native eucalypts are to be taken out. I have been told that the road proposal has already forced the relocation of a species of native plants—*dianella*—which is rare in the Mount Lofty Ranges.

I have also been informed that there is another proposal to take a bend out of a creek in the area as part of a future development of the nearby caravan park, also within the Belair National Park. Such intrusions into what is supposed to be a native reserve are seen as a complete travesty. The new road will not only destroy native vegetation but rerouting the creek from its natural course could upset the natural

drainage of the land, causing further problems. It illustrates once again why people are so nervous about commercial interests operating in national parks, as what happens is the vested interests of developers can get in the way of the legitimate role of the national parks. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister ensure that native trees are not removed for this road to proceed?
2. Will the Minister undertake not to approve any reshaping of the creek?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

CARE GIVERS

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about itinerant surgeons.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: As a result of a tragic death in Yorketown this year and the ensuing coronial inquiry and report, there has been considerable concern among country general practitioners and resident and itinerant surgeons as to the need for a set of guidelines for post care of patients treated by itinerant surgeons. As a result of their concern, the Rural Doctors Association convened a workshop on itinerant surgery in country South Australia with the following aims: first, a concise set of guidelines for post operative care of patients treated by itinerant surgeons in country South Australia; and, secondly, to discuss a mechanism for providing boards of country hospitals with appropriate advice on what constitutes safe and appropriate itinerant surgery in country South Australian hospitals.

This workshop was held on Saturday 31 July at Modbury Hospital. It was attended by over 60 people, including: principal medical officers of rural hospitals, directors of nursing, chairpersons of hospital boards, itinerant surgeons, representatives of various specialist colleges involved, Medical Defence Association legal advisers, a representative from the South Australian faculty of South Australian rural medicine and the assistant coroner. In fact, the only body which was invited and which did not attend nor table an apology was the South Australian Health Commission. On 27 July, after having received an invitation to attend the Rural Doctors Association workshop, it announced its own committee into these matters consisting, I am told, entirely of city-based bureaucrats. My questions are:

1. Why was such a cross-section of rural health care givers snubbed by the Health Commission?
2. Who is on the Health Commission committee to inquire into these matters, and why have no grass roots care givers been included?
3. Will the Minister take steps to ensure that the South Australian Health Commission (which is constantly assuring people that it is a 'consultative body') includes actual grass roots rural care givers in this or any further inquiries of this sort?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in the Council, a question about SGIC.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Early this week, a report by the Crown Solicitor's Office was tabled in State Parliament dealing with allegations of nepotism against the Lotteries Commission General Manager, Mr Laurie Fioravanti. Last year, on 10 September 1992, I advised the House that Mr Vin Kean, Chairman of SGIC and director of Bouvet Pty Ltd, a fully-owned subsidiary of SGIC which operates the Terrace Hotel, had employed three relatives at the Terrace Hotel. His son-in-law, who apparently had no previous experience as a chauffeur, was employed to drive the Terrace Hotel's Rolls Royce. Mr Christopher Kean, his son, was paid \$24 000 to repair defective plumbing at the Terrace Hotel.

Mr Kean's daughter was employed to manage the Terrace Hotel's gift shop. This gift shop had previously been operated by Mr and Mrs Fisher who had been promised verbally and in writing that they would be able to continue as proprietors of the gift shop following the refurbishment of the Terrace Hotel. The Fishers had bought stock in anticipation of running this shop. The Fishers claimed they had lost \$60 000. Both suffered serious illnesses as a result. Many senior hotel staff believed they had been shabbily treated. The answers to my question were provided 11 weeks later on the last day of session, 26 November 1992. The Attorney-General, on behalf of the Treasurer, in answering my question, 'Does the Government condone the blatant nepotism that occurred at the Terrace Hotel?', simply stated, 'The Government does not condone nepotism.'

In attempting to justify Mr Christopher Kean's employment, the Attorney-General said, 'As the work had to be done quickly, the General Manager of the hotel, Mr Robert Arnold, went to someone he knew. He asked Mr Christopher Kean, whom he knew to possess a builder's licence, to have a look at the problem.'

On 25 March this year, I revealed that in 1989 Christopher Kean did not have a builders licence, was not registered as a plumber with the E&WS, and over the last 10 years had never held appropriate E&WS registration for plumbing work. Mr Kean in fact became the holder of a speculative builder's licence on 11 September 1992, the day after I asked my question and nearly three years after he helped with plumbing at the Terrace Hotel. In other words, the Attorney-General and the Treasurer seriously misled the Parliament.

In answer to my question, 'Why did the Treasurer seriously mislead Parliament?', the lame response received in late May was, 'SGIC had no reason to doubt the accuracy of the information it supplied to the Treasurer.' In answer to my question, 'Did the Government and/or SGIC check on whether Mr Kean had a builder's licence, as was claimed?' it was stated, 'The information was passed to SGIC in good faith.' The answer to the question, 'Who provided the information to the Government and SGIC that Mr Kean had a builder's licence?' was, 'The General Manager of the hotel, Mr Robert Arnold. Unfortunately, Mr Arnold cannot now recall having given this information.'

On 20 October 1992, I revealed that the 1986 Rolls Royce operated by the Terrace Hotel had been bought for \$275 000 from United Motors Retail Limited, the company in which SGIC Chairman Vin Kean was a director and shareholder.

The Rolls Royce had been purchased without being put out to tender. My inquiries around Australia revealed that, if SGIC had shopped around, it would have been able to purchase a car in similar condition for no more than \$250 000 and possibly less.

There is a widespread perception in the community that the Government has been involved in a desperate cover up of unacceptable and immoral commercial practices involving SGIC and the Terrace Hotel, and that the Government simply has not learnt any lessons from the State Bank debacle of February 1991. The Government talks about a code of conduct for organisations such as SGIC, but just does not enforce it. My questions are:

1. If the Government can require the Crown Solicitor's Office to report on allegations of nepotism made against the Lotteries Commission General Manager, why has the Government apparently taken no action whatsoever to fully investigate this string of examples of nepotism and conflict of interest which are far more serious in their nature, in their impact on other people and their cost to the taxpayers of South Australia?

2. Why has the Government provided a disgraceful string of incorrect and evasive answers to these serious allegations when the Opposition, without access to SGIC, has been able to establish the facts in each case?

3. Will the Government now undertake to immediately conduct an inquiry on the matters which I have raised?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The reason why the matters relating to the Lotteries Commission were referred to me as Attorney-General is that they were raised in an Auditor-General's report, and the Auditor-General's report on these matters was tabled in the House of Assembly, together with correspondence between the Treasurer and Chairman of the Lotteries Commission and the Auditor-General, I believe. As a result of that, the Treasurer thought that certain matters should be further looked at. So, these matters were raised with the Lotteries Commission in the normal course of an audit report by the Auditor-General. Following the making available to the Parliament of all that material, the Treasurer felt that certain matters should be further examined, and that is in fact what occurred. The results of that examination were tabled in the Parliament earlier this week, and the honourable member is aware of them.

With respect to the matters raised by the honourable member today, they are a recycling of matters that he has raised on previous occasions which have all been referred to the Treasurer by me as the Minister representing the Treasurer. I do not have personal Ministerial responsibility for these matters. They were referred to the Treasurer as the Minister responsible, and answers were provided by him to me which I provided to the Council.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, it is obvious that in relation to one—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Aren't you worried about it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am worried about it; I am not happy about it.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: And you're not going to do anything about it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What do you want me to do? The matters are fully laid out in the Parliament—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What I am saying is that the questions have been answered. With respect to one matter it is clear that the information provided by SGIC to the Treasurer was wrong, and one only has to note that that is not the first time in matters involving either the State Bank or the SGIC that information has been provided to the Government that was wrong. Regrettably during 1990, that became a bit of a habit, in particular, of the State Bank, and it has been found by the Royal Commissioner to have provided information to the Government or the then Treasurer that was wrong and misleading. Regrettably in this case, in relation to the matters raised by the honourable member, on one issue at least, the information provided to the Treasurer to provide that answer was wrong. Subsequently, the matter was further put to SGIC and I believe subsequently the correct information was provided to the Chamber. I do not condone that. I think it is disgraceful that statutory authorities such as the State Bank or SGIC should provide to the responsible Ministers information which is wrong. That is totally unacceptable. It should not happen and I am quite happy to go on the record as saying that. The Parliament is entitled to receive accurate answers to the questions that it asks. It did not receive accurate answers regrettably on all matters in 1990.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The question really is what one can do about it. These are matters that occurred some considerable—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute. What are you saying? Mr Kean is not Chairman of the SGIC any more. Mr Gerschwitz is not General Manager of the SGIC any more. I am not quite sure what the honourable member wants me to do. There is no evidence of criminal behaviour. The fact is that some procedures that should have been followed were not followed, although they are unlikely to have been followed in a private sector organisation, and no doubt the honourable member would not make any fuss about that. If this sort of activity had occurred in the private sector, he would be quite happy, because he knows that is what his friends in the private sector do every day of the week.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not sure about that. I am sure that they would in certain circumstances, because there is nothing illegal.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: And the SGIC is operating as a commercial organisation in the marketplace, albeit a Government statutory authority. So, I am not quite sure what the honourable member wants me to do. He has asked his questions; he has received answers. They were inaccurate in one respect at least and that has been clarified. The chief actors in relation to the matter are no longer there, so I am not sure what an inquiry would achieve. There is no suggestion of illegal or criminal conduct, and therefore it is impossible to see what an inquiry into those matters at least would reveal.

I am sorry if the information provided was incorrect. That obviously should not happen. Statutory authorities, even those operating in the commercial arena, should provide answers to questions asked by members of Parliament and those answers should be accurate.

PARLIAMENT, TELEVISIONING

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking you, Mr President, a question about discrimination against certain members.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Mr President, due to the quite proper restrictions on media access to this place, it transpires that certain members in certain positions in this Chamber tend to get the back of their heads televised more frequently than other parts of their anatomy.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Mr President, there has been some change in seating on this side of the Council and previously the Hon. Jamie Irwin occupied the seat in front of me and his stature was such that he did get a fair share of the television. But without reflecting at all on the capacity of the member, the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner does not fill the same space that the Hon. Mr Irwin did and will be difficult to film when she is making important statements. So, Mr President, having regard to the places occupied by the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner, the Hon. Mario Feleppa, the Hon. Michael Elliott and the questioner, I ask you to consider that when from time to time the television media wish to film our operations in this place they be authorised to do so from a position on the side of the Chamber and not be restricted to the back.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order. I wish to hear the question; it has been addressed to me.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am not sure that there is not an improper impugning of an honourable member going on here, Mr President.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Mr President, I do realise that you have given earnest thought to the matter of the proper televising of proceedings in this place and I respect your judgment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: However, if other honourable members are prepared to continue a form of discrimination of this nature, then we will have to suffer in silence. But we ask for a fair go.

The PRESIDENT: Order! In relation to the question that has been asked of me, I have always set myself up not to be the judge and jury of what happens in this Parliament. If members will recall, we banned still photography, except on special occasions when the President decided it could be done. I decided I was not going to set myself up as the judge and jury when the media came in and I banned still photography. When the members themselves heard of that—and a fax was sent by the *Advertiser* and the *News* to every member—they reversed that decision and we allowed still photography in. My attitude is still the same. I am happy to circulate the members: if they want the TV cameras to come down the sides and take photos they can.

I would also draw attention to the abuse that occurs in this Chamber by the TV media. Time and time again I have written to the TV media and told them that they cannot take

camera shots of members sitting in their seats, that the member must be on his or her feet, or it can be a broad angle shot of the Chamber itself. Time and time again they have written back and apologised profusely, yet they have still come in and done it. When any member in this place is newsworthy I will bet my bottom dollar that on the television news at night you will see the member sitting in their seat. It does not matter how many times I write to the TV stations and how many apologies I get, they still tend to do it. The other thing is to ban it. You can ban them for a week or a fortnight and they come back and still do the same thing. So eventually members themselves are going to have to accept some responsibility for how far they want the media to go. I am prepared to act on members' behalf. I will circulate the members with the question the honourable member has asked me. If members are in favour of the TV cameras down the side, I will let them do that; if not, they will not.

STATE BANK

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question about first-class air travel by State Bank executives.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: On 1 April I asked some questions about State Bank policy regarding domestic air travel by State Bank employees. In a reply from the Treasurer on 27 July 1993 I was advised that the State Bank policy in relation to domestic travel is that all employees, including executive directors, are to travel economy class. My questions are:

1. Will the Treasurer confirm under what circumstances the travel policy is not enforced?
2. Who is responsible for granting permission to waive the policy?
3. Will the Treasurer confirm if a State Bank executive was travelling first class on flight AN97, which is a 6.40 p.m. service from Melbourne to Adelaide, on 5 August 1993, and what were the circumstances which led to the first-class air travel?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It seems as though the honourable member has become the Heini Becker of the Legislative Council. Mr Heini Becker has spent his political life chasing Government cars around the suburbs of Adelaide to see in what circumstances they are being used with the SA Government numberplates. Questions are asked regularly in the Parliament by Mr Becker, on notice: what was Government car—and the registration number—doing at the supermarket at such and such a time, and then the Government is required to answer it. Most of the questions that have been asked have had legitimate reasons.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Ninety-four per cent.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Ninety-four per cent have had legitimate reasons, Mr President. So it seems as though the Hon. Mr Stefani is upgrading his queries somewhat—not cars but airfares. The honourable member should at least be content, as I am, that they are no longer flying around in private jets, which of course—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I did. They were. I provided correct information for a change in relation to this matter.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That's right, yes. They were in fact flying around in Lear jets. I do not know what the answer to this is, but one simple explanation, which might be the explanation which Heini Becker gets a lot of the time, is that they could have been upgraded. Since the two airline policy was effectively demolished I find that upgrades are more common for prominent people who—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I never get one.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, well you're not prominent enough yet. You will have to work on your public profile. I have no doubt that if you arrived at the Ansett or Australian counter and you were well known then you would probably get an upgrade.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Are you speaking from experience?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, I am speaking from experience, that's right, because occasionally airlines do upgrade people whose custom they value, like Ministers, Attorneys, members of Parliament and, presumably, State Bank executives.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Mr Gilfillan if he walks in backwards!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order. The honourable Attorney.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is my policy to fly economy. I buy economy seats domestically, and I have since I became a Minister, but occasionally I can be found up at the front of the plane because I have had an upgrade. It may well be that that is the case here, Mr President. I cannot say, but it is possible that people can buy economy class tickets, book economy and then get upgraded.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 11 August. Page 112.)

