

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 10 October 1990

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

PETITIONS: BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION LIMIT

Petitions signed by 469 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to set the blood alcohol concentration limit for fully licensed drivers at .05 per cent were presented by Messrs Becker and Blacker.
Petitions received.

PETITION: PHARMACEUTICAL BENEFITS SCHEME

A petition signed by 77 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose changes to the pharmaceutical benefits scheme was presented by Mr Becker.
Petition received.

PETITION: BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION LIMIT

A petition presented by 33 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to reduce the blood alcohol concentration limit for fully licensed drivers was presented by Mr Gunn.
Petition received.

PETITION: TEACHERS SALARY DISPUTE

A petition signed by 116 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to resolve the current teachers salary dispute was presented by the Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy.
Petition received.

PETITION: CARDIAC SURGERY UNIT

A petition signed by 276 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a cardiac surgery unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was presented by Mr Hamilton.
Petition received.

PETITION: HORWOOD BAGSHAW SITE

A petition signed by 433 residents of Mile End praying that the House urge the Government to designate a portion of the Horwood Bagshaw site as a recreation park was presented by Mr Heron.
Petition received.

PETITION: LAW AND ORDER

A petition signed by 295 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to devote

greater resources to the maintenance of law and order was presented by Mr Matthew.
Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 8-10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 29, 43, 68, 69, 77, 80, 85, 89, 96, 97, 99, 110, 111, 121, 122, 136, 141-144, 148, 150, 152-156, 159, 162, 163, 165, 168, 171, 174-183, 186 and 188; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL CONTAINERS

In reply to **Mr GUNN (Eyre)** 16 August.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: At present a situation paper is being prepared by the Department of Agriculture and the South Australian Waste Management Commission (SAWMC). This will address the disposal of unwanted and banned chemicals. Additionally, the current interdepartmental review on agricultural chemical spray drift is also looking at this question and considers it a problem that urgently needs addressing. The working party's report is due to be finalised by the end of October 1999.

While the SAWMC has not had specific conversations with agricultural chemicals producers with a view to establish a collection system for empty containers, it recognises that the safe disposal of empty containers presents a potential problem, particularly to rural councils. With this in mind, in October 1987 the SAWMC issued a technical bulletin which outlined guidelines for the disposal of empty pesticide containers to solid waste landfill depots licensed by the commission.

A number of rural councils have taken advantage of these guidelines and have conducted field days in their districts to facilitate the collection of empty containers at a central point and their subsequent disposal. Councils with small depots, however, may have an additional problem because the space taken up by large numbers of these drums will result in the rapid filling of the depot. To overcome this problem an organisation in Clare has developed a portable drum crushing machine, which is available for use by rural councils on a daily hire basis. Further information can be obtained from the SAWMC.

CONDOMS

In reply to **Mr SUCH (Fisher)** 16 August.

The **Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER**: In relation to the question asked by the member for Fisher concerning the practice, by police, of confiscating condoms issued to prostitutes, the Commissioner of Police has advised that from time to time police officers investigating prostitution-type offences find it necessary to seize property, including condoms, for evidentiary purposes. It is realised that condoms are essential for the prevention of sexually transmitted diseases and the Police Department does not want to be seen as contributing to the spread of sexually transmitted diseases by confiscating all condoms as evidence of prostitution-type offences.
Police Department policy on this matter is as follows:

- All condoms found are seized and are recorded in a police field receipt book;

- A sample condom(s) is retained by police, for example, one from each packet, carton, container, etc;
- All condoms located are photographed;
- The condoms (with the exception of the sample condom(s)) are then returned to the offender, who is required to acknowledge the details in the field receipt book.

IRAQ GRAIN CONTRACTS

In reply to **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** 21 August.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have written to the Hon. J. Kerin, Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, expressing my concern at the potential costs to wheat growers (and other exporters) as a result of the imposition of trade sanctions against Iraq, and I have urged the Commonwealth to consider the issue of compensation.

There are two ships involved with wheat from South Australia which was part of the contract with Iraq at the time of the imposition of the trade sanctions. One, the *Western Crystal*, which was scheduled to load at Port Adelaide, was diverted to load other cargo in New Zealand. The wheat which was to be loaded on the vessel is in the wheat silos at Port Adelaide. Although the wheat has a potential buyer the sale will not be secured until at least the end of September. The other ship was the *Ever Advantage* which was en route to Iraq from Port Kembla. In this case the full cargo was disposed of commercially.

KABANI PTY LTD

In reply to **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** 21 August.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Kabani Pty Ltd acts as a trustee for Kabani Unit Trust, which is an investment company involved in financial joint ventures and property joint ventures. Kabani was specifically formed by the management of Beneficial Finance in April 1985 to overcome restrictions placed on Beneficial Finance Corporation Limited by the debenture trust deed under which Beneficial and its subsidiaries were governed at that time. The 1960 debenture trust deed restricted Beneficial Finance in acquiring other companies and prevented Beneficial Finance undertaking separate secured borrowings.

To overcome this problem, Beneficial Finance used a complex but well known technique in finance circles of creating an 'off balance sheet company'. The company (Kabani Pty Ltd) is still under the absolute control of Beneficial management (although now de facto in nature) but is not classified as a subsidiary of Beneficial Finance for the purpose of the Companies Code nor the trust deed.

Current net assets (at 30 June 1990) are \$9 596. The company is quite fiscally neutral. Assets total \$124 533 329 against liabilities of \$124 523 602. The assets mainly comprise specially tailored loans to joint ventures and single purpose companies of individual corporate clients. The liabilities are loans from Beneficial and other outside sources. No profits are retained. The ultimate shareholders of Kabani Pty Ltd are discretionary trusts including members of the Beneficial group. A 'dividend' of \$3 647 000 was paid to Beneficial at June 1990.

The reason Kabani is not listed in the annual accounts of Beneficial Finance or the State Bank is that it is neither a subsidiary of Beneficial Finance nor an associate of the State Bank group and as such is not required by Australian accounting standards to be reported in the annual accounts.

As the shareholders of Kabani Pty Ltd are discretionary trusts, Beneficial and the State Bank cannot be exposed to outside risks or exposures other than commercial guarantees given in the ordinary course of business to Kabani for commitments. These guarantees are included in the bank group consolidated accounts as is normal practice.

In view of the foregoing, it would be incorrect to include Kabani in the bank or Beneficial consolidated results. State Bank Group is conscious of the obligations to monitor the risks associated with any entities in which it may be an equity participant. Reporting lines are in existence to ensure that the bank group is in a position to monitor all the activities of Kabani.

FISHING LICENCES

In reply to **Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier)** 23 August.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In response to my undertaking on 23 August 1990 to the member for Mount Gambier who sought clarification on behalf of the fishing industry on the Government's policy on fishing licence sales being subject to stamp duty, I am pleased to add the following information.

The fishing industry has previously been advised by both the Department of Fisheries and the Commissioner of Stamps of the current situation; namely, that the ruling by Chief Justice King in the Supreme Court in the case *Pennington v McGovern* (1987) determined that the class of licence in question is proprietary in character. This refers to licences and authorities which are capable of transfer for valuable consideration. It is on this ruling that the State Taxation Office on the advice of the Crown Solicitor has determined that stamp duty is payable on the conveyance of licences.

It is important to note the Crown Solicitor has also advised that the characterisation of such licences and authorities as property does not render them immune from the operation of the legislation pursuant to which they were created and are therefore subject to the Fisheries Act 1982 and regulations. This legislation does not confer any right of compensation or afford any basis upon which compensation can reasonably be expected in the event of suspension or revocation as a result of convictions or adjustment to access arrangements associated with licences. It is this latter issue that has appeared to generate confusion in the industry, despite being formally advised by the Director of Fisheries.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPERANNUATION FUND INVESTMENT TRUST

In reply to **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** 4 September.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust purchased its holding of convertible notes in Qintex on 8 July 1988. The decision to invest in those notes was taken at the meeting of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust Ltd on Friday 24 June 1988.

WILPENNA PROJECT

In reply to **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles)** 6 September.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Ayers Finnis commenced operations in August 1987. Its charter was to establish itself as an independent and autonomous merchant banking subsidiary of the State Bank Group. The Board of Ayers Finnis felt that the objective of independence would be facilitated by establishing Ayers Finnis in a location away from the bank's head office. The bank owns a building at 55 Grenfell Street, Adelaide. The mezzanine floor of this building was, in August 1987, occupied by the bank's marketing department. It was extremely expedient for the bank's marketing department to relocate to the bank's head office and for Ayers Finnis to take the vacated space in 55 Grenfell Street.

It happens that the Department of Environment and Planning was, and is, a tenant of this building. Having established itself as the pre-eminent merchant bank in South Australia, and on completion of the new State Bank Centre, Ayers Finnis leased the 27th floor of the centre and relocated in April 1989. Ayers Finnis' association with Ophix Ltd was in its capacity as corporate finance adviser and not financier. Ayers Finnis was not introduced to Ophix Ltd until early 1990 by a Sydney financial adviser.

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)** 6 September.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The reply is as follows:

1. There has been no waiver, nor any recommendation for any waiver, of any penalty under the Aboriginal Heritage Act for any works associated with the Wilpena project.
2. The approved site works involved archaeological excavation of previously identified sites.
3. The consultant archaeologist responsible for site works was Dr Roger Leubbers.
4. The works were authorised under sections 21 and 23 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act on 5 April 1989 and 10 May 1989.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** 6 September.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In August 1986 a partnership acquired for \$100 million annuities issued by SAFA which involved the deferral of annuity payments for between nine and 13 years. SAFA entered into the transaction on the basis of an opinion prepared by a Queen's Counsel obtained by Crown Law and three other legal opinions provided to other parties by eminent law firms. The issue of deferred annuities by SAFA was one of a number of issues undertaken by semi-government authorities in three States.

Subsequent to the deferred annuity issue by SAFA the Federal Treasurer announced a proposed change in taxation law to remove tax advantages from future issues, but also expressed the view that existing taxation law at that time was sufficient to provide for the taxation of the annuity income as it accrued rather than when received by the purchasers. A number of the purchasers of the annuities issued by semi-government authorities have now had the income accruing under the annuities assessed for taxation, thus triggering indemnity provisions. Objections to these assessments in at least three cases have been disallowed. One such disallowance is now before the Federal Court and other cases are pending, including an appeal by the purchaser of a 1 per cent interest in the SAFA deferred annuities. The purchaser of the 99 per cent interest in the SAFA annuities is yet to have its objection to an unfavourable assessment disallowed.

While additional favourable legal opinions covering the taxation of the deferred annuities have been provided to

Crown Law, SAFA believes it is now prudent to bring to account the additional expense which would fall due under the indemnity provisions of the annuities if challenges to the disputed taxation assessments fail. SAFA has brought to account in 1989-90 in respect of deferred annuities an abnormal expense of \$21 million covering the period to 30 June 1989 and is now accruing interest expense on the basis that the taxation assumptions contained in the annuity documentation may not apply.

DRUM NETS

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey)** 14 August.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Excellent work is being carried out by the John Lake Centre in New South Wales. However, stocking the river with native freshwater fishes is an expensive program, especially in the light of the fact that stocking the Murray River proper with small fingerlings has been unsuccessful on even a small scale. Stocking with hatchery reared fish has been successful in some new impoundments and farm dams.

Before undertaking a restocking program it will be necessary to improve the survival success of fingerlings placed in the river. This will involve growing them to a larger size before release. Mass production of larger fingerlings—that is, juvenile fish larger than 150 mm—has not been successful. The use of the much smaller fingerlings currently available presents problems in ensuring a consistency of supply for the very large number of fish required for stocking into South Australia's waters.

Recent restrictions on commercial and recreational operations were introduced as a result of concerns that native fish populations had declined. Preliminary assessments indicate that to supplement natural recruitment with hatchery reared fish would be very expensive and would not be welcomed by the community in the form of additional (new) licence fees. The fact is that natural recruitment is still occurring and the Government's first preference is to enhance this element and to avoid a decline in the fishery to the point where the river needs to be stocked with possibly inferior and certainly more expensive hatchery reared fingerlings.

The decision to discontinue recreational drum netting in South Australia complemented the existing legislation of the other three States with responsibilities in the Murray-Darling Basin. Whilst there may be some illegal drum netting occurring within the river, fisheries officers report that the majority of recreational fishers along the Murray River honour the regulations and support this action aimed at improving our river fishery. More specifically, metal detectors have never been used by enforcement officers to locate illegal fishing devices.

Since the implementation of the revised management arrangements for the river fishery in 1989, the South Australian Department of Fisheries has commenced an extensive research program in cooperation with both the Commonwealth and the other Murray Basin States. The main thrust of this research is to investigate mechanisms for enhancing the natural production of our native fish by evaluating whether existing fish stocks can be managed so as to maintain themselves cost effectively. This involves controlled experimentation on water level management and retention on available flood plains. This type of research is not being performed elsewhere. The results of this research will indicate whether we can manipulate the river levels in order to maintain a viable river fishery rather than embarking on expensive and ongoing hatchery-based stocking pro-

grams. Nevertheless, as part of the ongoing research and review of the river fishery, all options for stock enhancement are being considered.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Regulations—
Chiropractors Act 1979—Registration Fee.
Controlled Substances Act 1984—Regulations—Pest Controllers.
Food Act 1985—Regulations—Prawn Colouring.
Public and Environmental Health Act 1987—Regulation—Notifiable Diseases.
Retirement Villages Act 1987—Regulations—Residence Contracts.
- By the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Technology Development Corporation—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Advisory Board of Agriculture—Report, 1989-90.
Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Justices Act 1921—Rules—Fees.
Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Local Court Rules—Warehouse Liens.
Supreme Court Act 1935—Rules of Court—Supreme Court.
Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935—Criminal Appeals—Applications in Criminal Proceedings.
Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Liquor Consumption—Port Adelaide.
Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Regulations—Fees.
Supreme Court Act 1935—Regulations—Fees.
Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulation—Care Labelling.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board—Report, 1989-90.
Department of Road Transport—Report, 1989-90.
State Transport Authority—Report, 1989-90.
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—
Registration Fees and Charges.
Accident Towing Fees.
Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Permits and Fees.
- By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Architects Board of South Australia—Report, 1989.
- By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works—Sixty-third General Report.
- By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1989-90.
South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Annual Reports, 1989-90—
Department for the Arts—Report, 1989-90.
South Australian Museum Board—Report, 1989-90.
State Theatre Company—Report, 1989-90.
Eyre Peninsula Cultural Trust—Report, 1989-90.
Northern Cultural Trust—Report, 1989-90.
South East Cultural Trust—Report, 1989-90.
Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report by South Australian Planning Commission on Proposed Alterations—Aberfoyle Park Primary School.

- By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Murray-Darling Basin Commission—Report, 1989.
Rates and Land Tax Remission Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.
- By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Report on the Operations of the Auditor-General's Department, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service—Report, 1989-90.
South Australian State Emergency Service—Report, 1989-90.
Commissioner of Police—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
Electricity Trust of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
Department of Mines and Energy—Report, 1989-90.
Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
South Australian Timber Corporation—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Industrial Court and Commission of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Regulations—Recreational Applications.
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Regulations—
Manual Handling.
Commercial Safety—Manual Handling Repeal.
Industrial Safety—Manual Handling Repeal.
- By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.
Marine Act 1936—Regulations—Houseboats.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—
South Australian Institute of Languages—Report, January 1989-June 1990.
Department of Local Government—Report, 1989-90.
Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia—Report, 1990.
Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1989-90.
Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Regulation—Declared Vocation.
Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—Regulation—Local Government Community Services Association.
Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—Ticket Dispensing Machines.
Corporation of Tea Tree Gully By-laws—
No. 4—Swimming Centres.
No. 6—Dogs.
No. 8—Bees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RURAL ECONOMIC CLIMATE

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Recent media reports have focused on the state of agriculture and the economic climate that it is now facing. There has been talk of a 'rural crisis' or 'rural depression'. These terms are dramatic and, while they may end up being true, also create the risk of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Nevertheless, the rural economy is facing a difficult economic future. The State Government cannot on its own solve the rural downturn, but we will help this vital sector through these troubled times. But, just as important is the fact that the rural community needs the

bipartisan support of this Parliament: it does not need politicians trying to score points out of people's problems.

Furthermore, South Australian's farming sector needs a realistic response based on sound economic principles. In 1989-90 the gross value of agricultural commodities produced in South Australia was \$2.6 billion. It now appears that the various commodity sectors of South Australian agriculture can all expect major reductions in income in the year ahead. Despite prospects for an average to good season in output terms, income receipts look set to fall.

Wheat values are likely to fall by 47 per cent—a drop in 1989-90 from \$501 million to \$265 million in 1990-91. Barley values will fall by around 29 per cent—a drop in 1989-90 from \$241 million to \$171 million in 1990-91. Wool production is expected to decline by 25 per cent in 1990-91, and the producers' wool cheque will drop by more than 25 per cent in 1990-91 because the wool levy has been increased from 8 per cent to 25 per cent, and the surcharge may be increased further.

Similarly, other commodities, such as citrus, are facing major falls in income. While it is true that agricultural commodities have cycles, there are some extraordinary factors presently having an impact. The present low level of real prices for many commodities is the result of production levels in competitor countries (including subsidies to produce), loss of some sales opportunities (such as that caused by the Middle East crisis) and the relatively high value of the Australian dollar. Alongside falls in real returns there has also been an escalation in costs of production. High fuel costs coupled with the high cost of money have added to the financial problems facing producers.

There are no quick fix solutions. Some of the problems being faced are determined by international market factors largely beyond this country's control; others by policies determined at the national level. The role of a State Government is therefore somewhat constrained. However, within those constraints, this Government is determined to provide realistic assistance. With respect to the cost of fuel, the most recent State budget maintained the favourable treatment accorded rural areas in terms of State petrol franchise licence fees. The State Government will be calling on the Federal Government to investigate how any increase in tax receipts gained from rising petrol prices can be used to finance costs involved in finding new markets for our commodities and in providing compensation for some of the losses incurred by producers. The State Government and the United Farmers and Stockowners will meet soon with financial institutions to consider options to the problems facing the farming community.

On the matter of interest rates, there are two avenues of assistance from the State Government. The first, the Rural Adjustment Scheme, has offered support for producers. In response to present circumstances, we will vary the loan limits on debt reconstruction loans and the interest rates that apply. Loans up to \$100 000 will continue to be available at 10 per cent per annum (moving to a commercial rate, presently 15 per cent per annum, after three years). In addition, a new limit will be available for this type of loan up to \$150 000 at an interest rate of 12 per cent (with the same move to a commercial rate after three years).

Aside from the Rural Adjustment Scheme, the Rural Finance and Development Division of the Agriculture Department presently offers a commercial rural lending scheme to producers. The rate, which presently stands at between 15.2 and 15.8 per cent, represents a significant reduction on rates asked by alternative sources of finance, and there are no fees and charges on this scheme. Therefore, the commercial rural loan rate not only offers a direct saving

to those producers who use such loans but also applies downward pressure on the rates being charged by competitors.

I have also asked that, at a national meeting of Agriculture Ministers in November, the Commonwealth consider a future long-term commitment for the level of lending for the new Rural Adjustment Scheme. The State Government also accepts its responsibilities in the social justice area. The involvement in rural counselling and business analysis services, its training and information services for women and rural youth and its support for rural groups are all aimed at assisting farm families to cope with the pressure of change.

We have also introduced sheep management measures such as culling strategies and feeding. The Department of Agriculture, together with local government, is also offering advice on the humane and environmentally safe disposal of surplus stock. We are awaiting further advice from the Federal Government as to the details of the decision announced on Monday considering funding assistance for schemes for the orderly and humane slaughter of sheep. The State Government believes that consideration should be given to using some of the available funding to assist in finding alternative markets for mutton as well as prime lamb. Furthermore, we believe that further research should be done on finding economic ways of processing sheep for use as part of Australia's aid program. I have asked the Department of Agriculture to prepare as a matter of urgency a research brief on the matter of the drying of sheep meat to enable its use in the poor food storage conditions and varied diets of many aid-recipient countries.

A key issue being faced by many commodity sectors is the issue of unfair trading. While the South Australian Government accepts that, in an ideal market place, free trading is a reasonable goal to aspire towards, it is quite clear that present international trading does not represent a free trade environment.

Subsidies to producers by EC countries along with the export enhancement program of the United States, combined with both tariff and non-tariff barriers to entry, are causing major losses in returns for producers. What we want and what we know producers want is no more than a 'fair trading' environment, a level playing field at both ends of the ground. The South Australian Government has proven its support for this concept, for example, by actions such as those undertaken with the dried apricot industry and the dumping of imported orange juice concentrate.

The Government will continue to pursue this line and, in order to improve the immediacy of our approaches to the Federal Government, a 'Trade Watch Committee' is to be established. I will invite producer organisations and representatives of the food processing sector to provide representatives to join with officers from the Departments of Agriculture and Industry, Trade and Technology to form this committee. This committee, which will be provided with research assistance, will seek out evidence of unfair trading practices by competitor nations or markets that we are seeking to sell into and recommend the best courses of intercession that can be taken by the State Government.

On a positive note, the Department of Agriculture has embarked on a major program of working with industry in developing new production opportunities and markets. As I have travelled throughout rural South Australia recently, I remain impressed by the resilience of the rural community. They realise these difficult times will not be corrected by quick-fix bandaid measures. I can assure the House that, with this Government's commitment to the rural sector, agriculture will continue to play a key role in the South Australian economy.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SCHOOL CLOSURES

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: During Estimates Committee proceedings on 13 September I was asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to provide a regional analysis of schools, with enrolments of less than 160 students, that the Education Department proposes to close. A reply was provided to the Opposition last week indicating 14 schools considered for closure or amalgamation. I have now been advised that two small schools in the western area, Gulnare and Murray Town rural schools, were omitted from that list in error. A revised list has been provided for *Hansard*. I point out that the Education Department has an ongoing responsibility to monitor the viability of its schools and will continue this function. As a result of this process, other schools may close in the future.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MOUNT LOFTY RANGES REVIEW AND BAROSSA VALLEY REVIEW

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Mount Lofty Ranges Review was established as a joint initiative with local government in July 1987. The task was to develop a regional plan to protect the environment, including the water catchments and prime agricultural lands, from urbanisation and inappropriate land management. Following written reports from 120 individuals and interested groups, a strategy report was prepared and accepted by the committees established for the purpose. A plan for the implementation of these strategies was then prepared in conjunction with local government.

In fact, the concept is essentially a proposal of local government, and it is to be congratulated on its initiative and enthusiasm. Because release of the strategy report had potential to generate uncertainty and provide the opportunity for unscrupulous and unwanted speculation, the Government decided that an interim supplementary development plan was necessary to prevent land division and the development of vacant titles unless certain conditions were met, until comprehensive planning controls were put in place.

Before this interim SDP could be considered by the Government, the Planning Act required that the councils concerned be consulted. This should be seen in the context that the three-year review process had already involved extensive consultation with the councils but, notwithstanding this, the consultation process resulted in wide, adverse and misleading publicity. This led to many development applications being lodged and, if allowed to continue, would have defeated the very purpose of the review. It would have destroyed three years work carried out by the councils and those groups I have mentioned, at a cost of almost \$2 million. Therefore, the Government decided to introduce an interim supplementary development plan from 14 September 1990, and to accommodate a longer consultation period with the councils. It was announced that consultations would extend for a further 30 days and, if appropriate, an amended interim SDP would be implemented. This decision was taken after consultation with the Local Government Consultative Committee. All interested councils were advised of the extended consultation period in writing, and the committee has

undertaken to advise the Government on any changes to the interim SDP.

I now refer to the effects of the interim controls. First, a number of activities are exempt, namely: alterations or additions to existing dwellings, farming and horticulture, farm buildings and outbuildings of less than 40 square metres. Secondly, the moratorium will not affect large sections of townships which are adequately sewered, including Hahndorf and Kangarilla, Stirling, Mount Barker, Nairne, Meadows, Callington, Port Elliot, Goolwa and Victor Harbor. The Government was also concerned that applications by individuals wishing to build a residence on properties already owned in the areas affected by the moratorium be treated on merit and with compassion as prohibited use applications. Accordingly, the Department of Environment and Planning developed guidelines for the assessment of applications for prohibited development in the ranges, and these have been referred to the local councils. The South Australian Planning Commission has also been consulted and has agreed on the guidelines, which I now table. Essentially, these guidelines mean that people owning a single allotment at 14 September 1990 will be able to construct a dwelling providing they meet with the guidelines.

The strategy report proposes that a regional planning authority be established for the Mount Lofty Ranges, and I welcome the initiative of the Mount Lofty councils in making the suggestion. The matter has been referred to the planning review committee for urgent advice to the Government. A supplementary development plan will be prepared and exhibited as a matter of priority, and well within the statutory period of 12 months allowed under section 43 of the Planning Act for the interim supplementary development plan.

I will now refer briefly to the Barossa Valley review and the interim supplementary development plan, which came into effect on 18 September 1990. In this case, the interim control was requested by the steering committee reviewing planning and land management in the region.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I shall be only too delighted to provide a copy of the letter for the honourable member, and I will, of course, demand an apology. This committee comprises two representatives from each of the councils involved and one State Government representative. In the Barossa Valley, the strategies are based on combining the creation of opportunities for appropriate forms of economic development with the protection of the character and amenity of the valley. As with the Mount Lofty Ranges, the period of consultation has been extended for a further 30 days beyond the initial period to allow councils adequate time to consider the interim supplementary development plan and, if appropriate, a further interim SDP will be implemented.

These decisions have been taken by the Government with the support of the reviews, and are absolutely essential to preserve the integrity of the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Barossa Valley. I am sure the vast majority of people already living in these areas welcome the opportunity to have their communities and lifestyles protected from the urban sprawl. Similarly, the people of South Australia understand that the Government is acting to protect the integrity of the Adelaide water supply, the agricultural use and aesthetic amenity of the Mount Lofty Ranges, and the viticultural heritage and economic viability of the Barossa Valley.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Cleland Wildlife Park—redevelopment of entrance buildings,

University of Adelaide—Ligertwood Building, extension and upgrading.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. At this time of economic recession, why does the Government intend to reduce labour force flexibility by seeking to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to widen and entrench employment preference to unionists and to force employers to give preference to union members in matters such as promotion, regrading, transfer, taking annual leave, overtime and vocational training?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I imagine that the Leader is referring to a draft proposal that has been the subject of consideration by the Industrial Relations Advisory Council, a tripartite body comprising representatives of Government, employers and unions, of which my colleague the Minister of Labour is the Chair. From time to time it considers variations or changes that may be required to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and propositions are before it at the moment.

In relation to any provisions dealing with preference to unionists, I should like to make it quite clear that this Government has always had a policy of preference to unionists, as we believe, and the evidence very strongly supports this, that proper representation by the work force in its organisation into unions ensures that we have a far more orderly industrial relations scene and much greater—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, indeed! The Leader of the Opposition interjects and asks whether that is what I found overseas. I can give no better example than that of West Germany, one of the most successful manufacturing countries in the world, which is strongly insistent on major groups of employees and employers and which even has them on all the supervisory boards and authorities that run the establishments. It is very interesting, and we could well take a leaf out of their book.

The reason why we have not been able to go that far is that it has been strenuously resisted by members opposite, so I am delighted that the Leader is interested in overseas countries. I also instance France where, again, the trade unions play a major role in various enterprise groupings, and I could cite a number of other European countries where that is exactly the case. Let me come back to the point: this Government has supported preference to unionists along those lines, and it has always been an ideological line, if you like, that has been drawn between us and the Opposition in this State. It has worked very well for us in South Australia and will continue to do so, and many of the major employers in the private sector go much further than that and insist not only on preference but on ensuring that they have total union representation. They will argue—quite strongly and convincingly in many cases—that this is the best way to ensure that decisions can be properly com-

municated and understood and that work practices and work conditions can be properly regulated.

I do not believe, therefore, that this sort of Pavlovian reaction of the Opposition does any good whatsoever in the current environment or any other, and I do not think that it is very helpful of the Opposition to try to take from the Industrial Relations Advisory Council proposals that are being discussed by that body in a reasonable and sensible way and to try to make a political football of them. Opposition members will have their opportunity when such proposals come before Parliament, and they can then be properly debated. Members opposite should allow the organisation that this Parliament has established to have reasonable discussion and consideration without the kind of pressure the Opposition seeks to apply to it.

KILKENNY RAILWAY STATION

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Transport explain the reason for the demolition of the Kilkenny Railway Station signals cabin and the conversion of its pedestrian subway to a crypt? The suburb of Kilkenny, once advertised as the Sheffield of South Australia, has been served by its railway station since 1880, when the line to Port Adelaide was duplicated. Kilkenny station developed a network of sidings for the surrounding engineering firms (including John Shearer) from 1904.

The signals cabin was erected in 1909 and is familiar to South Australians as it has featured for generations in the advertisement for the furniture retailer, Lindsays of Kilkenny. Although the cabin's signals function ceased in 1977, when Kilkenny was closed to goods traffic, the cabin had remained as a local landmark.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question and, in particular, for the very interesting and informative explanation. Had I known that this particular structure had such a long and colourful history I might have obtained a little more information for him. Suffice to say that the Kilkenny Railway Station, like a number of other railway stations, has outlived its usefulness as far as the STA is concerned. For some time now the station has not been staffed and, unfortunately in this day and age, that means a great deal of vandalism, graffiti and damage on something that is really not worth keeping.

I did not quite understand the honourable member's reference to turning the subway into a crypt. I am not quite sure what that refers to. If it means that we are filling in the subway, that is quite correct. It is very hard for us to win on this question of subways. I get as many arguments from members—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I get as many requests from members to block up subways as I do from members who want subways, so it seems to be a 'no win' area. However, in an area where there is good access across railway lines without a subway I think, on balance, it is better not to have a subway because, as I said, they are abused. People do not like using them, particularly at night, and I can understand that. So, that is why the subway is being closed.

All these points were discussed with the city of Woodville which agreed that it was probably the best way to deal with the problem. It certainly raised no objection with us. However, it is a pity that we can no longer afford, as a nation, to have small railway stations, to have them staffed and to

have them maintained in a condition that we would all like. The consequences of that would be much higher taxes.

RURAL ECONOMIC CRISIS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier agree with the Opposition that interest rates and the dollar have remained too high for too long, to the point where they now confront South Australia with a serious rural crisis? Will he immediately urge Mr Keating to act to relax monetary policy so that interest rates and the dollar fall before the South Australian economy moves deeper into recession?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the Deputy Leader to a number of comments and statements I have made on this issue over the past few months.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House whether there has been any increase in the number of young men and women entering apprenticeships and traineeships?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for her interest in this area. I am pleased to inform the House that the latest figures for apprenticeships and traineeships indicates that we now have the highest number of people in apprenticeships and training for well over a decade. There are now 12 045 apprentices in South Australia. That is the highest number since 1977. This year, the number of new apprenticeship commencements rose for the fourth consecutive year with 227 more people commencing apprenticeships in 1989-90 than in 1988-89—an increase of almost 6 per cent.

The increase in traineeship commencements for the year was 424, which is just under 50 per cent. Overall new commencements rose by 651 from 4 780 to 5 431—an increase of 14 per cent. There has been a strong growth in commencements in the metals engineering trades, up more than 16 per cent, and the electrical/electronic trades, up more than 7 per cent.

Reflecting the increased levels of commencements, there was a further increase in the numbers in training. In the apprenticeship area, the increase was from 11 812 to 12 045, whilst in the traineeship area the numbers rose from 745 to 1 117, again, an increase of 15 per cent. Although unemployment has increased in recent months, I am heartened to see that employers have the foresight to realise that a commitment to training is essential in order to achieve a long-term viability. The recent job vacancies data indicates a deterioration of the labour market. However, if our skills base is eroded too much through reduced recruitment of apprentices and trainees, for example, we will be unable to respond quickly to the increased levels of demand which occur when the economy rebounds, as it inevitably will.

South Australia's economic success depends upon a skilled work force both now and in the future. In responding to the honourable member's question relating to the increase in the number of apprenticeships for women, I am pleased that there has been almost a 10 per cent increase in the number of women apprentices training in non-traditional areas. In the apprenticeship area—and I exclude hairdressing—the number of women in training increased from 476 to 523. I acknowledge there is a long way to go in encour-

aging more women to take up apprenticeship training in non-traditional areas, but we are committed to doing so, despite the inane comments of the Jed and Jethro leadership of the Liberal Party.

RURAL POLICY

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Why has the Government failed to honour commitments made by the Premier in its rural policy at the last election to revamp and upgrade procedures for providing rural finance in South Australia and why has the Premier so conspicuously failed to honour its commitment to farmers at the last election to 'press the Federal Government on the urgent need to improve their export viability' by refusing to push for waterfront reform and the removal of other barriers to the competitiveness of our world trade?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I do not quite know where the member for Goyder has been. He seems to have been living in some cloud cuckoo land where he has not been paying any attention to what has been happening within this State. I simply identify that, with respect to the rural assistance commitments made in the policy, significant progress has been made in that regard and I draw the honourable member's attention to what was actually promised. First, given the fact that there are some policy areas that do need refining from time to time in rural assistance, and also given the fact that we should have opinions expressed about that from the rural community, we committed ourselves to establishing a ministerial committee with respect to policy and rural assistance. That has been considered by Cabinet—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, that is what was promised, that is what the honourable member asked about, and that is what I am now telling the House has been happening. Cabinet has considered that matter and made a determination agreeing to such a committee being established.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The other area that was looked at was in respect of those applications—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate the Leader's wanting to bail out the shadow Minister for asking an inane question that was quite easily answered. The second area is with respect to those applications which fall within a grey area and which perhaps need to be looked at again—an appeal mechanism, so to speak. That resulted in the establishment of a separate committee structure proposal. That is what was promised and that is what is in the final stages of being drawn together at the moment. Cabinet has already considered the terms of reference of that body and I will be making announcements about the membership of that committee in the very near future.

With respect to other areas, such as the waterfront, again I suggest that the honourable member has paid little attention to what has been happening in South Australia over recent months, to the work of my colleague the Minister of Marine and Harbors or to the work at the Federal level. This Government is committed to recognising and to seeing that there is change in the waterfront and to doing that as effectively as possible. I suggest that, the next time the honourable member asks a question about the policies of this Government, he look a little more carefully at what has actually happened and perhaps start addressing more

the real problems of today rather than the issues of yesterday.

NATIVE VEGETATION MANAGEMENT SCHEME

Mr McKEE (Gilles): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What progress has been made under the Government's native vegetation management scheme to protect this State's remaining native vegetation? Has there been an acceptance of the program by landowners?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to provide the honourable member with an update on the success of the native vegetation management scheme. In the financial year 1989-90, the scheme ensured that 294 clearance applications were processed and an additional 98 heritage agreements were entered into by land-holders. In that year, \$11.2 million was paid for financial assistance and management of the areas protected. This means that, at the end of June 1990, the following had been achieved: the number of heritage agreements, including voluntary agreements, had reached 462; the area protected—and this is quite significant—was 238 000 hectares; and expenditure to date has totalled \$225.5 million.

There has been increasing acceptance of the scheme by land-holders, with expectations of gaining clearance approval being more realistic than in the past. At the time of lodging a clearance application, many land-holders have indicated a willingness to enter into a heritage agreement over areas which would be refused clearance. Action is presently being taken to draw the clearance phase of the scheme to an end and to move resources towards the management of areas of native vegetation. I believe this is a vitally important part of the whole program. It is one thing to protect the native vegetation: it is another thing to properly manage the vegetation with respect to rabbits and other types of infestation, and bushfires. Consultation continues with interest groups as the next phase of the scheme evolves. The need for new legislation is also under review as the consultations with the relevant organisations and individuals continue.