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Last night I sought leave to conclude after indicating that Australia and South Australia had to maximise their opportunities in the Asian-Pacific region and do all they can to overcome the serious problem of unemployment. Unemployment in Australia, and in all developed countries, is a major problem. Most of the economies worldwide are either in recession or in a state of very slow growth. It is the most critical problem that we face as a nation and as a State. The problem facing the people of South Australia at the moment is that we have a lot of negativism out in the community. It is fuelled by the Opposition, picked up by the media and, unfortunately, South Australia, as a trading State in a trading nation that is experiencing slow growth, is having difficulty in obtaining a profile to attract investment.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: It is all our fault, is it?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Most of it is. In relation to Australia and South Australia, in particular, being able to develop a profile, international and national investors will not be attracted to a State that is constantly being carped about by a major section of the Parliament, that is, the Opposition. The problems to which I have alluded have risen out of the 1980s and we need 1990s solutions to these problems. Many people are looking to Government for answers to the

problems that they face. Employment opportunities is the key problem that faces people out in the community.

We need to maximise all the opportunities we have to develop our trading base into Asia and to maximise the benefits that come with building up new relationships with people in the Asian-Pacific region. Many people, particularly young people, are doing training programs and courses that are structured for entry into mainstream employment opportunities, but at this stage those opportunities are being lost through restructuring. There is a lot of frustration in the community.

However, on the positive side, there is a lot of goodwill by many people in the community to give Australia, and particularly South Australia, an opportunity to put together training programs that allow them to get into the mainstream. The Federal Government has a number of programs operating that allow for people to continue their education and to upgrade their qualifications and skills. South Australia has a program for international best practice, which at least puts it at a starting point for entry into international export.

The problem that we are having is that with shrinking trade opportunities to Europe and America we are becoming more reliant on developing new opportunities for ourselves. Unfortunately, with a recessed economy, with very little prospect for growth, there is a confidence being built in the community that the Opposition has the answers to place South Australia in a position to maximise its trade position in the next decade. I am afraid that people in South Australia are going to be disappointed, and it will be the same for people in Victoria, Tasmania and to some extent sections of Western Australia.

The problems cannot be overcome by the programs being put forward in terms of deregulation at a microeconomic level. The problems can only be overcome by Australia and South Australia tapping into a mainstream economy, while recognising that there are many people in the community who will not be picked up and that programs have to be put in place where, perhaps instead of looking at the sharp end of town, if you like, in relation to job creation and employment and economic development, we have to look at some of the economies of underdeveloped nations and try to assist and support their programs for development while enhancing some of those less developed industries and less developed areas of economic activity that should be looked at and developed in these recessed times.

It is all very well to have international best practice industries aimed at the international economy, and we have to do that because there are no alternatives, but certainly in relation to the economies of Africa and South America, of some developing Asian nations, of India, of the subcontinent and of sections of China, we really need to look at some of our developing industries or those industries and areas of our economy that are not directed at the developed nations. We need to be putting together joint programs with some of the underdeveloped countries so that we are able to maximise employment opportunities for all our people.

It is quite clear that the expanding economies of developed countries are shedding labour. There is very little or no job growth in the expanding areas in manufacturing and communications, in many of the areas that did provide growth in the 1980s. Those areas of growth are no longer there. If one looks at IBM and the other large computer organisations one will see that their growth is now restricted. In fact, if one looks at the American Stock Exchange one sees that some of the companies that did well in the 1980s are now starting to

stutter and fall over. We now need to look at other opportunities that present themselves.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: What are they?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: It is a matter of particular regional development authorities within South Australia and within Australia generally looking at and doing a stocktake of the particular advantages that those regions have in developing programs that can assist in job creation within those regions.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Doing what?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I have read some of the Address in Reply speeches and I have listened to the debate in the Lower House on the Supply Bill, and as far as I can gather no options are being put by the Opposition other than microeconomic reform at a labour level and trying to attack wages and conditions and bringing them down to the lowest common denominator.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That's not true.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Do you want me to quote out of your policy?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: What about value adding?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: 'Value-added' is a buzz term that has been around for a long time. There is a lot of value adding being done; but it is a matter of looking at some of the lies and untruths that are being presented to the people of South Australia and to the people of Australia generally about alternative policies that people can hang their hope on. I am afraid that those people who are reading the *Advertiser* and listening to the media outlets in South Australia generally must understand that before you demolish a program that a Government has put in place—as has been happening to the Government over the past 18 months to two years—you have to have something to replace what you demolish.

Unfortunately, the people of South Australia are being conned. The policies that the Liberal Opposition is going to put in place have no strength or basis to them. If—and it is a big 'if'—the Liberal Party does win Government, the people of South Australia will have another four years of frustration because there are no policies inherent in the State Liberal Party's platform that I have seen that come to terms with the problems associated with large manufacturing sector restructuring and dismantling labour growth and there are no alternative policies built into the Liberal Party's program to enable any growth to occur. People will have built up in their mind this cleansing process of removing a Labor Government, of putting in a Liberal Government that will come in all shiny and new—as the Hon. Dean Brown is trying to present himself—but it would be coming in with no policies at all, which would be very frustrating for those people who may support the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You just said that you knew our policy was going to be hopeless, but now you are saying we haven't got any.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: It is part of the strategy development of the Liberal Party. You have put together a hotchpotch of policies that really do not—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I understand that the Hon. Mr Lucas has spoken in this debate.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: It was not long enough.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: There are no industry, manufacturing or regional development policies which I can see and from which the people in those areas where unemployment is highest can have any hope. It is not a major

criticism of individuals in the Liberal Party. You have drawn up a strategy to win Government. All I am doing is alerting the people of South Australia to the fact that they should not put too much reliance on the Liberal Party's policies to change any of the economic formulae and outcomes over the next period. The international position will not be taken advantage of by what I can see coming out of the Liberal Party. It will be a division within Australia to divide off the rich and the poor again. The Labor party did quite well—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: We would have to be better than you lot though, wouldn't we?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I must say that some of the Federal policies within the 1980s did not take advantage of the opportunities as well. I am self critical about the thrust and general direction of the Government's program in the 1980s, and there were a lot of wasted opportunities. However, they should not be repeated, and the con trick being played on the public of South Australia now is that somehow or another there should be hope built into a change of Government, without actually the proposed Government to come into place having any policies at all in which people can have confidence that there will be any change, because the restricted ability of the State's economy to influence national outcomes is very limited. So, in relation to the confidence levels that people have about change, I am afraid that if change does occur—and I sincerely hope that it does not—they will be very disappointed.

I think the greatest victims in the 1980s were those who hoped that there would be some sort of manufacturing or development base built into those years. We did have a bit of breathing space to set a structure to take us into the 1990s, but unfortunately the entrepreneurs who gained hold of Australia's investment base did not put it into a sound position at all: it went into paper shuffling, into high rise buildings and into speculative capital outlays, and it made a few people rich for a very short length of time.

In fact, many of those entrepreneurs who were touted as the saviours of Australia's destiny, and who were held up in high esteem as heroes of Australia, are now languishing either just outside of city gaols, or in a lot of cases they are awaiting prosecutions pending from the programs that they were tied up in during that period of unwise, unsound investment programs. The hard working section, if you like, of Australia's economy—the backbone of primary industries and the manufacturing sector—were not seen as areas of sound investment and were not seen as the high fliers of Australia. Indeed, a lot of hard work was being done for little or no rewards in both those sectors, and they were totally ignored, and we are now paying part of our price for that.

I must say that the people who are bearing the brunt of high unemployment at the moment are those who are least able to restructure or retrain themselves to take part in any take up in the mainstream economy, and they are languishing outside of the mainstream, tucked into social security and into lifestyles that do not add a lot of reward to their way of living. We must do something about that. For a nation and for a State to survive, and for its social system to survive, people do need hope to be able to hold together their family structures, to have ambitions to own a home, to be able to put together a few commodities inside their home and to have some hope.

At the moment there are no indications that the national economy will take off any faster than the growth in the international community, and I think that it is quite scandalous that people in this State are given false hope in that

somehow or other a change of Government will bring about a change of fortune. I sincerely hope that, in 1994, regardless of who is in power, there is an economic shot internationally played and that Australia's and South Australia's economy can tap into that, that we do have growth figures higher than 3.5 per cent and that some hope can be given to providing job opportunities for people in that expanding economy.

I would hope that primary products prices and commodity prices generally can pick up, but I am quite pessimistic about that happening. If that does not happen, you need a Government with policies that can take into account perhaps a second scenario where you do not aim all your policies at the shiny end of town: you look at tapping your economy into some of the less developed countries, some of the developing countries, and you form relationships with them to expand sections of your economy that they can help to develop. It is not known as the clever strategy or working smarter: it means that you change the nature of the direction of your investment and trading patterns that you build up.

The Hon. Jamie Irwin referred to his hope of being able to set in place barter arrangements for primary products. I think some of the rural organisations are now starting to change their direction about how they trade. There are a lot of developing nations and a lot of developed nations which now have a need for goods, services and products but which have no capital. I refer to Eastern Europe, and the former Yugoslavia in particular, which will have to rebuild its economy and its nation. There is no capital available to those nations to be able to trade in cash so we have to look at alternatives to that, as well as at some of the primary industries particularly forming cooperative programs for the formation of trade opportunities for the products they develop and market into those countries directly, certainly with Government assistance and standards and controls.

So, we need a whole range of variations on how we trade and how we develop goods and services, and how we develop society basically, because the mainstream economy certainly will not deliver the standards of living to which people have been accustomed, particularly over the past 40 years, since natural growth occurred after the Second World War.

There are probably a lot on my side of the Chamber (but I cannot see at this stage that there are too many on the Opposition benches) who are still traditionally locked into servicing mainstream requirements and building up the economy around mainstream than into changing attitudes. I suspect that those who do understand the rural sector know they are a very conservative sector as far as its trade operations are concerned. There is a lot of effort going into trying to change those problems because of the desperate situation in which rural people find themselves. No longer can they afford to have rural based agribusiness determining their futures because it is just not delivering back into rural communities. Communities now have to take more control over their determination and direction, and it is a matter of empowering local governments and regional development boards. All the areas need to do a local stocktake on exactly what wealth can be created in particular regions, and then working out a marketing arrangement that can get those products onto the international market and get some capital return so that the cake—perhaps not a huge cake but perhaps a lot of smaller cakes—can be created and distributed back into the community.

There is also a role to play, and it is being played in many areas throughout Australia. Indeed, in some areas in South Australia it is starting to take off: some cottage industries and

local craft industries are localising their economic programs and, although it is not the same as everybody taking in everyone's washing, it is an arrangement that a lot of people prefer. They do not want to be in the mainstream, beating it up and working 60 hours a week.

Another anomalous situation is that those people who are in the mainstream, who are lucky enough to be in full-time employment, seem to be working far longer than they ever have and putting in far more hours and those without employment with no hope of ever getting into a paid position are working no hours. The Liberals' position on that is: 'Let's cut back public holidays; let's make people work longer.'

If we look at the myriad of press releases we see that the Conservative view is to push forward a 38-hour week into a 40 or 42-hour week and change all the award conditions so that those in industry and in full-time employment work longer for less conditions and less money.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The commission remains.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I did not mention the commission. You must have a bit of a conscience about the removal of the commission.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: How will you change the award?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I understand that the Opposition's policy is to have voluntary agreements where individuals go into bat against the employer who will have at least one or two lawyers on their side and individual workers will negotiate a single contract. That is not the way to go. I am intimating that the Liberal Party's policy—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS:—of micro-political reform, not micro-economic reform, through micro minds is that those now in employment should take less—I cannot understand how that will help small business, because people will have less money in their pocket to spend—and work longer, even though the mainstream cannot now accommodate the 12 per cent unemployed and probably 20 per cent under-employed. What the honourable member is saying is that all those people in employment should work longer hours for less money and that somehow or other the trickle down effect of that is that people in the community will have more money to spend.

I am afraid that the Liberal Party's policy in relation to economic development is one of the 1960s and does not come to terms with what is going on in the 1990s. Its policy generally is to encourage individual choice: I think that is the overall theme through the industrial policy of the Liberal Party. An individual choice made basically out of fear will be to do whatever the employer at either a public or a private level tells them to do because of the pressure that will be on them to deliver as a result of the high level of unemployment. It has nothing to do with cooperatively working together through the problems faced by this State and the whole nation. It must be done in a cooperative way; it cannot be done in a coopted or confrontationist way, because you will end up losing the goodwill of the people whom you are trying to get on side.

If the honourable member opposite can convince me during the next month that his policies should be put into place so that South Australia can come out of the economic recession with people at all levels in the community being able to work cooperatively together—and the cake that I was talking about can be created and distributed fairly and equitably—I will take the venom out of my opposition to the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: But will you support us?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I did not say I would go that far. I said I would take the venom out of my opposition and perhaps turn a deaf ear when someone asks me what I think of the Liberal Party's policies.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: At the moment I am not turning a deaf ear; I am advocating that they support the Labor Government because they are being taken as part of a great con trick. If they follow the Liberal Party's policies without any change at all being indicated we will end up in the same confrontationist way as have New Zealand, Victoria, Tasmania and now Western Australia.

I would like to conclude by saying that another area that needs to be looked at is in relation to restructuring Australia's economy to take advantage of international best practice and, at another level, helping our economy by supporting developed and developing nations. Much of the relationship between the State and Federal Governments and local government needs to be altered.

One of the positions that I have advocated over the past six months is a change to accommodate the combination of South Australia and the Northern Territory into one trading State so that transport, communications and the advantages of a single administrative economic unit can be put together. Regarding that trading base of which I spoke where Australia needs to place itself in relation to Asia, South Australia can have some hope of being able creatively to put a program together that will get the support and respect of those people whom we are trying to attract, and that is the Asian nations.

I suspect that because of our geographical position transport is a problem for South Australia without the Darwin-Alice Springs rail line. I also acknowledge that Tasmania probably has worse problems. I am not quite sure how Australia as a nation should deal with those problems, but South Australia has the option to improve its effectiveness and efficiency administratively by joining with the Northern Territory to create a more effective economic unit. I must thank all those people who have written and supported my idea.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I have a heap of correspondence. I do not have any from the members of Parliament in the Northern Territory, but I was contacted by a number of them on both sides of the House and I contacted a few. Their view of the world basically was that they were doing very well making their contacts in Asia, that they had a lot of promised development and that their economic development zone that has been operating now for nearly 10 years is starting to look attractive to the Asian nations.

However, if South Australia is to take advantage of its unused intellectual potential and its manufacturing culture, I advocate that the Northern Territorians ought to look at using South Australia's academic and export cultural base that we have in our manufacturing sector, put the Northern Territory's geographic advantage into South Australia's export and academic base and, with the population levels in parts of the Eastern States trading base, we could be able to pull together a State that has a national dimension feeding into the Eastern States' economies through exporting from our natural base. Also, with our surpluses from some of those domestic industries we ought to be able to build up an economic export program through the Northern Territory.

The Northern Territory members of Parliament and their industry development programs are doing as well as can be expected, but if they looked at some of the advantages that could be gleaned from joining South Australia I am sure they would look at us in a more favourable light.

On the other side of the Conservative argument not to do with the joining of the Northern Territory and South Australia but with where South Australia should be going, all I can hear from the economic rationalists basically is that we should develop an economy similar to that of Hong Kong, Singapore and, I have been told, Switzerland, without taking into account the size and nature of Australia's relationship and its difficulties with transport and communication.

One cannot compare those trading nations with Australia in any way. Some credence is given to the fact that the manufacturing cultures and the business-like cultures of those countries need to be transferred to Australia. I will not argue with the business ethic of those countries because their runs are on the board. However, the geographical differences between Singapore, Hong Kong and Australia are marked. The cultural make-up of those countries is a lot different, but I am sure that a lot of links and cultural understanding could take place so that Singapore and Australia could build much closer links. I am sure that they are.

Many businesses are now starting to forge links with Singaporean business people who can act as agents for Australian products and assist Australia to come to terms with learning about the variations in the Asian cultures and to break down the icker content of many of our preceding trading delegations.

There is now an air of desperation within Australia and South Australia that requires enough unorthodoxy to come to terms with our problems. If we do not come to grips with creating a larger cake for Australia to divide amongst its residents, unfortunately many groups could suffer in the future. For example, we have many people who are expressing a lot of good will, who are young and patient and who are waiting to get into the mainstream economy. We also have many migrant groups of people who were brought to Australia in the 1950s and 1960s to work inside the factories at the time, and their children are now having difficulty finding work. There are also people whose backgrounds would be such that being inactive would be quite foreign to them, and they need work as an expression of their individuality. The definition of 'work' needs to change, and the prospect of legitimising work other than in the mainstream needs to be done so that we can have a whole community working together.

If we look at how statistics are drawn up, we will see that statistics are broken down into groups of young people, women, older people and all sorts of categories, but what we are talking about is whole communities. It is my view that you do not differentiate between groups or individuals: we are talking about a whole community that has been alienated out of a developing process that has a lot to do with improved productivity levels through technology and displacement of people out of legitimate mainstream work, and alienation into separate parts of the community. We need to pull together those separate parts and make sure that people who are not a part of mainstream work programs are given a value and a worth in the community. If we do not come to grips with that, as I said you do not have to be very clever to foreshadow that, with the creation of differences between those who are able to partake in the mainstream and those who are locked out of it, you will end up with social dislocation in the community.

People who rely on a change of Government to bring about progressive policies will be very disappointed. I know there are many wets on the Opposition benches who probably agree with much of what I say in relation to the rebuilding of South Australia and the nation as a whole, but I suspect that even the dampest of the wets on the side of the Liberal Party will not come anywhere near being able to recognise what I am saying as being either accurate or worth while following up: they will hit the conservative button again and try to take Australia back another 30 years. They will then try to redistribute wealth away from the poor to those who have it already, and that will bring about further social dislocation.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: We can't be any worse than you, Terry.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I didn't hear that. There will be calls for greater penalties for crime and misdemeanours and greater repression of individual rights, unless you fit in the mainstream. I urge anyone who reads *Hansard*—and I am not sure that there are enough readers to make any difference—to go out there and spread the message that, if the Liberal Party policies are seen as a panacea for the salvation of this State, I am afraid there will be many disappointed people. I issue a challenge to the media to stop dismantling this current Government in terms of presentations of individual—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Ask Hemmings!

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I'm just raising that—points of view instead of concentrating on far more important matters of economic direction and analysis.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I join with Her Excellency, the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell in her condolences to the families of those eminent people who served our State so well, to Sir Condor Laucke, a former Lieutenant Governor; Richard Geddes, a member of the Legislative Council; Berthold Teusner, the member of the Assembly and a former Speaker of the House; and Hugh Hudson, member of the Assembly and former Deputy Premier. Although I have not known all these people, they have contributed to our State, and after listening to our members' contributions there is no doubt that we are indebted to them for their service.

I welcome my new colleague the Hon. Mrs Caroline Schaefer to this Council and hope to give her as much support as I can, knowing the difficulties that can be encountered as a new member. In welcoming Mrs Schaefer, I am sad that the Hon. Dr Ritson has left the Council. He was one of my main guides during my initial entry into Parliament and his deep and gentle advice has stood me in good stead. I thank Dr Ritson for his help. The ill health of the Hon. John Burdett has caused us great concern, and I wish him a speedy recovery.

This fifth session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament will be dominated by deep economic concerns, as not only do we have a general world-wide recession and a national depression but also our own economic disaster, the State Bank. As we know, the royal commission was set up in 1991, under the Hon. Samuel Jacobs QC in which it was required to inquire into and report on the relationship between the bank and the Government. The Hon. S. Jacobs, QC, has reported, and the comments were damning to this Government. We now have the reports of the Auditor-General. The first report in March 1993 relates to the operation of the bank. Basically it asks, 'What went wrong and why?' The conclusion in essence was that the bank failed because, 'It grew too fast.' The Auditor-General's analogy of the whole situation is most apt:

There are chemicals which kill trees by forcing them to grow. They contain a growth hormone that stimulates and forces even a mature tree to produce new leaves and branches, expanding its canopy. But its growth is uncontrollable and wildly excessive, outstripping the ability of the tree to support and sustain itself. The tree's system cannot keep up. The new growth withers and the tree dies.

Yes, this is what has happened to our bank with its poor direction setting and its bad lending policies. For example, we note that the Collinsville stud group has still to find a buyer. In the second report in June 1993, the Auditor-General wrote in his introduction:

That a few individuals, charged with the responsibility for the administration of a major publicly owned financial institution and one of its wholly-owned companies, could, in a period of a few short years, allow the creation of a situation that has contributed to one of the largest financial disasters that Australia has experienced is difficult to comprehend. It is, nonetheless, a reality.

Further the Auditor-General said:

The social and economic consequences for all who live and conduct business in South Australia are so far reaching that South Australians will be paying for the excesses of the State Bank group for many years to come.

Again the phrase 'for many years to come' will be ringing in our ears especially when we look at the unemployment rate and jobs, especially for our youth and young adults in the age range of 15 to 25 years.

The second report looked into the affairs and operations of Beneficial Finance Corporation Limited, and whether the external audits of the accounts of the bank and of Beneficial Finance were appropriate and adequate. The Auditor-General's definition of 'adequate' is used to mean 'sufficient', and 'appropriate' to mean 'proper and fit'. In this context, the Auditor-General has found many instances in the audits of the bank and of Beneficial Finance that were not appropriate and that were not adequate.

In the summary of the factors that contributed to the losses sustained by Beneficial Finance were—and I will name some of them: Beneficial Finance's excessive exposure to commercial property development; Beneficial Finance's failure to establish adequate policies and procedures to evaluate credit risk; Beneficial Finance's inadequacies in management; Beneficial Finance's inadequacies in management information; the failure of the directors of Beneficial Finance to promptly supervise, direct and control Beneficial Finance's operations; the CEO's failure to adequately supervise, direct and control; and the failure of certain officers and employees to adequately supervise, direct and control, etc.

There were inadequacies all along the line, Beneficial Finance being the main financial arm of the bank. Evidence shows that this Government failed to act to ensure that the causes of Beneficial's losses were not promptly identified and dealt with. We now have a loss of \$3.1 billion or, more accurately, \$3 150 million total loss by the State Bank group. This is the largest single loss, but there is evidence of more losses that this Government is responsible for.

I will quote a few: a loss of \$300 million on 333 Collins Street; a loss of \$210 million on the Remm project; a loss of \$350 million by SGIC; a loss of \$60 million on Scrimber; payouts of \$10 million in legal costs relating to the Marine-land development; a blowout of \$28 million on the Justice Information System; a blowout of \$6 million regarding the Crouzet tickets by STA; a blowout of \$11 million in building the Island Seaway ferry to Kangaroo Island; and a blowout of \$4.2 million on the State Acquatic Centre. This is a litany of disastrous financial mismanagement of taxpayers' money.

We are now left with rising costs of interest payments on this State's debt. By June 1993, the Government debt will be about \$8.8 billion, compared with \$2.6 billion at June 1982. This means that important services like education, health, community safety and transport will have less funds, and a deterioration of these services will be inevitable.

With the predicted decline of our essential services, the other area of great concern is the unemployment rate. South Australia has a long standing jobs crisis due to this Government's policies which fail to encourage investments to sustain long term jobs. Let us look into some statistics on unemployment as released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics for June 1993. These are the South Australian statistics on the unemployment rate according to gender and according to the ability to speak English, and compared with the national rate. I seek leave to include in *Hansard* these tables from ABS June 1993 showing these statistics as mentioned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M.S.Feleppa): Is the table purely of a statistical nature?

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: Yes.

Leave granted.

S.A. EMPLOYMENT RATE—JUNE 1993		
	Male	Female
Total	11.7% (11.3%)*	8.5% (9.7%)*
Born in Australia	11.3% (10.7%)*	7.7% (9.1%)*
Born outside Australia		
English speaking country	11.0% (10.5%)*	8.8% (7.2%)*
Born outside Australia non-English speaking country	15.7% (14.9%)*	15.3% (14.7%)*
(*) National Unemployment Rate		

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: We note that, for South Australian males born in Australia, the unemployment rate for June 1993 is 11.3 per cent. For those born outside of Australia, but of English speaking background, the unemployment rate was 11 per cent. For those born outside Australia, but of non-English speaking background, the unemployment rate was 15.7 per cent. We will note there is a significant trend that shows that those born in Australia had a higher unemployment rate than those born outside of Australia but from an English speaking background. However, the trend also shows that those born outside of Australia and non-English speaking had a higher unemployment rate than any of the other two groups.

Generally, for all the three groups, the South Australian unemployment rate was higher than the national unemployment rate, and the national unemployment rate was 10.7 per cent for those born in Australia, 10.5 per cent for those born outside but from English speaking background, and 14.7 per cent for those born outside of Australia from a non-English speaking background.

Similarly, looking at the unemployment rate of South Australian females, we note that for those born in Australia, the rate was 7.7 per cent; for those born outside of Australia, the unemployment rate was 8 per cent from an English speaking background; and for those born outside Australia from a non-English speaking background the rate was 15.3 per cent. So we note that the trend shows that in South Australia the unemployment rate for females was lower than their male counterparts in the three groups.

However, again, except for the females born in South Australia, the South Australian rate for unemployment was higher than the national average. The national unemployment rate for females, for those born in Australia, was 9.1 per cent;

those born outside of Australia but from English speaking backgrounds, 7.2 per cent; and those born outside of Australia from a non-English speaking background, 14.7 per cent. We therefore note that in the race for jobs the males appear to be worse off than the females and, without the ability to communicate through the English language, one is significantly disadvantaged.

Next we look at the June 1993 ABS national unemployment rate according to gender and according to age. I seek leave to incorporate into *Hansard* this table of these statistics.

Leave granted.

NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE—JUNE 1993		
According to Age		
	Male	Female
Total	11.3%	9.7%
15-19 year olds		
looking for full time	27.5% (1:4)	37.3% (1:3)
20-24 year olds full time	18.3% (1:5)	15.8% (1:7)
(Total national average 10.5%)		

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: We note that in this table, for the age group 15 to 19 years, the unemployment rate for males was 27.5 per cent, and the unemployment rate for females was 37.3 per cent. In the second age group, from 20 to 24 years of age, the unemployment rate for males was 18.3 per cent and that for females was 15.8 per cent. The national average, as I mentioned, is 10.5 per cent. We therefore note that for youths and young adults there is an unacceptably high unemployment rate which varies in the ratio of one out of every three for teenage females and one out of every four for teenage males. It is one out of every five for young adult males, and one out of every seven for young adult females.

As an editorial entitled 'An everyday tragedy in our midst' in the *Advertiser* noted recently, when writing on youth unemployment:

... more will need to be done. . . and it will need to be done for years to come.

That is perhaps an echo of the bank disaster. These figures of high unemployment are unacceptable to all of us, in particular to our young adults looking for jobs for the first time. I understand that our young tertiary educated graduates, mainly in economics and accountancy, have to look for their first jobs overseas in places like Singapore and Malaysia where the unemployment rate is 2 per cent. This is a sad situation when our bright young men and women will be giving of their best to another country. The only bright aspect of this temporary migration is that perhaps our fully trained graduates will be imbued with the excellent work ethics and culture of that Asian country.

But, Mr Acting President, where are the jobs? In an article from the *Business Review* in 1991 Mr Foreman predicts that some areas will grow—and there are some areas that will, despite the recession—and therefore jobs will eventuate. One area is direct marketing, in particular telephone marketing. This work force has grown to 30 000. He points out that most of these jobs will not have been there 10 years ago. It is predicted that as Australia follows the US trend in this area direct marketing will increase from .35 per cent of the work force to 2.8 per cent, as is the percentage in the US. A further example of this is a Sydney firm that now has 35 000 contracted walkers who drop 1.1 billion items in letterboxes a year.

Another service that has increased is corporate training. With the introduction of the training guarantee levy there is

an explosion of training providers. Work for these well qualified people with educational skills will continue to grow. The waste management industry has grown 30 per cent a year since the late 1980s. With the tightening of State controls on the environment and consumer awareness of environmental issues, the area will continue to grow and with it a large range of jobs for chemists to unskilled labourers who are required to collect newspapers.

The supply of paper for recycling has also grown. Employment in the paper and printing industry has risen from 1.8 per cent since 1982-83, compared to a rise in manufacturing employment of only .6 per cent. Smaller printing shops employing 10 or less people have never been busier. There is a relative slowing, however, of the medium and large high quality producers. This printing industry will need bright school leavers who are computer literate and who can understand and control the whole process from keying in the information to printing the final product.

Older people who have lost their jobs in management are now buying into franchises. Franchising accounts for 22 per cent of Australia's retail sales and is predicted to rise to 30 per cent by the year 2000. In the US, franchising is already at 30 per cent of retail sales and is predicted to reach 50 per cent. Highly qualified professionals with a substantial pool of capital are getting into franchising because jobs are disappearing in industries where they used to work. The home care area will expand. Such home services will be for looking after the aged, for home cleaning and for collecting children from school, etc.

Finally, tourism is the expected big growth industry, with international visitors and numbers expected to increase by 9 per cent. Queensland appears to be leading the way. It is reported that 18 per cent of the over 2 million tourists who visited Australia went last year to Cairns. It is expected that the proportion will rise to 25 per cent. In South Australia, we have unique attractions of fresh fruits, fresh meat and fresh seafood, of parklands and easily accessible scenic amenities in the Adelaide Hills, of affordable use of golf courses, superb wines and a marvellous Mediterranean climate—and all of this is sought after by our near Asian neighbours who are now considered affluent by any standard. We must work harder to capture a greater percentage of the tourism market for South Australia.

In the context of increasing market potential we need to look at the rural area. The old adage that Australia rides on the sheep's back is in some respects no longer true. However, it can be further argued that in this recession, and with our continued reliance on the export of unprocessed raw materials, this saying is still as true as ever. However, the ride is now not quite so smooth. Our export of goods and services is down from 37.3 per cent in 1980-81 to 21.5 per cent. We are told *ad infinitum* that we must export value added products, that is, exports which include significant inputs of Australian labour and Australian technology.