THE NEWS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): In view of the Premier's statement reported on the front page of the *News* on 7 August 1987 (the day on which the management buy-out resulting in the current ownership arrangements for the *News* was announced) that 'it is important that any large metropolitan city like Adelaide has two stable daily papers under different ownership', has he taken any action to reassure himself that this situation will continue in Adelaide despite last week's closure of the afternoon papers in Sydney and Melbourne? Does the South Australian Government intend to support proposals by the Federal Government's Transport and Communications Committee to call on the Federal Treasurer to launch an inquiry into ownership of the print media, or to make submissions to the Trade Practices Commission about relaxing its rules regarding monopolies, to ensure the retention of the Adelaide *News* in the marketplace?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that the Managing Director of the Adelaide *News* has assured his staff that the changes that have been made in the 24-hour publications in Sydney and Melbourne are not relevant to the operation of the *News* in Adelaide. There is no question that, around the world, afternoon newspapers are finding themselves in difficulty in terms of market share and prof-

itability. I certainly stand by the statement I made in 1987 and I hope that the *News* will be able to continue in operation for a very long time yet.

Having said that, I must point out that it is a private enterprise activity. The Government does not intend to invest in or own a newspaper, and I do not think it would be appropriate for it to do so. I assume that the honourable member is not requesting that that take place. The position at present is that the decision made in Sydney or Melbourne will not apply here but, as I said, the long-term future will be very much a question of commercial considerations.

TRIPLETS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Family and Community Services consider the provision of additional assistance to the parents of newborn triplets? Additional services and support are given to parents of newborn quadruplets, and that continues to a certain age. However, there is no extra help for parents of triplets, whose problems are virtually the same as those of the parents of quads.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The short answer is 'Yes'. Sometime ago representatives of the Australian Multiple Births Association visited me and we had discussions about the dilemmas into which people can be placed as a result of this blessed event, which may, in some cases, be nature being more bounteous than that which had been suggested. Of course, there is an additional factor in this situation because, as members should well know, with one caveat, the means whereby our species procreates has not changed over the millennia. However, the one caveat is that the IVF program has brought a new flavour, as it were, to this whole matter. In fact, there is evidence to show that the contribution of the IVF program to the frequency of multiple births is declining and will continue to decline with time as better technology enables greater certainty of fertilisation, even though fewer ova are used.

However, we cannot escape the fact that the IVF program has made some contribution to the frequency of multiple births. There are a number of Government agencies that are currently providing assistance. For example, the Mount Barker Hospital provided respite for parents, a paramedical aide and a nappy service, and in-hospital respite was made available as necessary; the Quorn Hospital provided outreach nursing three times a week; the Port Augusta Hospital provided domiciliary care following the receipt of a medical certificate stating mental and physical exhaustion (and who could be surprised at that), assistance with linen, home help and also a paramedical aide; the Tintinara Health Centre provided a night nurse, home help and family day care when quadruplets were born.

To bring this matter to a head, obviously there has to be a great deal of cross-agency cooperation, and for those reasons it was placed before the Human Services Committee of Cabinet recently and an in-principle decision was taken to provide expanded assistance, the details of which will be further considered in short order.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. How many vehicle owners have been overcharged because of a fault in the Motor Registration Division's new computer program, which has resulted in owners of three and five cylinder vehicles being billed at a fee set for registration of eight cylinder vehicles, with over-

charging of up to \$142 per vehicle? When did the fault in the computer program occur and when was it corrected? What action is the Minister taking to ensure that people who have been overcharged are made aware of the fact and their right to reclaim the balance?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Fisher will be pleased to know that the answer is 'Probably no'; no person has been overcharged because of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The answer is 'Probably none', and the reason why it is none is nothing to do with the computer; the computer is still sending the bills for—and I correct the member for Fisher—12 cylinder cars. I was not sure that there was such a thing.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Just calm down; you are going well. You will start hyperventilating.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am trying to, Mr Speaker. Obviously, someone who has a one, three, or five cylinder car and receives a registration bill for a 12 cylinder car tends to notice it. They bring it in and say, 'There is something wrong with this' and we say, 'There certainly is' and we correct the problem straightaway. In an abundance of caution, I have asked the Motor Registration Division to contact all those people who have been sent registration notices for 12 cylinder vehicles just to ask them whether the appropriate bill was sent.

I assure the House that people who have received notification of a very large registration fee have let us know very quickly indeed, and I am pleased they have done so. Members of the Opposition will be pleased to know that the computer program is being modified yet again to take into account the fact that some people have one, three and five cylinder vehicles.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Transport say what consequences there would be for South Australia if the State Government handed over its vehicle registration powers to the Commonwealth? It has been reported in the media that the Federal Minister for Land Transport (Bob Brown) has suggested that the Commonwealth Government consider using its annual road funding as a lever to entice the States into handing over their vehicle registration powers to the Commonwealth. It has been reported also that Mr Brown has advocated the possible use of the Commonwealth's constitutional powers to forcibly centralise vehicle registration.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: When I read the report in yesterday's *Australian* that Federal Cabinet may consider the use of its constitutional powers to force us to do something that we have opposed, I almost choked on my corn-flakes. However, subsequent investigations show that the Federal Minister did not say that. What he did say (and this concerns me—there is no doubt about it) was that, whilst he was not considering the use of constitutional powers, he might use the financial powers of the Commonwealth to insist on the States' complying with the Inter-State Commission's proposal on road charging. This Government has made its position very clear—and with some belated support from the Opposition—that it does not support the Federal Government's proposal as presently stated. We agree—and anyone with any sense at all who under-

stands the transport industry would agree—that the present system is far from perfect. There is no doubt that some sections of the road-using community—for example, private vehicles—are overcharged, in some cases, in my view, and that some sections of the heavy transport industry are not paying sufficiently.

It would have been noticed in the last budget that to some extent this problem has been addressed: we increased trailer fees on heavier vehicles—and so we should. I was pleased to see that the Federal Minister did not go so far as to say that the constitutional provisions might be used, because it would be going right over the top to try to impose a view on another sovereign Government.

This Government has made it perfectly clear to all South Australia and to the Federal Minister that it disagrees. An article published in *Stock Haul*, the management magazine for livestock carriers, which is a very reputable magazine circulating within a significant section of this industry, states that the National Farmers Federation and the Business Council of Australia back the ISC report. I can understand that the Business Council of Australia would do so, but it is appalling that the National Farmers Federation, which is supposed to be looking after rural industry, does not support this Government's opposition to the ISC report. Every member who has any influence with the National Farmers Federation ought to ask that organisation why it is selling out people in the rural areas of this State. They should not just praise the National Farmers Federation and ask it to get out onto the streets to oppose the Federal Government: they should ask it to justify this kind of statement quoted by the Federal Minister. Whilst I am defending South Australian farmers, he says, 'Well, what about the National Farmers Federation, which supports it?'

That is the kind of thing we have to put up with because of the so-called economic rationalists in the National Farmers Federation. They do not care about farmers. I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question: we do oppose the ISC report in its present form, and will continue to do so.

HOUSING TRUST MANAGER

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Minister of Housing and Construction. Is the Government considering the appointment of a former Senator, Janine Haines, as the new General Manager of the Housing Trust?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is the best one I have heard in days! I am sure that the member for Hanson is pulling my leg but, in all seriousness, the matter has been dealt with by the appointments panel consisting of the Chairman of the board, board members and the Commissioner for Public Employment. They are still interviewing applicants for the position, and I cannot really comment.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No, the answer is 'Not yet.' Certainly, that is one of the best questions I have been asked since I have been in this place.

FUNDING FOR YOUTH SERVICES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I direct my question to the Minister of Youth Affairs. Is the Government planning to cut funds for youth organisations and youth workers? In the media in recent days there has been much comment and speculation that the State Government is about to slash funding for youth. This has caused much

disquiet among youth organisations, including the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am grateful that the honourable member has raised this issue, because we are talking not about youth cuts but about youth funding increases, but that fact seems to have been overlooked somewhere along the line in the reporting of the situation. The comments made by the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia seem rather strange, since that council obtained a major increase in its recent budget allocations, and had a major win.

My message to it and to all other youth services is that the youth field, like any other area reliant on Government funding, can no longer demand more programs, at higher costs. Youth workers, like all other levels of Government, must be made accountable for dollars spent, and programs and services must be subjected to rigorous scrutiny. Those of us who care about social justice must make sure that every post is a winner and that each dollar is accounted for.

Some of our new initiatives should actually be designed to save money instead of costing more. The point that I was trying to make to youth organisations in my recent speech on the subject was that the mere existence of a program is not an excuse for its perpetuation, whether it is a youth welfare program or a training scheme.

As we create new programs, we must regard them as replacements, not necessarily as additions. We must have the daring to try new innovations and explore new ideas, but we must also have the courage to discard them if they fail, for only then can we successfully stand up against the conservative—Liberal—‘do nothing’ strategy which assails ends as well as means.

Quite frankly, I believe, as all members of this House must, that unexamined programs are not worth keeping. We must also remember that good intentions cannot redeem bad results. We have to ask ourselves constantly what each program, no matter how dear it may be to our hearts, has done to break the cycle of poverty and dependence, because our ultimate goal in all these programs in the youth and employment areas is not to support people but to help them become self-supporting.

JOURNALISTS' FREEDOM

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister of Emergency Services acknowledge that it is important for mutual and strong trust to be maintained between police and journalists and that journalists must retain the freedom to go about their legitimate reporting activities without fear of intimidation when they identify themselves as journalists; and, if he does, what action has he taken to ensure that allegations by two *Advertiser* journalists that they were allegedly bashed by police when trouble flared at Alberton Oval early Monday during premiership celebrations are fully investigated?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am going to have to make a statement here which unfortunately will not reflect well on a particular reporter. On Monday morning I was contacted by Chris Taylor from the *Advertiser* who told me that two *Advertiser* journalists had been at the celebration to which the honourable member refers, and he indicated that they were caught in the middle of a problem between the people who were celebrating in excess and the police. He indicated that in the opinion of the two journalists the police used excessive force, and he then asked me what I would do about it.

I said that those people should refer their allegations to the Police Complaints Authority either by writing to me or

writing to the Police Commissioner. Mr Taylor then asked me whether I was going to pursue the matter personally, and I indicated that, on the basis of the information he had provided to me, it did not sound as though it was something that warranted a ministerial inquiry. It was with some dismay that I read the next day in the *Advertiser* that, after apparently stating that they were *Advertiser* reporters and that consequently the police ought to have left them alone, at least one of the journalists, allegedly, had been knocked unconscious by police and one had been hit over the head by a police officer with a baton.

Once I became aware of that situation I automatically—I think as people would assume I would do—contacted the Police Commissioner and asked for a report. I also contacted the Editor of the *Advertiser* to indicate my grave disquiet at being given one story and asked to comment on it, then a different story being written and my comments for the first story being used as comments for the second one. I do not think that that is appropriate and I think that every single member of the House would resent being misquoted under those circumstances. Indeed, I might add that it is the first time in 10 years in public life that I have actually contacted an editor of any organisation—whether it be media or newspapers—to indicate that I believed that something was over the top and should not have happened.

I have a report from the Police Commissioner which indicates that the situation at Alberton Oval was indeed very difficult; that people were apparently stealing and distributing alcohol which they clearly did not own. The report also indicates that at one stage the police were forced to release people who had been detained because it was not possible to manage the situation. The report makes no reference to several people claiming to be *Advertiser* journalists. I can well imagine that, under the circumstances, one might well say that, but police officers who are under considerable pressure might not hear it. Under the circumstances, that situation needs to be passed on to the Police Complaints Authority for it to be thoroughly sorted out. At the time of my coming into this Parliament today I made inquiries as to whether the police or the Police Complaints Authority had received complaints from the two reporters in question and, at that time, that had not occurred.

VERTEBRATE PEST BOUNTY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the House, and not wishing to distract from the previous serious question, I would like to place on record my congratulations to the Port Adelaide Football Club for its third magnificent victory.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order, although I fully support his sentiments.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you for your concurrence, Sir. Will the Minister for Environment and Planning give consideration to introducing a bounty on foxes and cats taken in country areas? At a recent meeting of the Murray Valley League, a Paringa delegate raised this issue with me and stated that foxes and feral cats were responsible for the local extermination of the mallee fowl from many parts of South Australia.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member had indicated to me that he had been asked about this matter when he was in the Riverland recently, and I am very pleased to provide the answer. It is important to point out to the House that, since the clearance of the Mallee for agriculture and the introduction of vertebrate pests such as

foxes and cats, what the honourable member has stated—that is, that mallee fowl numbers have decreased disastrously—is correct. They have decreased to the point where the mallee fowl, which was once common over most southern parts of South Australia and Victoria, is now locally extinct through most of its range.

Largely due to the network of conservation parks and areas of native vegetation held under heritage agreements through the South Australian mallee, isolated populations of mallee fowl remain, but research indicates that predation by foxes, and cats in particular, has reduced the fertility of most breeding pairs below the replacement rate. For this reason, the National Parks and Wildlife Service has undertaken a mallee fowl breeding program at Monarto, with a view to reintroducing mallee fowl to parts of their former range throughout South Australia and Victoria, although the program is clearly of limited value without some control on the numbers of predators.

I should make clear to the honourable member at this point that the option of bounties has been investigated periodically, and the general view is that bounties are only effective when the population density of the pest species is high. At normal population levels of foxes and cats, therefore, it is unlikely that the payment of a bounty would have much effect in reducing the population much below its present level, and would certainly not be an effective way of eliminating foxes and cats from the Mallee. In any event, the obligation for control of pest species such as foxes and cats lies with individual land-holders, who are obliged under the conditions of the Animal and Plant Control Act to keep vertebrate pests under control.

Further, I point out that, at the recent Concom meeting held last month, I raised this whole question of vertebrate pest control and had the support of the other Environment Ministers from around the country. We received a briefing on the national research and the status of that program with respect to the biological control methods of a number of vertebrate species, including foxes and cats. However, the whole question of rabbits is another issue that is causing grave concern to many land-holders in outback areas.

LAND TAX

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is directed to the Premier. On 23 August the Minister of Finance stated:

The practice of incorporating in leases a clause which requires the tenant to meet the cost of land tax defeats the purpose for which land tax was devised.

If that is so, why has the Government permitted SGIC to follow such a practice as demonstrated by a letter I have in my possession signed by an SGIC property officer to a tenant which shows that the commission has been recovering increasing land tax from the tenant—in this particular case an amount of more than \$68 000 in 1989-90, which represented an increase of almost 78 per cent on the previous year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: SGIC pursues a commercial brief and, when it does not do so, I hear howls of outrage from members opposite in any case. It is simply doing what has now become a fairly standard practice. It is for that reason that a Bill is before this House to correct the situation, as the Minister of Finance has made clear.

DIURON HERBICIDE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): What is the Minister of Agriculture's response to the damage to wheat crops on Eyre

Peninsula caused by the herbicide diuron? Diuron herbicide is applied to wheat crops after sowing but before the crop has emerged. It is now being used more often because it does not leave significant residues in high pH soils, but, in about 1 per cent of the area treated with diuron, the crop has been spoiled. A Port Lincoln agronomist has described the incidence of the damage as completely indiscriminate.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The press report to which the honourable member refers overemphasises what is in fact a minor problem which has occurred in relatively small areas. The advice I have received is that there have been minor instances of crop injury on sandier soils at higher use levels and, in the 1990 season, this has been somewhat more pronounced than in the past. To date, the extent of the damage to vegetative growth is estimated at less than 1 per cent.

From the experimental work available, I understand that diuron applied to the soil surface is safer than the currently recommended post-crop and weed application on a gram for gram basis of product. For grass weed control, a higher rate of herbicide is used than in the post-emergent situation for general broadleaf control. Applied pre-sowing, diuron is placed in close proximity to the seed and the potential for damage to the germinating cereal is greater than in post-emergent situations, especially as the herbicide is not highly selective. Where the diuron is applied to the soil surface after sowing and prior to crop emergence there appears to be a greater margin of crop safety. There have not been any reported problems when a low level of herbicide is added to SpraySeed, which is a registered brand name, for improved control of capeweed and cruciferous weeds.

Problems are most likely to occur in very sandy soils low in organic matter and, alternatively, where the crop is shallow-sown and there is a high level of herbicide activity or when sowing takes place too soon after application. It is also possible that a herbicide by trace element interaction on alkaline soils may lead to crop injury. That indicates that the report overemphasised what is a relatively minor problem in a very small area. The level of damage was low and within commercially acceptable limits but the wide-scale use of diuron applied pre-sowing by farmers is not recommended at present. There is a need to continue experiments with the technique of diuron application to cereals and other crops prior to sowing to ascertain the margin of crop safety and efficacy of weed control.

Wheat, barley and oats have exhibited good tolerance to diuron when applied post-sowing prior to crop emergence in trials, and this may well be the better option. The possibility of label amendments to include this as a recommendation is unlikely as diuron is a generic product and there is no financial incentive to any company to pursue these label changes.

CONTRACT TEACHERS

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Will the Minister of Education explain why he did not take any action in 1987 when the Education Department was advised that the teachers salaries award, signed in 1983, meant that many relief and contract teachers had to be paid a full day's pay for undertaking a part day's work? Does the Minister agree that, if action had been taken at that time, the department's current estimate of between \$25 million and \$30 million in repayments would have been reduced by at least \$10 million?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Education Department denies that that is the correct interpretation of the award. There is a single decision of a magistrate and it is the view

of the Education Department that that decision should be confined to that particular case. I assure the honourable member that the department will very strongly resist other claims of this type and, of course, it is seeking to take action to have this matter clarified with respect to the current award to put the matter beyond doubt.

ASHFORD CARDIAC UNIT

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Health advise when a decision will be made in relation to connecting the Ashford Cardiac Surgery Unit to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? The Minister would be aware that a number of members of Parliament in the western suburbs, being concerned at the high incidence of heart disease in the western suburbs, have made representations to him. The Minister would also be aware that the 1990 social health atlas of South Australia shows that the areas of lowest socioeconomic status in the metropolitan area—Port Adelaide, west Enfield, north and east Woodville, Hindmarsh, and East and West Torrens—have the highest incidence of heart disease in South Australia.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The House would be aware that, when the decision was taken to set up a second cardiac unit in South Australia involving the private sector, it was agreed that private sector involvement through Ashford Hospital would be permitted only under the sponsorship of a teaching hospital. At the time it was anticipated that Flinders would be the only teaching hospital interested but, in the event, the commission received two extremely good submissions—one from Flinders and one from QEH. I acknowledge the representations that have been made by the honourable member and a number of other members in relation to one of those submissions. The commission decided, with my blessing, that the decision as to which of these two hospitals should be the sponsor of the program should be subject to the same searching examination as was Ashford's original application. This searching investigation has continued.

The closest I can get to giving the honourable member a timetable is to indicate that it was being discussed by the commission yesterday afternoon. I do not know whether a definite decision was reached on that occasion because I have had no contact with the commission. As soon as a definite decision is made, it will be conveyed to the honourable member and all other interested members.

STA TRAIN REPAIRS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Transport say how often STA trains are sent to Ballarat for service or repair and what allowance has had to be made in STA budgets as a result of Commonwealth Engineering (Comeng) moving from Dry Creek to Ballarat? I am reliably informed that at 8.7 a.m. yesterday a 2000 series railcar towing a 2100 series carriage departed from Adelaide bound for Ballarat. Apparently, the floor of the 2100 series carriage was severely buckled as the result of a recent accident. Because Comeng has moved from Dry Creek to Ballarat and it was the company that manufactured the carriage, I understand that STA vehicles are now sent to Ballarat for repair. I am informed that the vehicles are expected back at approximately 3.30 p.m. on Thursday 11 October, and the estimated cost of the trip to and from Ballarat will be about \$7 500.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have nothing further to add to the explanation. It seems to have answered the question very well.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Health inform the House whether the Port Pirie Hospital redevelopment is on schedule and what stage has been reached in the redevelopment program?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The hospital redevelopment program at Port Pirie is a very important one, which has been given some priority by the commission and I know that it has received a great deal of support from the honourable member, so I will get a considered report for the honourable member and the House as to exactly where we are in that program at present.

STATE BANK

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Does the Treasurer support the view of the Managing Director of the State Bank (Mr Marcus Clark) that Federal Treasurer Keating wants the Federal Government to take over all the State Banks through the Commonwealth Bank?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have read Mr Clark's speech. I thought it was a very interesting one and I agreed with most of what he said. In large part, he dealt with the issue of privatisation and its implications. I would be very interested to know Opposition members' views on Mr Clark's remarks on that point because of attitudes being taken by them both within the State and nationally—whether they are in favour of selling off our State Bank to the private sector.

To get back to the original point—Mr Clark's comments were triggered by remarks made by the Federal Treasurer that State Banks were irrelevant or had had their day. He quite rightly pointed out that that is nonsense, that, indeed—and I endorse these remarks totally—without the existence of a vibrant banking institution headquartered in a regional economy, we would be very severely disadvantaged. We have experienced that effect, fortunately briefly, and the presence of the State Bank here in South Australia is absolutely fundamental to our long-term prosperity and confidence.

A lot of things are happening here in South Australia because we have that institution, not because that institution is writing all the business, but because its presence here also contributes greatly to the competitive impetus. If we lost headquartered banks, and if a scenario emerged whereby the State Bank was either wound down or sold off to interstate interests, that would be a very sorry outlook indeed, and I certainly agree with Mr Clark on that point.

LEAF CUTTER BEES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether there have been any developments within the Department of Agriculture to increase the number of leaf cutter bees being imported from New Zealand into Australia? A deputation of lucerne growers from my electorate has been to see me about whether there was any chance of increasing the number of leaf cutter bees being brought into South Australia, thereby improving the pollination of their crop.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, because I am sure the member for Goyder would acknowledge that there are lucerne growers in the electorate of Napier and that, therefore, he would not share in the mirth of the member for Bragg on what is an important question.

It is certainly true that leaf cutter bees do have a significance for lucerne production. The lucerne industry has been seeking the importation of leaf cutter bees for many years. To date, the program has not been enormously successful. First, there has had to be rigorous testing for pathogens. When that was completed, there was a release of bees in January 1988 in the Keith district of South Australia. However, it was not overly successful in that most of them died.

Secondly, there was a further attempt at breeding up leaf cutter bees, and a further release in 1990, and I understand that that breeding has been more successful. I am told that the present population is very small but comprises 3 653 bees, and that implies that someone has actually gone and counted them. I find that a bit odd, but nevertheless I think he can take it that there is a small population that is showing it may have some viability.

There has been no impact at all on the local flora and fauna as a result of this importation, and no feral population has been established. However, as to the import of further leaf cutter bees from New Zealand, we do have to be concerned about chalk brood disease, which has the capacity to affect honey bees in this country. Therefore, because of concern about that, no further importing has occurred at this stage. The New Zealand Department of Scientific and Industrial Research has prepared a quarantine protocol for the importation of leaf cutter bees into Australia. That has been submitted to the Australian Department of Primary Industry to see whether we can reach an agreement on whether leaf cutter bees could be imported after determining that they were free of chalk brood disease. I understand that the protocol has been accepted by the Australian Quarantine Service in principle, pending comments from an expert from the United States, and we will be awaiting further advice to see whether or not leaf cutter bees will be imported in the 1990-91 season.

WORKERS REHABILITATION CLAIM

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. What disciplinary action has been taken by the department against an employee who, while on full workers compensation benefit, worked as a taxi driver and, when detected, then grossly understated to the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Office the amount of money he had been earning as a taxi driver?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was very disturbed when I heard that a prison officer—I think from the Mobilong prison—was on workers compensation and was working at the time. He has been prosecuted, found guilty and fined. The department, in conjunction with Crown Law, is examining what action we can take as the employer of that prison officer who abused the workers compensation system. I will certainly let the member for Light know as soon as a decision has been taken. This matter is being discussed at the moment between the department and Crown Law.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BAROSSA VALLEY REVIEW

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: During my ministerial statement I believe that the member for Light suggested that I was misleading the House and not telling the truth when I said that, with respect to the Barossa Valley moratorium, interim control was requested by the steering committee reviewing planning and land management in the region. I would like to correct that false impression about my statement that has been given by the member for Light. I refer to a letter which I received from the Barossa Valley review and which was dated 10 August:

On the advice of our consultants my steering committee has resolved to request you to take urgent action to ensure that the rural parts of the valley are protected from unacceptable development, as an interim measure before the preparation of a comprehensive SDP for the valley as a whole. The committee is particularly concerned about the threat to the areas outside townships where the proliferation of separate titles makes the area vulnerable to the erection of new dwellings and other structures which mar the special landscape quality unique to the valley.

The consultants' strategy report which is due to be released later this month will embody detailed recommendations for the introduction of strict planning guidelines for areas outside townships. We are concerned that on release of this report the very areas we are concerned about will be at risk under the current planning provisions. We plan to seek the endorsement at a joint meeting of Barossa councils of our proposed course of action at a meeting on 16 August.

This is the most important part of the letter:

To this end, the committee requests that you take urgent action to introduce an SDP using the necessary planning provisions.

The final paragraph states:

We are grateful for your interest and support in achieving our goals for the Barossa.

Yours faithfully, G.F. Tucker, Coordinator.

Not only did I not mislead the House but also I believe I was very temperate in my ministerial statement, and I acknowledge the tremendous support, the vision and the initiative of the Barossa councils and, indeed, of the Barossa review and its steering committee. I would like an apology from the honourable member—that would be very nice.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is the letter. You may have a copy. It is very interesting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allotted for completion of the Appropriation Bill be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 11 October.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1927 the members of this House appointed to that committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House today.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Just six weeks after its introduction, this budget stands discredited and isolated.

An honourable member: We have heard that before.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The honourable member will hear it again, and he might listen this time, because he did not learn much from the last episode. The budget is discredited by the bureaucratic fat and inefficiency exposed by the Estimates Committees, which confirmed that there is an alternative to raising taxes. It is isolated by the path taken by other States in their budgets where significant cost savings have been ordered to avoid tax increases at a time of looming economic recession.

For almost eight years, the Premier has paraded as a paragon of economic moderation and virtue. He has claimed to be responsible and responsive to South Australia's economic difficulties. He has claimed to be a good manager and a low taxer but, with this budget, the camouflage is stripped away forever. We can now see the Premier and his Ministers in the true light of their incompetence and their deceptive ways.

I stand in this House this afternoon on behalf of all South Australian taxpayers to say that this budget is an outrage. It introduces record tax increases, and it ignores the need to save money—to cut waste—so that tax rises could have been avoided. The Premier has no mandate for this budget. He has cast adrift the fundamental promises he made to South Australians less than a year ago—the promises to keep taxes down, to give the private sector the room to breathe and to give businesses the incentive to create more jobs.

The Premier has treated the last election like a mirage in the desert, which is what he said when the member for Kavel intimated that South Australia would get the greatest project that this State has ever had. His promises shimmer in the heat of political battle, only to evaporate in the cold light of day. This Government acts as though we live in a dream world. The challenges facing our State and national economies float past the eyes of the Premier and his Ministers as though South Australia is somehow isolated from the nightmare of the recession that is now facing us.

The Government, with this budget, has done nothing to help South Australians to weather the storm. Indeed, it has ensured that, for many, that storm will bring even more havoc. Before this Government wakes up, many South Australians will be facing the harsh reality of bankruptcy, or, even worse, unemployment—South Australians who cannot, like this Government, with this budget, push the burdens onto someone else.

We are now only six weeks short of a year since the last election. Never has a year been more wasted by a Government. It is the first year of a four-year term, the time to take some brave decisions for a change and the time to grapple with the problems of a shrinking regional economy. But time and time again, this Government has wimped out.

I welcome the Premier back from his overseas visit. I hope his mission benefits South Australia, but I urge the Premier to look at the other State budgets which were introduced in his absence. I urge him to look at their common threads and to compare what the other States are doing this year to contain spending, taxes and borrowings, and to participate in the vital process of micro-reform, and to look at the missed opportunities in this South Australian budget. I urge the Premier to re-read the document that he released last year just before the last election called 'Securing the Future'. It purported to set his Government's economic directions for the next five years and it made some solid commitments to South Australian business. I remind the Premier of some of the things he wrote in that document. I remind him that he stated:

Small businesses are often leanly resourced, particularly in the early stages of development. The State Government's taxes and charges policy recognises the need to minimise business costs.

I remind the Premier of the promise in that document that his Government would 'maintain a State Government taxation and charges policy which ensures that business costs are kept to a minimum'. I remind the Premier of further words in his bid to win another term of office as follows:

For its part, the Government recognises its prime task is to sustain a climate in which entrepreneurial drive, innovation and investment thrive. This demands an accessible Government working in partnership with business and the trade unions, and a cost-effective public sector which efficiently delivers on key infrastructure.

I invite the Premier to compare all those commitments with the reality of this budget: the reality of its 10.4 per cent real increase in taxation; the reality of its 2 per cent real increase in recurrent spending; the reality that it is doing absolutely nothing to rid South Australians of the cost of bureaucratic flab and failure; and the reality that it is turning its back completely on an economy which is sick and getting worse as recession begins to bite.

In the same month in which this budget was introduced, South Australia's unemployment rate jumped by a whole percentage point to 8.2 per cent. The rural sector is in crisis. There are major problems for wool, wheat and meat exports. These are made worse by Mr Keating's high dollar and continuing crippling interest rates, policies to which this Government has given sickening, subservient support. In fact, today it was topped off by the Premier's not being prepared to stand up to the Federal Treasurer and to fight on behalf of rural South Australia. The document released by the Minister of Agriculture does absolutely nothing that had not been promised earlier by the Government, and of course it does nothing for rural South Australia and therefore will do nothing for South Australia in general. Small businesses, rural businesses and businesses throughout the State are facing liquidation and bankruptcy in large and growing numbers. The car industry has huge inventories of unsold vehicles and production is contracting rapidly. The property market is depressed with 11 per cent excess rental capacity in the central business district of Adelaide and major construction companies in deep trouble. Forward indicators of future economic activity produced by the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research now parallel the path of the 1982-83 recession.

At such a time, public and private sectors alike face enormous challenges and tough decisions. The burden of

those challenges and decisions has to be shared. To a greater or lesser extent, all other State budgets introduced in the past six weeks, except this one, have sought to do that. At such a time of impending crisis the response by this Government should have been to reduce the burden on business so that the severity of the downturn and unemployment are reduced. At such a time, the need for greater Government efficiency and less waste is paramount. Other Premiers—and, I might add, other Labor Premiers—have seen this. Let me quote from the budget speech by the Western Australian Labor Premier, Dr Carmen Lawrence, delivered only a fortnight ago:

The key objective is to create jobs in the private sector so families can look to the future with confidence. That will be achieved by encouraging private investment. We were faced with a clear choice: to increase taxes across the board or to rein in public sector spending.

The Government decided it was unrealistic to expect that the public sector can continue to grow regardless of the economic conditions facing the State. Rather than savagely increasing the burden of Government on the business sector, this budget reduces Government spending in real terms while maintaining services essential to families. We have made no increase in payroll tax, no increase in stamp duties, no increase in fuel levies, or in any other consumer or business taxes, with the sole exception of the financial institutions duty which will increase only to the level adopted by most other States.

I apologise to members for the length of the quote, but I think it is important for the House to contrast this approach with that adopted in the South Australian budget. In Western Australia, recurrent outlays this year will increase by 3.7 per cent in nominal terms—which is a real reduction of more than 3 per cent. In South Australia, recurrent outlays will increase by a real 2 per cent.

The Western Australian Government is trimming public sector numbers by more than 700. It is cutting the size of the Government vehicle fleet. It is reducing spending on computing to the bare essentials and taking other action to shoulder its share of the burden of restraint. Similar action is being taken in other States. In New South Wales, further productivity savings of \$140 million are being sought and the process of micro-reform will continue to be pursued in earnest.

In Tasmania, 2 per cent efficiency savings are being sought. In Queensland, there is no petrol tax, no FID, and payroll tax remains at a nationwide low. Mr Goss and his Treasurer (Mr DeLacy) have also started the ball rolling on privatising the power industry, railways and ports and productivity improvements of 1.5 per cent have been imposed on Government departments.

The same targets are applied in the Victorian budget. In marked contrast, this Government has sought to isolate itself from the tough decisions which are necessary and which have been taken by the other States to contain expenditure rather than to squeeze more hard pressed taxpayers out of business.

Further proof that this Government's \$233 million tax hike this financial year is the result of unchecked spending is provided in the Victorian budget papers. In a comparison of all Governments, they show that last financial year the South Australian Government increased its own outlays by 13.8 per cent compared with the average for all the States and the Commonwealth of 8.8 per cent. Our Government was the biggest spender in the election year and, with more of the bills for this reckless approach coming in this year, taxes are going up to pay them.

The Premier has tried to camouflage the real impact of his revenue measures by, for the first time, not calling motor registration and licence fees a tax. We have to go to page 37 of the paper just completed by Treasury, 'The Finances of South Australia', to obtain the admission that total tax

collections will increase by \$233 million this financial year—or a real 10.4 per cent. These new tax changes will cost the average family of four in South Australia almost \$400 this financial year.

This compares with just over \$300 as a result of tax changes in the Victorian budget, and \$150 in New South Wales. An analysis of the budget papers of New South Wales and Victoria indicates that the cost advantage South Australia has maintained to keep and to attract business is being eroded as a result of changed tax relativities. The new tax measures in this budget are the equivalent of an extra \$93.79 for every man, woman and child in this State. Even in debt-ridden Victoria, the per capita increase from changed tax arrangements in this financial year is \$82.38. In Liberal New South Wales, the figure is \$39.74.

This is why my Party has called on this Government to impose a moratorium on FID and payroll tax increases, to be funded temporarily by the accumulated surplus of SAFA until this mythical Expenditure Review Committee can make ongoing savings. The SAFA surplus is to provide for emergency circumstances. And, if ever emergency circumstances existed, they exist today in South Australia. It is not a hollow log to be used for political expediency in an election year. Unless the Government acts urgently to ease its increasing cost squeeze on business, unemployment and bankruptcy, moves interstate are likely to compound economic recession in our State.

In the election year, the Premier was quite happy to manipulate the accounts of SAFA. We saw that \$60 million of retained surpluses was brought into the budget last financial year. We saw another \$47 million come from the Electricity Trust. We have asked what the Government intends this financial year. We sought information during the Estimates Committee.

We had the farce of the Treasurer and his officials pretending there was not a budget for SAFA this financial year. Fancy the Treasurer of this State telling the Estimates Committee that SAFA does not have a budget! Fancy the public of South Australia knowing that the Treasurer is running the biggest business of this State—yet it does not have a budget! That is totally unacceptable. The Premier simply wants to do all he can to avoid the exposure of his Government's failed financial management.

What we do know is that SAFA has considerable reserves and \$99 million, in one separate account, of retained surpluses. The Opposition says that those surpluses should not be used in three years time for expedient electioneering purposes. They should be used here and now, when they are needed to take the squeeze off South Australian taxpayers.

As well as the impost of State taxation, business, over the period of this Government, is also paying much more in licensing and registration fees. In reply to a series of questions on notice, I have obtained information which paints a picture of significant real increases in charges on business. The following are just some examples of the increase in revenue between 1982 and 1983 and that budgeted for this financial year: builders licensing fees, up 429 per cent; second-hand motor vehicle dealers fees, up 675 per cent; liquor licence fees, up 116 per cent; mineral exploration licence fees, up 139.3 per cent; licences for lifts and cranes, up 212 per cent; and occupational health, safety and welfare licence fees, up almost 50 per cent in just three years. Fees like these add to the cost of running a business.