Let us first look at farm assets and their decline in the 1990s. In an article in 1992, put out by the National Australia Bank, Tim Hutchins states that in 1970 a ton of wheat bought 2 200 litres of fuel but by 1991 it bought less than 200 litres. This highlights the problems faced by farmers in this last decade of the twentieth century. The prices of our major products—wheat, wool, cattle—have been slowly declining since the 1960s. However, the agricultural sector has increased its productivity at double the rate of our other economic sectors. The broadacre industries have averaged 2.2

per cent productivity growth, compared to 1.3 per cent for the manufacturing sector.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer: They're still starving to death.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: As my colleague says, yes, they are still starving to death, so why the apparent contradiction between increasing productivity but declining yields? Hutchins tells us that the current average levels of production at existing prices are insufficient to cover costs. Therefore, surplus capital for upgrading the farm, its plant and its improvements are not available. The other reason for declining investments is that the current system of accounting masks the true costs of farming.

The underlying lack of investment is invisible to the community at large. The effects are that there is a decline in productive assets such as plant and improvements, a decline in the level of services to the rural community and an increasing level of environmental degradation occurring in the farmlands. The condition of the family on the farm is deteriorating compared with that of town and city dwellers. This trend is amplified by the lack of leisure time available for farming families. For example, leisure time in days per week for a husband on the farm is .6 days per week; in the town it is 1.4 days; and in the city it is two days per week. For the wife on the farm it is 1.2 days; 3.2 days in the town; and 3.1 days in the city. We must recognise and accept that that is not much leisure time at all for rural people.

Further, the migration of children away from agriculture has even more serious implications. The long-term future of the farming industry depends on young people seeing farming as an attractive and rewarding profession. However, with the increasing age of machinery, the increasing age of buildings and the increasing age of the farmers themselves, farming does not look attractive. A New South Wales farmer, when asked how he gets through such periods, replied:

I'm in survival mode, I guess you'd call it. You don't replace machinery. You only do essential maintenance and you live to some degree on last year's fat. We have reduced staff and we are probably down to less than ideal.

However, having listened to my colleague the Hon. Mrs Caroline Schaefer's speech, I recall her saying that rural people are 'resilient and resourceful'. I believe this to be so, as I attended the recent conference of the South Australian Farmers Federation and heard Mr Graham Blight, the President, speaking on *New Horizons*. It was a most forceful and practical speech. He said:

New Horizons emphasises the need to not only get the farm side right but also to get the processing and marketing right. Value adding in Australia can only be successful if all the linkages in the system are competitive. Farmers are one of these links and we at the farm level must ensure we are at world's best performance.

The term 'value adding to agriculture', as mentioned by Mr Blight and numerous others, is the way to go, but it needs to be internationally competitive. In an article in *Agricultural Science* of March 1992, the reasons given for the benefits of value adding are:

1. It contributes directly to the national GDP.
2. It either boosts export revenue or reduces import payments and it contributes to the current account balance, which is still at a disastrous annual level of \$16 billion.
3. It contributes to employment.

What are the strategies for increasing value adding in agriculture? A 10-point agenda is suggested in the *Agricultural Science* article. These points are:

1. Develop goals and strategies for successful value adding industry development.

2. Provide a climate of cooperation between industry, Government, researchers and teachers.

3. Recognise that there is a role for Government; for example, incentive and appropriate regulatory framework. The notion of a 'level playing field' is a theory and not part of the real world.

I would subscribe to that. It continues:

4. Foster a strong export culture, forging strong commercial links with Asia. We should be marketing Australia and its products as an integral part of the West Pacific Rim.

5. Give top priority to markets and marketing strategy.

6. Develop and adopt market driven innovations.

7. Foster in Australia a fundamental change in attitude to the workplace and to the role of Australian industry in underpinning our living standards.

8. The high protection levels need to be lowered, but the pace of reduction is critical and needs to be appropriately phased.

9. Continue the reform program regarding waterfront, industrial relations, land transport, infrastructure and regulations.

10. Provide the education and training environment needed by business to develop the capital intensive, higher wage value adding activities.

In discussing value adding, one of the points recommended was the forging of strong commercial links with Asia. We ought to integrate strongly with Asian economies and to exploit the ongoing industrial migration patterns occurring there. This is a recommendation that we must implement if we are to trade with our Asian neighbours. We have to have a renewed commitment towards Asia.

In our recent trade and cultural delegation to Singapore, Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia) and Vietnam we noticed that Australians were very well liked and that there are tremendous trade and tourist opportunities. We need to position ourselves in Asia to capture these opportunities. Some ideas are: to enhance return, Australian companies should recognise the diversity and fragmentation of Asia in carefully selecting specific areas of Asia for participation and selecting specific roles for building competitive advantage. In addition, to better assess and contain risks, Australian firms must play the game of business in Asian ways and become insiders in the regional markets where we seek to earn returns.

Further, how will we be able to deal competently in Asia? The *Business Council Bulletin* suggests that the selection and development of people who will work in and with Asian operations is a very important factor. The other point to emphasise is the knowledge of Asian ways. What is their custom and their culture? There are two main hidden differences in eastern and western culture. The first key concept is the fast and slow speeds of sending messages. The eastern method is by the slow speed; it takes time for relationships and friendships to develop and a long time for them to solidify.

Closeness in relationships is important in the Eastern culture. Developing friendships in the Western culture is relatively easy. Some would say that these friendships are informal, superficial and do not involve deep confidences. Australians may take longer to 'read' the Asians than they are accustomed to.

The second key concept is high and low context. Context is the information that surrounds an event. Asians have a high context, as they have networks amongst family and friends, and normal transactions do not require much background information. A high context communication is one where most of the information is in the person and very little is in the transmitted part of the message. Low context communication is the very opposite: most of the information is in the message. Australians are seen as low context people. We have to know and understand these hidden differences.

So far, the discussion has been on economics, jobs, rural issues and trade with Asia. I am not usually familiar with these topics. However, in this climate we have to highlight these issues, as financially or economically we have been, and are still, on a downward slide. We must try somehow to arrest this slide.

The final topics that I want to touch upon are more familiar to me, and in better economic times a more detailed discussion would ensue. However, that does not mean that these issues are any less important. They are the topics of the indigenous people; the environment; and abuse of children, women and human kind—that is, human rights.

This year is the International Year of the World's Indigenous People, and I would like to raise some issues for our Aboriginal people, in particular for Aboriginal women and children. Previously, as a Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service medical doctor, I had worked with Aboriginal mothers and their children, mainly at Port Adelaide and at the Aboriginal community at Point Pearce on Yorke Peninsula. I noted at that time that the health of the Aboriginal children was not up to the standard of that of the majority of the children in Australia. I am therefore delighted to be informed that the Aboriginal Women's Council was asked to conduct its own study to ascertain what Aboriginal women think about child protection policies. The outcome was a book entitled—and I will give the English version—'*Looking After Children, Grandmother's Way. That Is The Way*'. The recommendations are important and are as follows:

1. That FACS immediately begin the process of establishing policies and procedural guidelines which are based upon the desire of the Anangu and the organisations which represent Anangu.
2. That such policy development must involve Anangu in a decision making role in the preparation of any statement relevant to the AP lands. Policy regarding removal of children from the AP lands is a crucial issue for Anangu which needs to be addressed in this process.
3. That FACS hold immediate discussions with the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Women's Council and other bodies determined to establish agreed mechanisms for the department's operation on AP Lands.
4. That FACS initiate inter-departmental discussions with ATSIC (the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Commission), the Department of Social Security and other relevant departments concerning the needs of women on the AP lands who are fostering children and are in need of urgent resources.
5. That appropriate training of all departmental staff in cross-cultural issues be conducted, with Anangu closely involved in training programs, development and implementation. This is particularly important for staff whose duties directly involve Anangu.
6. That FACS provide resources as a high priority to the establishment of appropriate programs and strategies for education in service delivery for child protection on the AP lands as are identified in the report. Such programs must be proposed and managed by Anangu, with agreed mechanisms for accountability to the departments involved.

Mr Acting President, Mr H. Wootton QC states:

It is essential to stop treating Aborigines as dependent people, whose welfare is looked after by others who know better than they, and give them back the opportunities for self reliance, independence and self-respect. . .

And that goes for all of us. It is important also to note that, in the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Women's Council from 1980 to 1990, the council has put together the Aboriginal women's activities, concerns and achievements over that period. It has been collated in a book entitled *Women Growing Strong Together*, and as the coordinator of the women's council suggests: it is in unity that women have gained their strength. In the book there are noted some of the major projects with which the

women's council has been involved, and they show a wide range of activities, and congratulations to them are due.

As the Chairperson of the women's council, Ruby Forbes, stated:

We want other people to learn how important it is to have our own organisation. We feel we are strong through having our own council. It gives us a voice to be strong.

So, Mr President we next look at the environment. There appears to be a lessening of support for environmental issues due to the economic downturn. There is the perception of trees or jobs—environment or development. This argument has raged ever since I have been in Parliament and during my local council days. I still find it hard to understand, even during the recession, how one does not try to conserve whilst also supporting development. Of course, there are times when the two are irreconcilable, in which case surely the environment must be supported.

If we subscribe to Brundtland's definition of sustainable development, which is 'that the needs of the present generation should be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs', there is an interdependence between the environment and the economy. In this section on the environment I would like to quote some philosophies that I support. In the *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, December 1992, T. Hundloe stated:

Sustainable development is an ethical issue beyond the limits of economics.

In *Habitat Australia*, February 1992, R. Beaumont stated:

In the long run, the real choice is not jobs or environment. It's both or neither. What kind of jobs will be possible in a world of depleted resources, poisoned water and foul air, a world where ozone depletion and greenhouse warming makes it difficult to survive?

Finally, in the conclusion of an article from the *Business Council Bulletin* of November 1992, entitled 'Business and sustainable development', I quote as follows:

A number of conclusions emerge—

1. We are well into an era when environmental consensus are being integrated into every aspect of business decision making.
2. If business wants a stable, predictable policy climate in which to work, it must accept responsibility for maintaining high environmental standards.
3. However, the responsibility for sustainable development cannot rest with business alone. Government can assist or hinder in this process, depending upon the framework which it establishes.
4. There is an urgent need for a more balanced and predictable policy framework in Australia. If we cannot achieve that, the goal of sustainable development will elude us.

I hope that we will be able to take a balanced look at all development and ensure that sustainable development can and must be achieved.

My concluding topic is on abuse. We are supposed to be civilised and a developed nation and State. However, the latest abuse that we as a community are perpetrating on our children is horrendous. We are given graphic accounts of physical abuse on children and on women. Our reaction, understandably, I suppose, is to hit back, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. 'Bring back corporal punishment; bring back capital punishment,' we cry. But will this address the situation? I think not, as this reactive solution has been tried and has not decreased our unacceptable and anti-social activities.

We must search for the cause of these actions, as humans are complex beings who do not react simply to physical punishment as a deterrent. At best, physical punishment will serve only as a temporary retardation, so we must find the cause. This we know is easier said than done. However, we

note from the latest *Journal of Paediatrics*, July 1990, that a strategy called 'home visitation' has evolved in America. It is a research program whereby nurses visit the homes of certain target groups, for example, socially disadvantaged women and children from the prenatal period regularly and over a period of two years.

The evidence suggests that the home visit programs that have the greatest chance of success have three characteristics, the first of which is that they are based on ecological models; that is, influences on mother and child's health are reviewed in terms of material, social, behavioural and psychological factors rather than a single influence.

The second characteristic is that these programs are designed to address the ecology of the family during pregnancy and early child bearing years and to establish a rapport with the families by regular and long-term contact.

Thirdly, the programs are targeted at families at greater risk of material and child health problems by virtue of their poverty and lack of personal and social resources. We must try harder to address the root cause of these horrendous reactions of people under stress.

As we discuss abuse, that brings me onto the international stage of human rights. During my international visits I have observed that Australia as a nation is respected by our Asian neighbours for our strong stance in supporting human rights. We have been acknowledged for our disapproval of apartheid in South Africa. Now, with East Timor at our backdoor, we seem to be dragging our feet. As we know, the Leader of the East Timor resistance, Mr Gusmoa, has been given a life sentence by the Indonesian court in Dili, East Timor. There is now concern for his well-being and he has not been allowed any visitors.

This year, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights passed a resolution, supported by Australia, that calls on Indonesia to ensure that all East Timorese in custody are treated in accordance with international humanitarian law; expresses its concern about the investigations of the massacre at Dili; and urges the Indonesian Government to invite four special rapporteurs to the territory. It is time for us to allow East Timor the right to self-determination.

As I end on this international note, one might say that the East Timor issue is a Federal matter. However, issues that touch on the abuse of people, of women and of children, are our responsibility in whatever sphere of Government; and we have a duty to respond. In this State and nation of ours even in our economic difficulties we must not forget, overlook or take for granted the gift that our legislation imparts to us: freedom of speech. I support the motion.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage): In rising to support the motion I feel that I should explain why I wish to make a speech today on State libraries. Three months ago I was invited to give a speech on the Labor Party policy regarding libraries, but due to a misunderstanding with the organisers I did not have sufficient time to give the full speech. Since then, the Hon Ms Laidlaw has requested a copy of my speech. I felt it inappropriate to provide a copy of a speech that I had not given. To enable her to obtain the information that she wishes, I felt that in the Address in Reply debate I would give the speech that I would have given on that occasion, somewhat modified, of course, to make it appropriate for this occasion.

In talking about the library services in this State, I want to stress very clearly the Government's commitment to library services. First, I would like to indicate just what we

have achieved in the past couple of years. Our achievements are considerable, and I feel they deserve close attention. This Government believes we should provide the best possible library service to all South Australians, from Coober Pedy to Mount Gambier, and not just to the people of Adelaide.

It is this overall support for public libraries that I would like to address first. In December 1991 the then Premier and the then Chair of the Local Government Association agreed on a formula to provide funding to the then 135 public libraries across this State. This formula will see the Government commit \$8.5 million for public libraries in the financial year we have just come into. That \$8.5 million is distributed evenly via a *per capita* formula with some adjustments for special needs. The funds go to the big public libraries, and let us take Salisbury as an example. Next year Salisbury public library will receive \$653 593 in State Government grants, and that is not an inconsiderable sum, as I am sure honourable members will agree. The money is divided into two major components: there is a grant to the local council to assist with the operating costs of the library, and there is a grant for the purchase of materials such as books, magazines, audio cassettes and video tapes.

It is certainly not just the big city communities that benefit from this library money. We are also providing Minlaton on the Yorke Peninsula with \$9 357 and Port Pirie with \$112 613. Andamooka will receive \$7 271. I could go on and list the 137 different grants, but I am sure that if any honourable member is interested they can request a copy of the grants for each library. Quite clearly, many of the services around the State would simply cease to exist without our support, and I certainly believe the people of Andamooka have as much right to public library services as anyone else in South Australia. From my various visits to regions in this State and throughout the wider metropolitan area, I know just how much these library services are appreciated.

We must not forget that libraries are our greatest cultural asset. Forty per cent of South Australians use the public library service; that is one of the highest usage rates in Australia. I would suggest that the great majority of that 40 per cent enjoy that cultural resource at a local level, which is why I am so committed to ensuring that all public libraries across the State continue to be well funded. These grants to local libraries form only a part of our support for local libraries. In this current year the Government will also spend almost \$.5 million promoting and supporting community information services, mostly through local libraries. These provide a vital link in ensuring that local communities are kept informed with up-to-date and accurate information on the services that affect their day-to-day lives. That means ensuring that people know not only what services are available but also what are their rights to these services.

Then there is PLAIN (the Public Libraries Automated Information Network); quite simply, it is an electronic system which connects all the public libraries in South Australia. PLAIN, therefore, enables anyone to approach their local library, inquire about any item held at any other public library in the State and arrange to take out that item on loan. Thus, the combined collections of every public library are potentially available to any public library user in the State.

To give members an indication of the benefits of PLAIN to the people of South Australia, the system currently holds the records for some 1.3 million items, and that figure is growing daily. By the way, PLAIN is already processing some 4 000 inter-library loans each month. The latest stage of PLAIN, stage 4, which I launched a few months ago, will

allow local libraries to select for themselves the materials relevant to their own community, whilst retaining the cost benefits of centralised purchasing and processing of materials. That is another significant technological achievement. However, these just do not happen. There has to be financial support to take ideas off the drawing board and turn them into something concrete. Back in 1988, the State and local governments agreed to jointly fund PLAIN. That agreement stands today as a powerful symbol of the relationship between State and local governments in South Australia. Over the past five years, almost \$6 million has been spent developing this system to that which we have today—and I may say it is the envy of the library systems in all the other States.

Perhaps we could look at the fact that technology and its impact on library services is not a new phenomenon. Indeed, if we turn the clock back to 1896, it was reported (and I would like to quote from an article at the time):

The card catalogue ordered for the public library on the recommendations of Mr Adams, the librarian, has been received. It consists of a cabinet containing six drawers, with 22 500 cards and 1 500 guides, as well as rods, blocks, labelholders and labels. It is estimated that this supply will suffice for the cataloguing of one-third of the present contents of the library. For two years the Library Committee has been obliged to stop the purchase of all books, and if the peculiar economy continues, the librarian will be able to devote much of his time to the new catalogue.

I need hardly point out that no such 'peculiar economies' were necessary for the development of PLAIN. There was no suggestion that, in order to improve our cataloguing system, we had to cease buying all books for the period of technological development. Certainly, in the current financial year the State Government will be contributing some \$2.1 million towards the continuing operating costs of PLAIN. You, Mr President, may have gathered that PLAIN is a system of which I am particularly proud. It was developed on budget and on time by a South Australian company, and it is already saving the taxpayers of this State some \$1 million a year. I repeat: it is the envy of public libraries in all other Australian States. It is another achievement that people should note because, without the support and the initiative of the State Government, it simply would not exist today.

The City of Adelaide Lending Library would not exist today, either, but for the foresight and the generous financial support of the State Government. For many years it has been recognised that Adelaide was the only State capital not to have a lending library for its residents run by the City Council. The State Government looked to redress this and, following negotiations between the City Council and the Libraries Board, I signed an agreement in 1991 establishing the city of Adelaide lending library, which has the delightful acronym CALL.

The State Government continues to fund half the running costs of this lending library. This will amount to nearly \$500 000 in the current financial year.

Turning to the State Library itself, within the library we have begun implementing the SALINET system, which provides on-line access to the catalogue of the library's collections as well as improving the technical management of acquisitions, cataloguing and materials processing. So, the movement of materials can be monitored and controlled both within and outside the library.

This SALINET (South Australian Library Information Network) system will cost a total of \$2.8 million and is already providing excellent service improvements to library users and staff, including networking facilities to access other

information utilities locally and world-wide through the Australian Academic Research Network. Wilson indices loaded into SALINET give access to more than four million articles in about 3 900 periodicals.

The State Library has also acquired several hundred periodic titles on CD-ROM that extends the library's capacity without the need for the extensive collections of other libraries. These various projects demonstrate the library's commitment to provide information to the South Australian public using state of the art technology, by building a most sophisticated and integrated library information system and network.

Furthermore, shortly PLAIN will be linked to the SALINET system so that the world-wide access available through SALINET can be tapped into at the most remote and smallest of our public libraries throughout the State.

The Government has also spent a considerable sum on the exterior restoration of the Institute Building on the corner of North Terrace and Kintore Avenue. This recognises the historic architectural and cultural importance of the building, the oldest cultural building in South Australia.

The key ground floor rooms of the institute have been refurbished and were opened recently by the Premier. They will enhance the library's capacity to deliver a full and stimulating range of public programs. The former Adelaide Circulating Library room will be available for South Australian writers and authors as a venue for book launches at no hiring cost to the author.

The State Library is also contributing to a number of community programs. Indeed, Foundation South Australia recognises that the State Library's co-funding of a community health program is one of its most effective sponsorships. The Libraries Board has recently submitted a new proposal to Foundation South Australia for establishing a health information access centre at the State Library. There is also in existence a community information program that delivers a range of video and other library resources to public libraries and information agencies throughout the State.

In addition, there is the recent production of a training kit and promotional video for community information workers that is seen as an important contribution to the Government's social justice program. Furthermore, staff at the State Library are developing a range of programs that acknowledge the culturally and diverse nature of South Australians, including both those of non-English speaking background and Aboriginal Australians.

The State Library's position as a leader in the nation is recognised by our library having management of the national plan for Australian newspapers on behalf of all the State libraries in the country, including the National Library.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the recent election of the State Library Director, Fran Awcock, to be Chair of the Council of Australian State Libraries. This is a tribute both to her and to our State Library. All of what I have outlined so far reinforces my original statement that the State Government is committed to the provision of effective library services in South Australia. These are very real achievements that we should all be proud of as South Australians.

But I would also like to talk some hard facts. First, the State Government expects to spend some \$23.5 million on library services in South Australia this financial year. That figure represents about 34 per cent of the total Arts and Cultural Heritage budget. Secondly (and this is not generally recognised), our State Government spends more *per capita* on library services than any other State or Territory in

Australia apart from Tasmania. With its tiny population, Tasmania does have greater servicing costs, and in Tasmania there is no local government contribution at all.

According to the latest available figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, South Australia spends \$25.71 per head of population on libraries; Western Australia spends \$22.65; Victoria spends \$18.95; Queensland spends \$16.17; and New South Wales comes up bottom with just \$15.62 *per capita*. Nationally, the average is \$18.26, and I remind members that for South Australia the *per capita* figure is \$25.71. I may say also that we are penalised as a State for being above the average in the fiscal equalisation formulae which are determined by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. However, this does not alter our resolve to maintain excellent library services for all our citizens. Our commitment is above reproach.

I would like to touch briefly on the question of State Library opening hours, which has been mentioned in this Parliament on several occasions. Let us start by considering the facts, because numerous erroneous statements have been made. First, our State Library does not have the shortest opening hours of any State library in Australia. For the main library services, that is both our Bray Reference Library and the Mortlock Australiana Library, the State Library of South Australia currently provides 56.5 hours per week of full service, and that is considerably more than both Queensland, with 42 hours, and Tasmania, with 38 hours per week. I stress that the question of the level of service of the library is something which should not be ignored.

Other State libraries may claim greater opening hours, but it is the level of service they provide during those hours which they neglect to mention, and with very good reason. What is the point of saying your library is open for 61 hours a week, as Queensland claims, when sections such as the John Oxley library, which is the equivalent of our Mortlock, is open for only 42 hours a week? Is a State Library really open if service points are not staffed to assist with inquiries and if books and materials cannot be retrieved from all the main library areas? I would suggest that to say so is playing with words. If all it took to open a library was unlocking a door and leaving a light on, our State Library could easily be open for 24 hours a day, seven days a week and 365 days a year, but I would imagine that complaints about lack of service would become extremely vociferous.

We should not forget that until last year our Mortlock Library also was closed for 2½ days a week. I think we must recognise that our State Library is meeting the needs of the people of South Australia and I applaud the decision of the Libraries Board to maintain the same hours of access and service for both the Bray and Mortlock Libraries.

I would like to quote briefly from a survey of State Library users which was carried out in July last year. Only 21 per cent of respondents said that they would often use the State Library between the hours of 6 and 8 o'clock in the evenings. In other words, 79 per cent said they would not. Further, 64 per cent said they would never use it after 9 o'clock. Friday was identified as the most important evening to be open and so the board of the State Library responded by ensuring that on Fridays the library remained open in the evening.

I did not relish the prospect of closing the State Library on other weekday evenings, but I certainly strongly supported the board's view that it was better to reduce opening hours than to cut the resources being put into the collections. After all, items which are not purchased when they are available

will be gone forever from the library shelves, and that will affect future generations far more than a few less hours of opening. The Libraries Board certainly believed that, with the resources available, it was more important to provide a full service for a shorter number of hours rather than a threadbare service spread across longer hours. We should note that at the same time the weekend services were increased—and I stress increased—unlike those of the university libraries, so that families and working people continue to be catered for on both Saturdays and Sundays for a far greater number of hours.

In relation to hours at the State Library, members may know that as from 1 July the State Library is open for two evenings a week, Wednesdays and Fridays, until 8 o'clock. Those two evenings were chosen because the survey I mentioned previously indicated that these were the most two popular evenings for library users. Further, we have made a commitment that no later than 1 March next year the Library will remain open with full service every week night—that is Monday to Friday—until 8 o'clock. This is a big increase in opening hours in real terms.

This is a most significant commitment by this Government and I can add that it will be achieved without resorting to cuts to any other State Library service or any major area of service from the arts budget being depleted to compensate. We should be proud of our library services in this State. They are undoubtedly the best in this country and we have much to applaud and appreciate. I support the motion.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: In my contribution to the Address in Reply to Her Excellency the Governor's speech, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Caroline Schaefer and wish her all the best in this Council. Unfortunately, at the late hour when Dr Ritson retired, I did not have the opportunity to say a few words about him. Dr Ritson was well respected in this Parliament by everybody. He was never a person who attacked anybody personally in the House: he was one who, if he wanted to attack anybody, he would attack the Party. He was very helpful to me and I classed him as a good friend in this place. Last August when I was suffering somewhat and was advised to go to chiropractors and physiotherapists because I was losing the use of my legs, Dr Ritson advised me strongly against it.

I finally went and had X-rays taken. Of course, I received the same results as I have for the last 15 years with the same problem, and that was that it was torn fibres. Nothing showed up on the black and white X-rays, but finally Dr Ritson talked me into having a CAT scan, which I did, and we found then that I had broken bones in the back which were sticking into the nerves, and some of them were very close to the spinal cord, I might add. If I had gone to a chiropractor I would really have been in trouble. So I class Dr Ritson as a good friend and I am sorry he has retired from this place, but no doubt we will be seeing him again very shortly.

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: Did he ask you to change Party?

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: No, he didn't ask me to change. I did not think I would ever hear myself saying this, but recently our resident poet in this place, the Hon. Mr Davis, went and gave evidence before a Senate committee. Now, if this has not been hyped up by the press, which I am not sure of at this stage, then what the Federal Government is proposing to do is disgusting. People are trying to save for their future, they are putting a bit of money away and perhaps putting it into shares, but now they have to pay tax on that. That is totally unacceptable as far as I am concerned.

They are virtually saying to these people, 'If you want to go and spend all your money and go to the races, etc, and get rid of it that way, then we will look after you on the old age pension,' but some people want the dignity of having a bit of money put aside for their old age. I believe they are entitled to do that, without any shadow of doubt. So I think Mr Dawkins is quite wrong.

A constituent came to see me recently—and if he wants to look at things like this he might get some better ideas on how to save money. He has his 17-year-old son living with him and makes \$40 000 a year. He is separated from his wife, who makes \$19 000 a year. If the son lives with his mother he can claim Austudy and get \$7 000 and he also gets a medical card. But if he lives with his father he is not entitled to that. The boy said to his father, 'Look, Dad, I don't want to be a burden on you, I want to be able to claim Austudy.' Virtually what we are saying to these young people is that they have to lie and say they are living in the other house. If the system has so many holes in it, it should be looked at. There is no doubt about that whatsoever.

I want to refer also to the tragedy of the State Bank of South Australia. The money we lost there—\$3.1 billion—is a tragedy. Everybody in this place feels it. We are all very disappointed at the way our people spent the taxpayers' money, or lent it into unsecured areas. But we have to take into account the turndown in the economic world in which we live these days. If we look at, say, Great Britain, the Bank of England also spent something like £12 billion (which is approximately \$27 million) to prop up banks in England. We can look at America. If we went around the banks of the world we would find that it would run into trillions of dollars.

It has been very handy for those in the Liberal Party in South Australia and they have talked about nothing else for the past one and a half years. I do not know whether they know anything about the unemployment that is happening around Australia. South Australia is picking up in the unemployment area; we have been since the Arnold Government took over in this State. We are starting to see ourselves come out of this but, of course, we will never be given credit for that and we will never be given support for that by the Opposition because the Opposition is trying to disenfranchise itself with the rest of the States. It does not want to be like Victoria; it does not want to be like New South Wales; it does not want to be like Western Australia; and it certainly does not want to be like Tasmania. It is saying, 'We will not have any of those industrial problems here. We are not going to change anything here.' But we all know that that is what the Liberal Party would most certainly do.

The union movement also sees what is happening in this State and it is running for cover. If the Liberal Party does get elected in this State we will find that a lot of the unions will change over to Federal awards, to try to protect their membership. No real policy has been brought down by the Liberal Party. Every time they have been challenged to put up or shut up they have never been able to put up.

South Australians will be much worse off under a Liberal Government. South Australia does not want the hard line Hewson/Howard/Kennett attack on its industrial relations and we will put up a real fight to make sure that that does not occur in South Australia. I think the people of South Australia have enough sense to realise that there is no way that the Liberal Party can get us out of the problems that we have in this State at the present time. But the Labor Party can and will, and we are moving towards that at the present time.

When Opposition members get up in here and speak about unemployment we never hear them tell people about the submarine contracts, the submarine that is just about to come out, the thousands of workers who are working down there and the thousands of jobs that that is creating in South Australia. They are not prepared to talk about these things because what they are trying to do is to keep us down. They want to keep quiet and not put any policies forward so that when we go to the election they will hit us and hit us pretty hard.

The Liberal Party has learnt very well from the New Zealand National Party. When that Party first started to move into power in New Zealand it was not going to change industrial relations. New Zealand has the worst legislation for workers of any country but Australia has picked it up very well. Victoria has done very well on it, Western Australia is now starting to move into that area and, of course, New South Wales. We will give them a run for their money at the next election. The people of South Australia are not silly. They know what the Liberal Party will do and I am sure, when they look at what has occurred in the other States, they will most certainly vote Labor at the next election.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I am pleased to support Her Excellency's speech on the opening of the Fifth Session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament, and in so doing I offer my condolences to the family and relatives of Sir Condor Laucke, a former Lieutenant Governor and member of this House whose contribution has been well documented. I also extend my condolences to the families and relatives of Richard (Dick) Geddes who was also a member of this House and with whom I had quite some contact. He was a fighter for country people and a man with a likeable personality and a great sense of humour. He always enjoyed writing small texts or messages to the world, which he would do in a most unusual manner—whilst he was out in the paddock feeding grain to his sheep. He would write his message to the world as he fed the sheep and in time the grain would germinate and there, for all the world to see, would be Dick's delightful messages. I also pay my respects to the family of Hugh Hudson who was a latter-day member of the House of Assembly and whose record has been spoken of at length in this forum.