Real increases in charges on top of real increases in taxation mean less incentive for investment and job creation in South Australia. The Premier will try to argue that he has had no choice. I totally reject that. All other States have

had to grapple with a declining share of Commonwealth funds, but we have not heard their Premiers whinge about it as ours has done. Instead, they have got on with the job of getting rid of Government inefficiencies.

They are reforming the operations of their Governments so that those which are unnecessary are eliminated, while those important to the public are made more efficient but, constantly, this Government has ignored the siren call of micro-reform. It has treated the repeated warnings and advice of the Auditor-General as through the annual report each year to Parliament is a fairytale—not to be believed, not to be taken notice of.

When will this Government leave the dream world that it seems to constantly inhabit and get on with the job of providing a public sector that taxpayers can afford rather than a bloated bureaucracy that is able to become even fatter because of Government inaction? In my budget speech, I gave the Government some options to consider: I listed activities which could be privatised or exposed to the challenge of competition with the private sector to improve efficiencies and cut costs. This afternoon, I again issue the challenge.

Unlike this negative and 'do nothing' Government, we are an Opposition with the ideas and, more importantly, with the intestinal fortitude to be prepared to offer solutions which may be opposed by some but which are right for the vast majority of South Australians. I invite the house to consider some of the examples I now put before it where the Government could have saved money—where it could and should have acted to avoid the record tax increases our State now faces.

I refer, first, to workers compensation. In his 1985 annual report, the Auditor-General highlighted a significant increase in workers compensation claims for Government employees. He said that a continuing high priority needed to be given to work outlined by the Department of Labour to contain these costs. The warning was repeated in 1986, but claims have continued to mount.

Last financial year, claims paid totalled almost \$36.5 million. They have increased by a staggering 216 per cent since 1983; and this does not tell the full story. Over the past two years, arrangements have been established requiring some departments to pick up the first 21 days of compensation from within their own budgets. The actual public sector bill for workers compensation now is likely to be close to \$50 million—or about \$1 million a week. This is a scandal for a Government which has bullied and brow beaten the private sector about its work practices.

Obviously, Ministers have not the faintest idea how to fix the problem. When the Minister of Correctional Services was asked during his Estimates Committee about the budget line which must fund a \$6 million increase in that department's premium this financial year, his first response was to suggest that the extra spending was the result of 'the Government's generosity'. Clearly, this is a Minister with no comprehension of responsibility or accountability for spending the hard earned money of taxpayers. Yet, this same Minister will chair the Expenditure Review Committee—and that, surely, does not throw a very good light on that committee.

There are alarming trends in other departments intensified and identified by Estimates Committee probing. The Education Department's 1990-91 workers compensation premium will increase by almost 20 per cent to \$8.5 million. The STA faces a rise of almost 19 per cent to \$4.2 million. The Minister of Labour, who has the responsibility for public sector programs to reduce work related injury, proudly boasted to his Estimates Committee that in the Department

of Marine and Harbors the cost of workers compensation had reduced significantly in real terms over the past four years. What he failed to acknowledge was that the workforce in the department has also reduced significantly—in fact, at the blue collar end. When this is taken into account, the cost per employee of workers compensation in the Department of Marine and Harbors since 1985-86 has actually increased by a real 13 per cent.

In the Opposition's view, workers compensation claims are now costing taxpayers at least \$10 million more a year than they need to—because this Government has failed to act to identify trends and causes of injury to enable preventive action to be taken. Workers rehabilitation and safety management in the public sector is a shambles.

Sick leave: In 1988 the Auditor-General identified potential widespread abuse of sick leave in the public sector and the Government promised urgent action, but sick leave is on the increase again in the Health Commission, where it was initially identified, and in other areas like the STA, where no action has been taken (according to the Auditor-General) to implement improved procedures to reduce the cost of sick leave. Based on previous comments by the Auditor-General, eliminating the abuse of sick leave throughout the public sector could save \$10 million a year.

Government computing systems: These are an ongoing saga. The completed cost of the justice information system is now put at \$49.6 million—\$20.6 million more than the original estimates. The on-line registration and licence system in the Motor Registration Division will cost about \$10.1 million—\$3.6 million more than the original estimates. Despite this \$24 million-plus blow-out on just two systems, the Government continues to ignore advice from the Auditor-General that it should review the management and implementation of public sector computing systems.

So much contempt does this Government have for such advice that the Premier replied only on 29 July this year to a letter he received from the Auditor-General more than a year ago—19 July 1989—which contained expressions of concern about proposals to upgrade the State Computing Centre's computing equipment. There is now the potential for further blow-outs in this computing area. Seven years ago, a consultant recommended 17 computing systems for the Police Department and put a 'three to four year' period on the time to be taken to develop them.

But, in his latest report, the Auditor-General has highlighted delays in implementing these systems and in finalising a proper management structure for them. Over the past two years alone the Police Department has spent \$400 000 on technology consultants, yet there is not even a strategic information technology plan in place, let alone the computing systems. There is also continuing confusion about potential duplication and overlap between the police computing system and the JIS. With almost \$1.9 million budgeted this financial year to buy computing services equipment for the Police Department, the Opposition is seriously concerned that these purchases will be made without the department really knowing what its computing needs are.

School cleaning: For some years the Auditor-General has been highlighting the potential savings that can be made by increasing the use of industrial contractors to clean Government schools. In 1985 he reported that, based on existing contracts, the estimated annual savings in using industrial cleaners would be \$2.2 million. Since then the cost of cleaning schools has risen by more than \$5.7 million a year.

It is clear from figures contained in previous annual reports of the Auditor-General that annual savings of about \$3.7 million could now be achieved. Again this year the Auditor-General has commented on this matter as follows:

The use of industrial contractors is clearly the most cost effective method of cleaning departmental property.

However, all the Minister of Education could say was that the matter 'is under active consideration at the moment'. Considering that the Auditor-General first raised this matter five years ago, the Minister's response can only be regarded as Sir Humphrey at his best.

School transport: A Sir Humphrey also appears to have been behind Government responses to suggestions by the Auditor-General for saving on the cost of school transport. In 1983 a School Transport Policy Review Steering Committee was established—another committee formed by this Government. It reported to the Minister in April 1985. In July 1986, the Minister approved the establishment of a working group, comprising five departmental officers, to prepare a policy and procedures statement taking into account the steering committee's recommendations. This working group recommended new procedures for repairs, maintenance and route rationalisation to save \$3.8 million and additional savings to be achieved from greater use of private contractors to provide some services. But, not yet convinced, the Education Department then commissioned a consultancy to assess these estimated savings. In 1988 the Auditor-General reported to Parliament in a perhaps understated, if not frustrated, way that 'early resolution of this matter is important'.

Over the past five years the cost of school transport to the Education Department has increased by 56 per cent. In the same period, the number of privately owned buses operating under contract to the department has increased by only 46. Contractors continue to supply less than half the services despite the potential for cost savings of several million dollars a year. The Estimates Committee identified further waste in the Education Department through continuing overpayments to teachers, amounting to almost \$1 million a year, and rent on vacant teaching housing totalling \$450 000. In Further Education, the Government has admitted that \$1 million has been spent on upgrading the Lossie Street campus of Kensington TAFE which it now intends to shut.

Government office accommodation: The issue of waste of public money on accommodation has previously attracted the attention of the Auditor-General. In his 1987 report, the Auditor-General commented:

Long-term planning and a more co-ordinated approach can lead to more efficient resource utilisation and avoid or perhaps minimise situations such as paying pre-occupation rentals which amounted to \$403 000 in 1986-87, and having areas in Government buildings unoccupied for extended periods.

The Government responded by establishing a Government Office Accommodation Unit within the Department of Housing and Construction. But still the waste continues. The Minister of Housing and Construction revealed to his Estimates Committee that the Government had 5 117 square metres of office space currently vacant on which it is paying rent.

Mr Brindal: How much?

Mr D.S. BAKER: A total of 5 117 square metres, and that equates to an annual cost of almost \$1.6 million. This includes the Health Commission fiasco. When the Opposition revealed that the commission was paying more than \$300 000 a year in rent for seven floors of unused space in a city building, the Government minders became active. They attempted to sell the story that these arrangements had been approved by the Public Works Committee, emphasising that the committee has three Liberal members. Of course, what the minders did not mention to the media was the fact that the committee had expressed concern that this waste could occur if it agreed to plans to re-locate the Health

Commission's central administration. It sought and received assurances, according to its report on this matter, that other Government agencies would be located in this accommodation. The Government's attempts to defend itself in this matter have amounted to a contempt of the Committee.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What other empty buildings does it have around town at the moment?

Mr D.S. BAKER: It would be an embarrassment. It will not tell us but we will find out. It is of concern to note that, while the Health Commission has had to spend \$300 000 a year on this bungle, booking lists for surgery at the five metropolitan general hospitals get no smaller. At the end of June this year the lists carried the names of 7 040 people. This was only six fewer than a year earlier despite the Government's promise that additional funding to hospitals announced in the lead up to the election would allow them to meet increased demand. It appears that that funding went to paying for vacant office blocks.

Mr Lewis: Once the rent and salaries are paid, there is nothing left for the patients.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Like the hospital down south that is fully staffed but has no patients.

The State Transport Authority: According to a business plan approved by the Government early this year, the authority was to reach annual savings of more than \$24 million a year by 1990-91. It is now clear from statements by the Minister that these savings will not be achieved. Further comments in the Auditor-General's Report suggest that, while the authority should be well on the way to achieving these savings by now, little if anything will be done to reduce the escalating STA operating deficit.

This year, Government recurrent outlays on the STA are estimated to be \$164 million—\$130 million as a general subsidy from taxation receipts and \$34 million as a subsidy for concessional fares. This means that every man, woman and child in this State will subsidise the operations of the State Transport Authority this year by \$116. At the same time as the STA operating deficit is increasing, patronage is declining. Both passenger journeys and fare receipts are falling. People are voting with their feet and choosing not to use our public transport. This is a disgrace.

Contrast this with the State Transit Authority in New South Wales which in the past few years has transformed a \$90 million deficit into break even this year while at the same time increasing patronage. With an efficient, modern service this Government and its tough talking Minister of Transport should be able to cut the STA's general subsidy by half and save taxpayers in the vicinity of \$65 million a year. In the short term there is no excuse for not reducing the deficit by \$24 million without slashing services.

The scrimber project: The Timber Corporation and its scrimber project have been the subject of continuing unfavourable mention in the annual reports of the Auditor-General. The budget Estimates Committee has given further cause for concern about the future of this investment. The project is more than two years late coming into production. Its pre-production cost has doubled to more than \$50 million. So far, according to the Minister's statements to the Estimates Committee, it has produced only 30 slabs of timber of an acceptable standard.

A major and continuing justification for the project has been the international licence agreements it would attract. But here as well, the news shows cause for alarm. Last year, before the scrimber plant's election campaign opening, the Government said that there was wide international interest in the project. It talked about being involved in negotiations to manufacture scrimber under licence with '12 serious expressions of interest'.

The Minister of Forests told the Estimates Committee last year that the Government had 'received advice from a French company that is prepared to sign a secrecy agreement and that involves \$US50 000'. However, the information provided to this year's Estimates Committee shows there has been very little, if any, progress over the past 12 months. The only licence commitment fee paid has come from the United States, and that was already in place last year. The Minister has said the Government is also negotiating with 'a party from Thailand'. But this is now the sum total of international interest. The promises of last year have evaporated as quickly as the many dates given by the Government on the opening of the scrimber mill.

In his first report this year, the new Auditor-General, like his predecessor, raised concerns about the quality of information used by the Government in making decisions which lead to major spending commitments. Scrimber is one notorious example. There are others which come within the Auditor-General's ambit of concern. In his report this year, he commented as follows:

The quality of information provided to support investment proposals has fallen short of standards which would normally be expected to apply. For example, failure to include all costs associated with a proposal deprives those responsible for making decisions of information relevant to the decision-making process.

One project specifically nominated by the Auditor-General for such criticism this year is the Centre for Remote Sensing. The centre's relatively short history is a case in point of completely irresponsible dreamworld business management by the Government. The centre was formed in 1984 to develop and apply remote sensing technologies. Remote sensing involves the computer processing and analysis of information about the earth's surface as detected from satellites and aircraft.

Government approval to establish this centre as a commercial operation with taxpayers' money was based on a business plan predicting cost recovery of 67 per cent by 1987-88. But the centre has failed to get within 30 per cent of that target at any time since it was established. After its first year of operation, the Auditor-General reported to Parliament about deficiencies in management accounting and reporting procedures. The Government promised action to correct them. However, two years later, another audit revealed weaknesses in project costing, general accounting, record-keeping processes and financial reporting of operations. Accordingly, a new business plan was developed, downgrading cost recovery targets to reaching 32 per cent in 1988-89. The actual result achieved in that year was 17.3 per cent.

The centre's operations were further reviewed with yet another business plan intended to bring the centre to a revenue neutral status from July next year. But there is only one problem with this latest plan: it makes no provision for depreciation and interest on capital funds estimated to amount to almost \$200 000 annually. This is a cost which will make revenue neutrality impossible to achieve—a cost which no private sector operator could or would overlook in developing a business plan.

As well as coming to the attention of the Auditor-General, this centre has also been scrutinised by the Public Accounts Committee. In its 56th report, the committee commented about a proposal by the centre to acquire an image processing and digitisation system to cost \$320 000. The committee reported that the centre, in proposing this expenditure, had not separately identified salary overheads involved, had not separated development and operating costs and had not taken into account interest or financing costs. So far, this centre has cost taxpayers almost \$4 million, with no obvious return in public benefit.

It is not so much the actual amount of this waste; for there are other more costly examples in larger Government organisations with commercial charters, such as the Timber Corporation, the Meat Corporation and the State Transport Authority. Of greatest concern is the fact that action was not taken immediately the financial failures were identified—immediately it was obvious taxpayers' money was being wasted. Repeated warnings of the Auditor-General have been ignored. Now, devoted to Sir Humphrey to the last, the Government has stripped the centre of its own identity and merged it into the Lands Department, obviously hoping it will be more difficult for Parliament to keep track of its performance—a performance which last financial year again failed to meet targets with revenue below budget and spending exceeding budget.

The Opposition is concerned that information obtained in the Estimates Committees indicates there could be further centres for remote sensing looming in the public sector. I mention two at this stage in the hope that any problems will be dealt with much more swiftly than was the case with scrimber, the Centre for Remote Sensing and others.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Well, some are. First, the Tandanya Aboriginal Cultural Institute. A special injection of \$139 000 was required last financial year because the institute did not reach its revenue projections during its first year of operation. The institute's finances were structured on the assumption that it would attract about 5 800 visitors per month. However, the actual number has been less than a third of this—1 900 per month. Revised future financial returns are based on a projected 20 000 visitors per year—again less than a third the estimates on which financing of this project was based. It would appear that this is another example of major spending decisions having been made with incomplete or inaccurate information.

I also question whether this will become the case with the Science Park being established on a 30 hectare site opposite Flinders University. The Premier announced this project during the election campaign. It has received a State grant of \$2.5 million and a SAFA loan of \$8.3 million to purchase the land and develop a multi-tenant facility on the site. During the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology's Estimates Committee, it was revealed that the marketing manager has resigned and that the plans of two companies which were initially interested 'have not progressed as rapidly as was hoped'. There are no other expressions of interest other than from these two companies. I would be interested to hear from the Premier as to the Government's current views about the prospects of this project. It is certainly to be hoped that this project can fulfil the potential suggested by the Government when taxpayers' money was committed to it.

I have raised a number of examples where taxpayers' money is being wasted. I have pointed out that this is occurring because the Government has repeatedly ignored advice and warnings from the Auditor-General. Put simply but starkly, this bunch of fiscal illiterates opposite cannot manage the economy.

What have they done about the alarming escalation in public servants, workers compensation payments and the rising cost of unchecked sick leave abuse? What have they done about multi-million dollar blow-outs on computer systems and the millions going to waste because they do not have the guts to contract out more school cleaning and school transport services? What about the other Education Department waste that the Opposition has identified, and the vacant office accommodation costing hundreds of thousands of dollars in rent?

What has the Government done about our inefficient and costly public transport system? What has the Government done about the scrimber scandal—twice the price, two years late and still no production? What about the Centre for Remote Sensing—more flat earth fiscal management! This is a waste of more than \$100 million. Better management, more concern and more responsibility would have eradicated this waste and prevented the need for tax increases.

There are plenty of other options to save. In my speech in reply to the budget, I nominated other options to save taxpayers money. I said that public sector employment levels should be contained to June 1989 levels, and the full year saving alone would be \$27 million. I urged the introduction of specific productivity savings equivalent to 1.5 per cent of outlays on wages, salaries and oncosts. Other States have done that.

There would be a full year saving in current dollars of more than \$32 million in South Australia. I said there should be comprehensive contracting out and competitive tendering of day-to-day Government services such as cleaning, printing, maintenance and construction, security, meter reading, distribution of bills and so on. Savings of about \$30 million a year could be aimed for. I said that the elimination of waste and these efficiency improvements should be the emphasis of a first phase of the review of Government operations promised by the Premier. The potential savings I have identified far exceed the amount of additional tax revenue the Premier claims is necessary to fund the budget this year. In other words with a more diligent and determined approach to saving money and forcing efficiencies in public sector operations, the tax rises could have been avoided. Previous reports of the Auditor-General have identified these opportunities. The Government can no longer ignore them.

I have also said that, as a second phase, the Government review to be headed by the Minister of Finance should undertake a comprehensive and systematic evaluation of all Government activities. It should determine which activities should remain in total or in part Government control, and which activities should be put into the private sector. Again, the Labor Governments in Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia are doing this, to follow the lead given by the Liberal Government in New South Wales. Only this Government, of all the States, wants to stand aside from what is happening and what is this vital process of micro reform.

The Premier, in his Estimates Committee, told the Opposition that the Government would not consider any privatisation options. If the Government maintains this position, its whole review process becomes just another wasted opportunity. Privatisation in some areas can produce returns to pay off Government debt. This in turn can significantly reduce annual interest repayments, estimated to cost almost \$690 million this financial year. Overall, by tackling waste, by improving efficiency, and with some privatisation of Government activities, well over \$200 million a year could be saved in recurrent expenditure. These savings could be returned to South Australian taxpayers in taxation relief, rather than the savage tax increases now proposed.

Public Service productivity: It has become obvious through a scrutiny of this budget that this Government is not genuine about reviewing its operations, about saving money and about relieving the burden on the taxpayers of South Australia. I have said that improved productivity is one opportunity to contain costs and to lift efficiency. The private sector has been forced to lift productivity. Other State Governments are doing it but, when the Opposition sought information during the Estimates Committees about

what this Government is doing, we met stonewalling and silence. The Premier said the information was in the budget papers. This was a cue followed by other Ministers. But this was just an excuse we found in the end to avoid exposure. The Government does not want to expose the fact that it has done very little to improve public sector productivity.

This issue goes back to 1987 and the second tier national wage case rise. The Premier, in his 1987 budget speech, said that the cost of this increase would have to be completely offset by productivity gains. A central steering committee on productivity and efficiency was then formed. Departments and agencies had to identify to that committee productivity cost avoidance and savings measures. We know that one department—the Court Services Department—did this. It has reported savings totalling \$928 000 over a full year to offset the cost of the second tier 4 per cent wage increase. Those savings have been detailed in the department's annual report. But this is about all the evidence we can find of public sector productivity improvements.

As there has been no real reduction in Government recurrent spending over the past three years, it can only be concluded that this is another budget target nominated by the Premier which has not been achieved. In fact, the Premier's Estimates Committee exposed confusion within the Government about just what it has been doing. Asked about productivity targets in other States, the Premier replied:

We have had productivity targets in the preparation of this year's budget. As part of the wage and salary negotiations over the past few years there has been tremendous emphasis on achieving productivity targets.

However, the Chief Executive Officer of the Government Management Board, Mr Cossey, said this immediately after the Premier's statement:

The Government Management Board's approach, rather than setting particular targets, has been to get a focus within agencies on service improvement, and a particular focus on reducing white collar overheads without setting productivity targets of the sort to which you have referred that might be applied in other areas.

Here we have it: the Premier says there are productivity targets; the Government Management Board says there are not. How can the taxpayers have any confidence in the financial management of the Premier and Treasurer when there is such confusion over fundamentally important cost-saving issues. The fact is that any productivity improvements are not identified in the budget papers. The Opposition will continue to seek this information.

Asset registers: As another means of improving longer term financial management, the Government has received advice from the Auditor-General and the Public Accounts Committee about the need to establish asset registers. I go back first to the 1987 Auditor-General's Report. Then, the Auditor-General said this about asset registers:

One essential component for accrual accounting and required by all organisations for effective asset management is an adequate and complete asset register for control, custody, maintenance, costing and replacement funding purposes. The register is also essential to ensure that assets (such as property) are being effectively utilised. Many organisations do not have registers or have inadequate registers. My officers will be encouraging agency management to take urgent steps to correct this situation.

The following year, the Auditor-General reported some progress on this matter. I quote from his 1988 report:

Treasury has now asked all public sector agencies to establish asset registers capable of providing information on all assets held, including historical cost, current cost or other agreed valuation, economic life, etc. Treasury anticipates that it should be possible to establish information on major assets of agencies by 30 June 1989, and the proposal is for all agencies to have complete asset registers by 30 June 1990. This represents a significant and logical first step in the modified accrual accounting process.

In December 1988, a Treasurer's instruction was sent to all departments and agencies requiring them to have asset registers completed by June this year. In the meantime, the Public Accounts Committee has underlined the importance of this exercise with a series of reports highlighting the escalating cost of replacing assets in areas such as public housing, public hospitals, highways, water supplies and school buildings.

At the beginning of this session, I put a question on notice seeking information from the Premier on the number of departments and agencies which had complied with his instruction to complete their asset registers by June. The Premier's reply simply stated that three agencies had sought an extension of time. However, this did not line up with the concern expressed by the Auditor-General in his report this year where he commented that 'an insufficient number of returns from agencies had been received to permit a general assessment of progress to June'. Further information we obtained in the Estimates Committees revealed that in fact only about half the departments and agencies had complied with this instruction. Again, this exposes completely lax financial management and a total disregard of important advice from the Auditor-General.

The Government has no handle on the total assets it owns, so how can we be certain those assets are being managed effectively and efficiently? Similarly, the Government does not know precisely how many committees are within its bureaucracy. It does not know, according to the recent report on the Public Accounts Committee, how many companies it owns. This whole picture smacks of unwieldy and totally inefficient government.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Of course, that is even more dangerous, and that is why we will continue to probe—the people have the right to know. The Government, in its total scope, is far too big. It is unmanageable in terms of ensuring that priority is given to key services such as education, health, community safety and the provision of water supplies. Stretched too far, the Government is simply unable to account to Parliament for what is being done in the name of taxpayers and, more importantly, with their money. This is an issue that Liberals have long recognised.

At the 1985 election, we put forward a comprehensive program to contain the spread and cost of government. The Premier, however, opposed our policies through smear and misrepresentation. He opposed the very principles his Party, federally, now desperately attempts to grasp as Australia heads into economic recession. We have had five wasted years as a result of Labor's failure to come to terms with the need to make government more efficient, and to get government out of areas it no longer has any business being in.

Mr Lewis: If it ever had any.

Mr D.S. BAKER: That is absolutely correct. I remind the Premier of what he said in his 1985 election policy speech. These were his words: 'privatisation equals higher prices, higher fares, higher costs and less jobs'. How does this square with his Party's policy now to sell Australian Airlines lock, stock and barrel? How does this square with his Party's policy to sell Aussat lock, stock and barrel? How does this square with what is happening in Victoria and Queensland, where Labor Governments in those States are marching down the privatisation path? This has never been treated by the Liberal Party as an ideological issue. It is about people; it is about improving their services and containing the costs they have to pay in taxes and charges; and it is about having a public sector taxpayers can afford. But the

structure of the ALP in this State forbids the Premier from following this long overdue course.

In the 1980s, the Liberal Party was looking to the 1990s and beyond. Our policies, those we have consistently stood for, are now being vindicated by events in Australia and around the world. However, this Government, alone in Australia, still looks back to the failed solutions of the 1970s, the solutions which mean big government, rising taxes, increasing borrowings and, ultimately, economic recession. While this Government remains snap frozen by its own inaction and indecision, our regional economy continues to decline. New fixed capital expenditure by private enterprise is at its lowest level this decade. South Australia is currently accounting for only 5.9 per cent of national capital expenditure. This is a key barometer of future economic activity. We also know that without growth in our exports our economy cannot expand.

The Premier has tried to gloss over these failures, and these are some of the real failures of the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments. They are admitted in the Premier's own words. In October 1988, during a trade mission to Europe, the Premier urged the business community to continue efforts to develop new export markets. I quote from a press statement of the Premier issued on 18 October 1988:

Speaking at an investment seminar in Frankfurt, Mr Bannon said that the days when South Australia and Australia could rely on parochial policies, which paid little heed to the world economy, were gone.

It would appear he took with him the same script on his latest trade mission. He said in Rome last Friday that, unless Australian companies got out of the domestic market and into the export market, the Australian economy would not survive. Here the Premier admits two more wasted years; two years in which the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments have failed to do anything about the obstacles to export growth for Australia; the high interest rate policies; the high tax policies; and the inefficiencies on our waterfronts and in other key areas, which determine finally, the competitiveness of Australians in overseas markets. Returning to the Premier's pre-election pronouncements in the publication 'Securing the Future', he said:

Exports have risen steadily over the past five years.

In fact, in only one of the past five years has export growth for South Australia been higher than the national average. Our share of total Australian exports by value last financial year was 5.5 per cent compared with 6.6 per cent in the year this Government came to office. The Premier said also in 'Securing the Future' that 'we need to create a strong export culture across the community if the State is to prosper in a fiercely competitive world economy'. As an exporter, of course, I agree with that statement. He also said:

Primarily, the Government's role is to create a business climate conducive to export.

Again, no-one could disagree with that, but where is the performance to match the promise? Certainly, it is not in this budget. The Premier should retitile 'Securing the Future' to 'Securing his Future', because that is all it was intended to do. It made some soothing sounds at election time when the Government had no intention of following up the thrust of the document with action. This has been typical of this Government's performance throughout its period in office.

Last Friday, I released a list of projects promised by this Government during or just before the last two elections which have yet to see the light of day. The Premier, through his minders, has disputed my figures. But they were not my figures: they were the Government's own figures used with the announcement of each of these promises, and I thought it would be pertinent to go through them today.

First, in relation to the paper recycling plant, again referred to in the document 'Securing the Future', the Premier had this to say:

The Government is committed to actively promoting South Australia as the major commercial recycling centre in the nation. In a press statement on 6 November, the Premier elaborated on this proposal. It was reported in the *Advertiser* of 7 November last year as follows:

A paper recycling plant to handle the State's wastepapers will be set up as part of an eight point State Government recycling strategy for the 1990s. Launching the Government's statement on recycling strategy for the election, the Premier, Mr Bannon, said the plant would shred and bale paper for local and overseas markets and talks would be held with local government to involve it in the venture.

With this announcement, the Premier's minders fed to the media the suggestions that the plant could cost in the vicinity of \$300 million. They now say, lamely, as reported in Monday's *Advertiser*, that it may cost as little as \$1 million. That means, if you do not do anything, it may not cost much. I would like them to explain how this squares with the Premier's promise to make this State the recycling centre of the nation.

Project 2—The Victoria Square facelift: I again quote from the *Advertiser*, this time dated 21 November last year, as follows:

A new police headquarters in King William Street, new State Government ministerial offices, an upgraded Magistrates Court complex and an east-west traffic tunnel are key features of a futuristic plan for the redevelopment of Victoria Square announced yesterday by the Premier, Mr Bannon. Mr Bannon said he hoped the multi-million dollar upgrading could be finished in time for year 2000 celebrations. He said the proposals would cost 'more than \$200 million' but precise figures had yet to be worked out.

A year on, where is the evidence of substantial progress in implementing this promise? Information given to the Estimates Committee by the Minister of Housing and Construction suggests that the plans for the police headquarters are being revised from those originally announced by the Premier.

Project 3—O-Bahn tunnel under the parklands: In announcing the Government's transport policy before the last election, the Minister of Transport made the following announcement, and I quote from the *Advertiser* of 22 November:

A plan to extend the north-eastern busway into the centre of Adelaide by building a tunnel underneath the parklands will be considered by the State Government next year.

Launching the Government's transport policy, the Minister of Transport (Mr Blevins) said that the Government would have to weigh up the likely cost of the project with the amount of time the tunnel would cut from existing journeys. Announced as it was just three days before the election, this was intended to give the impression that this project would proceed. The Liberal Party had this project costed when it developed its O-Bahn plans. In current dollars there would be no change from \$40 million.

Project 4—Marino Rocks marine housing development: On 20 September last year, the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning went on location to announce this project. With television cameras suitably in tow, they surveyed the landscape and duly promised 'one of the most exciting marina developments in Australia'. What they did not reveal was that there were a few small matters still to be resolved, such as who owned the site and the financial viability of the proponents. This did not stop the Premier's minders scurrying around the journalists and putting a price tag of \$360 million on the project. This was the figure headlined in the *News* front page story on 20 September last year. It was a figure that came straight from the Premier's office.

Project 5—Mount Lofty development: On 28 August last year, the Premier, again with the Minister for Environment and Planning at his side, promised spending of \$15 million on the first stage of this project. I quote directly from their press statement, as follows:

This State Government and the Mount Lofty development consortium today agreed on a joint venture to transform the derelict St Michael's Seminary into a first-class tourist and communication facility... the first stage is estimated to cost \$15 million.

Project 6—Southern O-Bahn and Tonsley interchange: Members will recall the Minister of Transport showing maps for this project to the 1989 Estimates Committees. His predecessor (Hon. Gavin Keneally) had told the House earlier last year that an interchange at Tonsley 'would provide a considerable opportunity for people who live south of Adelaide to access the metropolitan area more quickly than is the case at the moment' (*Hansard*, 6 April 1989).

Finally, in his 1989 election policy speech, the Premier said:

Extension of this successful O-Bahn system from the city to the south is one option to upgrade transport services to our southern suburbs.

This was a quite blatant attempt to convince the long suffering commuters of the south that action would finally be taken, but now the Minister of Transport has explained to his Estimates Committee that these projects are, for all intents and purposes, dead and buried.

Project 7—Art Gallery expansion: During the election campaign, the Minister for the Arts promised that construction would start this year. I quote from the *Advertiser* of 15 November 1989, as follows:

The Art Gallery expansion, expected to cost about \$30 million, was the outstanding initiative of the [ALP arts] policy. Ms Levy said that, if all went well, construction of the new gallery areas would begin next year.

There is no budget provision for construction work to begin this financial year.

Project 8—Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium upgrading: In August last year, the Minister of Recreation and Sport stood before the crowds at Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium to promise Government funding for this major upgrading. A budget allocation of \$3 million was made in the election year. This has now been pared down to less than \$1 million with the plans substantially downgraded.

Project 9—Woomera redevelopment: In June last year, the Premier took a caravan of journalists to Woomera to announce a \$250 million upgrading. I refer to the report in the *Advertiser* of 3 June 1989, as follows:

'Redevelopment of the old Woomera Rocket Range in the north of South Australia could begin early in 1991,' the Premier, Mr Bannon, said yesterday. It was expected that the companies interested in taking over the range facilities would invest up to \$250 million in the project.

This project has now been shelved by the Federal Government.

Project 10—Major hotel at West Beach: On 13 February last year the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology promised that this ill-fated project on the Marineland site would cost \$35 million. After Zhen Yun had become fed up with this Government's dithering and mismanagement and pulled out, the Premier was still promising, earlier this year, that it would proceed. I quote from the *Advertiser* of 21 May as follows:

'A development at the Marineland site would go ahead with or without the involvement of Chinese developer Zhen Yun (Australia) Pty Ltd,' the Premier, Mr Bannon, said yesterday.

When we asked the Premier during the Estimates Committee about progress he handballed the question to the West Beach Trust. Its General Manager has reported as follows:

There are no immediate plans for any other forms of development on the reserve other than to continue to upgrade our own operational facilities of the Marineland village, the caravan park and the golf course.

Project 11—Port Adelaide Quayside residential development: The Premier first promised this project in 1987 as part of a development centred on the submarine construction. In March last year, he said that it was still a goer. I quote from the *News* of 29 March 1989, as follows:

The State Government is to develop a new community near Port Adelaide to accommodate forecast industrial and residential growth over the next 20 years. The Premier, Mr Bannon, today announced development of 700 hectares in a giant horseshoe from Outer Harbor to Salisbury along Port River. He described it as one of the most ambitious plans undertaken in South Australia. The instant suburb would cater for planned industrial and residential expansion in the area over the next two decades.

The Government's cost of the residential components was estimated at \$35 million. However, the Minister of Local Government has now reported to the Estimates Committee that progress has been very disappointing.

Project 12—Northern Power Station: Another project announced and reannounced a number of times has been the proposed third unit for the Northern Power Station. During the 1985 election campaign it received its first green light. The *News* of 17 October 1985 stated:

The green light for the new station was announced by the Premier, Mr Bannon, today when he went to Port Augusta to open the first stages of the Northern Power Station development. Approval for construction of the third 250 megawatt generator should boost employment in the Iron Triangle as well as easing South Australia's heavy reliance on gas fired electricity.

The project got a mention in Labor's 1985 policy speech, as follows:

We have commissioned the Northern Power Station and announced that, subject to appropriate environmental studies, a third unit will be built at Port Augusta.

The project was announced again in March 1988. A statement was issued by the Premier's office on 30 March 1988, as follows:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, and the Minister of Mines and Energy, Ron Payne, today announced the go-ahead for a third electricity generating unit at Port Augusta's Northern Power Station. The 250 megawatt unit, which will cost \$450 million in present day prices, will significantly increase the State's capacity for electricity generation and will provide a boost to the State's heavy engineering sector.

However, this project is now shelved because the economics do not justify it—a fact the Liberal Party often identified but which the Government refused to acknowledge until after the last election.

Project 13—Hackney bus depot relocation: The Premier's bid for the so-called 'green vote' began in earnest in 1985 with the promise to relocate the Hackney bus depot and return the site to parklands. The front page *Advertiser* story of 23 September 1985, which also featured a photograph of a smiling Premier with the depot in the background, stated:

The concrete and bitumen jungle of the Hackney bus depot will revert to lush green parklands over the next five years. Costing more than \$10 million, petrol pumps will give way to trees, parking spots will become lawns and garages will be replaced by scientific and education display areas. Work to start immediately will be completed in stages as funds become available and the bus depot is moved to its new Richmond site. The final plans for the prime five hectare site were revealed yesterday by the Premier, Mr Bannon.

I stress the point made in this announcement that the work was to begin immediately and was to be finished by 1990. As all members would know, it has yet to start.

Project 14—Petrochemical and coal gasification plant: These hardy election perennials were paraded by the Premier in his 1985 election policy speech with the boast that 'We are talking about petrochemical power generation and fuelled production developments worth well over \$1 bil-

lion.' The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology more recently has again raised the petrochemical project. In the *Advertiser* of 22 November 1988 he was reported as stating that investors from Japan, Korea, China and Europe had shown interest in the project.