I also pay my respects to the family of Bert Teusner, who was a member of the House of Assembly.

I also want to pay a tribute to my friend and colleague, the Hon. Dr Robert Ritson, who has unselfishly retired from this Parliament and allowed Carolyn Schaefer to assume his seat. Bob shared a room with me and, although at times we had trouble seeing each other through the smoke haze, there was never a cross word or a heated feeling between us. We did not always see issues from the same angle, but we generally agreed in the final analysis.

Much has been said about Bob's integrity and I concur. However, the most memorable picture in my mind is Bob's speeches off the cuff. They were always well reasoned, spoken with conviction and read very well the next day. I salute Bob and wish him all the best, whether he is doctoring, rock hounding or sailing the seven seas—three things I know he enjoys very much.

Carolyn Schaefer will be a significant contributor to this Parliament and her background surely indicates that her contribution will be interesting. I am delighted to have another Eyre Peninsula representative in this Parliament.

I note with interest that the Governor's speech suggests signs of an economic recovery for this State. However, I wonder about that because the rest of Australia has been bouncing along on the bottom of an economic trough with little spikes of recovery every now and again for far too long.

One of the reasons for the very poor signs of recovery is that we are not exporting enough. Commodity prices on a world basis have been low, particularly in the rural sector, and the collapse of the wool industry has caused a trickle-down effect, causing woolgrowers to try other commodities, for example, barley, oats, wheat, beef and exotics such as wine, deer and emu. Some of these commodities, particularly beef and sheep meats, are now coming under restrictions from other countries.

The EEC and North America are able to subsidise their primary producers to a very large extent because of their large populations. Australia has been singularly unsuccessful in having subsidies lowered by other nations. There are very few support schemes for primary industries in Australia because of its economic health, which is quite poor at the moment. This is borne out by the huge rural debt now in Australia.

In South Australia alone it averages \$160 000 per farm. This means that the interest bill is, say, \$16 000 per annum before living and running expenses can be added. These producers are still efficient, growing more and more produce per farm each year. However, thousands of farmers are drowning in debt and are leaving the industry—a trend that has accelerated in the period of this Labor Government.

If primary producers are to remain viable, States such as South Australia must keep their costs to a minimum. In South Australia during the past 11 years, the Labor Government has inflicted huge debts on the public, most of which will have to be picked up by the exporters. Production costs, such as the highest FID in Australia, stamp duty and payroll tax are bad enough, but combine them with the loss of capital expenditure on other infrastructure such as schools, hospitals, roads and ports, and it can be seen how our standard of living has slipped.

These debts are to be added to any personal debt we may have incurred whilst establishing or running our businesses. The State Bank collapse of \$3.5 billion—or \$2 250 for every man, woman and child—has to be added to any personal debt, and this means that for a family of four \$9 000 can be added to the family debt.

If we take the equation further, the picture is even more horrifying. By the Premier's own admission to the Public Service Association earlier this year, if there is no change of policy the State debt will blow out to \$12 billion by 1996, or \$8 000 for every man, woman and child, adding \$32 000 to the debt of every family of four. This huge debt is eating so much of the State's revenue. Simply put, for every dollar raised by taxation 50¢ is going to pay the interest on the State debt, leaving only 50¢ for capital and running expenditure. This must surely be one of the worst cases of mismanagement of a State's affairs in modern times. How can the public have confidence in the Arnold Labor Government's ability to manage the affairs of the State in future?

I want to spend a few minutes on rural debt, particularly the debt on farms in South Australia. Much has been said over the past five years, but each day the picture seems to change, and I believe that an update on thinking in this area is due.

In recent years banks, both large and small, have lost, if I may use the term, megabucks, with clients chasing the property markets, for example. The State Bank chased the

Remm development and it had exposure to developments on the Gold Coast, in New Zealand, London and New York, most of which have failed badly. The valuation of these investments is now half or one-third of their purchase prices, and returns on investments are low.

It is quite evident that the State Bank believes it cannot recover most of these investment losses; otherwise, it would not have split the bank into the good and the bad bank.

If that equation or standard is suitable for one strata of society—investors and property developers who provide very little in the way of new money for the community with no or very few exports—why cannot the same formula apply to farm debt and have some of it written off? This is not a new idea as it applied at the latter end of the Great Depression of the 1920s and 1930s. In fact, in the 1930s the property that I now own had a debt that could not be serviced because of the low income from commodity prices, but after much negotiation some £1 400 was written off by the State Bank and the property changed title from freehold to leasehold under the State Bank, and that title still exists today.

I am sure that a formula for debt adjustment can be devised to assist those primary producers whose operations became non-viable, through no fault of their own, through the high interest rates in the mid 1980s, which is something they could not have foreseen in the early 1980s. Private bank shareholders may oppose this suggestion, but they have already had their dividends reduced markedly by imprudent lending by their banks, mostly in real estate development. The banks stand to make good returns, and in fact have made good returns, from the debt being paid for by those who are indebted to them now, or by primary producers who are now hanging in and living very modest lives so that they can pay the enormous interest bills to which I have previously referred.

I should now like to make some comments regarding Mabo. This is a particularly emotive issue, but I should just like to take a few minutes to put my perspective. I have had reasonably close contact with the Aboriginal community, particularly the Western Desert people, and last month I travelled to Thursday Island, where I talked to a cross-section of people for a short time about the Mabo issue.

I also attended a conference in Canberra recently dealing with Mabo and its ramifications on the Constitution. Addressing that conference were some well-informed and interesting speakers. Amongst these were two North American Indians and Chief Justice Durrie from New Zealand, who chairs the tribunal dealing with claims made by the Maori people under the Treaty of Waitangi. The message that came from Durrie was that a structure for resolution must be put in place quickly and the solving of individual claims be spread over a much longer period. For example, Chief Justice Durrie informed us that there were about 300 claims now under the Treaty of Waitangi and they expected to resolve between two and four per year, so it will be a long time before they resolve the New Zealand problem.

Last year the High Court ruled that *terra nullius* (that is, that Australia was deemed to be unoccupied) was not to apply as it was claimed in 1788. Since 1788 a whole land title system and a large amount of the legal precedent which are understood by the present generation of Australians have been established. In 1901 the institution, which was drawn up by our forefathers, included both hindsight and foresight and also the feeling of the day. It has proved to be a marvellous document which brought the States and Territories together to form the Commonwealth.

However, when it came to recognising indigenous people of Australia it was not only relatively silent but also positively discriminated against them. Certainly they were not recognised in the Constitution when it dealt with franchise in Part 4, section 41, setting out the franchise requirements. I will quote from a commentary on the Constitution. Entitled *The Australian Constitution (An Analysis)*, and written by H.S. Nichols, an analysis written in 1952, it refers to that section 41 of which I just spoke. It states:

All persons not under 21, whether male or female, who have lived in Australia for six months continuously or who are naturally born or naturalised subjects of the King are entitled to enrol with certain exceptions.

I want members to note these exceptions, as follows:

No Aboriginal native or Australian, African or the Islands of the Pacific, except New Zealand, is entitled to vote unless he is entitled under section 41.

That refers to people being able to vote within the States. It goes on to say:

... or he is a native of British India or he holds a certificate of naturalisation.

So, it is very interesting to note that the New Zealanders were eligible to vote in 1901, as were the natives of British India but our own Aboriginals were not. This anomaly, of course, was corrected in 1967 when Harold Holt was the Attorney-General. The original Constitution also specifies that Aboriginal people were not to be counted, so all these actions have now been reversed.

However, during that period of non-entity the Aboriginal community had no areas to call their own. In my opinion, that defies logic. However, the High Court has determined that *terra nullius* is to be overturned and that native title was not to extinguish where Aboriginal people can establish the necessary connection with that land. They do not have claim, according to the High Court, where the land has been alienated by the granting of freehold, leasehold or right to exclusive title.

In the meantime a number of claims by Aboriginal people for large parcels of land, particularly in the Eastern States, have taken place and many of these claims have covered freehold, leasehold and other titles. It is understandable that the general public have become agitated that such claims are being made and even more concerned by the media reports that these claims may be upheld in the State or Commonwealth courts.

At the other end of the spectrum, the mining industry has been most incensed that it may lose a right that it now enjoys, that is, to be able to explore and mine for minerals anywhere in Australia other than in world heritage listed areas and some specified parks.

The negotiations and handling of this debate have indeed got a long way to go. In fact the discussions may take years. In the meantime, the least we can expect from the Federal Government are clear guidelines which allow the States to have common legislation with compensation, if necessary, to be covered by the Federal Parliament, because it is a matter which affects everybody in Australia and not just this State.

What of the implications for South Australia? It appears to me that the claims in South Australia may be less than those in Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Queensland because South Australia is in the unique position of having given many areas such as the Anangu Pitjantjatjara and the Maralinga Tjarutja and other smaller areas to the Aboriginal communities. Of those lands, there are very few areas over which a legitimate claim can be laid.

It is my considered opinion—although I am not a lawyer—that if ambit claims made by the Aboriginal community are way out of the ball park they will engender much animosity throughout the entire South Australian community and achieve very little. Should the Federal Government legislate to control what is clearly a State obligation, that is, the control of the land title, a rapid solution to the framework of Mabo may eventuate. I support the motion.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I support the motion and, in so doing, thank Her Excellency for opening this session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament and reaffirm my pledge of loyalty to the Queen and to her representative, Her Excellency the Governor of South Australia.

I join my colleagues in expressing my appreciation to the Hon. Dr Bob Ritson for his contribution to Parliament and for the personal friendship and guidance which he so kindly provided to me when I first entered Parliament.

I extend a warm welcome to my colleague the Hon. Caroline Schaefer who, I am sure, will make a positive contribution to the parliamentary process and who will represent the broad interests of South Australia.

I also join my other parliamentary colleagues in expressing my condolences to the families of Sir Condor Laucke, the Hon. Hugh Hudson and other members of Parliament, all of whom have made significant contributions in serving the South Australian community.

I wish to discuss several important issues that we as a community and as a State will need to address if we are to achieve some long-term economic growth and recovery in order to provide the appropriate future job opportunities for our young people.

For too long, business organisations have allowed a range of short-term solutions and sectional interests to divert their attention from the main task of creating the environment in which private enterprise can flourish and grow. For too long, we have tolerated the spirit of enterprise being shackled by the restriction of Government over-regulation. For too long, risk taking has been rewarded only with high taxation. For too long, profit has not been seen as the one essential ingredient in the creation of jobs.

For too long, we have allowed our school leavers to enter the work force with totally unrealistic expectations about work and with information that is totally inappropriate. For too long, we have allowed the tall poppy syndrome to exist, where our best achievers are cut down or forced to leave for overseas.

What we must do as a Government and as a community is renew our commitment to the creation of an environment where a vibrant and responsible private sector will prosper and operate to secure future standards of living and protect our individual freedoms.

Clearly, the challenge before us is to create a community that nurtures ambition, that rewards initiative and prepares its young people to be satisfied with nothing less than excellence in everything they do. We must create a State that has its heroes, those who reach for the horizon and then strive to lead us beyond it. If we create such a State in South Australia we will have an efficient and productive society, which is both competitive and successful.

There is little disagreement amongst members of Parliament that this is the challenge before us all. The issue is what we do in order to meet that challenge, and what is the business agenda for the 1990s that will help us more closely achieve that goal. Perhaps that, in itself, is the first challenge.

We need to set down quite clearly what business wants to achieve. For a decade or more I believe that business has only reacted to the policies and initiatives dictated to it by either the UTLC or the Labor Government. That is no longer good enough. The creation of an agenda in consultation with organisations such as the South Australian Employers Federation, the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the union organisation must be one of the high priority tasks of a Liberal Government over the coming years. In setting that agenda there is also the need to bring employees and business groups together with the task of achieving a greater degree of unity.

I am not naive enough to believe that it is either possible or appropriate for all employers and employees to have common views and policies on every issue. Some media commentators constantly harp on the division within these groups. However, people fail to understand that the very essence of a vibrant private enterprise system is that there is a whole range of attitudes on specific issues. I am firmly of the belief that, out of that variety of opinions, we can achieve a greater degree of common purpose than has been achieved in the past. There is little to be gained by debating our differences, but much to be gained by searching for a common goal.

Given the need for an agenda and the requirement for appropriate linkages between the employer and employee groups, one must ask: what are the issues that will be important for the future? The first item that comes to mind is the unquestionable fact that initiative and the spirit of enterprise cannot co-exist in a situation where there is excessive Government control. Where excessive regulation is applied the spirit of enterprise is destroyed. For years the Labor party has campaigned on the basis of smaller Government and fewer regulations and restrictions. Indeed, when the Labor Government has been re-elected to office it has on the one hand repeatedly introduced new regulations and restrictions, whilst on the other hand it has also created a regulation review unit with a specific purpose to advise Government on the areas of reduction in regulation. In the end this unit has amounted to little more than talk by the Labor Government, with businesses continuing to struggle to survive, under an ever growing burden of regulations. Therefore, the important task is to remove all unnecessary regulation and let business get on with its job. The opposite side to the argument is that, as Government regulation is eased, business must take up the challenge to ensure that it acts in a responsible way, and in a way that promotes the public interest.

The next priority item on the agenda must be taxation. Corporate taxes must be at more realistic levels, and this can be achieved only through a fundamental reform of the taxation system. Whilst broader taxation policy issues fall under Federal Government control, we must seek to have a review of corporate tax systems in order to retain and encourage new business investment both within Australia and South Australia. In our approach to taxation reform we must be adventurous in seeking a new system that will provide new incentives for a modern and competitive South Australia.

A third critical element for consideration must be the reform of the industrial relations system. Whilst it is recognised that the Industrial Relations Commission and the various State tribunals will remain as a major force in regulating wages and conditions of employment, especially for smaller and medium size employers, there is a distinct and irreversible trend to centralise industrial relations and to bring decision making back to the enterprise level.

I believe that this will be of great benefit for the future. The major purpose of reform in industrial relations must be to remove from the system any issue that makes us less competitive. Given the imperative of competition, one factor that must guide our industrial relations in the future is our approach to wage increases, which must be used as an instrument to achieve improvements in productivity. For almost the past 100 years wage increases have been granted by employers or ordered by tribunals because of the increased cost of living or as a result of demands by unions who wanted more money. Wages have seldom been increased because we became more productive or efficient in our work.

As a result of acceding to these demands, our rate of inflation climbed to almost three times that of our trading partners and world competitors. What we must recognise is that the lucky country has gone forever and that from here on we will need to earn our keep by utilising all the skills and ingenuity that we have within our human resources. The first way in which that can be achieved is by ensuring that wage increases are always utilised as an incentive to achieve greater flexibility in hours of work or more fundamental changes to work practices in order to create an entirely new award system that will ensure the most efficient application of our labour resources. This is extremely important in the light of the current developments that are occurring in award restructuring.

Over a long period industry has paid a great deal more for wage increases, but not all increases have produced appropriate results. Some increases have been granted on the basis of promised workplace and award reforms that at times have never occurred. To date, we have seen little reform that could be said to result in productivity improvements. The challenge for Government, business and unions will be to ensure that real reforms in awards and pay conditions occur first and then are matched by an appropriate increase.

Given the current economic conditions in our State, I challenge all employers and employee organisations to take a mature and responsible attitude to wage demands or increases that they might be considering for the future. I believe that with industrial reforms there will be a need for management to significantly improve its skills in working with the work force. This approach should be considered as a high priority by any employer. In addition, we must recognise the importance of providing the appropriate level of training for our future human resources, because the future of this State will depend on their success.

A Liberal Government will give priority to addressing the requirement of efficient training for our industries and businesses. The imposition of training levies is not the answer to this problem. We must think again and find new ways and solutions. We must train more people. There is a need for many industries to put more resources into training programs. In doing so, it is critical for our future that we recognise the central role of the first line management and supervisors. Industries have often spent much money on training senior management and have devoted more resources to training apprentices and trainees, but it is the first line supervisors who often hold the key to our efficiency and productivity.

An aggressive and successful approach to our future must also contain proposals that will lift our human skills to new heights, as our future will depend on it. A Liberal Government must seek reforms that will look at ways of involving more employees in running the businesses and Government departments that will employ them. It must establish a clearly defined environmental policy that properly balances the need

for economic growth with the demand for an appropriate environment that will protect the interests of future generations.

As a Government we must work towards achieving a just community and one which is economically secure and constantly seeking to improve on its strengths, for these are some of the factors that will influence the direction and changes we are seeking to achieve over the next decade. We must cease to react to pressure groups and union power, because they act in self-interest and not for the benefit of the whole community.

I firmly believe that Government, business and employees must concentrate on making themselves and the whole work force more efficient and more competitive. There is no other way through which we can restore our balance of payments and reduce the unacceptably high level of unemployment. One of the main challenges facing Governments will be significantly to reduce business regulations and to achieve some measure of tax reform which will reduce and remove imposts on the business community. We must promote industrial relations to a level where they will become an instrument for achieving efficiency and high productivity and profitability, thus ensuring better rewards and greater training for the work force to provide the parameters of greater employee involvement in training and developing our enterprises.

I sincerely hope that in the lead-up to the next State election all parties will participate in a rational debate which should be free of union scare tactics and distortions and which must be free from political mud-slinging. Finally, I believe there is an urgent need for change, and the Liberal Party is ready to lead the community into an era of change, a new direction, so we may all play a role in restoring South Australia to its rightful place as one of the great States in Australia and amongst the best places in the world, where people can confidently bring up their families and build an exciting future for themselves and their children.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

In reply to **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** (6 May 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Ministerial Statement which I made on 4 May, 1993 included a number of issues in relation to the contribution of staff in developing a dynamic public sector. At the time I said that 'A significant element of our reform of the South Australian public sector will be the way in which we manage the people who make it happen—our staff'. The issues which I canvassed in that report covered the administrative systems, management style and methods of operation which motivate our staff to give their best. Particular programs such as Best Practice and the Leadership 2000 program are being developed to assist in obtaining the best outcomes.

As part of the Leadership 2000 program, the Government Management Board is developing a number of important measures to make it easier for staff to both use their expertise and develop expertise and experience across the public sector in areas of greatest need and as the Honourable Member pointed out, the Government will also be encouraging public sector employees to seek opportunities to pursue their public service career in the private sector.

The discussions taking place between the Government and the Public Service Association on a draft Enterprise Bargain include:

- a guarantee of the availability of funding for skills development and training etc required as a result of organisational change and public sector reform programs, with such funds

being provided out of savings made from the change initiatives;

- provide training for managers and supervisors to make the workplace more effective, creative and satisfying for all employees.

To allow the joint arrangements to be developed, negotiations have begun with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry with initially a joint seminar 'SA Means Business', on Wednesday, 7 July 1993. The Seminar has been designed to provide an opportunity for public and private sector executives to focus on a common vision for South Australia.

Following that initiative, work has commenced on opportunities for public and private sector managers to be involved in a development program which will allow those managers to spend one to five days together and then undertake joint action and research learning activities of benefit to both sectors. From this kind of sharing of resources and ideas, it is expected that opportunities will arise for public sector staff to spend time within the private sector on specific projects, thereby leading to greater joint actions in the future. The details of salaries and conditions will be negotiated and will be part of the ongoing negotiations between the Office of Public Sector Reform and the Public Service Association and the Department of Labour. It is unlikely that the early projects can be done, however, on existing conditions.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (29 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My colleague, the Treasurer provided the following response:

1. The fee ultimately paid to J P Morgan was \$3.465 million. J P Morgan was involved with the State Bank at a critical time when the nature and extent of the problems of the Bank were becoming more apparent. As a consequence, the nature of work expected of J P Morgan changed considerably and the assignment became one of major significance.

The fee also included a major assignment in assisting the State Bank in its sale of United Bank in New Zealand.

2. The Bank is not currently employing the services of J P Morgan.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (6 May 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My colleague the Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. The State Bank has assured the Treasurer that it does not have a policy such as that alleged.

2. It is the Bank's objective, which the Government supports, to de-complicate its structure by eliminating or winding up non operating subsidiaries. In this process, I am informed the Bank will deal with genuine creditors of partly owned subsidiaries on a case by case basis. It admits no legal obligation to these creditors, and will reject any spurious or unsubstantial claims or the claims of fellow risk venturers such as minority shareholders.

3. The Bank has assured the Treasurer that it has no policy such as that alleged.

Further, in this particular case, I am informed that in November, 1992 there were no existing creditors of Ibis with proven claims who were prejudiced by the withdrawal of the Southstate Corporate Holdings Ltd resolution support.

MYER REMM PROJECT

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (28 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. The Treasurer has no influence over the valuations carried out by the Valuer-General pursuant to his statutory responsibilities.

2. The carrying value of the Myer Centre in the books of Group Asset Management Division (GMAD) is \$290 million. The carrying value of this asset was based on an independent valuation as a non-current asset as at 30 June 1992.

However, the carrying value of the Myer Centre in the books of GMAD will, as is the case with all assets, be reviewed on a regular basis.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (29 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has thoroughly checked her records of complaints and inquiries regarding school uniform and student appearance standards. There is no record of any inquiry or complaint relating to the wearing of earrings, of girls wearing boys' uniforms or of boys wearing girls' uniforms. Your assertion that the Commission has on file details of schools where such issues have been subject to complaints under the Equal Opportunities Act is therefore incorrect.

There has been one recent formal complaint from a male student who was suspended by a private school for having hair of a length which was quite acceptable for female students. In conciliation, the school concerned agreed to reinstate the student and to review its rules to ensure that they were not discriminatory.

I have been advised that the Commission has not given 'bizarre and extremist interpretations' of the Equal Opportunities Act concerning dress and appearance issues.

If in fact officers were asked for advice, the response would be that the Act does not spell out specifics of dress and appearance codes. It requires that treatment of male and female students be fair and based on equivalent standards, not necessarily imposing identical requirements on girls or boys. The Act allows any student who believes she or he has been disadvantaged by the application of unfair and discriminatory rules, to lodge a complaint with the Commissioner. Such complaints will be investigated. It is the experience of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity that virtually all of them are resolved quickly and to the satisfaction of all parties through conciliation.

In terms of the Honourable Member's question, the Commission does provide timely and common sense advice on issues of dress and appearance, and that no action is necessary to change existing procedures.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (22 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. With the exception of Mr Stokes the people mentioned by the Honourable Member were appointed as advisers to the Bank.

2. The State Bank is holding copies of letters of appointment relating to the employment of Sir Sidney Schubert and Mr Malcolmson, indicating that they were to be paid \$15 000 each per annum, effective 1 July 1990. It is considered reasonable to assume that the same arrangements were made for Sir Lawrence Govan and Mr Studdy, except that Mr Studdy appears to have been appointed at some earlier point in 1989.

3. It was considered that the interstate advisers would provide the Board with expert business knowledge in their respective States and in New Zealand.

4. None of the advisers are still employed by the Bank. All contracts appear to have been terminated during the 1990-91 financial year.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** (4 May 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My colleague, the Treasurer provided the following response:

1. The Government was not specifically consulted in relation to the action taken by the State Bank in relation to David Hellaby, but the Treasurer was briefed on developments concerning this matter as part of the arrangements in place for him to be kept informed of all significant issues concerning the Bank.

2. The terms of the settlement with Mr Hellaby are confidential, but certain agreements were reached concerning the State Bank's costs.

3. To the end of March 1993, legal costs of \$70 000 had been incurred. The total cost is expected to exceed \$100 000.

SPEED CAMERAS

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (30 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Emergency Services has provided the following response:

1. Three expiation notices were issued by the speed camera at the described location between the hours stated.

2. The photographic evidence available in relation to the issue of two notices in question has been re-checked and found to be accurate. Each frame taken has a different identification number imprinted automatically from the camera.

The two photographs in question clearly indicate they were taken at different times albeit at the same location on the same day. Both offences clearly occurred and were detected and reported correctly.

3. No faults have been reported by operators using this particular equipment and in line with normal practice, every frame at that location was verified by the operator as being consistent with the operator's estimate of speed.

HOFEX

In reply to **Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (5 May 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Premier has provided the following response:

The South Australian Government is kept well informed of a wide range of trade fairs through a variety of avenues. These include the State's Commercial Representatives around the world, Austrade, the ethnic chambers of commerce and various industry groups.

One of the key documents provided to us on this matter is Austrade's 'Trade Fair and Display Programme' for 1993-1994 (copy attached). This lists around 100 such fairs around the world, selected from 17 industry areas. This list is condensed down from the very large number of fairs which occur yearly, worldwide, on the basis of what Austrade has evaluated to be the best available. Austrade uses the significant resources of its Trade Fairs and Display Office in Australia, its Business Development Units in Australia and its overseas posts to coordinate attendance at these fairs. We note that HOFEX is one of the listed Austrade-supported fairs.

A trade fair attendance costs a participant around \$10 000 and our experience of South Australian interest at such fairs indicates that 5 or 6 participants are the maximum expected.

This represents a total cost at a fair around \$60 000. Simply to satisfy the 100 or so top shows identified by Austrade would entail an expenditure of \$6 million.

Thus, the key issues are:

- (i) being focused in our approach to promoting our industry sectors;
- (ii) taking the lead from industry in selecting the modes they prefer to use in promoting their industry (for example to \$1.5 million provided to the wine industry);
- (iii) working in coordination with Austrade on the prime trade fairs around the world.

Over the years, the South Australian Government (through the Economic Development Authority (and, formerly, DITT), the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, the Department of Agriculture and others) have provided support funds to associations and organisations who have been pro-active in bringing together industry groups targeted at specific trade fairs, displays and missions.

A key requirement has been that the level of participation be sufficient (around a minimum of 5 participants). The number of fairs we have supported is too long to list here.

In recent times, our need to stay focused has led us to carry our industry-specific promotion and activities. For example, we have had EDA (DITT) sponsored business missions into South East Asia within the last 12 months focused on health and media services and products. These entail bringing South Australian business people in direct contact with targeted distributors, partners and buyers in the marketplace. Turning to food we have taken this approach very recently in Japan (Okayama) where an EDA-sponsored food display was organised as part of the Premier's visit to provide test marketing as well as having established business contacts prior to the visit. It is in this way, that we can achieve commitment from companies in the target marketplace ahead of spending the not inconsiderable expense of getting our industry people there in the first place. Where we, as government, add value to the process is in establishing the links up front and in providing a framework within which the links, once consummated, can be nurtured to survive.

We are following up on this approach with a similar exercise planned for late June involving the food industry in Singapore. Again, prior connections put in place through earlier visits by EDA officers will be provided to a group of food industry companies seeking market access into this important marketplace.

The central principle being illustrated is that it is for companies to make a commercial decision as to whether participation in a trade fair is justified and as to which trade fairs will provide the best return for their investment. Austrade, the EDA and other South Australian agencies assist by bringing to firms' attention that trade fairs exist through publications and direct contacts (e.g. Export Centre).

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (30 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Premier has provided the following response:

1. Under the MFP Development Act the CEO is an appointment of the Board of the Corporation. The term of the contract appointment is five years which comprises a salary component of \$300 000 per annum and a \$70 000 performance bonus.

Targets for the MFP activity will continue to be focused on the business activity and the urban development activity. The Board of which Mr Kennan is a member are directing the objectives of the Corporation.

2. Performance objectives are being mutually reviewed by the Board and Mr Kennan following his arrival and will pertain to organisational competence, integration of TDC with MFP, and development of the MFP activity through private sector involvement, national and international marketing and the urban development strategy.

3. Money spent on marketing, public relations, advertising and communications is as follows: 1990-91 \$218 978; and 1991-92 \$513 703. This includes production of promotional printed material, displays, corporate identity program and audio-visual requirements. In the 1991-92 financial year the Commonwealth Government contributed \$400 000 to the marketing/public relations program.

A Manager, Public Affairs was appointed to the MFP in January 1992. Reporting to the Manager are a Public Affairs Officer, Information Officer and Public Affairs Coordinator. Up until that time marketing and public relations had largely been carried out by external consultants.

The specific responsibilities of Public Affairs staff include promoting awareness of the MFP at a state, national and international level. It involves local community relations through to specialist international publications. Activities include public and corporate relations, media relations, lobbying, corporate image and design, advertising, presentations, promotions as well as providing support services to the marketing and business development arms of the MFP.

There are currently no retainer contracts with public relations or marketing consultancies. An Adelaide-based advertising agency is utilised for employment placement and ad hoc advertising requirements. Minor use of a public relations consultancy has occurred on an over-load basis.

Marketing within the MFP organisation is a separate function and is staffed by a marketing manager in Adelaide, a marketing officer attached to the Australian Embassy in Tokyo and utilisation of the services of the London-based South Australian Agent General.

IMPARJA TELEVISION

In reply to **Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (2 March 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Premier has provided the following response to your question:

1. The Government is aware of the plight of Imparja Television and the commitment given in 1986 by the then Minister of State Development, Technology, Employment and Further Education.

2. At the time Imparja was established, the Government was prepared to support it on the basis of the service's prospective commercial viability. Unfortunately, the services prospects of commercial viability changed when Commonwealth policies led to much increased AUSSAT satellite transponder costs impacting on Imparja (increasing from \$0.9 million in 1987-88 to \$4.09 million in 1989-90). The Government was no longer able to justify its support for Imparja given its inability to produce a business plan that convinced us of its prospects for financial viability.