Project 15—North-south arterial road: I complete the list by returning to the long history of promises made to the commuters of the south. In August 1984, the Premier promised a third arterial road. His press statement of 15 August 1984 was as follows:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, today announced plans for a major new road south of Adelaide. The decision to provide a third arterial road to supplement South Road and Ocean Boulevard was announced after the Transport Minister released a major report on southern area transport issues. Mr Bannon said the Government had a strong commitment to developments in the southern region.

Labor's 1985 transport policy put the cost of the project at some \$50 million. It called the project a 'firm and vital commitment by the Bannon Labor Government'. This was emphasised in the Premier's policy speech when he stated:

We will commence construction of a by-pass to relieve congestion at the Darlington intersection, which will form the start of a third arterial road to provide a new corridor to the southern suburbs.

I have listed 15 major projects worth, on the Government's own figures, more than \$2.9 billion. Their common thread has been loud and lavish announcements by the Government that these projects would proceed—no 'ifs', no 'buts' and no 'maybes'. This has been typical government by press release, promise, policy and project—indeed every 'P' except the most important one, and that is principle. The Government's record on honouring promises has been scandalous. Whether it is taxes, tourist projects, traffic problems or anything else, this Government's word is not worth the paper it is written on. This hoax is continuing as the Government desperately attempts to pretend that the economic outlook and confidence in South Australia are better than they seem.

At the beginning of this session, the Governor's opening speech referred to 'tourism projects totalling more than \$650 million either under construction or in the planning stage'. For two months the Opposition has been attempting, through questions on notice, to identify the justification for this statement. The Government has yet to answer. This is hardly surprising coming from the Minister of Tourism.

In April the Minister went to Kangaroo Island to promise that she would apply to the Federal Government for a grant to seal the south coast road from Kingscote to Flinders Chase. When asked in the Estimates Committee six months later what progress had been made, the Minister replied, 'I have not actually done that yet.' Ministers in this Government cannot plan, manage, add up, or keep their promises.

This afternoon I have identified this Government's continuing disregard for advice from the Auditor-General. I have identified the waste of money and the wasted opportunities this year to take some very brave decisions in the first year of a term that perhaps may go four years (but I doubt it). As a result, more and more South Australian people and businesses will be wasted on the scrap heap of unemployment and bankruptcy.

The Government's performance, reflected in this budget, is unacceptable to the Opposition. It is unacceptable to the people of South Australia, and it should be unacceptable to all members of this House. The Government has no mandate for the high taxes, inefficiencies and inaction that this budget enshrines. The Opposition will be taking all possible measures to ensure that the Government is forced to rethink its approach and to accept its role and responsibility to

minimise the impact of economic recession in South Australia.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In noting the Estimates Committee reports, and having heard the length and breadth of the Leader's speech, one can assume that the Estimates Committees have been quite successful in revealing some of the grave inadequacies of Government management in this State. I would like to pay some compliments, however, because the two Committees in which I participated, examining the Premier's and the Minister of Education's lines, were conducted extremely well, and both the Premier and the Minister of Education responded well to questions.

This was in stark contrast to Committee B, which was under the chairmanship of the member for Napier. I received daily reports—daily complaints I should say—about the conduct of that Committee by the member for Napier, and it leads me to the conclusion that, if these Estimates Committees are to operate properly, perhaps the Opposition should be able to vote on the appointment of the Chairman of the Committee, rather than that this decision be made by the Government. Martyn Evans, the Independent member for Elizabeth, chaired Committee A in a very controlled and good managerial fashion, enabling the Committee to run very smoothly. He picked up transgressions very quickly and did not waste time lecturing members of the Committee.

I spent only a small time in Estimates Committee B on the recreation and sport lines one Thursday evening under the chairmanship of the member for Napier. After I had participated in two very good sessions in Committee A, the Chairman of Committee B spent 10 minutes telling that Committee what the Minister should or should not answer, and how he intended to look after the Minister in the process. It was a complete and absolute disgrace, and the member for Napier is just totally inept at running anything, including the proverbial chook raffle.

I know that other members will reflect on the running of the Committees, but the only other serious complaint I heard concerned the Minister of Mines and Energy and Minister of Forests, who was quite arrogant and failed to respond to the various questions. By and large, I believe that all members actually gained from the experience of the Estimates Committees. In summary, they were well guided and well intentioned. There was very little time wasting except on behalf of some notables, and questions that could not be answered at the time were obligingly responded to with an assurance that answers would be forthcoming. The Estimates Committees are getting better year by year in that they really do provide the opportunity for the Government's performance to be examined critically. I might add that we are still waiting for answers from some of the Committees, so the final test of how good they are is still to come.

It must be noted that all replies should have been in the hands of the members and received by *Hansard* by 28 September for the Committees conducted in the first week, and by 5 October for those conducted in the second week. I do not know that any Minister has fully complied with that requirement, although I believe that the Premier has certainly answered about 90 per cent of questions very adequately within the time frame set. Other Ministers have been more tardy and some members are still waiting for the answers to their questions. I will mention here the matter of reform. Because the Estimates Committee is a very important part of the examination of the Government's performance, I believe it is high time that Estimates Committee scrutiny involved the Upper House.

Having seen some very good Chairmen and some very poor Chairmen (with the member for Napier in the latter category), I believe that we should have a better system of choosing those persons who aspire to that position. For example, I know that the member for Henley Beach would do a superb job as Chairman, as he has done in the past. I know that the member for Hartley could certainly do an excellent job, and a number of other members on the other side of the House could do a better job than the member for Napier, who really did not acquit himself with a great deal of glory. It is important that questions be ruled out of order if they involve self-promotion. The place for that is in a press release and not in the Committee.

In some cases, time-wasting was indulged in also. It is important that we examine off-budget items which, unless the Minister agrees otherwise, do not reach the scrutiny of the Committee. For example, in the lines of the Premier and Treasurer in Committee A, we had the advantage of asking questions directly of the Premier, but the General Manager of SGIC was also available to answer those questions, and that was most helpful. However, we did not have the same situation with regard to the State Bank. If we are to reform this area, I believe that many of these off-budget items have to be part of the total budget scrutiny. Perhaps another reform is to give the Opposition a two-for-one question advantage. All members would be well aware that a Government member can ask a Minister a question at any stage, and the answer would be provided. However, that is not the case with the Opposition, and perhaps we should look at some reform in this area. I should add that, in my involvement on both Committees, Government members gave way to facilitate questions by Opposition members. However, in both instances, we still had many important questions which we would have wished to ask the relevant Minister but which could not be asked because of time constraints.

The only other area of reform that I suggest is to bring down the Auditor-General's Report at the same time as the budget, so that in the speeches associated with the budget many of the Auditor-General's criticisms could be responded to by the Opposition. So much for the conduct of the Estimates Committees, which I believe are getting better year by year. We did not have as many superficial changes to the accounting procedures, so comparisons were far more relevant than they have been previously.

With reference to the Auditor-General's role in terms of his responsibility to the Parliament, there are a number of valuable lessons in the Auditor-General's Report which did not necessarily escape the Opposition's attention but, if the report had been received at the same time as the budget was introduced, it would have been a far more powerful document than it has been. It is a very important and essential document for accountability within Government. The Leader referred to the fact that the Auditor-General's Report contains a number of messages, some of which are new but some of which have been the same for the past five years, in that the Government is still not getting itself up to the mark.

The Auditor-General has pinpointed seven areas that require a great deal of effort to bring them up to scratch. First, I note that the Government's investment decisions are based on inadequate and insufficient information: that point was made very strongly by the Auditor-General. Secondly, the accounting systems are quite inadequate to measure performance, and attention must be paid to that matter. Thirdly, there is no control on the various committees. Committees spring up and nobody has any idea of how much manpower is spent on committee work and whether,

at the end of the day, all that effort and tying up of resources is indeed worth while.

It could be questioned whether anyone has an adequate list of all the committees that operate today. The Auditor-General has extreme reservations. He also raised the question of the management of personnel, suggesting that sick leave and absenteeism levels were unsatisfactory. The problem of choosing computers and their operation raised its head. Time and time again Government departments make inappropriate choices, and these problems are compounded by inexpert programming of resources.

Another area of concern is that the development of asset registers to account progressively for all input has been very tardy. It is essential that we account for our assets, that they play a part in the accounting procedures, because they are a cost as well as an asset in the balance sheet. The last item that I will mention is the need for internal audits. The Auditor-General plainly says that the job is well beyond the capacity of a few people from the Auditor-General's department adequately to go through all the accounts that are processed by Government departments. They can only skim the surface. Each department should have an internal audit team which keeps a close check on the manner in which the finances of the organisation are conducted.

At the beginning of my contribution, I mentioned that the length and breadth of the Leader's speech made fairly evident that there have been some great successes with the Estimates Committees, and I believe that to be the case. Whilst it is very easy to be critical, some areas really have to be scrutinised and questioned seriously because, unless we can reduce the cost of government in today's economic environment, people will suffer. This is a critical factor. It might well have been that, during the growing periods of the 1950s, the 1960s and the 1970s, Governments could afford to have some elements of inefficiencies. It could be that growth hid a lot of wastage. Resources were not scarce: they were plentiful.

That is not the case today and, at this time, some profound challenges face the South Australian economy, and the national economy as well. We know, without being hysterical, or without overstating the situation, that all the indicators look very bleak. I will speak a little more about this next week when we debate the taxation measures of the Government. If all the unfavourable factors come together at the one time, we will have a disaster on our hands. Over the past 30 years, there have been minor downturns in the economy as a result of one or two factors coming together at one time. They might have involved a rural crisis, and that has often been the case. Those factors might have been the result of Government action to tighten up finance because there were increases in demand and inflation; in other words, they were Government-lead stringencies. There have been times when manufacturing industry has taken a buffeting because of reduced domestic demand or failure on our overseas markets.

However, in the past 30 years or so, I cannot recall a time when all the negative factors came together, as is the case today. I do not wish to overstate the case, but I simply make the observation that we are in for very, very tough times and it will require a great deal of will and expert management of the economy, which is not being provided by our Federal leadership in the form of Hawke and Keating, to get us out of this position without severe impact.

Under these conditions, we cannot afford one cent of waste. We cannot allow budgets to overrun. We cannot allow wastage of expenditure because the taxation needed to pay for that wastage comes from the productive sectors, the ones that are bearing the pain at the moment. If ever

we have to be lean, mean and efficient, it is today. Therefore, we cannot afford the wastage in the system, so I will run through a few items that the Opposition picked up during the Estimates Committees.

First, I refer to the top price paid for accommodation at the Riverside development down the road. There is so much vacant space in Adelaide, yet the Government is paying over \$300 per square metre at Riverside. I refer also to the breakdown of the \$130 million productivity saving mentioned in the budget papers. On questioning, the Premier could not provide us with an example of where that \$130 million came from or, more specifically, what target savings have been achieved within his own departments. That condemns the Premier. We noted that the health age study cost \$99 000 and was undertaken by ANOP. It just happened to be the same survey and the same surveyor that asked questions about the rating of the State Labor Government prior to the last election. It was obviously a politically motivated survey using Government funds. We cannot afford these corruptions of the system.

We know about the funny accounting practices regarding the sale of the Agent-General's house in Wimbledon and the purchase of another home in Fulham. The changeover price was almost equal, yet the programs were split to satisfy someone's curiosity, I guess, as to what function the Agent-General's house performs. The Premier admitted that he did not know what was the timing of the Entertainment Centre, one of the centrepieces of Government development in recent times and, to his discredit, he had no idea of its running costs. So, a building is going up with an open cheque. The Premier did not know the number of committees. He has not set productivity targets and, as we are well aware, they have not been set by the review committee.

The Opposition noted that the Government Management Board had applied its expertise to Satco, the South Australian Urban Land Trust, State Computing, State Finance and the South Australian Film Corporation, presumably with the object of improving their performance. After many years, we are still waiting for one-stop shopping for businesses in this State. We saw the dishonesty of the Premier when he compared the \$30 million honest result of the New South Wales Treasury Corporation, as being its true profit, with the \$336 million generated by the South Australian Government Financing Authority. Of course, had he been honest with the committee, he would have recognised that the New South Wales figures took in only that part which was for management of funds, not the return on capital previously invested. Further dishonest figures were revealed with the \$53 million water grants, etc.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion before the Chair. I congratulate the Leader on the extent of the research which went into the preparation of his contribution this afternoon. Some may suggest that it was too long a rendition, but I do not accept that argument. It is essential that the critical analysis of what has taken place with this budget, and more particularly as a result of the Estimates Committees, be on the record. From that point alone, the documentation and information provided by the Leader will serve this House well over a long period.

From time to time members opposite might say that people will trot out certain statements from that document and say, 'We told you so.' However, it is essential that the Opposition has a base from which it can work. If the Opposition has perception, and if it has given the proper perspective on the various pieces of information, it should

be able to show the Government that it was warned on a certain date, and that if it heeded that advice at that time the State would not be in such a parlous position. I think we will see plenty of that.

The real value of the Estimates Committees will be demonstrated—and this point is not new at this stage of the debate—in the supplementary *Hansard*, which will have the detailed answers to the many unanswered questions that unfolded during the Estimates Committees. It is interesting that thus far the Minister of Local Government, via our own staff, has distributed the answers to the easy questions relative to the consultancies and the committees, which are an essential part of local government activity, but has not yet distributed answers to the biting questions which were put to the Minister asking for in-depth information relating to activities of the Minister's department.

The stewardship of the Chairman, the member for Elizabeth, in Estimates Committee A was excellent. The performance of the Minister was unfortunate—unfortunate in that there was a large volume of words and a desire to talk and talk but not really provide any answers.

An honourable member: Is this the Minister of Local Government?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: This is the Minister of Local Government, who was examined also in relation to the Arts and State Services. We got talk and more talk, we got lengthy statements and we got answers to Dorothy Dix questions, which really was not of any great consequence to anybody on the Committee—least of all those members who asked the questions. The first question related to one thing, the third question related to something else and the sixth question related to something else again, and we had to put up with quite mundane explorations which were of little value.

I come back to the point that the real value of the Estimates Committee system will be demonstrated a little later when the *Hansard* report is available. I trust that what happened in 1989 is not repeated. In 1989 we had to wait over five months after the Estimates Committees finished before we received consolidated answers, and even then many of the questions were not answered and, to my knowledge, still have not been answered. It is a little bit like questions to Ministers in Question Time. In recent times, I have had cause to write to the Minister of Finance asking for an answer to a question I was promised in February of this year in the previous session. The Minister promised to come back to the House as soon as possible; we are now in October, in the next session, and I still do not have an answer.

An honourable member: That is just not good enough.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is not good enough. It is hiding behind the bureaucracy; it is hiding behind the system to deny the people of South Australia, and, more particularly, those who represent them on the floor of this Parliament, knowledge that is essential to put matters of Government expenditure into proper perspective.

Since its delivery in late August, the document we are addressing this afternoon has become even more unfortunate because circumstances about us are changing so fast. In fact, Federal matters, which are intruding into everyday life and the conduct of business, are making many of the predictions contained in that document quite unachievable—quite unachievable because the number of South Australians able to meet the costs which are being foisted upon them is reducing daily. In most cases no jobs are available in manufacturing. There are some high fliers in industry and the Submarine Corporation is doing quite well, but it has

no forward bookings beyond the six submarines which were originally intended to be built.

There are other instances where individual businesses are reaping the benefit of demand in this State, interstate and overseas. However, an increasing number of businesses are laying off workers because they do not have orders on their order book. Those same businesses are finding themselves in the position of having to meet additional and escalating costs which are imposed upon them by both the Federal and State Governments. One could develop quite an argument relative to the additional costs being foisted upon business at present due to the escalation in respect of fuel costs, but I think that is a debate for another time. However, I certainly draw attention to the number of business persons in my own district who are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the bloated costs of WorkCover as a result of decisions taken by this Government—and I trust that the select committee will be able to report to us, if only in an interim form, at the earliest possible moment.

I draw attention to one anomalous circumstances in relation to WorkCover that is destroying business. It is a clear indication of this Government's contempt of business ethics, and it relies entirely upon double-dipping. I refer to a long-term employee who resigns after amassing entitlements for long service leave, sickness benefit—if it is transferred (and that does not happen in every case)—and recreation leave. The employee gives notice indicating that they have found themselves another job (and it is their complete right to sell their labour wherever) and says to the employer with whom they have been for a long period, 'I am going to finish work on Friday afternoon. I will be starting my new job on Monday. Thank you very much for the long-term employment that you have given me. The new job is closer to home. Thank you also for the large sums of money you will pay me for long service leave, superannuation, etc.'

What happens then? The business that no longer employs that person, after they arrive home that Friday night, has to pay WorkCover on the total of that person's payments. For example (and I will not nominate the business, but I will be happy to give it to any member privately, including the Minister), if a person finished work last Friday week after a period of time, that person will be on the books of their former company in respect of the payment of WorkCover funds until 9 February. Yet three days after leaving the employ of the original company, they went on to a new workforce, and WorkCover is being paid at the same rate in relation to that person's new employment from that three day subsequent period. That is a situation of absolute double-dipping. WorkCover cannot even get it right, or have a balanced fund or have a fund in reserve which looks reasonable, even though there is all of that double-dipping.

A situation is unfolding in relation to the quite massive escalation of land tax, albeit that there has been some reduction in the rate in the dollar because of out-of-date valuations. I will be interested to see what the Bill which the Minister gave notice of today will do in relation to the provision of true valuations. We have valuations which will apply to land tax, as they do to local government and to water and sewer services at present, which relate to sales made in November last year and January this year that are out of kilter with the value of those properties today. Yet, people are being rated and taxed on the basis of a quite unachievable sale value of those same properties.

I recall recounting to the House at the time that financial institutions duty came into existence the story of an elderly lady who came into my office and showed me her bankbook saying, 'Dr Eastick, it is almost like a mouse is nibbling at

my balance.' There was a levy of 25 cents in one place, \$1.58 in another place, and so on. I hazard a guess that it will not be long before that same person will be saying, 'I think the mouse has turned into a rat', because with a 2½ times costing of FID those additional costs will bite into the well-being and the funds of a large number of people in our community.

I think people are starting to question Mr Bannon, and it is right that they should, because what he projects as being for the good of South Australia is not what is happening. It comes back to the point that I made earlier that daily we are finding ourselves in a reduced capacity to achieve a balanced budget, if we happen to be in business, than we were the day before or the week before.

What else will happen that will impact upon people in our community? It came out in our discussions about local government—in fact, this was contained in the financial document delivered by the Premier when he brought down his budget—that serious consideration is being given to phasing out the Local Government Department. The Minister was unable to advise the Committee of precisely what will happen in this regard because they are still talking about it. However, the word around the traps, and from what can be picked up from the documentation that has been presented to the House, is that the Local Government Department may well become a local government authority separate from Government involvement with no Government employees. It will be a local government authority paid for by local government itself.

What will happen then? Local government will be responsible for paying for that authority and ratepayers will be demanding that it maintain current services. State and Federal Governments are telling taxpayers that they should demand these services from local government, that it has the capacity to meet this demand. So up go the rates and, if local government has to pay for this new authority, the rates will go up even further. So, we will be passing on to the ratepayers—the residents of South Australia—additional costs from this third tier of government. In fact, costs are already very high in a number of areas because of various actions which have been taken by the Government to unload responsibility to local government.

What are the social consequences of the freeze which has now been imposed in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Horrific!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The member for Coles makes a very pertinent point—they are horrific. Certainly, they have not been thought through; no consideration has been given to the cash flow of businesses which provide equipment for housing or sheds or other services for building operations. There has been no consultation with local government in the true sense of the word. The Minister stood here today and claimed that there had been but, according to the Concise Oxford Dictionary, 'consultation' is the 'act of consulting; deliberation; conference.'

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Well may the member for Coles laugh, because the only consultation, deliberation and conference in this State was to pass a piece of paper before a council the day before the event saying, 'This is what we are going to do, and we will talk about it later.'

A similar situation has occurred in a number of cases. The officers of a number of local government bodies were told over the radio that something had happened before they were given any working tools. People were hammering at their doors making inquiries about where they stood in relation to a commitment that they had made already to a bank or to a builder and, because council staff were ignorant

of what the Government had done and had not been told by the Government what it had done, they had to turn these people aside saying, 'When we know we will tell you, but in the meantime we have not been told. We have been given an impression, but how it will be delivered, how it will work and for how long it will be effective we have no idea.'

I draw attention to the word 'freeze' as it applies to planning in this State. In February 1987, a freeze was placed on five areas of this State that might have been required at a later stage for further urban development, with a clear indication that the freeze would last for six months or, at the most, 12 months until what was to be undertaken for the benefit of the community was sorted out. In October 1990, 3½ years later, three of those areas are still under the original freeze.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: What about the Aldinga Plains; they have been frozen for nearly a decade.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Aldinga Plains, Sandy Creek and Roseworthy—people are still suspended, not knowing what is going to take place. They cannot get answers. This is an indication of a Government that talks of consultation but does not practice it and leaves people in suspended animation. What the Government has done in the past is hollow, and what it is doing now is hollow. I will now make way for my colleague the member for Flinders.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): During the Estimates Committees I attended the House on many occasions and, in almost every instance, I attended each Committee for a short time. Whilst I appreciated what I heard on many occasions, I was rather disturbed that the real effect of the Estimates Committees has been undermined and the true value of being able to examine and question the Minister and departmental officers seems to be giving way to a large number of Dorothy Dix type questions and rather lengthy answers prepared in advance to fill out the time and reduce the opportunities for proper questioning.

This worries me a little because the real intent of the Estimates Committees as established over a number of years was, I believe, good and they should be pursued in that light. I believe that there has been some abuse of the system, and if all members could acknowledge that fact and work towards a better arrangement the true value of the Estimates Committees and their credibility could be improved.

Today, the Minister of Agriculture issued a statement expressing the Government's concern about the rural 'crisis'. I put that word in inverted commas because the Minister quite rightly said that we must be careful, when talking about the dilemma that is facing so many people at this time, to not talk ourselves down, that we should try to talk ourselves up to encourage people to try to work their way out of the present situation.

I do not want to be accused of talking down the problem or talking up the crisis, whichever way we like to put it, but I am concerned that very little concern appears to be expressed by the Government in relation to the dilemma confronting so many people. I do not think that many people really understand the gravity of the situation or its depth. I was asked to comment only yesterday by one of the media, and made the comment that I believe we could well be facing a situation considerably worse than that which we faced at the height of the series of droughts that confronted Eyre Peninsula in the late 1980s.

On this occasion, however, the circumstances are somewhat different, in as much as it is the whole community and the whole State—in fact, the whole nation—that will be affected. Only last Monday I attended a meeting in

Sydney of a number of agricultural spokesmen from the National Party and found that very few industries are facing an upward trend in the agricultural field at this time. The point was made then, and has been made in other places, that seldom in our history have all industries faced a downturn at the same time, therefore compounding one another's problems. In order to confront this now national problem, we need to address a number of issues.

The State Minister said, quite rightly, that few of the areas in which some action can be taken are within the realms of the State Government. There are some areas in which I believe Governments could move, and I have been approached on numerous occasions by people in the local government field as to whether some sort of freeze can be put on local council rates since, for many people, the payment of rates, particularly given the escalation factor in some council areas that has put on 12 per cent to 15 per cent, is very difficult.

Of course, that just compounds the problem that everyone else is facing. Those persons involved in the agricultural scene who are almost exclusively wool, meat and cereal growers will, of course, find the next harvest somewhat disappointing. Although in many areas we look like facing an above-average production year in terms of yield, obviously, the returns will be down considerably. We are looking at a 50 per cent cut in wool returns, a \$50 a tonne cut in wheat prices, barley down 29 per cent and live sheep meats impossible to give away.

Anyone could have been given a semi-trailer load of 5½ year-old ewes at many of our recent markets on Eyre Peninsula, but no-one would take them. In fact, at one of the auctions I attended the auctioneers were going along the line, and dropped down to 20c. The auctioneers said they would leave them there, and the owner asked whether anyone would take them, but there was not even an offer to take the sheep for nothing.

That is a management problem now confronting the farmers. It is a problem that has been exacerbated by virtue of the fact that it was unforeseen by all the Government's departmental advisers six months or 12 months ago. I make that point quite specifically, because it was put to me by one journalist that a Government departmental officer had said, talking about the slaughter scheme, that the Government should not be involved in that scheme to cover farmers' poor management. My next question to the journalist was, 'Did the Government know about this problem last November?' The journalist asked, 'Why last November?' I said, 'That is when the rams were mated with the ewes. If the Government did know about this pending crisis at that time and failed to take any action to advise the farmers, then it is negligent in its duties.'

Obviously, the problem is much more severe than many people say, and we cannot point the finger at farmers and say that it is a management problem since, as early as February and March of this year, the rural scene was still looking good. There were good wool prices; there was still an available avenue for wool sales; wheat prices were good; barley prices looked like being stronger; and sheep prices were still quite okay, although the live sheep trade had somewhat diminished. Basically there was an optimistic outlook—and I am talking of a period less than six months ago.

In that six-month period we have had a complete turnaround in the whole situation. I should like to think that in six months it could turn around again, but let us be pragmatic: I do not think that any of us really believes that the wool industry can turn around in a six-month period. Perhaps the wheat industry will revive much more quickly

than will the wool and sheep meat industries—one never knows. If one could open up a market in a new country, perhaps the opportunity could arise.

That is the point of caution I need to raise: Australia's problem is that we are uncompetitive on the world scene, and for two reasons. The first is that many of our competitor countries are very heavily subsidised from within their own nations. I refer, of course, to the EEC and to the American system, whereby the respective Governments heavily subsidise the farmers to produce and, in some cases, pay them not to put in crops yet pay them as though the crops were put in.

That seems an act of lunacy but, regrettably, that is the type of environment against which we are competing. I was interested in some statistics I was given a short time ago. I am advised that the proportion of the Japanese farmers' income provided by the Japanese Government is an extraordinary 72 per cent. I do not think that any one of us suggests that we should go down that path of Government support for a primary product, but, as much as we can within the limits of our State borders, we must ensure that our production costs are kept to an absolute minimum.

The next statistic really highlights one of our problems in that area, that is, the comparative cost of slaughtering one beast. In the United States it costs \$36 to slaughter a beast; in Uruguay it costs \$56; but, in Australia, it costs \$111. Why does it cost three times as much in Australia as in America? I should have thought that some parallel could be drawn between the American style of Government (free enterprise or whatever it is called) and the Australian system, but the costs of slaughter in that country are one-third of our cost. Is it any wonder that we are not competitive in those sorts of fields.

The other interesting point is that one of the biggest single food commodities that we export, in terms of returns to Australia, is processed beef. We must look within our own borders at where some of these extraordinary costs arise. Let us take that one step further. The total processing costs for an animal, including slaughtering and other processing, is \$88 in the United States, \$82 in Uruguay and \$193 in Australia. From those figures we see what is happening and why we are losing the competitive edge of which we used to be proud. We used to be very proud of the fact that we were able to compete on a world-wide basis. We used to be proud of the fact that we were very efficient as farmers. However, we are now finding that that efficiency, of which we could once be proud and about which we could boast, has gone.

What has to be addressed is this attitudinal problem of Australians, and that problem shows up in other areas such as the social welfare area, where there has been a 130 per cent increase in the number of persons receiving invalid pensions and a 195 per cent increase in the number of persons receiving sickness benefits over the past 20 years. I do not think that any of us would necessarily object too much to those figures, because our population is ageing and, therefore, invalid and sickness benefits will naturally increase. We have either a generation of people who are exploiting the system more or a generation of people who are not as healthy as they used to be—or something has gone wrong. I think we all have our suspicions about what has gone wrong—there is greater exploitation of the system. Along that line the Australian and the State communities are paying for it. They are the issues that need to be addressed.

Previously I briefly mentioned that I was looking at a scheme for stock disposal. On 22 August I spoke to the Minister of Agriculture to see whether he could consider some form of assistance to local government for the disposal

of stock. I make this point in qualification: I want to put forward not a doom and gloom message but the practical problems that are confronting the industry. As I mentioned earlier, nobody knew about the pending excess stock numbers because the rams had already been mated with the ewes last November. By the time we faced the dilemma of the increased stock numbers and the collapse of the wool industry and other rural industries, the ewes were lambing in the paddocks. So, immediately we had a 20 per cent increase in the national flock numbers by virtue of the natural increase that was occurring. Given that 20 per cent increase and the removal of any market to get rid of the aged sheep, we had the dilemma of overstocking by 20 per cent over and above the number that had been built up over the past four or five years. That number has to be diminished.

The problem for Government agencies is that there are many areas of the State where people cannot dig a hole and bury sheep. People cannot give them away. It would cost more money to freight them to a market than farmers would receive from their sale. There are many farmers who now pay people to take the sheep off their farms, but how far down the track do we go with that? I know of a number of people who have resorted to destroying their sheep by digging holes and burying them. I know of the early estimate of the department which thought that 5 000 or 6 000 sheep on Eyre Peninsula would have to be destroyed, but I know of three farmers who, between them, have disposed of 5 000 sheep. It is becoming a problem of immense proportions.

At least four Government departments would have to be involved in the disposal of sheep. To a lesser degree I suppose that local government would have to be involved, because they want to know what is going on in their areas. The Engineering and Water Supply Department would have to be involved, because it does not want stock disposed of over a water table or in a water catchment area, and we would all agree with that. If a hole of more than some 1.5 metres deep is to be dug it has to be shored, so the Department of Labour comes into it. If a hole more than two metres deep is to be dug I think the Department of Mines comes into it, and if those sheep have to be covered by two metres of soil obviously a hole more than two metres deep would have to be dug. We are running into a bureaucratic minefield.

What disturbs me is that farmers are not saying anything about it and are burying their sheep, and no-one will know what precautions are being taken. Maybe somewhere down the track problems will eventuate. That dilemma is confronting us and nobody is really coming to grips with it. It concerns me that certain members of the Government seem to scoff at this issue. To say that nothing should or could be done is not fact. This dilemma is great, not only for Eyre Peninsula farmers but for farmers across South Australia and perhaps even wider than that.

What has not been mentioned is the effect that this crisis is having on individual families. Many members would have today received a facsimile from Mr Errol Schuster of the Eastern Eyre Rural Counselling Service. I commend that report to members, because it sets out the facts that Mr Schuster has come across in his role as a counsellor. Those are the sorts of circumstances that really need to be addressed.

Unfortunately, we are creating second-class citizens in rural communities, and they cannot do anything about it. I can cite a perfect example of that, following a recent country show, which I will not name—and this trend is happening elsewhere—where normally there would be 200 to 300 peo-

ple in the front bar, be they exhibitors or so on, there were only four people in the bar.

An honourable member: The Burra show.

Mr BLACKER: No, it was not the Burra show, but it is indicative of the stress that has been put on the community. People have to close up and are unable to participate in community affairs.

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Having now experienced the workings of the Estimates Committees, which took place over a six-day period and having personally taken part in over 50 hours of questions and answers of Government Ministers, Government advisers and departmental Executive Officers, I can commend the system which is set up to enable the Parliament of South Australia its right to information and explanation by Government on the budget proclaimed for the coming year and thereby gauge its effects on the State and its people.

In commending the Estimates Committees system, I wish to qualify my commendation, which relates only to the system. I was amazed at certain abuses of the system by Ministers whose predetermined answers were almost marathon monologues, which I believe is outside the spirit of the Committees and demeans the entire process and, thereby, Parliament itself. As a member of this Parliament, I admonish the Government Ministers whose answers perpetuated that attitude.

Closer examination of the budget has only served to convince me of the inadequacy of this Government's feeble attempts to come to grips with an economy out of control. This Government will not practise efficiencies. It will not practise efficiencies within its own departments and it continues to accept high interest rates. This budget is designed to make it impossible for the Government to provide the level of services that the people expect. I wish to make many comments on a range of issues but, with time restrictions, I will make those remarks at another time.

I turn to a specific area that has impacted severely on the lives and livelihoods of my constituents and, indeed, has struck at people across the State. The unpredictable and insensitive decision by this Government to freeze development in the Mount Lofty Ranges shows once again not only how out of touch this Government is with the practicalities of this State but the disastrous effect these *ad hoc* impositions have on the residents of our communities.

Since the Government took this unprecedented draconian approach to problem solving, my office has been almost under siege by distressed constituents who are representative of families and of small business caught up in this disgraceful panic attack by the Government, which has totally ignored the rights of individuals. Families who have saved for years to build the home they have worked hard for have been denied that opportunity by this Government at the stroke of a pen. I hope the Minister for Environment and Planning has positive answers for these people, some of whom now face economic ruin, some of whom will face thousands of dollars of additional expense brought about by these delays, and most of whom have seen their properties devalued overnight by tens of thousands of dollars.

I will read into the record just one of the many stories of the effect on the lives of residents, because this is the reality when Government imposes the type of bans one would expect reserved for what is classed as a State disaster situation. The letter reads:

To whom it may concern, I am writing this letter in the hope that someone can help us with our dilemma over this new building law that took effect last Friday, 14 September. My husband and myself have sold our home and purchased land in . . . with

the hope of having a home built on some land and being able to take possession of said house around February next year. This being the case we borrowed money from the bank, signed a contract with builders and enrolled our daughter in . . . high school to start next February 1991.

On Monday 17 September we took our plans to the . . . council ourselves, thinking that we could help speed up the procedure. However, when we got there we were met with such a shock that we now are beginning to wonder if, in fact, we will have anywhere to live. We were told by a gentleman at the council that we would be lucky if our building was started in March or April 1991.

That brings me to the point. (1) If we cannot start building within three months of signing the contract we will be charged 1 per cent of the full contract price per month and, not only that, our building materials go up in price. We cannot afford to sustain such costs, because we are already at our limit as far as finances go. (2) My daughter must start school . . . next year. Because of her subject choice, it would almost certainly cause her to fail the year if she were to start halfway through (the year) because she would be studying different subjects at school here in Adelaide. She is in year 10 and is branching off for her matriculation subjects.

(3) We started these plans about three months ago with the utmost care to each and every aspect and now it really looks as though we are going to have nowhere to live together as a family for almost seven months. (4) The reason we may have to split the family up is because there are no houses for rent in . . . so my daughter and myself will probably have to hire a van in the caravan park, while my husband and my son will be living in Adelaide . . .

(5) That brings me to my next point, which is double rent. Why should we have to do that at all, let alone wondering how we are going to be able to afford it. My aim in writing this letter, as I said at the beginning, is to get some help, and what I would like is for someone to take a good look at this new law and what it is going to cost a lot of people financially as well as socially.

Just a quick footnote, prior to selling our house or buying any land we spoke to the building inspector . . . about building on the land; he informed us that there would be no problems and that the building should only take approximately three and a half months. On this advice we purchased land and then sold our house.

Another story comes to mind of a young couple whom this Government pretends to represent: a young married couple who have worked hard and whose savings see them the owners of two house blocks of land paid off over years. One block was to be sold to partially finance the house to be built on the second block. Soil tests on the building block were nearly completed. The house was about to become a reality and to assist finances, the couple had given up their rental accommodation and moved in with the in-laws. Overnight, trauma and uncertainty have hit this young couple unmercifully.

The inconvenience for two families sharing accommodation for a short time is only a minor matter. The time in which the house would have been built is now extended indefinitely. The block of land to be used to finance the building has been devalued and considered unsaleable. The builder will not hold the cost of the house at today's valuation. The move to the new site would have assisted the young man's career opportunities. The situation for this young couple is indeed a disaster.

The most damning aspect of this Government's crippling blanket ban on development in relation to this young couple is the ludicrous irony that, under any reasonable planning considerations, the site for development would have to be exempt from any criteria safeguarding water catchment or unnecessary development. The site in question sits between developed home blocks and is connected to a common effluent drainage system.

There would appear to be no apparent reason to deny a building to be erected amongst existing houses and, if common effluent drainage systems are to be excluded from planning decisions, a large part of Tea Tree Gully council area would come under contention. The South Australian Labor Party has had nearly a quarter of a century to develop positive policies to ensure that key towns and areas within

the hills face throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges were properly sewered. I believe that the Minister's department is at this time contacting the 21 or 22 councils affected by this ban in an attempt, through consultation, to identify the problems and determine solutions.

I ask the Minister why the consultation process was not initiated with councils and the Government's own Range Review Consultants Committee before this decision was taken. This Government elevated the word 'consultation' to a place of eminence within departmental jargon, a process by which all parties with interest and knowledge can participate to share knowledge and expertise, and take part in decision making. This Government has now changed the original meaning of the word 'consultation' into a farcical and hypocritical facsimile.

I remember well the consultation process promoted during the country hospitals closure debacle. Departmental officers would arrive in a country town to meet with members of the Country Hospitals Board and/or interested local personalities. Alleged consultations would then take place. No minutes of those meetings were allowed to be recorded, either by the written word or by tape recorder. No motions were received or voted upon. When the consultations were over, the departmental officers returned to the Health Commission and initiated the already preset Government policy. So much for consultation Labor Government style! This Government invested travel allowance and wages in an attempt to appease for the moment, certainly not to consult for the future good. Never let it be said that the Labor Party lets logic and informed debate get in the way of Labor policy.

Returning to this all-out blanket ban on hills development—a true consultation process should have taken place prior to decisions being taken. Specific problem areas should have been targeted rather than an all-out freeze destined to cause financial hardship to members of our community already struggling to secure some essence of financial stability in an already unstable economy mismanaged by this Government.

The public of South Australia has the right to be informed that this Government chose to spend Commonwealth specific purpose capital grants money totalling \$56 million on almost everything else but its designated target, water resources. This money was wasted on pre-election, no substance promises and gimmicks, and was redirected to recurrent spending, which had nothing to do with water. The Auditor-General's Report shows that only \$8 million of the Commonwealth money was actually spent on water resources. This year, the Commonwealth has allocated to the State a further \$14 million for water capital projects, but the Treasurer intends to use \$12 million of it for housing. This State faces serious water quality problems, yet this Government refuses to use money earmarked for this purpose to properly sewer our water catchment zone.

Several of the many constituents who have contacted me over the past weeks were incredulous at the contradiction in principle supported by the Minister for Environment and Planning. On the one hand is the alleged concern for our water quality and watershed control, and on the other hand is the support for a toxic waste incinerator to be built at Corowa, less than a kilometre from our major water supply, the Murray River. If any consistencies emerge from the Minister's support of both these recent decisions, they are definitely the consistency of major errors of judgment. Will the Minister of Water Resources explain her acceptance of this site, knowing that the criterion set by the joint task force has been breached? The site chosen by the joint task force on intractable waste breached its own criterion that

the incinerator should not be near a significant stream, and I doubt that any person in South Australia would class the Murray as anything less than significant.

To compound our immediate water quality problem, we have been told recently that three sewerage ponds adjacent to the Murray River will soon be flooded and that contaminated water will return to the river and eventually into the pipelines to Adelaide.

The Hon. H. Allison: It began this morning—Waikerie and the rest of them.

Mrs KOTZ: That is disgusting. We are expected to believe that by the time it reaches Adelaide the effluent will be watered down and not harmful to health. It was also reported recently that the E&WS Department was pumping hundreds of thousands of litres of effluent every day into the Onkaparinga River. The E&WS operations were pumping secondary treated effluent from Woodside, Hahndorf and the Woodside army camp into the Onkaparinga River. Pipes to divert this effluent to settling ponds were installed two years ago, but the Government has failed to allocate resources to complete the pumping station.

The E&WS Director of Technical Services, Mr Peter Norman, said that almost one million litres of secondary effluent was pumped daily from Hahndorf and Woodside into the Onkaparinga eventually to enter the Mount Bold reservoir. However, he said that this was a very small, single contribution to water pollution in the water catchment area and a system likely to be completed this year would pump Woodside discharge to settling ponds out of the water catchment area. It is planned to upgrade the Hahndorf treatment plant to improve the quality of effluent sent to the reservoir.

The State Government is a main contributor to water pollution in the Mount Lofty Ranges and is guilty of staggering hypocrisy. It is essential that money designated for our water resources is utilised to improve quality and safeguard existing future supplies from contamination. It is also essential that the freeze on hills development be lifted and that the Range Review Consultants Committee be given the task of assessing specific problem areas and developing strategies, in genuine consultation with appropriate councils, to present to the Minister to counter any debilitating problems detected. At the very least, it is essential that individual allotments with correct effluent drainage disposal be given building permission and the rights of individuals to pre-determine their future housing needs be assured by long-term planning measures instead of this *ad hoc* panic attack, bandaïd approach, which is indicative of this Government's approach to all elements of governing this State.

I have previously commented on a recent Federal Labor policy measure specifically tailored to remove funds from our elderly citizens. With the time remaining, I may not be able to complete what I would like to say on this, but I suggest that the removal of funds from our elderly citizens and aged pensioners is a cause of great trauma to the people concerned. This is one of a series of policies which reversed the process where pensioners were beneficiaries but, through these policies, have now become the victims. The elderly were informed that they must invest whatever savings they have at 10 per cent because whatever savings over \$2 000 held by them will be taxed at 10 per cent, whether those savings earn interest at 10 per cent or whether they are held in a non-interest bearing account.

A period has elapsed in which we have been able to judge the effects of this immoral tax grab, and they serve only to indicate that such an inequitable and administratively impractical tax should be removed immediately. Over the years we have heard the comment that money would be better off stored under the bed, and that statement has been

treated with scorn and ridicule. In the literal sense, the statement should be treated with scorn and ridicule but, in reality, taxpayers feel that their financial security is continually threatened and that they have no other choice but to protect what little savings they have, particularly where their weekly earning capacity has ceased.

The greatest anomaly with this new assessment of pensions at an earning rate of 10 per cent relates to the current rate of interest paid by banking institutions, which may be anywhere between 6 per cent and 9.5 per cent. The current rate of interest on high performance accounts is 9.5 per cent, and that is on amounts up to \$20 000. Where does the pensioner make up the 5 per cent difference when the tax is actuated at 10 per cent?

Mr Brindal: It's .5 per cent.

Mrs KOTZ: Yes, it is .5 per cent. I thank the member for Hayward. If a pensioner wishes to ensure that their savings are not diminished by less than their savings are earning, the only other choice is to place their funds in a fixed deposit account, which effectively locks those funds away for a year or more.

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I must say that I experienced my first Estimates Committee with some pleasure, and found it not only an entertaining process on some occasions but also one that was very worthwhile. I feel that it has been one of the most worthwhile processes with which I have been involved whilst in this Parliament. I found that there was at least some opportunity to interrogate the Government at length about the State budget.

I would also like it on the record that I noticed a distinct difference in styles between not only the Ministers but also those members who chaired the Committees. I wish to place on record my sincere thanks to the member for Elizabeth on the fine manner in which he conducted himself in the Chair and the impartial way he allowed the Committee to proceed; and, indeed, he ensured that the Committee process was exactly what it is designed to be, that is, an investigation of the Government's budget. Regrettably, I cannot offer those same congratulations to other members who occupied the Chair.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: I am delighted to see a number of them here tonight expressing their disappointment at that. The rabble opposite, unfortunately, found that it could not control its political allegiances within that process while in the Chair. I am well aware that some Ministers need protecting from time to time, but surely they do not need the protection, from the position of the Chair, of their colleagues who are reaching the twilight of their years.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier is out of his seat and interjecting, both of which are out of order.

Mr MATTHEW: I am pleased to see that members opposite find some wisdom in those words, are taking them in, absorbing them and staying upright for once in their life with their eyes wide open. Perhaps during the next budget Estimates process we will see a little more impartiality from the Chair. Regrettably, some Ministers also found it necessary to abuse the Estimates process. However, I was delighted to witness the fine response to questions asked of the Attorney-General. He went out of his way to ensure not only that the questions were answered within the committee but also those questions he was unable to answer were

followed up with a reply delivered in this House at a later time.

However, some Ministers found it necessary to ramble on, answer Dorothy Dix questions, use up the Committee process and, in general, avoid answering the questions that were put before them. But is it any wonder they wish to avoid answering questions put before them about this budget process? We have seen a number of bodies wake up to what is happening in this State. Indeed, many members in this place would be aware of the recent statement by the Institute of Public Affairs (IPA) about this State Government's tax grab in the last State budget. For the benefit of members opposite who may not be familiar with that body's findings it calculated that in South Australia an 18.2 per cent increase occurred in State taxation. A far cry indeed from the Premier's promise prior to the State election that no increases in State taxes and charges would occur beyond that offered by the CPI.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Members opposite may well bleat that we do not pay the highest rate of tax in Australia. We do not have the highest rate of tax in Australia—yet. However, with an 18.2 per cent increase, which is well above the rate of the CPI, I suggest to members opposite that it will not be very long before we take the country by storm with the highest taxes in the country. Will they sit there and condone an 18.2 per cent increase? Will they sit there now and tell me that that sort of increase is justified? I challenge members, at a later stage, to stand up in this House and justify to me and to the electorate the Government increases that have been imposed on the hard-working, taxpaying citizens of this State.

The matter goes beyond just those taxes and charges: we need to look at what has been actually occurring within the process of Government to bring about some of these rises—the sort of wasteful processes, the sort of bizarre philosophies that are espoused by members opposite and Ministers to come up with the ramshackle tax grab that we have seen put before this State. To demonstrate that analogy, I wish to refer to a number of events which occurred during the Estimates Committees so that members opposite are fully cognisant of some of the things that were said during that process.

I refer, first, to the Estimates Committee which examined the local government portfolio. During that process I saw fit to question the Minister of Local Government about her views regarding council rates. She volunteered that she regarded council rates as 'a property tax'. That is the way this Minister regards council rates: not a charge for a service, not a charge for picking up the garbage, laying the roads, laying the footpaths, providing reserves and library facilities, and also other community welfare facilities that we all have the opportunity to enjoy. No, it was not a charge for those services but a property tax. When investigating the matter further to ascertain the reason for this bizarre philosophy I said that surely she could not say that two houses, one next door to the other, had any benefit above their neighbours. However, according to the Minister those properties were of the value they were because of the services the local council was providing. According to the Minister's logic, they should pay for those services.

Quite clearly, if one house is next door to another, and one is valued at \$100 000 and the other is valued at \$150 000, the same garbage truck picks up their garbage (they probably put out the same amount of garbage), they use the same roads, the same footpaths, the same reserves and the same facilities. There is no justifiable reason for charging those people more. I put it to the Minister that there are people

who are asset rich and income poor. Certainly, in these times of high home mortgages there are many people who are income poor in order to pay off their only asset—their home. However, the Minister said:

... most people who are asset rich are also income rich and can afford to pay more, and people who are asset poor tend to be income poor.

That would have to go down as one of the most bizarre statements in this House for all time. I invite the Minister and other members opposite to come out into the real world and knock on some doors in home mortgage areas where people are going under because they cannot afford to pay their bills, or, indeed, to go to the rural areas (and we have heard a lot about those areas in this place today) and witness the difficulty that farmers are having paying off the loans they need to take out in order to run their business. Unfortunately, members opposite live in cuckoo land and have absolutely no concept of reality.

In relation to the local government portfolio, I wish to look at the issue of pensioner rebates. It seems that this Government has an intent, in order to reduce its billowing State budget, to push some areas of financial responsibility back on to local government. I contend that it is the intention of this Government to abolish the pensioner rebate and to force local government to fork out for the rebate it currently gives to pensioners.

In making this allegation, I refer to a letter which the Minister of Local Government sent to most local councils in South Australia. The letter was circularised on or about 18 May, and states:

The Ministers considered a report which detailed rate rebates for pensioners in the Australian States and Territories. It was interesting to note that South Australia and Western Australia are the only States where councils themselves do not assist in funding remission payments.

So, the Minister is concluding, after attending a local government conference, that simply because not all other States continue with that rebate system, we, in South Australia, should join that queue and force more payments off to local government. It does not end there: the Minister is also considering pushing motor vehicle registration payments back to local government. However, there seems to be some confusion between the Premier in his budget statement and the Minister in her statement in the Estimates Committee as to what is really the case.

The Premier told this place that all local government motor vehicle registrations would have to be paid by local government. However, the Minister said that registration would apply only to private vehicles and that vehicles used by local government for road construction and other purposes would have their registration fees covered by State Government. We on this side of the House are still waiting for this mess to be sorted out and for the Minister and the Premier to make up their mind as to who they are going to charge and what they are going to charge them for.

The Government's main motive throughout this whole messy process seems to be to fork not only individual responsibilities back to local government but perhaps the whole administrative process itself. Indeed, there has been some speculation in the media that it is quite likely that the Local Government Department will be abolished and that this Government will set up either a commission funded at least in part by councils or, alternatively, move the department's responsibilities to another department such as the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The Minister was very evasive when giving her answers during the Estimates Committees and kept saying, 'The report is not ready yet; I cannot comment' or something to that effect.

Another area that needs to be looked at where incredible waste has been occurring for a considerable period is the State Clothing Corporation. I pointed out to the Minister of State Services that last financial year the State Clothing Corporation made another loss—in fact it amounted to \$252 000. That loss may be added to losses of \$118 000 in 1985-86; \$68 000 in 1986-87; \$496 000 in 1987-88; and \$591 000 in 1988-89. The Minister's response to my run-down of those losses was:

I would certainly point out that the loss last year was considerably reduced.

That was the Minister's justification for a loss of \$252 000 of taxpayers' money.

I repeat that figure: \$252 000. How many members in this place could think of worthwhile projects within this State on which to spend \$252 000? It would be cheaper to close up that operation, send all of those workers home and still pay their salaries. At least we would save a considerable part of the money that we are presently losing. What makes the matter worse is that this particular body is competing with some very viable and profitable private enterprise companies which produce a product of good quality and at a comparable price, make a profit each year and continue to expand.

There is no justification for retaining this sort of publicly-funded enterprise at the taxpayer's expense. It is time that the State Clothing Corporation was closed down, sold off to the highest bidder (if in fact a bidder can be found) and done away with. Certainly, I hope that the member for Whyalla when heading up his so-called 'razor gang' looks very closely at the State Clothing Corporation but, of course, it is in his electorate so perhaps he will turn a blind eye to it.

The waste does not end there. We can look also at the cost of running our prison system. In this area we really do have a burden. I note on page 47 of this year's Auditor-General's Report a table detailing the cost of keeping a prisoner in gaol for one year. It is interesting to note that as at 30 June 1990 the cost of keeping a prisoner in Yatala Labour Prison has blown out to \$84 000. It costs \$84 000 to keep one prisoner behind bars in that institution for a period of only 12 months. The average cost of keeping a prisoner in detention for 12 months is \$59 000.

It is interesting also to look at the number of staff and the average daily number of prisoners in Yatala Labour Prison. As at 30 June 1990, the average daily number of prisoners in Yatala was 228 and the number of staff was 302. I repeat: 302 staff for 228 inmates. That is an amazing correlation between those numbers which has resulted to a significant extent in that massive cost of \$84 000 to keep a prisoner behind bars in Yatala Labour Prison. This is just one example of where the taxpayer's money is going.

Let us now look at the area of computing, where we see some wonderful blow-outs of taxpayers' money by this Government! The area of computing in the Police Department must be subjected to close scrutiny in the immediate future to try to avoid further budget blow-outs. I note that seven years ago a report was handed down by the respected consultants Touche Ross recommending the establishment of a departmental computer strategy for the Police Department. It is now seven years later and that department still has no computing strategy.

The Auditor-General has stated that over the past two years the department has expended \$400 000 of taxpayers' money on, believe it or not, trying to get another computing strategy under way, but still nothing has been laid in concrete. That department continues to blunder along spending money on duplicate projects all over the place, and the

Minister's response during the Estimates Committees was to say, 'I cannot answer that; I need to take it on notice.'

The honourable member's question is too detailed.' In frustration, I pointed out to the Minister that his advisers might be able to assist him. I incurred the wrath of the Chairman on that occasion, but I am pleased to note that the Minister listened and allowed one of his advisers to try to answer my question. The answer gave me the detail that I expected.

The Police Department has no ADP strategy set in concrete. It continues to waste the taxpayer's money, to create duplicate systems and to expend the taxpayer's money on computing projects without doing its homework and without knowing on what it is spending that money. That department is heading for disaster in this area and warrants very close scrutiny.

It is interesting also to look at some of the things that are coming to a head in the MFS, CFS and St John's debacle. During the Estimates Committee I asked the Minister of Emergency Services whether he could throw any light on why 20 Acco fire trucks were housed in Wakefield Street showing a CFS badge with MFS clearly printed in the middle. He could not answer that question—he was incredulous. I further asked him whether he could throw any light on why there were a number of white hats bearing the name South Australian Fire Services. Once again, he tried to evade the question.

I want to throw one more thing into the melting pot. It is my belief that this Government intends to combine the MFS, the CFS and the St John's Ambulance Service under one umbrella called the South Australian Fire Services. In doing that, the Government will achieve what it wants: it will force volunteers out of those services and bring about a situation of unionised labour in this sort of facility. We are heading for a disaster in this area with the quashing of good volunteers, and that sort of service can only go downhill.

My colleagues have given examples in this place of problems that have occurred within St John's since the demise of the St John's volunteers. Those people will not remain silent forever and it will be only a matter of time before they start to demonstrate loudly and clearly. Members opposite should be prepared for the full extent of not only their wrath but the wrath of the public as they witness the decline of these emergency services. We are playing around with lives. Perhaps members opposite have forgotten this in their striving to unionise the labour force. We are playing around with lives, and that is a very serious matter.

I refer briefly to the number of people who did not vote at the last State election. During the Estimates Committee I was advised that 4 200 non-voters were expected to pay a court fine of about \$20 for not voting at the last State election. To the Attorney's credit, I have been given a detailed breakdown of the cost of processing fines for the 25 November 1989 State election. That cost amounts to \$89 614.01. I ask members opposite: is it really worthwhile undergoing this sort of process to force people to vote? Surely we have reached a situation where the time has come to offer the freedom to vote or not to vote as people see fit. Perhaps members opposite are afraid that, if they offer that freedom, it may be that those who are now forced to vote Labor under the coercion of union pressure will decide to go to the football, to the cricket or to play tennis and they might lose those votes.

We must head for a free and democratic society, and the only way to do that is to have full freedom of choice. That means the freedom of association, freedom of whether or not to join a union, the freedom of being treated accordingly

if someone does not join a union, and the freedom to vote or not to vote. It is about time members opposite started looking towards democracy—but then, I guess, they would not really know the meaning of that word. After all, they are sitting in government with a mere 47.9 per cent of the vote, with an Opposition which attracted 52.1 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling on further speakers in this debate, I should draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Chair is becoming increasingly concerned about reflections upon members and upon the chairmanship of the Committees. The machinery was available at the time of those Committees for action to be taken if anything was considered to be wrong, but no action was taken. Any reflections on members and on the Chair at that time are against Standing Order 127, and the Chair will be listening very closely to contributions from now on.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I thought that your comments, Sir, were very appropriate. I intended to mention that topic myself, but you have done it probably better than I would.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, I don't crawl at all. I call a spade a spade, and I think everyone knows that. I welcome the opportunity to talk in this debate. It is most unfortunate that kids still wet behind the ears stand up here and reflect upon Chairpersons of Committees. I must say that, during the years in which I have been involved with the budget Estimates Committees, I have found them an absolute delight. If an honourable member is prepared to do his or her work, a wealth of information can be obtained from those Committees. If the member for Bright is not bright enough to be able to pursue a particular line of questioning—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member reflect upon what the Chair has said about reflecting upon members and be very careful about his words.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: There is a nice reflection, Sir!

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order and the honourable member will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: You can call me what you like; it doesn't worry me. I don't mind. I want to talk about some of the allegations made prior to the budget Estimates Committees. I think it is very important to raise these issues, because we heard the member for Morphet who, when in Opposition, is a repository of wisdom but, when in Government, railroads and runs over the top of people every chance he gets. We saw a demonstration of this just prior to the Estimates Committees. I can recall his talking about hoping that there would not be any dorothy dixers asked during those Committees yet, lo and behold, we see this pious hypocrite having questions directed to him in Committee B by none other than one of his colleagues in the Upper House, who was running the rabbit back and forward with all these questions.

Mr MATTHEW: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the honourable member opposite obviously still has not taken note of what you said, and continues to reflect on members on this side of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! Unfortunately, my attention was distracted at the time, but I will now pay absolute attention

to every word said in this debate. I ask the honourable member once again to be careful of the words used.

Mr HAMILTON: I was just stating the facts, Sir. In terms of dorothy dixers, allegations were made against members of the Government prior to the Estimates Committees. The reality is that we saw repeatedly, particularly on the Committees of which I was a member, that questions were run back and forward by people who were not members of the Committee and it was the Chairman of Committee B who, I recall, had to pull up members. I will not utter the word that was said during the Committee hearings by someone sitting in the Strangers Gallery.

It is all right for people to dish it up, but if there is one thing I have learned in life it is that if you dish it out you have to cop it. I would do it within the rules. We saw this hypocrisy about people talking of dorothy dixers. If people want to be fair dinkum, let them be, but they should not flaunt or be as open and brazen as we saw in Estimates Committee B. I really enjoyed the budget Estimates Committees, because the opportunity was there for members of Committees, who were prepared to do a little bit of homework. Unfortunately, on some Committees I have seen over the years, some people want only to get stuck into the Government but are not prepared, in my view, to look after their own electorate.

I have a particular view that the responsibility of a member of Parliament is to look after his or her electorate first. Number one is to get in there and do the best you can. Unfortunately, there are those who have gone before us (and some who, perhaps, are still here) who want only to make cheap political points. From the budget Estimates Committees I attended, I obtained a wealth of information from my ministerial colleagues and from the public servants who attended. I applaud those heads of departments and congratulate them on the way in which they had done their homework.

I thought that they did a fantastic job. The questions were put, and the Ministers responded unstintingly to me, quite openly and frankly. I can only speak about how I found it. For example, the response I received when I asked questions of the Minister of Marine—

Mr Ingerson: Who was that?

Mr HAMILTON: I will ignore that. I am glad that *Hansard* picked it up. I asked questions (page 443 of *Hansard*) about the West Lakes waterway, an issue about which I think all members of this House would know I have considerable concern. The Minister, in answer to a question about the cost of replacement of the revetment, quite openly and frankly said that there were problems down there. The Minister would have known that I would have pursued that matter as I did in the past.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Just contain yourself—you will have your chance. The reality is that the Minister indicated that the cost could be as high as \$10 million. Quite openly and frankly, the Minister was prepared to provide that information to the Committee. I pursued the Minister in relation to this issue, at (page 443 of *Hansard*). The reality is that, because the questions were properly framed, not politically biased or motivated but seeking information, I obtained the responses I sought.

If people are provoking, they must expect to get a little in return. Unfortunately, some members are like Paddy's dog: they dish it up, but they cannot take it. When they get it back, they start crying like big sooks! Tough: that is what I say! I asked numerous questions of the Minister for Environment and Planning, questions about the problems of the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works, and the response

was very enlightening. The Minister told me what was to be done and that it could cost another \$6 million; I was told about the problems with seepage, with salinity in the ground and with electrolysis of the copper pipes, etc. When I raised the question of sand carting, again the Minister was prepared to deliver the information I was seeking.

The same applies to the Attorney-General. When I asked questions about law and order, the Attorney-General provided me with an open and frank response: 'Here it is, Kevin—have a look at this. There is all the information.' He heaped so much information on me that I had to go away and try to absorb it all. I must say that the Attorney-General has done a wonderful job. During the Estimates Committee, I asked what would happen to kids as a result of juvenile offences?

I refer members opposite to the enlightening contribution of the Minister when responding to my question about juvenile crime, unlike the politicking that we have come to expect from members opposite. They do not want to hear the truth; do not let the truth get in the way of a damn good story.

I hear a lot of diatribe about the trade union movement. One thing I learned when in the trade union movement was that, if you had the wit to research and understand the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, as some fools do not, you would understand the situation. If I were of the mind of some members opposite and believed that the trade union movement was crook, why would I not encourage my own members or supporters to infiltrate the union movement to change the Act or the union. But no, they do not want to do that, because they want to do one thing in this country, that is, to destroy the trade union movement. If they were prepared to get in there and find out what the trade union movement was all about, they would know that there are constraints on it. Because of time constraints placed on me by the Whip I will have to wind up my remarks. Last but not least—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, I understand that. I understand that my good friend opposite, that nice fellow who lives up in good country around Crystal Brook, wants to make a contribution. I will be calling in on him for a cup of tea shortly. Seriously, I welcome the opportunity presented by the Estimates Committees; I believe they are an ideal forum. However, when the member for Hanson first talked about this matter I had some reservations, but I congratulate him on what he did. It is an excellent forum and provides an excellent opportunity for members. If I could give a bit of gratuitous advice: if some members were not so aggressive and agro I think the Committees would work much better.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): In taking part in this debate in relation to the approval of expenditure that was referred to the Estimates Committees, I believe that the House and the nation should understand very clearly the difficult economic situation in which not only this State but this nation has found itself. What is required of both State and Federal Governments is a very conscious course of action to endeavour to instil some confidence back into both agricultural and general commercial businesses so that people not only have confidence but are given the necessary support to enable them to continue their operations.

It is no good people making snide remarks in an attempt to gain cheap, short-term political advantage. The problem we currently face is far too serious to engage in that sort of irresponsible activity. What is required is very sound and sensible policy changes in this State and nation. If members do not understand that we have a potentially disastrous

situation in rural Australia and in the small business community they have failed to carry out their duty as members of Parliament and Governments. Let there be no misunderstanding of the seriousness of the situation: what Governments have to do is clearly face their responsibilities and take some responsible courses of action.

The Federal Government has created an economic minefield. It knows how to use only one economic tool, that is, high interest rates. Coupled with high interest rates we have an over-valued dollar, and what is the effect on the average Australian? It is placing the average Australian at a great disadvantage: standards of living are falling; people's ability to provide education for their families has been attacked; and the nation as a whole is deteriorating rapidly. Surely, any responsible and sensible Government would want to rectify that situation.

It is a long time since our commodity prices were so low, and the effects that that will have on the economy of South Australia will be disastrous. Many small towns will have grave consequences foisted upon them. Businesses will be drastically affected. Employment will be reduced. Schools, education and hospitals will all be affected. Not enough people live in rural areas already. Governments have to accept a clear responsibility: if they have got it wrong, they should be big enough and have the political courage to change direction and make the right decisions. No-one but a fool could accept that the current high interest rate policy is bringing any benefits to the nation as a whole. It is a disastrous policy decision. The Federal Treasurer is about the only person whom I see speaking in public who really thinks that there is nothing wrong with the economy.

People only have to read journals and newspapers around this nation to understand clearly that we have problems. The Government has to accept that. It has to change course and create some confidence. If it creates confidence, that will give people some incentive to go forward and make some sound investment decisions. However, investment decisions will not be made across rural Australia or in those industries that rely on rural Australia for their income so that they can employ people, because there is no confidence there. It is no good members making cheap or doctored statements in Parliament or at news conferences. That will achieve nothing. What is required is sound policy directions and guidance so that the nation as a whole can benefit.

Let us look at some of the problems that people are facing. It has been a long time since wheat has been \$95 a tonne. That is not what the farmer will get, that is the price at the silo gate. From that \$95 one has to take off handling charges, in some cases two port charges and a number of other charges. In many cases farmers will get less than \$80 per tonne. Does any member have any idea of the cost of production or the cost of chemicals? Council rates are increasing and the price of fuel is unrealistically high. Some years ago a notable Australian said that the then Fraser Government had turned every petrol bowser into a tax agent. Well, if that was the case, what is occurring today? The Fraser Government was involved only in a kindergarten exercise compared with what we are now facing. The member for Stuart is sitting there quietly. She knows what it costs to buy fuel at Port Augusta; the price there is one of the highest for fuel anywhere in South Australia. Who is benefiting? It is not the poor fellow running the service station or the long suffering motorist: only the Government and those who are associated with it are benefiting.

The Government has to address that situation. I am concerned that the public will not get a chance for nearly three years to take the political decisions that are necessary to rectify this country. If the State and Federal Governments

continue down this disastrous course of destabilising the economy and of taking away all confidence and incentive, they will wreak havoc for generations to come. The long term effects will be disastrous.

We have heard of the Premier recently travelling around the world encouraging exports and talking about an export led recovery and the great opportunities. One thing the State Government has within its power to assist the exporters of this nation is to improve port facilities. Yet, we have a Minister of Marine who is so daft, does not understand or is on some ideological bent that he will not agree to sell to the bulk handling company the unloading facilities in the ports of this State. The Government tells us that at this stage it does not have the money to upgrade those facilities, but there is this opportunity for this well run and well organised company, which is owned by the grain growers of this State, to better manage and improve productivity and those facilities. All the ingredients are there, but the Government will not agree. That is highly irresponsible. It is quite stupid. There is not one reason I can think of, or anyone else could think of if they applied themselves to the subject, why it is necessary for the Government to maintain or own those unloading facilities. There is not an ounce of common sense in it. It would be in the interests of all South Australians and the nation as a whole if those facilities were sold to that responsible organisation.

Let us look at some of the problems facing rural producers in this nation. One of the problems is that we are not competing on a level playing field because we do not have subsidies like those around the rest of the world. Until recent years, we had some sensible taxation policies in this country which helped these people. I do not know whether members of this House or the Government are aware how agriculture overseas is subsidised and the difficulties that poses for agriculture in this State. In Japan, rural producers are subsidised by some 72 per cent; in the EEC, 38 per cent; in Canada, 35 per cent; and in the United States, 27 per cent. Yet we receive only 10 per cent support in this country. The United States is currently selling grain with a subsidy in excess of \$50 per tonne.

The Hon. H. Allison: We are the most efficient farmers.

Mr GUNN: We are the most efficient farmers in the world and we can remain so if Governments have some commonsense and put into place sensible policies. That is just one example. We have a taxation system which taxes exports, and that should be changed.

A serious attack has been made on the ability of people in rural areas to educate their children, restricting their access to tertiary education. If ever there was a disgraceful decision, one which has no relevance to commonsense, it is that decision. The attack which has been made on them through the alteration of the arrangements for Austudy is quite disgraceful. It is proposed that the maximum allowable assets for family allowance supplement and Austudy be dropped from \$323 000 to \$200 000, with an adjustment for Austudy allowing farm businesses to have assets up to \$400 000. These new asset tests will virtually remove every farming family from such benefits. Why is that the case when rural incomes are plummeting?

I suggest that, in most cases, the return from wool will be down about 50 per cent and it will be drastically down for wheat and barley. Surely these families are entitled to have access to tertiary education. If this particular proposal is put into place on 1 January, it will create tremendous hardship.

The editorial in the *Adelaide Advertiser* of 24 September stated:

It was only six months ago that Prime Minister Bob Hawke was promising us a fairer future for all as we built the clever

country. So much for election promises; the average farming family does not get the help in educating children that the average city family gets.

The Budget has cut, from January, the parental assets level to qualify for Austudy from a maximum of \$340 000 to \$200 000 (meaning \$400 000 for farmers because of a farming family discount) . . .

Unfortunately, the urban-based Labor Party usually shows a lamentable ignorance of rural affairs.

That is absolutely correct. The article goes on:

The value of total farm production is expected to fall 48 per cent this year following its fall of 20 per cent in 1989-90.

When we have Governments which make those sorts of disgraceful decisions, one really has to question not only the Government's credibility but whether it has any commonsense and believes in justice.

I call on the Premier—who happens to be Federal President of the Labor Party, but who likes to run away from that whenever he gets the opportunity—and the South Australian Minister of Education to stand up and have the courage to firmly approach the Federal Government and tell it that what is proposed is not only unfair but discriminates against people in rural areas, that it is anti-development, that it denies those people reasonable access to the education facilities of this State and nation, and that it should change the policy as a matter of high priority. In my view, if it believes in fairness and justice, the Government has not only a responsibility but also an obligation.

We have already seen attempts to disrupt education throughout rural areas of South Australia and it is impossible to have reasonable public works programs directed to areas of need in rural South Australia. I believe that the budget we are debating, which increases taxation by some \$200 million, is poorly based. The Government has done nothing to address duplication of Government facilities and the massive number of unnecessary and cumbersome statutory authorities in this State. Attempts have been made to have a proper parliamentary inquiry into these statutory authorities, but the Government has done nothing. That in itself is not only unfair but unfortunate. Massive bureaucracies are interfering and preventing production.

People pay too much attention to irrational minority groups in the community. The greens and other groups which want to stop all development interfere with the ability of people to produce. It is time to put that sort of nonsense completely out the window. If this country has any future, we must have sustainable development that is ongoing and soundly based. Then we will be able to create the conditions under which we can continue to export and build a better standard of living for every section of this community. I believe in a fair go for everyone. I believe that people are entitled to proper return for their efforts and their labour. But, for that to take place, Governments must have courage and put a stop to protracted, unnecessary and cumbersome procedures.

The time has long since passed when we should have to tolerate nonsense like the Planning and Development Act. It is an unnecessary impediment on the welfare of the State, that such duplication—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: An encumbrance we can't afford.

Mr GUNN: No, we cannot afford it any longer. Many public servants are racing around causing trouble. These things are unnecessary.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: And local government duplicating its actions.

Mr GUNN: It is very costly to local government. Surely the Government must comprehend and understand some of the problems: information is available to it. In a recent edition of the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics journal there is some interesting information

about which I believe the House should be fully aware. This information is available to the Government, but it appears not to understand it or not to be aware of it. In 1989, the rural indebtedness has been estimated at some \$10 859 million. In 1985 it was some \$7 160 million. There has been a massive increase. That includes the money owed to trading banks, finance companies, the Commonwealth Development Bank, life insurance companies and other lending groups. That is an increase of over \$3 000 million in rural indebtedness, where incomes are falling.

We must look at the effects that high interest rates are having on this country. It has been estimated up to June this year that we are paying an average of 18.8 per cent interest rates in this country. In Germany it is 8.3 per cent, in Japan it is 7.1 per cent, and in the United States it is 10 per cent. Look at the trading advantages those people have over us. This ridiculous interest policy is having the dramatic effect of restricting and stopping production. Surely the Federal President of the Australian Labor Party can understand that. If he has got a real concern for the welfare of the people of this State he should be prepared to take some very strong action against his Federal colleagues. This country suffers from droughts. Up to a year ago we had some sensible taxation policies, and we had some success in the rural field. Our farmers were not only efficient but they kept abreast of recent technology.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: There was a tax deduction for installing water facilities, for example.

Mr GUNN: That is right. Recently, a drought policy review task force was set up, and that group put out a report and made a number of recommendations, including the provision through existing programs of increased incentives for water management. Up until a few years ago, there were 100 per cent deductions but it has now been dropped to 30 per cent per year. We had a sensible income equalisation policy in place, but that has gone. We had sensible depreciation allowances in place, but they have all been taken away, because we have academics in charge of Treasury in Canberra. Most of them have never run anything in their life, and if they were given a chance they would not succeed anyway. I recommend this report to the Minister of Agriculture and to his officers and Federal colleagues. They should read it and pursue it, because it contains the right policy suggestions.