3. I am informed that officers from the Premier's Office have recently met with Imparja management to discuss Imparja's situation.

As a result of this meeting, the Government is currently reconsidering the opportunities for using the services of Imparja on a fee for service basis in the delivery of Government programs in the area. It is hoped that this might provide an avenue for this State to assist Imparja in its quest for viability.

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (23 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Following the Treasurer's statement in another place that he would refer the relevant correspondence to me for examination, which was duly done, I in turn, referred the

matter at the beginning of December, 1992 to the Crown Solicitor for any investigation and report that he considered warranted or necessary.

The Crown Solicitor has been conducting an investigation since that time and I am informed that that investigation is nearly completed. When the Crown Solicitor has completed his investigation and has reported to me I will convey that report to the Treasurer. Whether it is appropriate for the Treasurer to make a public statement at that time, or to report to the House of Assembly in due course, is a matter for the Treasurer.

NICHOLLS CASE

In reply to **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (30 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Correctional Services provided the following response:

1. The most appropriate manner in which Members of Parliament can have their needs dealt with in relation to prisoners serving sentences, or who are remanded in custody at Yatala Labour Prison is to contact the office of the General Manager of the prison with their request.

Investigations by the General Manager of the prison regarding Mr Davis's allegations reveal that Mr Davis did not, at any stage, identify himself to be a Member of Parliament to the Officer in Charge of the Visit Reception area. The rules that apply to members of the public who ring the prison and wish to leave messages are precisely as Mr Davis detailed in his question. If any other procedures were in place, the prison would be swamped with messages for prisoners.

2. It is unreasonable that any offenders serving sentences or who are remanded in custody at Yatala Labour Prison be entitled to receive messages from legal representatives, their immediate families and their friends. If Members of Parliament require access in any way to prisoners, this will be facilitated. If legal representatives require access urgently, they may ring the office of the General Manager of the prison and put their case.

3. There is no necessity to review the current procedures in place for access to prisoners whether they be in prison for minor offences or serious offences.

WORKCOVER

In reply to **Hon. J.C. BURDETT** (30 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Labour Relations provided the following response:

1. The advertisement referred to in the honourable member's question is correct. The honourable member may recall the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act No. 84 of 1992 which was proclaimed on the 3/12/92 whereby the common law liability under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act was removed.

2. Included in those amendments was a time limit for lodging actions of 12 months from the date of injury or 6 months from the commencement of the amendment whichever is the later.

3. The WorkCover Corporation estimates that 2000 actions are still likely to be received. As at 31/12/92 WorkCover Corporations activity estimates the outstanding common law liability at \$29 million.

333 COLLINS STREET

In reply to **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (23 March 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Deputy Premier has provided the following response:

1. The legal owner of 333 Collins Street, Collins Street Properties Pty Ltd has sought a valuation as at 30 June 1993 for accounting purposes. This valuation will be considered by the Boards of Collins Street Properties and the South Australian Government Financing Authority in the preparation of the annual accounts for the respective organisations. Any adjustment required to the valuation of the property will be reported in the accounts of SAFA at the appropriate time.

As the Hon. Member pointed out in the preamble to his questions the Melbourne office market is suffering from considerable over supply, the impact of which creates leasing up difficulties for not only 333 Collins Street, but also for the competitor buildings which are owned by financial institutions including the AMP, ANZ and major superannuation funds. Competition for tenants is particularly strong and significant incentives are being offered.

333 Collins Street comprises a total net lettable office area of approximately 57 000 square metres of which some 35 per cent is tenanted. While this is not a desirable tenancy level, JLW, the sole leasing agent, is actively pursuing prospective tenants.

2. In the financial year 1992-93 it is estimated that the holding cost SAFA will incur as a result of its exposure to 333 Collins Street will be around \$32 million. This is before any variation which may be required to the value of the property in SAFA's balance sheet. Holding costs are effectively provided for in the methodology which is used in determining the valuation (discounted cash flow analysis).

GRAND PRIX

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (20 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Tourism has provided the following response:

1. The Board has paid \$300 000 for the 50 per cent share in Goodsports Pty Ltd.
2. The 50 per cent equity was purchased on 1 July 1987.
3. The Board has received dividends and management fees totalling \$147 000 from this investment.
4. There is a contingent liability in that the Board is a joint signatory to a Guarantee to the State Bank of South Australia for an amount of \$1.5 million. This Guarantee covers the loan facilities provided to the company for its property and warehouse purchase and working capital requirements.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (21 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. Examination of the State Bank Group's accounting records has produced the following information which is relevant to the question. This information is believed to be comprehensive.

Private jets were hired on various occasions, particularly during the pilot's dispute in the period April to October 1989. This information may be summarised as follows:

State Bank of South Australia		
Date	Cost	Details
27/07/90	\$5 060	Lear jet charter, Adelaide to Melbourne to Adelaide. Service was used by Tim Marcus Clark for reasons that cannot be ascertained from existing records.
25/09/89	\$8 883	Charter of aircraft, Sydney to Adelaide. Service was used by an executive member and directors to attend a Board meeting of a subsidiary company in Sydney.
29/09/89	\$3 360	Charter of aircraft, Adelaide to Essendon to Adelaide. Service was used by Tim Marcus Clark and John Baker for a Melbourne trip for reasons that cannot be ascertained from existing records.
01/10/89	\$52 912	Charter of various aircraft. Service was to transport staff located at remote regions to and from the service quality 'Mission Impossible' event held at the Convention Centre for State Bank staff.
TOTAL	\$70 215	
Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd		
Date	Cost	Details
30/08/89		Charter of aircraft, Sydney to Adelaide to Perth
31/08/89- 01/09/89		Citation aircraft charter, Adelaide to Perth to Adelaide
01/09/89		Lear jet charter, Adelaide to Sydney to Adelaide
	\$43 050	Service was utilised to enable directors to attend a Board meeting in Perth.
17/08/89& 20/09/89	\$17 680	Charter of aircraft, Adelaide to Sydney to Adelaide. Service was used by executives for reasons that cannot be ascertained from existing records.
09/11/89-	\$10 940	Charter of aircraft, Adelaide to Perth to Adelaide
10/11/89		Service was used by executives for reasons that cannot be ascertained from existing records.

TOTAL \$71 670

2. Expenditure in connection with the Grand Prix by the State Bank Group has been as follows:

1990	\$231 233
1991	\$ 25 000
1992	Nil

In relation to the 1993 Grand Prix, budgets are yet to be finalised but I am advised that there will be a recommendation to the Board to approve a modest level of expenditure which can be justified on the basis of genuine business relationships.

OVERSEAS TRAVEL

In reply to **Hon. J.C. BURDETT** (4 May 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Premier provided the following response:

There are no recorded instances of misuse by South Australian persons using the official credential however as stated in my letter to Members, there is no effective way of monitoring the use of credentials once issued. All other State Governments have ceased the practice of issuing official credentials. Two States experienced instances of misuse prior to cancelling the issue of credentials.

Prior to sending my letter advising Members of the cancellation of the issue of credentials, I discussed the matter with the Leader of the Opposition who supported this recommendation.

SUPERDROME

In reply to **Hon. J.C. IRWIN** (25 March 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Emergency Services provided the following response:

1. The operation of the Superdrome is the responsibility of the Minister of Recreation and Sport. In the operation of the Superdrome advice on fire safety matters is obtained directly from the Metropolitan Fire Service.

2. The Minister of Recreation and Sport takes into account advice from the Metropolitan Fire Service in assessing possible uses for the velodrome. I am advised that no event has been, or will be, held in the Superdrome without the endorsement of the Metropolitan Fire Service of the safety precautions.

SPEED CAMERAS

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (31 March 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Emergency Services provided the following response:

1. The operational policy for speed cameras requires operators to place themselves outside the police vehicle and sit behind the instrument in such a position as to be able to both monitor the passing traffic and to read the indicated travel speed on the radar device. This policy applies irrespective of the weather conditions.

2. Infringement Notices are only issued when photographic evidence is supported by operator verification that the travel speed recorded matches the estimated speed of the vehicle. If the operator cannot provide the verification then no Infringement Notice is issued.

3. Two notices were issued at Robe Terrace, Medindie on Saturday 27 March, 1993 between 2.05 pm and 2.20 pm. The operator provided the necessary verification in relation to estimated and recorded speed in both cases. He has further advised that during the period of operation at Robe Terrace on 27 March he was forced due to rain to take refuge in the police vehicle on a number of occasions. On each occasion the unit was switched off and covered with a plastic shower cover.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (10 March 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

The questions raised cover a period of seven years over which the then Board and Executive Committees of the Bank delegated the authority of travel expenditure payments to the senior management of the operating divisions of the Bank. These delegations were in line with Bank policy to pay legitimate business expenses.

The Group Managing Director of the Bank has informed me that the allegations have been discussed with personnel who were employed by the Bank at the time referred to in your question, but no evidence has come to light to substantiate any of the claims made.

Nevertheless, if you are able to make available to me the details of specific incidents which you believe have occurred, I am happy to have them thoroughly investigated.

I am advised that the Bank has in place a strict policy for travel and accommodation. It is a stated objective of the policy to minimise the costs of accommodation incurred by the travelling employee and reimbursement is only available for legitimate business expenses.

TERRACE HOTEL

In reply to **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (24 March 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. I would not condone the Terrace Hotel's purchase of its Rolls Royce for \$275 000 if it were the case that no effort had been made to obtain the best possible price. I am however assured by SGIC that such efforts were made.

2. Due to the current unfavourable market, it has not been possible to obtain a realistic price for the Terrace's Rolls Royce. The vehicle has therefore been temporarily withdrawn from sale. Once the market picks up a reasonable offer will be considered.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (5 May 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. It is not readily apparent that any such discussions took place.

2. There is a school of thought that seven day trading would enhance the profitability of the retail sector in which many of the Bank's customers are involved.

3. The Bank's records do not indicate any further steps taken to promote seven day trading and no specific costs appear to have been incurred in this regard.

STATE FINANCES

In reply to **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (9 February 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1 2 3. It is difficult to accurately estimate the level of net debt between accounting periods. The Prime Minister's estimate is similar to the \$8.1 billion estimate for June 30, 1993, which was published in the Economic Statement and which is reconciled with the June 1992 figure on page 95 of that Statement. The actual net debt figure for June 30, 1993 will be published in the Budget.

4. The 1992 Budget contained an estimate of the interest cost of total support to the Bank in 1992-93 of the order of \$175 million.

SPEED CAMERAS

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (16 February 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Emergency Services has provided the following response:

1. Strict operating procedures govern the use of speed cameras and preclude the parking of police vehicles or the operating of speed cameras on private property. In this instance an officer incorrectly operated the speed camera unit from private property. The officer has been counselled regarding the correct operating procedures.

2. Action is being taken to ensure correct procedures are followed through training and closer supervision.

3. Police supervisors have been requested to pay particular attention to the siting of speed cameras in order to ensure adherence to the correct operating procedures in the future.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (1 April 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. The State Bank's policy in relation to overseas travel is that all employees and Board members travel by business class.

2. The State Bank's policy in relation to domestic travel is that all employees including Executive Directors travel by economy class. Board members usually travel by business class.

3. There are no status levels for business travel in place at the State Bank. All employees who travel on Bank business are subject to the policy outlined above.

Thirty employees are currently provided with corporate membership to airport lounge facilities.

4. The cost of first class air travel for executives and Board members was as follows:

July 1989-June 1990	\$150 777
July 1990-June 1991	88 170
July 1991-June 1992	29 973
July 1992-June 1993	1 499

CHILD SAFETY

In reply to **Hon. PETER DUNN** (6 May 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety has provided the following response:

1. The discussion paper was developed in tripartite consultative forums jointly with the South Australian Farmers Federation. One of the forums is the South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission's Rural Industry Working Party which has representatives from the rural industry as well as employee and government representatives. The proposals presented in the discussion paper are options for a strategy to prevent injury to children in occupational settings.

The purpose of the discussion paper was to invite public comment on:

(a) Proposed regulations for the protection of young children from dangerous power-driven machinery

- for all workplaces in all industries, including mining, construction, manufacturing and agriculture
- to prevent injury to young children (under 10 years of age) by dangerous power-driven machinery
- which would set specific mandatory requirements under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986

(b) Proposed code of practice for child safety in agriculture for farms

- to prevent injury and disease to children (under 15 years of age) by a whole range of agricultural hazards, including dangerous machinery, animals and chemicals
- to provide a practical and systematic framework for farmers to identify hazards, and to assess and control risks to children on farms
- which would be an approved code of practice under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986; this would mean there is an obligation to follow the preferred method or course of action in the code, or use another solution which achieves the same or a better standard of health and safety.

(c) The agricultural industry health and safety plan for children

- The SA Farmers Federation, representing the agricultural industry in South Australia, developed for implementation an industry-based health and safety plan for children.

2. The discussion paper on child safety in the workplace was launched in December 1992 for public comment for six months, which closed on 31 May 1993. The usual period for public comment is three months.

The Commission distributed 3 500 copies of the discussion paper to canvass a wide range of community views. Farmers and farmer organisations were specifically invited to present submissions on their view on the most efficient and effective strategy to reduce injuries to children on farms. At the close of public comment, over 1 000 submissions were received for the discussion paper. Many of the submissions were from country areas.

I am therefore confident that a very wide range of community views, including those from the country have been thoroughly canvassed.

3. The proposed code of practice for child safety in agriculture would not place new responsibilities on farmers. Employers, self-employed persons (such as owner-operators), and employees have for some time had legal obligations under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, 1986 to ensure that their work-related activities do not injure persons in the workplace, including children.

There is no requirement to guarantee that an injury will not occur. However, responsible persons need to show that reasonably practicable steps have been taken to control the possibility of injury occurring.

The needs to protect children from workplace hazards is evident from the facts presented in the discussion paper which included information from injury surveillance. The promotion of health and safety is always controversial to some extent because it involves making changes. However in our society, life is generally held in high regard. When compared to the life of a child, the cost of injury prevention is small.

Measures which can reduce the risk of injury do not have to be costly to be effective. They may include the closing of gates to prevent young children from unauthorised access to dangerous work. Older children working on farms should be instructed on how to use equipment or handle animals safely. Such measures should not increase costs to farmers.

With the proposed code of practice, farmers would be able to use their knowledge and experience together with the explanation provided by the code to meet their 'duty of care'.

GENTING GROUP

In reply to **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** (24 March 1993).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I refer to your Parliamentary Questions asked on 4 and 24 March, 1993, relating to the Genting Group.

On 23 March, 1993 the Deputy Premier made a Ministerial Statement which I reiterated in the Legislative Council on 24 March in response to your question and which dealt with some of the issues you raised.

Further, on 26 March, 1993 the Treasurer announced that the Casino Supervisory Authority would be conducting a full inquiry into Genting and its role as adviser to the Adelaide Casino.

The matters raised by you will be dealt with as part of that inquiry.

With respect to the allegations made when asking your questions that I misled Parliament, I have replied under separate cover.

I have also written clarifying the nature of the Genting inquiry.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 17 August at 2.15 p.m.