In conclusion, I believe that the serious situation facing many sections of the agricultural community in this State are far more serious than most people in this House believe. Today I received a fax from Mr Schuster, a rural counsellor, giving a number of examples of the difficult cases with which he is dealing. I believe that they are representative cases, not only of South Australia but of Australia. I have been following closely the nation's press, and I refer to a headline in the *Weekend Australian*, 'Farmers brace for crash'. The article states that 'low prices, high interest rates devastate rural communities.' It quotes a most successful farmer who says, 'If there is a drought, there will be real trouble.' References have been made also to the economy of this country.

Another headline in the *Weekend Australian* stated, 'Vacancies for jobs fall 50 per cent in one year.' A total of 50 per cent less positions have been created, and that is a clear result of the foolish policies of the Commonwealth Government, yet again this Government is going to increase taxes on employers and the fees applicable to registration in rural areas, and will continue to make things difficult for rural communities. Governments can do many things. I repeat: the first thing Government must do is instil some confidence back into those communities.

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

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): In these concluding stages of the budget debate for 1990-91, the member for Eyre has cited a number of statistical details that apply to the rural industry in particular. I want to concentrate on the impact that high interest rates are having on the Australian community.

It is my view that, if the Federal Government in its capacity as managers of the national economy were to direct the banking institutions of this country to reduce interest rates to 15 per cent, for example, it would provide equal relief to the householder, the small business community, the corporate sector, the rural people that we are so concerned about at the moment, and the public at large. I believe that it is a situation which needs to be addressed on behalf of every man, woman and child of this country, and there will be no need in these quite desperate circumstances either to be parochial or to apply ourselves to sectional interests of the community.

In referring to the rural community, we all witnessed today a statement by the Minister of Agriculture, which we have been awaiting now for over a week. Frankly, I was disappointed with that statement. I really thought that the gravemen of the Minister's undertaking would be to take a message from South Australia to his colleagues in Canberra, the Prime Minister and the Treasurer of this country, appealing for a substantial decrease in the interest rates that apply across the country. Accompanying that plea I thought would be a request of his Federal colleagues to undertake to pass back to the community, albeit under pressure, just some of this increased fuel tax bonanza that they have been enjoying on fuel in recent times. We can blame the crisis in the Gulf; we can blame all sorts of other factors for the substantial increase in the cost of petrol, diesel, oils, lubricants and other associated commodities, but the fact of the matter is that a very substantial proportion of the total price that we pay for those products is represented by taxation mainly applied at Federal Government level. For the Federal Government to exploit the community in these difficult times, by continuing to tax the product at the same formula levels as it applied previously, is outrageous.

It is more appalling when they are taking advantage of a community on its knees, and, as I indicated earlier, it is even worse when they appear unprepared to give anything back from that tax bonanza to provide relief for those under pressure. I repeat: whilst our rural communities are clearly under pressure, so, too, are our other citizens in the State, including those in country towns, as well as people in the cities.

It seems to me that one of the things the Minister ought to have addressed first was the detail and the homework associated with his statement, bearing in mind that he has been forecasting through the media for nigh on a week of his intention to deliver to this House a very important message on behalf of the rural community. On the very first page, he made a fundamental error in his calculations. He said, 'Wool production is expected to decline by 25 per cent in 1990-91.' That claim is blatantly ill-founded. Wool production in Australia, including South Australia, will be up during the 1990-91 financial year.

In fact, our national sheep population at the moment is about 30 million above the figure that this country has been carrying for a number of years. South Australia is up by 2 million or 3 million on the number of sheep that it can comfortably carry. No-one in his right mind, even if a Government subsidy for slaughter is available, would shoot

and/or dispose of his livestock in the wool. The sheep would be shorn first. I venture to say that no sheep ultimately subject to slaughter and waste in this country in the immediate future will be slaughtered with more than half an inch of wool pelt on them. They will be shorn first. So, to suggest that our country's wool production will be down—indeed, down by 25 per cent as the Minister claimed—is just an example of very bad and indeed shoddy homework by a Minister. In trying to play down the alleged crucial situation that applies out in the field, the Minister has misled this House in a matter of quite critical detail.

He went on to say, also in relation to the financial year 1991, that the wool levy had been increased from 8 per cent to 25 per cent. Again, he was wrong. The wool levy during the financial year 1990-91 has increased from 18 per cent to 25 per cent, not from 8 per cent to 25 per cent. He was one financial year out when making his statement to Parliament this afternoon. It was in the year 1989-90 that we were looking at a wool levy of 8 per cent. I cite those examples just to demonstrate that the South Australian Government is just a little remiss at times. Indeed, it fails to do its homework carefully, particularly when it relates to out-of-town statistics. I think it is a reflection on the Government for its Minister of Agriculture in particular not to have applied himself more diligently to the preparation of this all important State Government announcement.

On a more positive side, I agree that we ought not as parliamentarians, whatever our political persuasion, be arguing about the term or terms that describe the recession, depression, crisis, devastating situation, or whatever it might be best described outside in the public arena (in the big paddocks in the rural community, for example). I think it is a waste of our time and it serves no useful purpose to indulge in that sort of word description argument. I think it is important to recognise that the Australian economy is in bad shape, and it has all the hallmarks of being in worse shape further down the track.

Again, I plead with the Premier of this State to take our message as a total South Australian message to the Prime Minister, and to any of his other colleagues at Federal level to whom he has access. After all, the Premier of this State happens to be the President of the Australian Labor Party, and in that capacity one would have thought he should not have difficulty in gaining access to his own Party colleagues at the Federal level. I ask the Premier to give his Federal colleagues the very clear message that we can no longer afford the Labor track of maintaining high interest rates in this country that are burdening us now, that have been burdening us for a long time—indeed, too long—and that will absolutely suffocate us if we bear those interest rates for much longer.

I wish to refer to a couple of other points made in the statement of the Minister of Agriculture. I make no apologies for continually coming back to the situation on behalf of the rural community even though, as I said earlier, what affects those people out there in the big paddock affects every man, woman and child here in the metropolitan area. We are totally dependent upon one another; our production today is their food tomorrow, and the price they pay for it tomorrow is our return to go on producing the next day. It is no good kidding ourselves about which of the two is the most important. I believe they ought to be treated similarly, that they are of equal importance across the State and the nation and, indeed, the quicker we start treating our community as a whole with that sort of attitude and drop the parochialism of sector interest, the better off we will all be.

Notwithstanding that general application of fairness and proper equal recognition across the board for the producer,

the consumer and so on, I return to a couple of other matters that were highlighted in the Minister's address. He said:

The State Government will be calling on the Federal Government to investigate how any increase in tax receipts gained from rising petrol prices can be used to finance costs involved in finding new markets for our commodities and in providing compensation for some of the losses incurred by producers.

We have been there and done that before, and that is absolute gobbledegook. It is the sort of material that officers in the department—with due respect to our public officers—would put together for a Minister who has given them no direction. It is the sort of departmental jargon that is put together to be safe in what they say their Minister ought to report to Parliament. However, it does lack direction and credibility in the real producing world.

I welcome the redirection of some of the receipts from the fuel tax hike back to the community, and we have canvassed that issue. On that point I agree with the Minister. However, to muck around with words and to say that we will be calling on the Federal Government on how to do this and how to do that—

The Hon. Harold Allison: Tell them.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: 'Tell them' says the member for Mount Gambier. Of course tell them: tell them precisely and clearly what it is that is giving us trouble in this State, and what it is that we need to get us out of that trouble. We are not asking for handouts, we are not asking for grants that we do not deserve: we are simply asking as a total community for relief from a burden which is unprecedented across the country and unprecedented across the world. In fact, our interest rates across this country are absolutely outrageously out of step with those that apply in other countries and, more particularly, in other countries with whom we have to compete in order to sell our products. That is what makes the game unfair. That is what makes the Government, and the Minister in particular, weak as water—lily water or whatever it was we called it the other day.

The Hon. Harold Allison: Orange flower water.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: That's it: as weak as orange flower water. It is about time that a person of that physique, who has been around as long as the Minister of Agriculture, stood up and was counted. For God's sake, we need people with a bit of strength in this difficult time. He has everything at his disposal. He has a Government that does not know the subject by and large. He has a Premier who ducked for cover today when a direct question was put to him about what he was going to do about interest rates. He has everything at his feet. He does not have to make a hero of himself: all he has to do is act as a Minister of Agriculture should act in the climate that we are in at the moment.

As the audience starts to gather, and as the members start to show a bit of interest in what I am saying at last. I remind the House that the Minister said:

In response to the present circumstances, that we will vary loan limits on debt reconstruction loans and the interest rates that apply.

In all fairness, I suppose we ought to give the Minister just a little bit of credit for indicating that he is proposing to provide some relief at that level.

Mr Brindal: Not too much.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: No, not too much: he was extremely cautious about this. Indeed, he did not say which primary producers would qualify for this subsidised interest rate; he did not say that it was those who had existing loans under the rural industry assistance scheme, or under any other Federal Government assistance scheme for which the State is in agency; he did not say that this applies to those

who have been battling on with their trading banks under heavy competition in the financial community; and he did not say that they were going to be new clients of the department. The Minister did not give any details about this at all, but again I think we have to give him credit for having touched over it like a girl. For God's sake, he just gave us a little bit of an indication, just like dangling a lolly. We are led to think that there might be something in the bottom of the bag; there might be another lolly there. We hope to goodness that, in his further explanation down the track or under questioning from the media, he might just do that.

We should give the Minister the benefit of the doubt in that particular segment of his address; it was the only area in which he was anything like positive in what might be provided from the State level. Otherwise there were three pages of padding in his statement. I believe it really is a great disappointment, and I know it is a great disappointment as far as our shadow Minister of Agriculture is concerned, and also of the other members of the Liberal Party, whether they come from the rural community or the metropolitan area. They share my view on that subject. They argue like hell with me on some subjects, but on that issue I think I can safely say that the Minister of Agriculture's statement today was very disappointing.

An honourable member: Here he comes.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The Minister is coming? You would not see the Minister—what next! I would be delighted, Mr Deputy Speaker, if the Minister were to come in. He has sent in a former Minister, the member for Napier, grinning like a Cheshire cat. He is not a bad fellow, but he is useless; no wonder he is out of the ministry. The Minister is noticeable by his absence; in fact, I have not seen him in the House since he made that statement this afternoon. I invite him to come back: I would like to put to him a couple of direct questions. Although I am participating in a debate where questions are to some extent out of order, it would be a delight at the conclusion of this debate to have the Minister here. If there is anything at all that my colleagues on the other side of the House can do to bring him back, I plead with them to do so.

An honourable member: They've gone to get him.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Wonderful stuff; and I have three minutes to go. One of the other things to which the Minister referred was a very sensitive area. He talked about replacing the slaughter scheme and the wastage of sheep carcasses, if that should be required, and obviously it will. He suggested that we should strip the meat off the carcasses, package it and send it away as foreign aid instead of money. Theoretically, this is a wonderful thought and the Minister ought to be given a brownie point or two for it, but the real situation is that in Australia—and South Australia is no exception—it costs \$8 a head to slaughter a sheep and get it into carcase form before we even start to strip off the meat or package it up or freight it. As a guess, it would cost \$12 to recover the lean meat, that is, the fat stripped sheep meat, from one carcase and then send it away. So, in reality, it does not leave a lot of room for putting this scheme into effect.

To the ill-informed, to those who are not associated with the rural industry, those who have not needed to have a direct interest in this area, the Minister's statement sounded pretty impressive. I noticed even a few of my colleagues today looking at him with a certain amount of awe. Mind you, it was pretty short-lived, but a favourable impression of the Minister was gained when he launched into that particular part of his address. In reality it is a joke. I express my disappointment that the Minister did not see fit to come back and talk to us.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): It gave me little solace today to read Sir Peter Abel's comments that he did not share the optimism of the Federal Treasurer (Mr Keating) that things would improve over the next 18 months. Similarly, it gave me very little solace to realise that, despite the acceptance of the budget with some alacrity by senior officials of the UF&S only a few weeks ago, very little for rural South Australia is contained in that complex set of documents worth nearly \$5 billion.

Decentralisation is virtually a myth, whereas it used to be the catchword of governments with every intention of spreading largess and industrial development into rural South Australia. Now it is in the too hard basket. Labor governments across Australia are increasingly on the nose as far as electors are concerned. It is difficult enough to get industry to develop in Adelaide with the headquarters moving interstate. In my own electorate in rural South Australia employment is being phased out in the timber industry in several Government and non-Government enterprises. An abattoir has almost closed and is now processing only 2 000 carcasses a day simply for meat meal and wool flake. Pelletising is almost non-existent because the export livestock industry is virtually non-existent. The shipping industry has suffered as has the meat processing industry. The wool industry has massive stockpiles of wool which it is unable to sell on the foreign markets and, as the member for Eyre said, the wheat industry is in the doldrums.

State and Federal Labor Governments are doing virtually nothing to lift rural South Australia off its knees and, of course, this is with the realisation that a rural crisis in Australia is a total crisis and affects everyone. As the member for Alexandra said, the rural sector is not asking for anything to which the rest of Australia should not be entitled. It is not looking for handouts. We certainly were not looking for the bandaid treatment in the ministerial statement handed out by the Minister of Agriculture today, which was virtually the non-event of October 1990, despite the substantial build up for the press statement. What we need is a clear message to Canberra from the State Government instead of the wishy washy approach of 'we can do nothing' which has been prevalent over the past few weeks.

According to Government statistics, the farming community last year produced \$2.6 billion of income with even the small fishing industry bringing in \$109 million. Whilst rural areas are amazingly resilient, rebounding from droughts and floods, there is little real spring in the steps of rural residents today, and the reasons are good ones. The markets are poor. Whilst we in Australia talk of tariff reductions, it would be fatal if we took unilateral action at a time when, as other members have said, the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom, the United States and other communities in the world maintain their own industries with substantially greater subsidies than Australian farmers receive. The Australian farmer is amongst the world's most efficient farmers—he would have to be to survive in this climate. Interest rates continue at a killing rate with mortgages over properties and stock, the high cost of purchasing equipment to carry out effective farming procedures and the rest of it.

We are told this year that income on farms will be halved. As every member would know, fuel costs have rocketed. The Federal Government takes about 47 per cent of the cost of every litre of petrol, with the State Government taking an additional percentage.

The Government—and I ask members to bear this in mind—is indulging in immoral profiteering in a time of crisis. It is benefiting from ill fortune, from the fortunes of war, and even today's prices were chalked up two or three cents by the mere suggestion that Iraq might attack Saudi Arabia or Israel. Of course this brings additional profits into the coffers of the Federal Government and the oil companies—and the taxpayer has to foot the bill.

The value of the Australian dollar is far too high to allow us to export effectively. It is attracting foreign money into Australia. The Australian dollar is being kept artificially high by the Keating-Hawke policy of maintaining high interest rates in the hope that this will reduce imports. The best way to reduce imports is to reduce the interest rate. This would have the effect of reducing the dollar rate, of improving our export potential and making it a little harder for people to afford imports. Surely in accountancy circles this is the more acceptable strategy of managing the country, but Mr Hawke and Mr Keating say, 'We are on track.'

I like the idea put forward in the past couple of weeks by thinking young people in the community who do not like to see stock ruthlessly and wastefully slaughtered and then disposed of in an open pit. They suggest that we freeze the stock or convert it to meat meal and send it away as a gesture of benevolence from the Australian people to the starving nations, war refugees and other refugees throughout the world.

There are certainly plenty of those. We had the Ethiopian issue 18 months ago, and we now have the war refugees in the Middle East. There is never a shortage of hungry mouths to feed. The cost of new machinery and prolonged debt servicing at very high interest rates are having a catastrophic effect upon communities generally, not only rural communities, with the wool, mutton and wheat markets greatly diminished. I think that we should all be very thankful that, at least, we are not in the midst of a drought as we were this time last year, particularly on Eyre Peninsula. Even with a good season, the markets are depressed and there is no real benefit to our farmers or, ultimately, to Australia from that good season.

Some disadvantages to living in rural South Australia, which are effected by Governments, are things such as closure or imminent closure of the country rail system (members on both sides of the House are interested in that issue); closure of small schools; the closures of hospitals that have already taken place; the imminent closure of police stations; the poor roads in rural South Australia; the almost total lack of public transport; the recent reduction of relief through the Patient Assisted Travel Scheme (formerly the IPTAS), run by the Federal Government, and the tightening of criteria; and the difficulty that Australian rural students have in coming to Adelaide, where residential costs alone in our colleges are around \$7 500 to \$8 000 a year, plus tuition fees and transport to and from home. The criteria in that regard have been tightened, making it more difficult for children to attend tertiary institutions.

Small business in Australia has been hit by debt, by its own cost of debt recovery, by the bad debts that it cannot recover and by the diminution of trade as a result of stand-downs in industry and commerce. Petrol now costs 83c to 85c in country districts. It is by no means the dearest in South Australia, being over \$1 in some places. We have the high cost of motor vehicles, which is escalating year by year. These factors have already increased the cost of freight, which means that everything brought into and taken out of South Australia for export or to feed and supply Adelaide and country districts has already been increased by 10 per

cent since the Iraq crisis. Supplies are dearer, as are goods to market. Our problems are exacerbated.

The removal by the South Australian Government of the farm vehicle subsidy is just another small way in which it has chosen to hit an already disadvantaged sector of the community. Labour is not deregulated; of course, that would be the last thing the Labor Government would want, yet it means that shearing costs, for example, in rural South Australia are astronomically high. Of course, try to get rid of a bale of wool and you realise that shearing, then storing, then paying the 30 per cent to 50 per cent recently announced Kerin levy are just further nails in the farmer's coffin.

For all Keating's boasting two or three years ago when he allowed foreign banks into Australia, the financial market is, certainly, not deregulated. Even the admission of foreign banks into the system has led to some banking catastrophies in the past two or three years. In the past 12 months, it is obvious that some of the largest and important banks are not making the profits they envisaged. We have had some cataclysmic results on the financial markets. So, we have not deregulated the financial market properly, and we have certainly not deregulated the labour market, yet we are thinking of deregulating our tariff system, again to the disadvantage of the farmers who have to compete on a regulated tariff system internationally.

The Minister quoted only two examples, yet he has had a week or 10 days to prepare today's press release. He mentioned orange juice and apricots, in respect of which he suspects there might be unfair trading and the Government will take action. It takes about five years to bring a countervailing action against any country suspected of unfair trading, and many people will be bankrupt in far less time than that.

I could add for the Minister's edification that there are potatoes, fresh and frozen, from Canada, from Turkey and from New Zealand; cherries from Canada; cheeses from the United Kingdom, from New Zealand and from across the world, including the European Common Market; onions; and timber. And there is the example of the French who, through the courts, have religiously defended their proprietary wine brand names and who have, for the past 24 years, been selling a type of brandy labelled 'Chateau Napoleon', which certainly is not Napoleon brandy, at a price cheaper than the normal, quality Australian brandy.

It has never ever seen a Napoleon brandy still, yet it is marketed here for the unwitting purchaser as 'Chatelle Freres' or 'Chateau Napoleon'. I used to sell it in my hotel 24 years ago until I realised that the quality was nowhere near as good as that of South Australian brandy. Of course, South Australia used to produce 80 per cent of Australia's brandy and still produces over 50 per cent of Australia's wine. I suggest that a little more accurate and honest labelling from the French might help while they are taking us to court over our champagne.

If interest rates were down, they would bring down the dollar. We might have fewer imports. We would certainly have better export opportunities with some improved port management. The fact that Messrs Keating and Hawke say that we are on track makes me question what track they think they are on when they do not even seem able to run Australian National effectively. The glory of the multifunction polis—commendable though that may be in the longer term—is still light years away, yet the rural crisis, the Australian economic crisis, is here now.

I mentioned that we have had a 10 per cent increase in the cost of freight in South Australia as a result of the Iraq crisis. There would be another 10 per cent in the pipeline if the Federal transport legislation which is threatened should

actually be passed. I know that the South Australian Minister has expressed some opposition to this idea, but I mentioned in the House only three or four weeks ago—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Total—not some.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Total, the Minister says—thank goodness for that. There is total opposition. I mentioned a few weeks ago that the mass distance levy, that is, a fuel levy on every tonne taken for every kilometre between Adelaide and interstate, in addition to Federal licence levies, would also have the effect of increasing the cost of everything moving into and out of South Australia by road transport by another 10 per cent. We could hardly afford to exist, Minister, could we?

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Why do you think the National Farmers Federation supports it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have no idea: my opening remarks addressed that. I find it difficult to imagine why there is support for such a move. However, we will discover that in the fullness of time. The Minister will, no doubt, be aware that the rate of bankruptcies in South Australia has been climbing over the past several years, and that must surely be causing him and his Government colleagues great concern. At the moment, the Government appears to be shifting deck chairs on the *Titanic* and not even singing 'Abide with me'. It is going down in abject silence.

The rural crisis, as the members for Alexandra and Eyre have said, is Australia's crisis. Farmers are seeking no more than other Australians. They are not looking for handouts: they are simply looking for better financial and budgetary administration which will improve the lot of all Australians and, therefore, give farmers the chance to compete on national and international markets. Although time defeated them, I am sure that in their contributions to the debate the members for Alexandra and Eyre were hinting that specific actions on the part of this Government would be to tell Canberra to reduce interest rates, to reduce its massive cop of fuel excise charges—that huge impost it is raking off in this time of crisis, with massively escalated petrol costs—and to give rural assistance only of a sort that it might properly give to all other Australians, such as the mortgage relief which it has been offering to householders in metropolitan areas.

By doing that the Government would show that it knows how to manage Australia, instead of carrying out its present and long-continuing ostrich act of putting its head in the till and saying, 'Everything is all right, we are on track.' It is getting more tax out of the people of South Australia and spending more on Government departments but doing very little really to improve the lot of the average Australian.

I ask the Government to take immediate, simple and direct action, not the wishy-washy statements we have heard from Government Ministers and from the Minister of Agriculture today, but strong talk which tells the Federal Government that we are not happy. For example, the Premier of South Australia, the Federal President of the Labor Party, who says, 'I don't really have much power', should surely have a great deal of voice. If everything else is taken away from him at least he can talk and tell the Federal Government, 'We are extremely unhappy. Things are being very badly mishandled by the Federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister. This is how it is affecting South Australia. Please reduce interest rates and give some of the huge petrol profits back to soundly-based and properly-managed projects.' This should include improvements to the rail transport system, which is another way of keeping death off our roads, as more people will have the opportunity to travel in comfort. Queensland has done this recently by introducing a service from Brisbane to Rockhampton, which service doubled its

passenger numbers between 1 July and the end of July. The example has already been set; people will go for quality rail travel.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As my colleague the member for Newland says, the Federal President, by virtue of his very silence and his unwillingness to push South Australia's argument, in all probability simply agrees with Federal policies. We have heard very little to prove the contrary, and that is a point well worth making. I say to the State Ministers and the State Cabinet, 'Go for it. Protect South Australia's interests, protect the interests of rural and metropolitan South Australia and we will be on our way towards working out of the crisis.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the motion that the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to. I endorse the remarks of my colleagues who have noted with varying degrees of enthusiasm the usefulness of the Estimates Committees. It is worth noting, particularly for the benefit of new members as this is the first Estimates Committees experience after the most recent State election, the changed procedure that Estimates Committees brought to this Parliament in the examination of the budget.

When I was first elected to the House of Assembly 13 years ago the budget estimates were dealt with in what now appears to be a very primitive fashion. We had before us the Estimates of Payments in their very simplistic form—not unlike the form in which we receive them in Financial Paper No. 3. We also had before us a succession of Ministers who had, as their backup advice, a single public servant located in the box on the floor of the Chamber, and who were equipped with a very substantial volume from which he—it was invariably 'he' at that stage—hoped to find the answer to every question he might be asked.

It was indeed a primitive procedure in terms of obtaining any kind of detailed knowledge unless a Minister had an unusual grasp of his portfolio and an unusual ability to retain and disseminate detailed knowledge. When I think back to those budget Committee stages I realise how ill-equipped the Parliament was in terms of obtaining any kind of useful information on which one could really make an assessment as to the effectiveness of Government programs. In fact, the word 'program', as the member for Mount Gambier will recall, did not apply; there was no such thing as a program which had attached to it a recurrent cost, a capital cost and a staff allocation. The system was known as 'going through the lines of the budget', and the actual relationship between the cost input and the public outcome was impossible to determine.

I would suggest that, leaving aside entirely for the moment the benefit to the Parliament of the Program Estimates information, as provided in Financial Information Paper No. 1, we would all have to agree that the discipline of preparing the Program Estimates must be of significant benefit to the Public Service in the development and administration of its programs and budget, and must also therefore be of considerable benefit to Ministers. However, I feel that the Parliament has not yet received the full benefit of this enormously detailed set of procedures that the Public Service is bound to undertake for the benefit of the Parliament.

The detail in this substantial white book, Financial Information Paper No. 1, is quite amazing. We receive a full description of every program undertaken by each department, the staffing required for that program, the capital and recurrent expenditure, the goals for the current year, the outcomes of the previous year, the issues and trends that

are influencing the department's and the Government's policy, and the specific targets/objectives or specific initiatives/improvements or achievements that have been undertaken or set by the department for the budget. That kind of information was previously never made available to the Parliament.

However, I do not believe we have yet developed the sophistication to analyse that information effectively. Certainly, it would take an extremely conscientious member to examine all the departmental Program Estimates. I freely admit that I have not done it for every department. It is a little bit like reading the Encyclopaedia Britannica: I am not inclined to do that. However, those members who conscientiously compare the current year situation with the previous year situation will find that departments do not always follow the goals they have set for themselves and, even if they try to do so they do not always achieve the targets and objectives that they have set.

The public benefit in terms of outcome and comparative value of programs is difficult to analyse, even with the benefit of the Estimates Committees. As the member for Newland so rightly said in her speech, some of the Ministers engage in marathon monologues that are more of a rhetorical and philosophical nature and less beneficial in terms of hard information. I recall that last year, or it might have been the year before, the Deputy Premier when he was Minister for Environment and Planning, covered much more ground in terms of the numbers of questions he answered and the brevity and factual nature of the answers than did his successor this year in the Estimates Committee that examined the areas of environment and planning and water resources.

It is to the water resources committee that I would like to address myself first. One thing I found admirable in terms of candour was the willingness of the department to set down its performance indicators for the past three years in terms of several of the services which it provides. On page 319 of the Program Estimates, the department sets down the performance indicators for real operating expenses per customer. Those performance indicators show that the department has been able to prevent any increases and hold the line at \$124 per customer from 1986-87 to 1990-91, when the target will be \$125.

I am assuming that these sums have been adjusted so that they are equivalent in real terms, with inflation taken into account. However, when we look at some of the other performance indicators, we see that the department is actually lowering its standards. For example, the number of water quality complaints per thousand customers was 5.8 in 1986-87. It increased to 7.6 in 1987-88, and I recall that that was just before water filtration was introduced in the southern suburbs. It dropped to six complaints per thousand customers in 1988-89, and dropped again to 4.4 in 1989-90. However, the department is hoping that it will be not greater than five in the current year.

Of a more serious nature, I turn to the performance indicators in terms of programmed samples of acceptable effluent quality from sewage treatment works. The number of samples of acceptable quality was 91 per cent in 1986-87. It dropped to what I consider is a very worrying 60 per cent in 1989-90: that is to say, 40 per cent of the samples taken were unacceptable. The department has a modest target for the current year of 85 per cent. In other words, it is happy to have 15 per cent of samples at an unacceptable level. That means that our standards are significantly lower in this current year than they were in 1986-87.

Again, I think most South Australians would regard that as unacceptable, particularly when we have recently passed

legislation designed to ensure a reduction in pollution in the marine and estuarine environment. The same applies to performance indicators in the average time taken to restore supply after burst mains. It is clear that the department is being squeezed and is taking longer to answer requests. In 1987-88 it took six hours on average to restore supply after a burst main. The target for the current year is something less than 10 hours. We have a service that is half as good as we were able to provide three years ago.

For a department as important as Engineering and Water Supply, that is unsatisfactory. In 1986-87 the average time taken to respond to a choked main was one hour. The target for 1990-91 is eight hours or less. If you have a choked main and sewage flooding over your back garden, it is not acceptable to be required to wait eight hours, as at least one of my constituents was required to do recently. Whilst I commend the department's frankness in presenting those performance indicators in the way it has done, I cannot commend a department that is so reducing its resources and therefore having to admit to reducing its standards of service.

Page vi of the Auditor-General's report refers to financial management issues and the commercial approach to financial management. The Auditor-General reports that both the Engineering and Water Supply Department and State Services Department were placed on a fully commercial accounting basis, that is to say, adoption of accrual accounting principles with effect from 1 July 1988. As from 1 July this year, similar accounting arrangements will apply to the Lands Department and the Department of Marine and Harbours. I have not checked with the Program Estimates, but I will be interested to know whether the Lands Department's performance indicators showed, as I suspect they will do, a reduction in standards of service, particularly in regard to the issuing of lands titles.

I do not know whether anyone has ever analysed the cost to the private sector, be it the simple home owner or the developer, of the holding costs incurred through the delays in issuing lands titles. I can assure the House that, when you have to wait three or four months for the issue of a title and cannot sell or develop a block until that title is issued and have to pay interest on loans in that intervening time, the holding costs can become enormous. In fact, in a recent case of which I am personally aware, the simple transfer of a very small piece of suburban land valued at \$7 000 on the Valuer-General's estimate, cost \$20 000 in transfer fees. That clearly is a mad situation. It was only a portion of a block to which that I am referring. Obviously, in suburban Adelaide you do not get blocks for \$7 000. The Engineering and Water Supply charges, the planning fees, the land titles, and the holding costs added up to \$20 000 by the time this land was transferred.

When we consider the costs involved for a simple suburban block, what do we imagine the costs will be for a development in the city? When we look at some of the empty office buildings around the City of Adelaide, we can hardly be surprised at the number of companies that are going to the wall. There are floors and floors of unoccupied buildings for lease, some of which have been unoccupied for 18 months or more. In saying that, I do not for one moment overlook the fact that some large proportion of the responsibility for the glut of office space in this city must be laid at the door of the poor commercial judgment of developers, who completely miscalculated the market, and who presumably imagined they would get substantial short-term gain. Instead, they have been left with substantial long-term losses. If the Lands Department were capable of processing applications for titles much more quickly, the

costs of developing land in this city and State would be considerably reduced.

I also sat on the Mines and Energy Estimates Committee and, once again, was disappointed in the attitude of the Minister of Mines and Energy to the development of renewable energy in South Australia. I want to conclude by referring briefly to the words of Professor Faiman, one of the world's foremost solar energy scientists, who visited South Australia from the Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Israel, in order to assess the extent of and opportunity for development of renewable energy in this State. He said that South Australian industry has to put the ideas to work and that Government has to realise that if it does not take greenhouse seriously and start to pay for the clean up now, replacing fossil fuels with solar energy, future generations will have to bear a very large cost.

For about the sixth or seventh time in my efforts to encourage a positive response from the Minister of Mines and Energy to these proposals, and a positive awareness of the great benefits for this State in terms of economic development if we seized the initiative in this area, I have again been disappointed by the Minister's negative response. I repeat that this State has a magnificent opportunity but this Government is being myopic in failing to grasp it, and there is little or nothing in this budget that would give anyone interested in long term energy issues any cause for optimism or confidence in the Bannan Government's understanding of the importance of these issues or the need to develop new energy sources for this State in order to see us satisfactorily into the twenty-first century.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I must say that I really enjoyed this year's Estimates Committees. It was a change from giving clear and concise answers to a multitude of questions for the seven years that I was a Minister. As Chairperson of Estimates Committee B, it certainly gave me a different perspective of what the Committee system is all about. To be quite honest, I thought I handled the proceedings over the two weeks in a fair, compassionate and even handed manner. So, not only was I shocked tonight but, more so, saddened to find that some members disagree with that attitude. Mind you, Sir, I do not refer to everyone, as I have had quite a few people come to me and say they want to be dissociated from some of the remarks that have been made, but it just goes to show that despite one's best efforts and the fact that one tries to live up to a reputation of being a fair minded person, one cannot please everybody. However, that is the way it goes.

It has always been my practice when Parliament sits at night that, when I arrive home, no matter how late, I make a pot of Earl Grey tea and sit down with my wife and discuss the day's happenings. Usually I get a feel of how things have gone, and that is how it should be, to share with those dearest and closest to you the events of the day. Unfortunately, in the first week, my wife was in Broken Hill, so I used to go home to an empty house. The only one I was able to sit down with and describe the day's events to was my tortoiseshell cat Anastasia, who is actually a very intelligent cat. Judging by the way she was all over me—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, I hate to be a spoilsport but I think there is a Standing Order referring to relevance, and I fail to see the relevance of the honourable member's cat in the question of the budget estimates.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The debate is a very wide one. The honourable member may continue.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The way my cat was all over me, having described the day's events, it was obvious she thought I had done a good job as well. As I said, you cannot please all of the people all of the time. But let us return to some of the specifics in terms of what has been said by members so far. Much has been said by members opposite, apart from maligning me, suggesting that Ministers did not answer the questions or that the answers were too long, especially to those Government members who were asking questions. Well, as an unbiased observer of my Committee, let me put that to rest straight away. All Ministers in Committee B were cooperative, clear and concise in their answers. The problem was that some questions by Opposition members were so convoluted and loaded that it was impossible for Ministers to respond immediately.

However, despite the inexperience of some members opposite, we actually managed to get through 842 questions in 46.25 hours; that is, 18.2 questions per hour, which roughly works out at three minutes per question and answer. That is not bad. I do not know how you fared in your Committee, Mr Deputy Speaker, but that is a pretty good record and lays to rest some of the outrageous claims made by members opposite about Ministers spending far too long in answering a question. As I said before, the problem is that members opposite, especially the new ones, did not know how to correctly frame a question intelligently so that the Minister and the Minister's advisers could understand. Prior to the Estimates Committees meeting, the member for Alexandra—

Mrs KOTZ: On a point of order, I believe that Standing Orders provides that members should not reflect on other members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier has not yet reflected on an individual contrary to the wishes of the Chair. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Alexandra made an impassioned appeal for members on both sides of the House and Ministers to do the right thing and treat the Estimates Committees in the way they were intended. Actually, he made a very frank admission that, when he was a Minister, he actually abused the system. I thought that that was the truthful way in which the member for Alexandra approaches everything. He bears his soul and says: do not do what I did when I was a Minister or a member, just play the game fairly. Thankfully, Government members did exactly that, and I was proud. No bias, mind you—I was proud that members on this side of the House asked intelligent questions and they received intelligent answers.

The problem was that some members opposite either did not hear what the member for Alexandra was saying, did not understand what he was saying, or decided from the outset to ignore his advice. On one occasion, a member of the Opposition (who shall remain nameless because I am bearing in mind the advice of the Deputy Speaker) asked of me, 'Why is the Minister always able to answer Government members' questions but cannot answer mine?'

Need I say anything more. The problem was that that particular member went all around the garden all the time to try to get a point across to the Minister and failed miserably. Let us have a look at one question to the Minister of Emergency Services. The question was so bizarre that the mind boggles at its content. The question, which concerns 20 new white Acco fire trucks, states:

Why have approximately 20 new white Acco fire trucks been placed in a shed in Wakefield Street, showing the CFS badge with the MFS clearly printed in the centre; where will these appliances be used, and who will control them?

The Minister was quite incredulous at that particular question and even asked the member to repeat it. The same question was repeated. The real problem is that, despite assurances from the Minister and his advisers that 20 new white Acco fire trucks are not stored at the Wakefield Street fire station, the question was repeated tonight in this House by the member for Bright. One would have thought that, given the assurances of the Minister, and his advisers, the member for Bright would have accepted that. However, he did not: he got the sniff of a good story. Someone in the Metropolitan Fire Service or someone in the Country Fire Services is having a lend of the Opposition. They are having a lend of the member for Bright. The unfortunate thing is that members opposite just do not understand when someone is having a lend of them.

The day after these allegations were made I went down to the Wakefield Street fire station to check the claim. I also made a few phone calls, and what I found out certainly reinforces what I have already said tonight: ask an intelligent question and one will get a reasonable response. Let us have a look at the facts.

The Metropolitan Fire Service has one white truck, which has a South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service badge affixed to it. That truck, which is stored in the rear engine room, is used to transport foam compound and other heavy equipment to an emergency incident. The fire appliances, which are often stored at Wakefield Street, are part of the relief and reserve fleet. There are 13 appliances of various types, and they are all painted red with the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service badge affixed to them.

I am also advised that the CFS has not commissioned any Acco fire trucks since approximately 1986. The CFS has stopped buying Acco because it insists now on a rolling cab chassis with dimensions of no more than 8 metres by 3 metres, and anyone who follows fire engines—as I know you do, Mr Speaker—would have known that.

In relation to the cost implications, let us say, for example, that 20 new white Acco trucks were stored at Wakefield Street. I understand that a new Acco fire truck costs about \$100 000. So, if the member for Bright is correct in his allegation, somewhere in the Minister's office—despite the Auditor-General's going through all the finances associated with the State budget and despite the fact that an Estimates of Payments book is issued—\$2 million has been secreted away this year. The member for Bright knows that that does not go on. However, it did not end there, because the honourable member also said that there were some white fire helmets. If one works on the premise that a fire truck has a six-man crew and that there are 20 new fire trucks; it works out to 120 helmets costing about \$50 each (according to where they are bought), and that is not counting this new logo that the member for Bright has created in his own mind.

An Acco fire truck is 8 metres by 3 metres, so it would take a shed with an area of about 500 square metres to house those 20 fire trucks if they were welded together or placed end to end. As I say, the mind boggles! The member for Bright is a reasonably intelligent man, but the problem was that the Opposition was on a roll at that particular time. It was managing to get an occasional story on the television news, and the member for Bright, who is a new chum and enthusiastic, wanted to get his story. I uncovered this information after one visit to the Wakefield Street fire station. I stand by what I am saying but the member for Bright has nothing to back up his claims.

He has made them twice, despite assurances from the Minister that it was not the case. As I have said the member for Bright is a reasonably intelligent man and, if he actually

stopped and considered the checks and balances we have with the Auditor-General, he would realise that it would be impossible for any Minister or any Government to hide \$2 million. It would be physically impossible to hide 20 new fire trucks (despite the fact that the CFS has not ordered them since 1986) and, on top of that, to hide 120 white fire helmets.

I often give members opposite more credit than they are worth, and that is one of my shortcomings because I am a fair man. I think what we have heard from the member for Bright is just a clear case of his being in fantasy land. I suggest that the member for Bright reads my speech tomorrow. I will gladly take him down to Wakefield Street and put him in touch with the officer who gave me this information; and I would hope that the member for Bright—who is a good Christian man (and I say that very seriously)—has the decency to stand up and apologise to the Minister for the outrageous claims he made, not only during Estimates Committee B but also tonight.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I really do not think that Anastasia is relevant to the affairs of State as they stand in financial terms before us now. We face a greater crisis in this State at the present time than we have faced at any time in the term of office of any member of this Chamber. If members in the Government's back bench really think that it is appropriate to allow the member for Napier to abuse the House, and the seriousness of the situation, by addressing the House in the fashion that he did about such trite matters, then they, too, deserve the public condemnation, which he will receive for being so frivolous. I must say I do not find his demeanour much different on this occasion than I have found on previous occasions in recent times.

The Hon. H. Allison: You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, no matter how hard you try.

Mr LEWIS: I must accept that the interjection, even though it was out of order, is legitimate in describing a sow's or a boar's ear (being gender neutral, as I am always in any such references).

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: We have a bore—in fact, we have just had one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: Obviously, I struck a tender chord, or a raw nerve, with the member for Henley Beach when making the remark I did. I am anxious to address some remarks in general about the way in which I think the Estimates Committee system is functioning or failing to function and, by doing so, I in no way intend to transgress your earlier ruling, Mr Speaker, about that matter. I do not believe that the Committee system is working as was intended. It is appropriate for us in the context of our observations to make mention of that point so that the record will show, when examined historically, whether members were satisfied or otherwise with the way in which they were able to obtain information through the function of the Committee in the fashion that they thought they would be able to.

Generally, the comments made by members on this side of the Chamber have not been motivated by malice but rather by a desire to ensure that the process can be enhanced.

It may be that we need to take some substantive motions on sessional orders of the Committees at some appropriate time in the future. I therefore place on notice that at approximately this time 11 months from now when the motion to adopt sessional orders is moved, if no change has been made to them by then, I shall move certain amendments. I do not think it is appropriate to use private members' time for this purpose; when the motion to adopt those orders is before the House is the appropriate time for me to address this question and to move such amendments as I believe appropriate, amendments which will make the Committees more functional than they have been.

For instance, it is extremely difficult for a member in any circumstances to challenge the Chairman's ruling or to attempt to seek some variation of it because this could result quite simply in the Chairman gonging out the Committee and recalling the House at 9 a.m. the next morning. This would destroy the purpose for which we met on that occasion by preventing any further examination of the vote. The member of the Committee who indulged in such activity would personally be accountable for denying such scrutiny and denying others the opportunity to participate in that scrutiny by their preemptive provocative behaviour if the Chairman so chose to determine.

I could link the remarks I am now making with that part of the budget which deals with the legislature itself since we appropriate funds at this time as we have done historically from the Treasury through the Treasurer for the purpose of conducting the business of this chamber, the other place and this Parliament for the function of the Joint Parliamentary Services Committee. I wish to place on record that I believe that is quite inappropriate and that Parliament should appropriate for its own purposes, ahead of any other supply required by Government, such funds as it requires for the purpose of running both Chambers and the institution of the Parliament itself as well as, and including, members' electorate offices and other facilities.

It is not appropriate for this institution to be subject to the whimsical control of Ministers of the Crown. Executive Government presently dominates the process of parliamentary decision-making and the effective capacity which members have not only to represent the views of their constituents in this place but to provide information to those constituents in response to their inquiries and to make themselves accessible to those constituents. In my judgment, that is not an appropriate state of affairs. I foresee that in future Parliament will appropriate such funds as are necessary in its opinion for its own function before any Supply Bill for any other purpose may be introduced by the Premier of the State. Until that supply for Parliament is obtained, no supply will be available to the Government or any of its departments and agencies. That is the way in which I believe it ought to function.

I now turn to the matters of concern to me that arise out of political events of the moment and revenue-raising measures as well as expenditure proposals. I have discovered, as have other members, that the Government has done a remarkable about-face on poker machines for South Australia. It has used sophistry and semantics to justify the decision that it has taken—and it has done so by a deceitful backdoor method by introducing video poker machines at the casino through regulation rather than legislation.

So much for the pious rantings of Government members who stated that they were completely opposed to poker machines and electronic gaming devices of any kind. I am astonished that by the stroke of a pen 800 video poker machines, with the prospect of a further 400, are about to commence operation, and Parliament has had no opportu-

nity to say anything about it. The regulation has simply been made and, until Parliament decides to disallow the regulation, the machines can operate.

Enormous pressure will be placed on all members of Parliament by the people who advocate the introduction of these machines in any circumstances anywhere to leave them operating. The Government's clever dick trick causes me grave concern because it relies on that strategy to have poker machines introduced. We are now faced with a *fait accompli*.

In 1983 the Premier promised that if the Casino Bill was passed he would do research into the effects of gambling. He gave a commitment to do that, but in the seven years since that time not one stitch of research has been done, not one iota. I obtained that assurance from the Premier, and you, Mr Speaker, were in the Chamber at that time. Quite hypocritically and with arrogance and indifference the Premier and his Ministers backed up by other members of the Government have done nothing. This is in spite of the fact that the Government collected \$112 million net from gambling, \$23 million from the TAB and the Lotteries Commission and \$6.5 million from other sources. The Government expects that figure to rise to \$128 million according to this year's budget. It expects to collect another \$5 million net from the operation of the poker machines that will be introduced into the casino forthwith.

The Government is heavily promoting gambling. We see advertisements on the television promoting the notion that people can gamble and that there is a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow or good fortune if they participate. If the Government was subject to the same advertising laws to which private enterprise is subjected, it would not be able to get away with that advertising. It is misleading and it is deceitful. The Government knows that games of chance are designed to ensure that, over time, the punter will lose. Yet, the Government's advertising through its agencies and licensed operations promotes the notion that one will win, and that one can win on a continuing basis. Video poker machines will tap into new customers. The Premier and the Ministers know that, and we will see an increase in financial difficulties with gamblers in real trouble. This has been the experience both overseas and interstate, and I am appalled.

I now turn to another matter that arises out of the annual report of Mines and Energy Department which was tabled today. This report reveals a serious downturn in mineral exploration in Australia. The Minister did not tell us this during the Estimates Committee; he made no comment about it at all. During the Estimates Committees I was impressed by the standard of answers given by officers of the departments; I was not so impressed in all instances by the Ministers.

In this case, the Director-General, Mr Johns, says that since 1979, when the Liberal Party first came to office, mineral exploration expenditure in the Northern Territory has increased from a comparable sum to expenditure in South Australia to, at the present time, three times the level of expenditure in South Australia. Yet, a far greater proportion of Northern Territory lands has been alienated from exploration for one reason or another than has been the case in South Australia.

Not only is that true in the case of the proportion of the total State but there is a vast area in South Australia, many times greater than the area available for exploration in the Northern Territory, yet we now find that the Northern Territory outspends us three times. The report also points out that, compared with the national average spending on mineral exploration, which is \$100 per square kilometre, South Australia's share is less than \$8. It is 12.5 times less—

and then some. The report also states that spending has collapsed since the early 1980s when the former Liberal Government's positive commitment to the industry encouraged annual spending exceeding \$50 million—that is, in dollar terms at that time, not in 1990 dollar terms. It would be more than double that now. At that time, we had record expenditure on mineral exploration, in this State. The South Australian economy will continue to lag behind while this Government fails to give appropriate provisions and incentives to industries such as mining to invest and develop in South Australia.

While I am on that point, let me say that the things that cause the mining industry distress and loss of profitability, a general slowdown in development of any project, are the same things that are presently causing the crisis in the total economy which has been triggered by those factors. They include, quite simply, the dirty float on the dollar, which means that high interest rates are not officially produced to keep the accord intact but to prevent, at the same time, consumption outstripping supply, so that we do not have excessive demand pushing up prices and inflation.

The Treasurer has decided to run with a policy of very high interest rates which he artificially engineers through the Reserve Bank. It is similar to the character in George Bernard Shaw's play *Pygmalion*, in which Professor Higgins who manipulated the life of a poor young woman, Eliza Doolittle. Accordingly, it is Paul Keating using the Reserve Bank to manipulate interest rates and consumption in Australia, completely ignoring the implications that has for the viability of business.

Mr Quirke: I didn't know you read Shaw.

Mr LEWIS: It was Shaw, in fact, who said 'Life wasn't meant to be easy.'

Mr Ferguson: George Bernard Shaw?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, in the play 'Back to Methuselah', but the quote is not complete. It goes on:

But take courage, my child. It can be delightful.

I implore the member for Playford and all people in South Australia to do likewise. In due course, a Liberal Government will be elected and things will again become delightful, but in the meantime we have great misery to suffer, more than we can imagine is likely at the present time. I am distressed at the way in which members fail to recognise the significance of the predicament in which we now find ourselves as a consequence of allowing this Federal Treasurer to fool around with the economy in the fashion in which he has.

With the high interest rates attracting hot cash from around the world, we have an artificially high dollar. In consequence of that high dollar value *vis-a-vis* other currencies, we find that the returns in Australian dollar terms to exporters—the agricultural rural sector and the mining sector in primary industries—and viability are comparatively destroyed. We could have the floor price of wool at not 870c a kilogram but 1 000c a kilogram if only we let the dollar float honestly and let interest rates find their own level after deregulating not only the financial markets thoroughly and properly but, more importantly, the labour market. The sooner members of any political persuasion or Parliaments in this country understand the truth of that fact, the better off we will all be. The sooner we get a Treasurer and Government which understands the truth of that immutable fact, the better off we will all be. It is fundamental economics to understand that point.

The other thing that arises as a consequence of adopting the present policies as opposed to the policies I have just advocated is that we destroy the prospect and possibility of starting up new enterprises that are import substitution

enterprises. In consequence, we have to import too much, because it costs too much to make the same goods within our own economy. Our own industries cannot compete with overseas manufactured goods at that price level. Free trade is all very well. If we are going to have a deregulated international trading set up, as I advocate we should, we must also have an honest float on currency and a fair price in the money market for the cost of money, which is interest rates.

We must allow employers and employees who have banded together, enterprise by enterprise, to register their agreements as to wages and conditions so that, accordingly, enterprises can succeed, are viable and will produce wealth for our economy and prosperity for our people, and enable us to raise the revenue that is necessary to provide the public services for those citizens who are less fortunate than the majority of us. Until and unless we do that, we will not be able to do any of those other things. More important than anything else, we will not be able to do anything about addressing the environmental problems that confront this continent. It will otherwise be a simple question of survival of the very people who live here, and that will come to the crunch within 12 months.

I have been saying that since I became a member of this place and I will continue to say it until people begin to understand the truth of what I am saying, do something sensible in recognition of that truth in the introduction of policies that recognise it and enable us to get on with the job of restructuring our economy and establishing viable enterprises in which people can get real jobs.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish to begin by saying a few words about agriculture. It is my background and where I began my life, and many of my family are still involved in it. There is no doubt at all that the high interest rates and their effect on the Australian dollar are causing much of the trouble in the agricultural sector as far as exports are concerned. We live not just in a State but in a land in which we could grow every crop that can be grown in the world. There is not a crop that cannot be grown in Australia.

We live in a land which has every climatic condition and which has a continental shelf control of the ocean. That comprises an area two-thirds the size of our continent, having a huge amount of resources that have never been touched or, in many cases, researched or assessed properly. We have a small population of 17 million, and our only disadvantage is distance for travel and communication, although communication is not an expensive item in itself apart from the installation of services. Now we have gone to satellites and so on, it is perhaps cheaper than when it was nearly all done by land line.

That is the country we have, yet somehow we cannot manage it. Let us look at what has happened to South Australia and to Australia. We had a Prime Minister named Whitlam who gave the impression that money grew on trees. That, more than in any other time, was when the attitude was developed in Australia that money was going to be easy.

The Federal Government poured taxpayers' money out of the Federal coffers and went into overseas debt (or community debt as far as the taxpayer was concerned) as if it did not mean anything. The attitude was, 'Our children and our grandchildren will pay it off', I can understand that attitude to some degree. The Labor Party had been in

Opposition for a long while and it suddenly got its hands on money, it had never dreamt it could put its hand on; it squandered it on all sorts of silly projects that meant nothing for the long term benefit of the country.

The Dunstan era in this State was the same, and they coincided. If any members doubt what I say about the Dunstan era they should look at how much maintenance of public facilities was carried out. How many water mains were replaced? We know that those mains are up to 100 years old. In the Blackwood area alone in some cases mains are bursting every few weeks; there can be five bursts within 200 metres of one another. The water is lost but the mains are never replaced; they are just patched up. We have failed to maintain our public facilities. Our school buildings and other buildings are becoming derelict; they are not being maintained. We now tell school committees that they will have to raise the money because the Government has failed to maintain the buildings.

However, we spend money on fancy projects, such as on giving trade unions or others money to read or write poetry when really that could be done by those who are talented in that way with fewer grants and less support than has been made available through some weird program which was thought up by Federal or State Labor Governments and which over-zealous public servants attempted to put into practice.

There is no doubt that our State public facilities are in bad shape. We know that. We know that our roads, our water mains and our sewer mains are in bad shape. But, what has happened to the rural economy? Why is it that we cannot export our produce? We produce, and there are people in the world who could use those products, but our cost structure has become too high. Our dollar is too high. There is not a genuine floating of the dollar. To say that we are freeing the economy is not true at all. Keating still has his finger in the pie, telling the Reserve Bank what it will or will not do. That is not a free and open market. If our dollar is to remain around US\$83c, we will not be able to export, at a profit, the goods that we produce from the land. Our standard of living will drop so that it is below that of some of the third world countries. Keating has said that Australia will be a banana republic. He is not ashamed of it. If he were, he would do something about it.

What does our Premier, the Federal President of the Australian Labor Party, do? He says, 'I have said that interest rates are too high and that they should come down.' But, does he do anything else about it? Why is he not in Canberra banging on the doors of the Prime Minister and Keating saying, 'This is what is destroying our rural economy and, thus, the Australian and South Australian economies.' People in rural areas should not think that those in the metropolitan area do not understand. They do. Many of them have relatives or friends in rural areas or they can read and understand that the rural sector is an important part of our State economy, indeed of national economy.

They know that. But, the Federal Government does not recognise it and, more importantly, the man who holds the key position in this State, the Premier, the man who is the Federal President of the ALP, sits back in a wimpish-like way and says, 'Interest rates are too high.' I guarantee that if he had spent three weeks in Canberra banging on the doors of the Prime Minister and Keating instead of going to Italy and Europe, the end result would have been better for this country and this State. He could have convinced them, and stuck at it to make sure that interest rates drop.

Our greatest opportunity to get out of the bother is to make sure that rural products and the products of the mining industry can be exported at a profit. The only way

we will do that is by lowering interest rates. A while ago I heard the State Minister of Agriculture saying on air that he understands the difficulties faced by the primary sector, that he understands there will be some human suffering and that he understands that the future is uncertain. However, he thinks that the grain industry will be all right in a couple of years and that the wool industry will take about five years to improve. He does not know the future of the citrus industry; he does not know how long it will be before that industry will come good. And so he went on. There is no suggestion of help. He said that he would lend people more money. But, if people are in debt to the hilt now, how can they borrow more money, and at 16 per cent? I challenge any member to go out onto an average farm and borrow at 10 per cent half the equity that is needed to run the property—and make money. If people have a capital investment and cannot make the interest rate of the day, they are running at a loss. That is fact; there is no doubt about it.

Mr Ferguson: What about the capital gain?

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member should go to the Hills where a freeze has been placed on development to see the capital gain for the rural sector. The Minister for Environment and Planning and Water Resources says that people cannot now get, say, the titles for any property between Victor Harbor and Kapunda whereas they could do that a little more than a month ago. Those properties have been devalued overnight. That is the capital value, not the value enhanced overnight. The member for Henley Beach talks about the capital value of rural land. He should have a go at it himself to see how he gets on. Then he will understand it. Until the Premier of this State gets away from that smart, smug, sit-back and serpent-like smile—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, he sits back with those little lips tipping back. Until he becomes aggressive, goes to Canberra and tells Keating and Hawke that they must reduce interest rates, the rural sector will not get out of the bother it is in. The rural sector knows that, because that is the only way the Australian dollar will come down.

I want to refer briefly to the freeze that has been placed on the use of land in the Hills and some of the hypocrisy that applies. People living in the Hills have been told that never will the water that is reticulated to townships such as Mount Barker, Hahndorf and surrounding areas be filtered, that they will have to drink the filth from the Murray River as long as they live there unless they install rainwater tanks—and the Government might end up charging for that because it could say that that water will not be running into the reservoirs. That will be the next thing. What a sham! At the same time it delivers water from the Murray River about 500 metres down from Verdun, straight into the Onkaparinga River and into the Mount Bold Reservoir. That water contains the sludge and muck that is in the Murray River, drained from the eastern States and from part of this State, and it goes straight into the Onkaparinga River and into the Mount Bold Reservoir. And the Government says that it is concerned about water pollution. Where is the sincerity? There is none. There are double standards.

The Government does not care how many people live along the Murray and urinate or excrete along the banks or in the Murray. It does not care about whatever else goes into the river from the other States. That pollution comes down the Murray and we cop it. So, people living in the Hills have to drink that water and it flows into the Mount Bold Reservoir. We are told that the catchment area is polluted, so people cannot use their land. But a pipe of nearly one metre across drains water straight into the Mount

Bold Reservoir and down to Happy Valley, where it is filtered.

Other water from the catchment area, whether it be from Kangaroo Creek or elsewhere is also filtered. The Mount Bold reservoir was completed in 1936. In the early 1960s, my brothers and I had the job of clearing the scrub, and whatever else was there, in the new area to be covered by the reservoir when the height of the wall was increased by approximately 22ft—just under 7 metres. That contract stated that we were not to leave any vegetation whatsoever inside that holding area, in particular, native eucalypts. We had to burn or destroy it all because it would contaminate the reservoir. Now we have people telling us that we should be replanting and making sure that the native vegetation stays in the catchment area to run into the reservoir. Why did it contaminate in the early 1960s if it does not contaminate now?

Ever since Mount Bold reservoir was built, the silt has washed down off agricultural land or non-agricultural land, land in its native state or in its developed state, into that reservoir. With that goes all the organic material that falls to the ground—leaves, twigs, dead animals and dead birds, domestic and otherwise. It all goes into the Mount Bold reservoir. Thousands of tonnes of contaminated material lie at the bottom of every reservoir, particularly the oldest reservoirs. They have never been cleaned out. No attempt has been made to drain them and the Engineering and Water Supply Department knows that that is the cause of about half the contamination.

The Government will not give the E&WS enough money to fix the problem, nor will it admit it is the case because it does not have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say so. Part of the contamination problem is created because the water lies still. There is no aeration of the water. The water at the bottom of the reservoir lies still for long periods and becomes stagnant and contaminated. Another problem is eutrophication, that is, enrichment of the water through nutrients. Where does all that come from? Two independent studies show clearly that it does not come from households or housing developments. However, the Minister's department argues that it is caused by houses or by people living near the catchment. It is not. It may even be caused by agriculture because of the fertilisers and sprays that are used.

Yet, the argument for the freeze on development is that the Government wants to keep the rural properties as they are. I am not suggesting that we should get rid of them but I point out that that is where part of the problem lies. Let me give another example of double standards. The Government owns a botanic garden that lies, in the main, in the water catchment area below Mount Lofty summit in the shadow of the hill, that is, the Piccadilly side. A few years ago a local farmer wanted to sell a lot of natural fertiliser—horse manure—to a local market gardener. He was told, 'No'. Do members know who used it? The botanic gardens, right in the catchment area. It was not all right for a private operator but it was all right for the botanic gardens. The botanic gardens use fertilisers all the time, artificial as well as natural. They work the land, not a lot when plants become established, but they do work it. We need to think about that.

Another example is the National Fitness Camp, which is owned by the Government. People go there for sports training. It is situated right on the Onkaparinga River, with a septic tank right up against the river, which eventually drains into that. What do people do in the hot weather? Although it is prohibited, they swim in the river. In the same category are the youth camps owned by two church organisations, and I have no objection to those organisa-

tions. Both camps are right on the river, which is a lovely place for them.

The present campaign suggests that it is wrong to have people living in houses in the Hills, yet 50 000 people go to the Oakbank race meeting. The sewerage plant cannot carry the load and an acre and a half of raw sewage bubbles out over a paddock. That ends up in the Onkaparinga River and Mount Bold. We say that the race meeting is a great thing, and it is; it is a great venture for those who want to go. At the same time we have a Government which says that it wants more tourists to go to the Hills. Does that mean that the people who live there pollute and that the people who travel there and use the facilities do not pollute? Is that the argument?

More people visit the Hills in a year than live there, but the Government suggests that it is the people living there who create the problem, not those who travel to the Hills and use the facilities that are provided for health and hygiene purposes. Not all of them do so, especially those walking the Heysen Trail. I cannot see them sprinting 10 miles to get to the next dunny. There is a lot of hypocrisy.

My last point concerns the bus depot at Bridgewater, and I read in the paper a little letter from the public relations officer. That depot should never have been built in the catchment area, and two alternative sites were suggested to the Minister. One of them belonged to my family, who did not want to get rid of it, but I said that the wise thing was to take the depot out of the catchment area. The Government refused and put a huge bus depot in the middle of the catchment area. It could have put it four kilometres away outside the catchment area and not caused any problems. What makes people angry are the double standards. A person who owns a piece of land, which might be all scrub, should not lose the right to build a house on a corner of that block. He should not be forced to plant native trees around the home to screen it because that invites death and danger from bushfires. The houses should be screened with trees and shrubs with the lowest fire risk.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I have observed the Estimates Committees for eight years, but this was the first time that I have not been in the Chair of one of the Committees. In the first three years I assisted the Chairman of Committees by relieving him of his duties from time to time. In the following four years I was Chairman of Committees and took over the duties of Chairperson. So I have been able to observe at great length the quality and quantity of contributions made to those Committees.

Because of the shuffle in the shadow Ministry, I feel that Opposition members had many problems, sadly missing the experience of former shadow Ministers. The member for Coles will always be remembered in this House for the preparation put into her contribution to the Estimates Committees. In fact, I would say that, in my experience, the member for Coles is one of the best shadows that I have seen. The fact that she has been shifted from that position was one of the reasons why the Liberal Party's contribution this time was so poor.

The new shadow Ministers who graced us with their presence have already told us how keen and enthusiastic they are about this system of Estimates Committees. I suppose from their naivety—and I use that word in its nicest sense—they really believed that they were doing something worth while being involved with these committees. However, sad to say, when one looks at *Hansard* and examines

their actual contribution, I believe their assessment goes astray.

The member for Adelaide is a case in point, although I believe that it is true of all the new shadow Ministers who took advantage of utilising this system. The honourable member came in here, asked a question to which he knew the answer, and he received an answer. He had ready a prepared press release and, having received the answer, he issued the press release. He got his headlines almost immediately, but then, rather than use the rest of the time available to him to probe and obtain answers on the proposed expenditure and to highlight past mistakes that might have been made, he felt that all he had to do was occupy the crease. We were then subjected to a continuous barrage of dry, boring and inaccurate questions in order that he could fill out his time.

The new team of the Leader and the Deputy Leader, who asked questions of the Premier, did not do their planning very well at all. Throughout the morning and, indeed, spilling over into the afternoon, the most unimportant portions of the Premier's portfolios were canvassed. We fiddled around in the morning talking about the Parliament and asking the odd question of the Librarian and the odd question about what happens in and around Parliament House but, when they reached the most important part of the portfolio, matters affecting the Treasury, the Leader and Deputy Leader ran out of time. They found that when they started to score points, or when they thought they started to score points, they had not left themselves enough time to explore the points they had raised.

I thought the most impressive speeches, so far as the budget process is concerned, were delivered by the member for Alexandra and the member for Morphett. The member for Alexandra explained to us the way that he utilised the system of the Estimates Committees. He made no bones about it. He told us that he batted out time. He told us that he had questions prepared for him and, in general, did not think much of the system. I am inclined to agree with him. Because of the way the Liberal Party has handled Estimates Committees, the particular process that we go through at the moment is sadly in need of change. I am inclined to believe the rumours that have been circulating in this place concerning propositions with which the member for Elizabeth may or may not proceed in due course. Those changes might be revolutionary, but at least they would provide the Parliament with a better system than the one now operating.

The member for Morphett made a most impressive speech and told us that he was disgusted with the large number of Dorothy Dix questions. He was absolutely disgusted, and I tend to agree with him. The Dorothy Dix questions put up in the Estimates Committees should be done away with. However, we found that the Hon. Trevor Griffin, the Hon. Rob Lucas and the Hon. Di Laidlaw were sitting in the Speaker's gallery, all producing Dorothy Dix questions which were being handed to the Liberal Party members on the other side. The members obviously did not understand the questions because of the way they asked them. Even if they scored a point, they could not follow up that point because they could not understand the question in the first place. So, how can we accept as genuine someone who makes a speech in this House about Dorothy Dix questions and then allows shadow Ministers from the other place to sit in the Speaker's gallery and proceed to reel off questions and have them sent down by carrier pigeon to be asked of the Minister at the appropriate time?

Not only did we have to contend with that, but the questions were framed in a way typical of another place. They were so framed that they contravened our Standing

Orders. The Chairpersons had to constantly remind the Committee of the way in which those questions should be framed. Time is against me, but I must mention—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: Time is against me, but I must refer to—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point or order, the member is being repetitious.

The SPEAKER: Order! Frivolous points of order will be frowned upon by the Chair.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you for your protection, Sir. I am alarmed at the way in which members of the Opposition have taken the opportunity in this debate to attack one of the members who chaired Committee B. The way in which members of the Opposition have reflected upon that person is very close to a contravention of our Standing Orders. I hope that this sort of behaviour does not continue and that, if members wish to take issue with the Chair, they do so at the appropriate time and in the appropriate way. I have been told by my Whip that I can continue, but I will comply with his original wish and conclude my remarks. I hope that we reform the Estimates Committee system, because it definitely needs it.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to make a brief contribution this evening. The first thing on which I wish to comment is the remarks of the member for Henley Beach. I had the privilege of being a member of the Committees when he was Chairman, and he was an excellent Chairman but unfortunately this year the standard was not the same. I was privileged also to have the member for Elizabeth as Chairman of Estimates Committee A, and he did a brilliant job. The member for Napier was less than brilliant. In many instances, he took the standard rules of the debate and of the Estimates Committees beyond the pale. There were occasions when he was very hard and unreasonable in his chairmanship.

It is important when discussing this whole area of estimates that we put into perspective the comments about the shadow Ministers from the other place being in the gallery. All members of this House know that we specifically invite Ministers from the other House to be on the floor and to be part of the Committee. This is done specifically for one purpose: we need to have the Ministers who are in charge of their various portfolios in the other place in a position to directly advise the Committee. If we did not have that, we would have Ministers unfamiliar with those portfolios attempting to answer questions in a similar way to what happens in this place during Question Time. This was done deliberately: it was accepted by this House that there was a need to bring in the Ministers from the other place. I put to this House that one of the best modifications that we could make to this system would be to look at ways and means whereby shadow Ministers from the other place are able to be either part of the Committee or at least nearby to push the questions to and fro.

As the member for Napier well knows, there was one very special instance during the Committee when he had to advise the staff of the Minister that it was not their role to go on to the floor of the House and hand Dorothy Dixers directly to members of the Committee. The Chairman would know full well that he had to chastise that particular person because there was no doubt that the Dorothy Dixers were being handed directly to the member so that he could ask the Minister the question. Dorothy Dixers seem to be part and parcel of this place. It is a tragedy that the Government in many instances abuses the privilege of the Estimates

Committee. On the whole, the majority of members do not do this, but there are many occasions on which members of the Government have done so and I have cited a couple of instances.

I now want to talk about what this Government and the Premier in particular are doing to the economy of our State, and about the mess in which we have been left by the decisions of the Premier and his lack of influence in the Federal arena with Mr Keating. In an article in this evening's *News* headed 'Keating' 'wrong' says BHP chief, Sir Arvi Parbo, the Chairman of BHP, states:

Australia is unlikely to emerge from its current recession early next year despite assurances from the Treasurer Mr Keating.

He goes on to say:

Investment means interest rates which are conducive to new investment and if you depend on exports or if you are an import competitor, then an exchange rate which makes you competitive.

He states further:

Far from starting up business, existing businesses are going out of business.

I would like to take up that point and bring it back to some of the comments that our Premier made on his recent trip overseas. These comments appeared in our newspapers encouraging certain directions and, in particular, the export of goods out of our State.

I want to make the point that interest rates is the one single issue that has caused and is causing the most concern amongst business people in this State. There is no doubt that the long-term high interest rate policy of the Hawke Government supported strongly by Premier Bannon, not only as ALP President but as a member of the EPAC Committee, has caused massive problems for small, medium and large businesses in our State. The petrol tax increase, petrol prices generally, and taxes generally on petrol are causing massive problems for business people in our State. For example, the other day a retail group manager rang me saying that normally he had some 20 people on the road selling goods, but he has found now that within less than two months he has had to reduce that number to 10 because it is cheaper to maintain those people in the office making STD phone calls than it is to have them on the road because of the massive increases in petrol prices in this country.

This is a Federal issue, but what had we heard from the Premier or the Ministers on the front bench in relation to it? Where is the Minister of Transport? It is very easy for the Minister of Transport to cave in in respect of the .08 issue and to other decisions of the Federal Government because he is getting a measly \$12 million for his budget, but what about the real issues of petrol prices and the effect they are having on the economy and the business people in this State? Where is the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Finance and the Premier? We do not hear any comments from these people on this issue.

The other increases in respect of FID and payroll tax have caused a massive hike in business costs in this State. Some three or four months ago, \$60 million was taken out of the economy of this State by increases in WorkCover and workers compensation costs—\$60 million over and above the basic cost of workers compensation in this State. That figure will vary only if there is a dramatic down turn in the economy. That \$60 million lumped in with all of these other increases in taxes amounts to about \$200 million a year or \$4 million a week extra which has to come out of the cost of running businesses in this State.

We read in the paper last week a comment of the Premier from Rome that what we have to do in this State is increase exports and we have to become more of an export State and really have to get stuck into that area. However, in the

past six months this Premier has taken over \$200 million of profit out of all the businesses in this State to pay for the FID, payroll tax increases and workers compensation. Yet, the Premier stands up and says that export is the answer.

Now that the Premier is back from his selling campaign, he ought to walk down Unley Road and look at all the vacant shops. Every now and again, he should walk inside a shop and ask people about the problems they have. He should then go down to Albert Park and walk into a couple of the factories and ask the factory managers, the owners and the workers in those factories the sort of problems they have. He should then go out to Elizabeth and ask the people there how they are coping with these business tax increases, then go into General Motors-Holden's and ask about the \$2 million extra in payroll tax it has to pick up, and ask about the granting of the majority of the State supply budget to the Victorians.

Then he should go down to Mitsubishi and ask about the \$1.5 million increase in payroll tax and the massive increase in FID, and ask the workers on the floor what future they have with a Government that talks about exports and then pushes up all the costs required to enable businesses in this State to become exporters. Mr Bannon, as Premier of this State, has been in charge of our economy now for nearly eight years. Looking at some leading indicators published in the *Australian* late in August, we see the prime indicator that the Premier has been bolstering up while overseas, that is, the need for us to be great exporters and to push along exports. He made that same comment when he returned from his trip in 1988.

We find that, as a percentage of total exports from this country, South Australia exports 6 per cent. Our percentage of population is nearly 9 per cent, yet we are exporting only 6 per cent of the total national exports. Western Australia exports 16.9 per cent of all national exports, with the same population as we have; Tasmania has an export level of 4.2 per cent, which is two-thirds of our own level; Queensland's level is 22.5 per cent; Victoria's share, with very few minerals coming out of that State, is 18.3 per cent; while New South Wales has 25 per cent.

So, we have a position whereby, after eight years of the Bannon Government, we cannot raise our exports to a level that equates with our own population, yet the Premier says that this is the answer. He has been in power for eight years. As I said, two years ago the Premier said that exporting was the answer, that we were going to get out and sell the export concept. What he always does is go overseas and sell it very hard, then he has a holiday for two years. He has just been overseas and sold this concept very hard and, I bet, he will have another holiday for two years. What happens—nothing.

When we look at exports in South Australia we find that they are predominantly rural based. With the massive problem we have in the rural areas of our State today, I suspect that this figure of 6 per cent will take quite a dramatic dive. I think that we need the Premier of this State to start looking at some of the fundamental problems I talked about earlier. As Premier of this State and as President of the ALP—but far more, as far as I am concerned, as the Premier of this State—he should get on to Mr Keating and start talking about the problems interest rates are creating for small, medium and large businesses in manufacturing, retailing and in any business in this State.

I call on the Premier to go out and talk to a few people in his constituency who are really hurting because of that one single national problem—interest rates. I heard the Premier say today in this House that we have heard a lot

of comments from him on interest rates. I had a quick look through the papers for the past two or three months and have not yet been able to find one single comment on this issue from the Premier. I quickly went through the *Advertiser* and could not find one comment. That is not to say that there is not one there, but not too many members opposite can remember the Premier standing up, grand-standing and saying publicly that it is about time we got stuck into Keating.

I remember that when I was a young man Dunstan did that. When he was Premier, Dunstan used to have the guts to stand up and be counted for South Australia, but all we get is massive public relations when our Premier goes overseas. I do not mind that, but I will go back and look at the number of inches in the paper devoted to the Premier when he was away, and I will take a bet that there were more column inches taken up in comments from our Premier during that month than in the whole 12 months prior to that. The reason for that is that the Premier had a group of public relations and press people with him, writing stories and pumping those things out. We need to have a very good look at how the promotion of this State is being carried on, because I do not think it is happening at all other than as a result of promotional trips.

There is another issue I should like to talk about briefly. During the Estimates Committees I asked the Minister of Labour a question about the cost of workers compensation for the Government. Some figures were supplied to us today that show that the premium paid by all departments into the workers compensation Government fund was \$33.155 million, a figure that, compared to the previous year of \$31.382 million, seems quite reasonable on the surface.

I said to the Minister, 'Didn't you introduce a policy last year that said that the first 21 days would be paid by the department?' Of course, the Minister, said 'Yes.' We then asked the Minister, 'How much did that cost?' And he said 'I don't know, but we'll find out for you.' He has replied today, and we find that another \$10.6 million has been paid out for this 21 days, the new deal that had been covered up from the Auditor-General's Report.

In fact, we find that the cost of workers compensation last year in the Government sector alone jumped to \$43.1 million—a \$12.5 million increase in workers compensation payouts in the Government sector last year. That is approximately a 33 per cent increase in payments in workers compensation in a scheme that this Government says is the best in Australia.

It is, too—it is the best payout in Australia. But it has been abused and misused, and here is another example of a cover-up by this Government of the true cost of workers compensation in this State. It is a scam and a scandal. The Auditor-General's Report indicates that the cost of workers compensation is line ball. It is not line ball: it is \$10.5 million more than it was last year. It is an absolute scam, and the Government ought to come clean and tell everyone in the community what it will do about the abuse of this scheme.

As we in this place all know, it is the same scheme that the private sector also has to be part of. The benefits are the same, all the fraud opportunities are the same—every single thing is the same. I asked myself why this was covered up. It seemed very strange that the Government should get Treasury to slip \$10.5 million into this fund to keep it afloat, and that should be of concern to every person in this State.

I will conclude by referring to the Residential Tenancies Fund, which contains some \$27 million, \$20 million of which is bond money that belongs to individuals. An amount

of \$6.8 million in that fund is interest that has not been paid to any one of those bond holders, and that is a scandal. That money should be paid back to every person who has bond money returned. There is no justification for this.

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

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I am pleased to be speaking tonight: first, on the general process of Estimates Committees and then on some of the specific detail. As a first time member of Estimates Committee's I found the process excellent. Everyone would be aware that this was an innovation of the Tonkin Liberal Government. I thought that these Committees gave us a real opportunity to question the Government, which had previously brought out its public budget document—in fact, a public relations document.

Having been primarily involved in the Estimates Committee that questioned the Minister of Health, I would also say that the South Australian Health Commission advisers were cooperative. It was interesting to observe the Minister of Health frequently asking those advisers to answer questions rather than as occurred in other Estimates Committees in which I played a lesser role, the Minister taking all the running. While looking at the process of the Estimates Committees in general, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that often questions from outside the House were not answered properly on the basis that we have difficulty comparing like with like, one year being different from another because of wage's impacts and so on. I believe that, if the Estimates Committee process is an effort to make government more open, the Government ought to be able to accommodate our comparing like with like.

Estimates Committee A was chaired by the member for Elizabeth, and I commend him on his chairmanship of that Committee. In his opening statement to the Committee he said:

The approach to questions will be flexible.

I am uncertain about other Committees. Although I was not a member of those Committees, I have heard the various stories doing the rounds of Parliament, and it would appear that that was not the case in other Committees. If these Estimates Committees are to be a process whereby we can get the most out of it for the people for whom we are all theoretically working, I believe the approach of the member for Elizabeth—that the approach to questions will be flexible—is the right one. The Minister in his opening statement said:

We are here to be inspirational and erudite.

Erudite I can just accept, but he certainly was not inspirational. However, the Minister also said:

We are also here to provide the Parliament with as much information as we can.

I applaud that sentiment, but I do not believe it was carried out. This House is aware of the situation in relation to the Noarlunga Hospital and the well publicised *Yes, Minister* situation; administrative staff were first appointed in early 1990 and the first patients, if we are lucky, will attend the hospital in early April 1991. We also know that only 40 beds will come on stream at that time, and Lord only knows when the hospital will be fully operational.

Members might ask why I raise this issue again. I raise it again because during the Estimates Committee it became clear that there is no accounting in this budget for income from the Noarlunga Hospital. Already the opening date has been postponed three times and, with no accounting for income, I wonder when this hospital will open. I believe that the opening date is called into question by the expect-

tation of zero income, as we found out during the Estimates Committee.

I also noted that the South Australian Health Commission has paid \$970 000—nearly \$1 million of taxpayers' money—for seven storeys of prime central business district office accommodation which was unused for three years. The Government attempted to get out of this by saying that it was all okayed by the Public Works Standing Committee. I will quote to members of the Government the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in relation to town acre 86 office development (tenancy fit-out). At page 12, paragraph 13, concerning 'Decommissioning and lease costs', it is stated:

The committee was disturbed in the extreme that in one set of estimates \$2.555 million had been included in the estimates as the cost of decommissioning and terminating leases . . .

Witnesses further went on to say:

. . . this figure was put forward as the worst possible situation and that in the more likely situation other Public Service clients would be placed in the existing offices that had balances of leases to run and that existing partitions would be further utilised.

In the next paragraph the report, in relation to the decommissioning of the building, stated:

This is an unrealistic approach because what would happen in fact would be that the Government Office Accommodation Committee would move in other Government tenants into the accommodation that had unexpired terms to run or failing that it could sublet the leases.

What has the Government done? It has paid out \$1 million on seven storeys of prime central business district office accommodation. In a reply to a question about asbestos from the member for Playford the Minister noted:

There is also asbestos in some buildings we have quit, but we are no more responsible for the removal of that asbestos than we are for the reletting of them.

I do not necessarily agree with that but, if we accept that, we must also accept that the Government is responsible for the \$1 million wasted and, in particular, the Health Commission is responsible. The last time anyone had as much self-satisfied glee in washing their hands of a situation and expecting it to not rebound on them was when Pontius Pilate performed his well-known act.

Another example of where the Government is going wrong in the health system is the fee for service concept for country hospitals. Previously fees for service were picked up by the Health Commission as a separate item. What has happened now is that, in its supposed wisdom, the Health Commission has directed that the fee for service line should go into the global budget of country hospitals. The fee for service line, for those who may not know, represents the money paid to doctors for services they render to patients. Any sane and rational person would realise that the fees for service in a country hospital are totally and utterly unpredictable. Yet, this Government expects country hospitals to predict them, because that obviously puts them into the global budget. It is simply unable to realise that hospitals cannot budget for this item.

One country hospital has indicated to me that it has recently had a new labour ward commissioned. The people who live in that area have, therefore, decided to stay there for their confinement and this, of course, has led to a huge increase in the fee for service because of the obstetrics charges.

Another hospital has had an increase in other services because of different doctor skills; new specialists have arrived in that area, so, of course, the fee for service will increase dramatically. How can hospitals be expected to budget for these unpredictable events? How can hospitals be expected to budget for epidemics which they do not know are going to happen, or for major accidents? Of course, they cannot.

This fee for service being included in the global budget is causing Statewide anxiety in the health system.

The Government has done exactly the same thing with patient transport payments. In fact, we were told in the Estimates Committee:

It has been past practice to exclude fee for service and patient transport funding from the global budget, which has had an undesirable effect.

The only undesirable effect, excluding fee for service and patient transport funding from the global budget, is that patients have seen doctors if necessary and, if they have needed transport, it has been provided. If the Health Commission believes that that is undesirable, it has got its priorities seriously wrong.

What happens to country hospitals when their allocation runs out? We heard all sorts of platitudinous responses such as, 'We will mount arguments to Treasury' and 'We expect funds to be allocated after this entreaty.' Hospitals simply do not run like this. I am disappointed that the Health Commission would think they do. The 1990-91 health budget was announced on 23 August in a special release from the Minister. It stated:

A new initiatives package of \$5.7 million is the highlight of the 1991 health budget.

These initiatives also included accommodation and support services for people with disabilities to the tune of \$1 million. This creates lovely, warm, fuzzy feelings, but unfortunately this press release is long on rhetoric and short on action. I wish to cite an example to prove it. I have been contacted on many occasions by Mrs Veronica Charles from Aberfoyle Park. She and her husband fostered a boy, Kym, when he was aged three. At that stage his brain function was affected by meningitis. Kym is now nearly 20 years old and this family has looked after him day and night for 17 years. The parents are unable to relax for an instant and other members of the family have been stressed to breaking point. This family has made a magnificent effort, saving money for the community by fostering a very difficult child. I would like to quote from a review of services needed for Kym:

The need for a high level of supervision is to prevent stealing, to guard against what appears to be an obsession with fires, overtly intimate behaviour with physical displays of affection towards adults and children, inability to relate to children of his own age. Because of his immaturity, he is ridiculed and persecuted, resulting in acts of violent retaliation. Because he is a bad influence on younger children, displaying little or no commonsense in any of his actions and failure to respond readily to discipline.

I wrote to the Minister of Health on 1 June 1990 about this case—and received a response on 4 September, a mere three months later. The IDSC Acting Chief Executive Officer wrote a letter to Mrs Charles stating:

Kym is one of the people who is very high on their urgent waiting lists.

At the same time, the Minister—with more warm, fuzzy words—produced a media release about this much-vaunted budget, and stated:

Up to 100 families in crisis will benefit from the funding initiatives.

Yet the Charles family waits, having spent 17 years looking after this child. The advice from an officer of the Department for Family and Community Services was to put him onto the streets, because then at least he would come under Government protection. I wrote again to the Minister on 21 September 1990. I received an acknowledgement of the letter, but I have as yet had no meaningful response. All this comes from a Government which says, in warm, fuzzy press releases, that families will benefit. It comes from a Government that has erected a hospital which has no patients and an administrative building which has no administrators. If we try to compare like with like, we see that at least the

Government's ALP compatriots in Victoria addressed this issue by granting \$30 million over three years for cases such as that. What does this Government do? It makes much play of \$1 million, which addresses no issues.

Shortly after that happened we saw this plan to privatise the hospitals. Has there ever been anything more Monty Pythonesque? It was stated in the first paragraph of the lead item of the *Advertiser* of 22 September:

Unused hospital rooms could be hired out during the Australian Formula One Grand Prix as a part of a plan to commercialise South Australia's public health system.

I can imagine visitors from interstate lobbing back to the hospital late at night with six packs, stumbling around darkened wards, tripping over nurses, pulling out drips and generally having a great time. I can imagine late night partying. It would be wonderful. I also presume that there would be need for added security, such that it would negate any benefits.

I was a little distressed that the Minister stopped there. Thinking it through, I wondered why the car park of the hospital could not be used and people charged admission during the Grand Prix? It is close, within walking distance. There could be a good profit on that number. Perhaps the hospital kitchens could cater for the corporate hospitality tent. Maybe the porters could act as guides for the grandstands. There is the maintenance department. Think of the money that could be made from fixing the dents in the cars.

What about the X-ray machines? Perfect—let us privatise. What about the hospital library? How could that be used? A lot of people who come to South Australia with their spouses do not necessarily like the Grand Prix. We could hire out the chairs and give them a nice quiet reading space so they do not have to listen to the noise. Perhaps we could put the Noarlunga Hospital to good use. At last—a use for this unpatiented hospital. Let us put the visitors there. That would be a wonderful up-market spot.

There is also the Health Commission building. Let us accommodate the back-packers there. What a good idea.

Let us privatise. There is obviously method in the madness of the Minister. The Minister also indicates there will be paid advertising on hospital menus. There is a great opportunity for florists and undertakers. Maybe this is an early sign of changes to the situation of medical practitioner advertisements. Perhaps we had better inform the AMA. Unfortunately it is all too bizarre. I fear it comes from the fact that desperate men do desperate things. I feel it is an indicator of South Australia's poor state of health. I may add, I am very much in favour of applying private enterprise management principles to Government institutions, including hospitals, and just how much will be demonstrated when we are on that side of the Chamber. Do not let us buoy up South Australians with flights of fancy and flummery.

Health is a serious business. Unfortunately, it is too serious for those people who cannot get an ENT appointment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital until late April 1991. Just where we are in the health business was very aptly demonstrated in the Estimates Committee. It was a particularly valuable exercise and I believe that the Opposition learnt many things about just how poorly the Government is managing health.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to have the opportunity to make a few comments in noting the Estimates Committees. I will take them in the order of my attendance at the particular Committees but, in view of the hour, I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 11 October at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 10 October 1990

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

8. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of motor vehicle registered UQO 767 conducting on Saturday 19 May 1990 at 10.15 a.m. at the Target Shopping Centre, Fulham Gardens?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The motor vehicle in question is registered to the Intellectually Disabled Services Council (IDSC). On the day in question, the vehicle was being used by a development care worker from IDSC, in order to purchase goods for a residential respite home.

WORKCOVER

9. **Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: How many staff are employed in the Fraud Investigation Service of WorkCover, what are their roles and what are the details of any successful investigations?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Fraud investigation activities organised by WorkCover are to a large extent currently undertaken by private investigation organisations who are instructed and monitored by WorkCover's Fraud Prevention Department. There are currently seven persons employed within the Fraud Prevention Department and recruitment is at an advanced stage to employ another five persons. Of the approved staffing level of 12, seven will be involved with investigation of matters reported in a direct as well as a supervisory role in respect of the activities of private investigation contractors and the other five persons have management, administrative support and analytical roles in relation to fraud prevention, detection and control matters.

To this point in time in terms of visible success, there have been two convictions achieved, three cases where recovery of payments made is involved, one rejection of claim and in a less visible sense several 'miraculous' recoveries from injury and a broader deterrent effect in terms of claims not submitted has been reported. In addition there are currently six complaints before the Magistrates Court for attention as a result of investigations conducted, and a number of other cases in the final stages of investigation or with legal advisers also appear likely to result in legal action.

TOURISM SOUTH AUSTRALIA

10. **Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide)**, on notice, asked the Minister representing the Minister of Tourism:

1. Why is the office of Tourism South Australia not open every day of the year?

2. Why does the Government not provide a seven-day-a-week service for changing travellers cheques at the office of Tourism South Australia?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The replies are as follows:

1. The Adelaide Travel Centre is open every day of the year except Christmas Day.

2. The currency exchange facilities provided for tourists in Adelaide are comparable with facilities available in many areas within Australia and overseas. It is not the role of

Tourism South Australia to provide a seven-day service for changing travellers cheques. This role is undertaken by financial institutions and, to a lesser extent, by various retail outlets.

The experience of the Travel Centre is that tourists who encounter difficulty in exchanging travellers cheques outside normal banking hours are by far the exception rather than the rule. Nevertheless, Tourism South Australia has recognised that a problem exists and does, in fact, provide a limited exchange service on weekends between the hours of 9 a.m. and 2 p.m. Since the service was introduced in July 1989, it has been used occasionally.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

12. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of the motor vehicle registered UQQ 503 carrying out on the afternoon of Saturday 26 May 1990, parked at the Esplanade, Semaphore, and who were the three or four male passengers?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Motor vehicle UQQ 503 is registered to Glenside Hospital and was being used as part of the hospital's rehabilitation program. On Saturday 26 May 1990, the vehicle was allocated to a male clinical nurse who was taking three male patients for an approved outing to Semaphore beach.

14. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of the motor vehicle registered UQW 182 carrying out at 9.5 a.m. on Monday 28 May 1990 in Jeffcott Street, North Adelaide, and who was the young male passenger?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Motor vehicle registered UQW 182 is owned by the Country Fire Service and is stationed at its Bushfire Prevention Unit at Stirling. On the morning of 28 May 1990, the driver was travelling from his home at Salisbury to CFS Headquarters at Keswick to collect materials to be delivered to the Stirling office. The passenger was the driver's son and was provided with a ride as his destination was en route.

The travel from home to CFS Headquarters was authorised by the CFS Chief Executive Officer; however, carrying a passenger was not authorised. This breach of policy did not involve any deviation on the authorised journey, no time delay and no cost. The officer concerned acted without proper authority in that he failed to seek permission from his Chief Executive Officer to carry the passenger. The matter has been drawn to the attention of the officer. CFS policies have been reviewed and found to adequately cover such matters and all CFS staff have been advised in writing to comply with policies concerning the use of CFS motor vehicles.

WORKCOVER

15. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

1. What is the reason for the proposed increase in WorkCover levy for supermarkets from 3.3 per cent to 4.2 per cent?

2. What has been the total amount received by WorkCover from supermarkets in each year of WorkCover's operation to 30 June 1990?

3. What are the amounts paid by WorkCover since its inception in relation to claims on supermarkets including and excluding journey accidents?

4. What are the current estimates for all claims outstanding for supermarkets including and excluding journey accidents?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

1. Increases in the industry class levy rate for the retail sector, in particular supermarkets, are the result of the relative performance of each industry class for the 27 month period to 31 December 1989, coupled with the need to increase the average levy rate for the State to 3.8 per cent from 3.1 per cent.

An important factor in the increase in the rate for supermarkets is that, in the previous (1989) review, rate movements were constrained by a decision of the board to implement 'one-step' movements only. This decision was taken to stabilise levy movements and because in that review a considerable weighting was given to the historical (pre-WorkCover) experience of the industry, with a lesser weighting to WorkCover's own 15 months data.

The level of confidence in WorkCover claims data cannot be great at such an early stage in the scheme's life. Movements in rates were therefore restricted. Had they not been, there was sufficient pressure on the rate for supermarkets at that time to put it up to 3.8 per cent from 1 July 1989. (The rate was limited to 3.3 per cent.)

In the most recent review (1990), the pressure to increase the rate for supermarkets in fact reduced marginally due to some stabilisation in the industry's claims experience in the past 12 months. However, there was still pressure for an increase above 3.3 per cent, with an average rate for the State of 3.1 per cent. When the average rate was raised to 3.8 per cent, despite the simultaneous reduction in cross-subsidy, the rate for supermarkets emerged as 4.2 per cent.

2. Levy received financial year ended 30.6.88—\$2 518 096; levy received financial year ended 30.6.89—\$3 749 010; levy received financial year ended 30.6.90—\$3 949 318.

3. Claim payments including journey accidents—\$3 941 643; claim payments excluding journey accidents—\$3 708 000; (claims incurred for 'supermarkets' to 30.6.90).

4. Outstanding estimates including journey claims—\$2 996 469; outstanding estimates excluding journey claims—\$2 736 174; (claims incurred for 'supermarkets' to 30.6.90).

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE

18. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of the motor vehicle registered UQU 364 carrying out at about 10.55 a.m. on Friday 8 June 1990 in Jeffcott Street, North Adelaide?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This vehicle is registered in the name of the South Australian Housing Trust. On 8 June 1990, the Clerk of Works (attached to the Small Contracts and Land Supply Section) left the trust office situated at the Riverside complex, North Terrace, Adelaide, and it was his intention to proceed on a direct route to West Street, Brompton, for the purpose of carrying out a site inspection at that address. From there, he was to proceed to Croydon Park and Woodville for the same purpose.

He was obliged to travel along Jeffcott Street, North Adelaide, and in doing so he elected to stop the vehicle and carry on a brief conversation with a person known to him. Following that conversation, he then proceeded to the locations previously mentioned. The driver concerned did not deviate from his intended route and I am given to understand that only a very short time elapsed during the said conversation. Notwithstanding that, the officer has been

cautioned and made aware of his responsibilities—inasmuch as he should, at all times, proceed directly to the work site.

PHARMACEUTICAL FEES

29. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: What is the estimate of the 1990-91 revenue from 'Fees for Services and Pharmaceuticals Provided to Medicare Patients at Recognised Hospitals' announced in the *Government Gazette* of 28 June (pp. 1742-1743) and what were the actual amounts in each of the years 1987-88 and 1989-90?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reply is as follows:
Fees for Services and Pharmaceuticals Provided to Medicare Patients at Recognised Hospitals

	Actual Receipts			Est. Receipts 1990-91 \$
	1987-88 \$	1988-89 \$	1989-90 \$	
Ordinary private patients	31 761 937	33 525 108	33 003 822	33 779 805
Same day ordinary private patients	862 158	1 066 322	1 169 825	1 287 324
	32 624 095	34 591 430	34 173 647	35 067 129
Long stay acute patients	571 566	852 825	724 979	1 058 708
Pharmaceuticals	481 725	454 037	456 973	497 800
Totals	33 677 386	35 898 292	35 355 599	36 623 637

ETSA REVENUE

43. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the estimate of revenue from fees payable between 1 July and 30 November 1990 under the Electrical Articles and Materials Act, and what were the actual amounts in 1982-83 and 1989-90?

2. What is the estimate of revenue from administrative and testing fees payable to ETSA from 1 December 1990 to 30 June 1991 under the Electrical Products Act, announced in the *Government Gazette* of 10 May (pp. 1315-1326)?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. Estimates from 1 July to 30 November 1990—\$6 980; 1982-83—not available; (1983-84—\$31 060); 1989-90—\$27 940.

2. Estimates from 1 December 1990 to 30 June 1991—\$25 700.

BOWEL CANCER TESTS

68. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the South Australian Health Commission checked all tests used widely to detect bowel cancer and, if so, have any of the tests revealed grossly inaccurate results and, if so, what are the reasons for the inaccuracies and what action has the commission taken to advise the medical profession?

2. What further action does the commission propose to take following statements by Professor Doe, President of the Gastroenterological Society of Australia, in the *Weekend Australian* of 30 June/1 July that tests available over the counter from chemists and used extensively by local councils and Rotary groups for mass community screening for

bowel cancer delivered a negative result in up to 50 per cent of those tested?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The efficacy of home testing kits for detection of bowel cancer is not subject to evaluation by State or Federal health authorities. Under the proposed Commonwealth Therapeutic Goods Act, there is no proposal for the evaluation of therapeutic devices such as these which are used for *in vitro* testing procedures, although there will be some controls over label claims, advertising, and the like. Further information on this issue can be obtained from the Information Officer of the Therapeutic Devices Branch of the Commonwealth Department of Community Services and Health.

Quality control on these tests is the normal responsibility of clinical experts, who have known for some time that chemical or guaiac tests, the normal test and commonly used in home testing, have a high negative test result in the presence of bowel pathology, including cancer. The medical community is well informed of that fact, and the medical literature on the subject includes a recent *Medical Journal of Australia* (16 July 1990) article.

2. There are several procedures available for detecting blood in bowel motions, which is the basis of tests used to detect bowel cancer. These range from laboratory-based tests such as the Detectacol test used at the IMVS and chemical or guaiac tests supplied by major manufacturers to other laboratories or medical practitioners, through to home testing kits which use a variety of chemical procedures, including modifications of the guaiac test. The joint statement of the Gastroenterological Society of Australia and the Royal Australasian College of Physicians related particularly to home-based tests and to the general issue of screening for colorectal cancer. There is general agreement within the medical profession and the community that home-based chemical kit tests are unreliable and misleading, and they are not supported by the South Australian Health Commission.

GOVERNMENT BUS

69. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What Government business was the bus registered UQW 676 being used for at Adelaide Oval on Saturday 23 June 1990, how many passengers is the bus licensed to carry and where did it come from, where was it going and who authorised its use?

2. Which department or authority does the bus belong to, why was there no visible means of identification on it and what are the rules and regulations concerning use of the bus, particularly on weekends and were there any complaints about intimidation of other drivers by the bus driver on Saturday 23 June?

3. When was the bus purchased and at what cost?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government registered bus UQW 676 transported a group of Pitjantjatjara lands students to see a game of league football at the Adelaide Oval. Each term two groups of 10 students each, visit Adelaide for two by two week blocks as part of the North-West Multi-Trades Preparation Course. Obviously, with students of this background, the course objectives are very much broader than other programs. As a means of introducing them to different social and recreational activities non-existent in their own lands, particularly over the weekend when formal course work is not in progress, a visit to a sporting fixture is a useful activity. The bus is licensed to carry 18 people.

The School of Aboriginal Education approved the use of the bus as a means of transporting the students while in Adelaide (which included the visit to the oval); their accommodation is at Rosewater.

2. The School of Aboriginal Education, Adelaide College of TAFE, Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education. It has not been a policy of the school to have identification markings on the bus. The School of Aboriginal Education approved the use of the bus as a means of transporting students on the course. It was driven by the course coordinator and the outing assisted in fulfilling course objectives. Organised activity over the weekend is particularly important with students of such a different cultural background. The School of Aboriginal Education has no knowledge of complaints relating to intimidatory behaviour by the bus driver on Saturday 23 June.

3. The bus was purchased on 6 November 1989 at a cost of \$36 800. Operating costs for the vehicle would therefore only be the salary for the driver, which would occur in any event, petrol and general wear and tear of the vehicle.

SUPERANNUATION AND LONG SERVICE LEAVE

77. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Treasurer:

1. Has the June 1987 estimate of 'about \$2 000 million' for all State superannuation schemes been revised and, if so, what is the new estimate and, if not, why not and when will further progress be made to more precisely identify the liability?

2. Has the estimate of 'about \$400 to \$500 million for long service leave' been revised following the Auditor's comments and, if so, what is the new estimate and, if not, why not and when will further progress be made to more precisely identify the liability?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. A revised estimate of the State's aggregate gross superannuation liability as at June 1990 is \$4.5 billion. Of this, \$2 billion is the estimated liability for the 'Public Sector Industry Superannuation Scheme' (that is, the 3 per cent productivity benefit). Total assets of the State's superannuation schemes are approximately \$1.1 billion at June 1990, resulting in an estimated net liability of \$3.4 billion for the State's aggregate superannuation schemes.

2. No official, more recent estimate of the State's long service leave liabilities are available at present. The Treasury Department, in close consultation with the Auditor-General's Department, is giving priority to the development of improved and more regular and up-to-date reporting of the State's superannuation and long service leave liabilities. Reform is expected to be seen in the State's budget papers for 1991-92.

PUBLIC SERVICE LEAVE TRENDS

80. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Treasurer: What action has the Government taken in response to comments in the 1989 Auditor-General's Report (p. xvii) relating to 'systems to be in place so that management has prompt and reliable information available to regularly monitor leave trends' and that 'further emphasis may need to be given to the questions of sick leave obligations and to the adequacy of regulatory requirements'?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All hospitals have been instructed by the South Australian Health Commission to update sick leave records. Some of these health institutions

already have computerised records whilst others are still in the process of transferring them from existing manual systems. Supervisory staff are required regularly to monitor records for any established patterns which may necessitate the counselling of employees. OCAR Services were engaged as consultants to train supervisors in the metropolitan hospitals in counselling techniques.

In 1988 five metropolitan hospitals were surveyed by the Health Commission. The staff groups under review included: catering, cleaning, nursing, porters and orderlies. These five hospitals are now providing the South Australian Health Commission with the figures for sick leave absenteeism for the years 1988-89 and 1989-90.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION

85. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: Has the task force appointed to examine the opportunity to improve performance of the Corporate Services Division of the South Australian Health Commission completed its report and, if so, will the Minister make available a copy of the report to the Opposition?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The task force has recently completed its report and a copy will be made available to the Leader of the Opposition.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE

89. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, representing the Minister of Tourism: What was the operating deficit of the Adelaide Convention Centre in 1989-90, what was the Government's contribution towards meeting this deficit, and what is the estimated contribution to meeting the deficit in 1990-91?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reply is as follows:
ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE

<i>Operating Deficit 1989-90</i>	(\$'000)
Convention Operations	4 292
Common Areas	1 549
<i>Government Contribution 1989-90</i>	
Convention Operations	3 580
Common Areas	1 551
<i>Estimated Government Contribution 1990-91</i>	
Convention Operations	3 414
Common Areas	1 751

TEACHER STAFFING FORMULA

96. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education:

1. What was the outcome of the working party appointed last year to consider and approve a clear and precise definition of instruction time for teachers in Government schools?

2. Has a monitoring process been put in place for the 1990 academic year to permit the monitoring of average instruction time for teachers in individual schools and, if so, what progress has been made in ensuring non-instruction time is no greater than the allowance implied in the staffing formula?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. Included in the staffing package forwarded to schools in 1989 for the 1990 school year was a definition of instruction time. A modified definition will be included in the 1990-91 human resource package to take into account the

changing curriculum and the impact of the curriculum guarantee package.

2. The Senior Executive of the Education Department has agreed on a process to monitor the average instruction time for teachers in individual schools. A computer program has been developed to identify those schools that did not meet the implications of the staffing formulae. A list of schools that do not appear to meet the necessary standards will be forwarded to area directors as part of the monitoring and planning process. Area directors will take up the issue with individual schools as part of the school development plan.

RELIEF TEACHERS

97. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education: In view of the comments about the use of temporary relieving teachers in the 1989 Auditor-General's Report (pp. 57-58) and particularly his opinion that no new initiatives have been put in place during 1988-89 to contain costs, were any new initiatives put in place during 1989-90 to contain costs and, if so, what were they and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Education Department has developed a computerised budgeting system which allows direct comparison between work force entitlements and usage. The system is operational for permanent and contract teachers. The present phasing-in schedule will see temporary relieving teachers (TRT) being included for the beginning of 1991. The preparation of standard reports which will monitor TRT usage is in progress in readiness for implementation in 1991.

SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

99. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education: How many school enrolment audits were conducted during 1989-90 and how many schools were found to have overstated their enrolments?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The reply is as follows:

- (a) 313;
(b) 12.

FISHERIES REGULATIONS

110. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Fisheries: What is the estimate of the 1990-91 revenue from fees payable under regulation 19 of the Scheme of Management (Marine Scale Fishery) Regulations announced in the *Government Gazette* of 5 July (p. 224) and what were the actual amounts in each of the years 1984-85 to 1989-90?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The estimate of the 1990-91 revenue from fees payable under regulation 19 of the Scheme of Management (Marine Scale Fishery) Regulations announced in the *Government Gazette* of 5 July (p. 224) is \$115 594. Corresponding figures for previous years are:

1989-90	\$113 527
1988-89	\$104 060
1987-88	\$65 150
1986-87	\$67 440
1985-86	\$48 194
1984-85	\$43 924

111. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Fisheries: What is the estimate of the 1990-91 revenue from fees payable under regulation

12 of the Scheme of Management (Restricted Marine Scale Fishery) Regulations announced in the *Government Gazette* of 5 July (p. 225) and what were the actual amounts in each of the years 1984-85 to 1989-90?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The estimate of the 1990-91 revenue from fees payable under regulation 12 of the Scheme of Management (Restricted Marine Scale Fishery) Regulations announced in the *Government Gazette* of 5 July (p. 225) is \$15 772. Corresponding figures for previous years are:

1989-90	\$14 664
1988-89	\$14 715
1987-88	\$10 645
1986-87	\$11 496
1985-86	\$9 044
1984-85	\$7 781

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

121. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Are senior public servants with the classification EL3 now provided with unmarked Government motor vehicles and, if so:

- (a) is the use of the vehicles by these persons unrestricted, including during holidays;
- (b) can they take these vehicles interstate; and
- (c) what is the reason for these Government motor vehicles being unmarked and does this mean that the drivers are no longer accountable to the public?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Cabinet has approved the provisions of private-plated vehicles for business and private use to senior public servants classified at the EL3 level.

- (a) The vehicle can be used for all personal activities outside office hours but it is also to be made available for Government business during office hours. The vehicle is available to the officer assigned the vehicle whilst on leave with the cost being met by the department for periods of less than four weeks. A cost to the individual is involved for periods in excess of four weeks.
- (b) The vehicle may be taken interstate.
- (c) The provision of motor vehicles for private use has been part of remuneration packages available over a long period of time to senior executives in private industry. These provisions are also in existence in other State and Commonwealth Governments. Cabinet has recently agreed to include private use of motor vehicles in the remuneration package for senior executives employed by the Government and private plates are considered appropriate in these circumstances.

122. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of motor vehicle registered UQS 087 conducting at about 5 p.m. on Sunday 8 April 1990 in North Adelaide and who were the male and two female passengers?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Motor vehicle UQS 087 is registered to Glenside Hospital and was being used as part of the hospital's rehabilitation program. On Sunday 8 April 1990 the vehicle was being driven by a female enrolled nurse, who was taking a patient on trial leave to her premises in Ovingham. The patient's children were accompanying the enrolled nurse and the patient on this trip.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

136. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services: How many police officers are employed by the South Australian Police Department and of those officers:

- (a) how many are employed as mechanics;
- (b) how many are employed as band members;
- (c) how many are employed in an administrative capacity at 1 Angas Street and what types of duties do they perform;
- (d) how many are employed in other buildings on Angas Street and what types of duties do they perform;
- (e) how many are employed in an administrative capacity at 'Tara Hall' and what types of duties do they perform;
- (f) how many are employed in an administrative capacity in the Citicorp Building and what types of duties do they perform;
- (g) how many are employed in an administrative capacity at the Fort Largs Police Academy and what types of duties do they perform; and
- (h) how many are employed in an administrative capacity at the Thebarton Barracks and what types of duties do they perform?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows: As at 31 July 1990, 3 416 police officers were employed by the Police Department, and of those officers:

- (a) 18 were employed as mechanics;
- (b) 35 were in the band;
- (c) 79 within Central Police Headquarters were employed in an administrative capacity. They consisted of 19 commissioned officers and 60 other ranks. Their duties included management of the different units covering CIB and associated support services, technical services, Adelaide patrol force, prosecution services, staffing of the Communications Centre and maintenance of central records systems;
- (d) 16 in the Mitchell Building, consisting of the staff of personnel services involved in the management of police human resources including recruiting personnel, transfers and deployment of members, promotions, career planning and counselling and maintenance of police personnel records;
- (e) 21 at Police Headquarters (Tara Hall) including the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and four Assistant Commissioners forming executive management of the Police Force, staff officers to the Commissioners and members of the Research and Development Group involved in the formulation of departmental management policies and the provision of legal services.
- (f) 41 within the Citicorp Building comprising (1) management and staff of Community Affairs Branch providing public relations functions such as crime prevention services and multicultural services, including administration of the Aboriginal Police Aides Schemes; and (2) management and staff of organisational services responsible for the administrative planning and implementation to promote effective management of departmental resources;
- (g) 13 at the Police Academy involved in the management and administration of, and planning and development support to, the various training units based at the academy;

and

(h) 26 at Thebarton Barracks comprising commissioned officers and others involved in operational and operational support units based at that location. The above figure includes five staff of the Traffic Intelligence Centre providing intelligence to enable the effective deployment of police traffic resources.

It should be understood that all the above personnel are sworn members of the Police Force and are liable to work in 'operational' situations if and when required. In fact, many have been used in times of emergencies and special operations such as the Australian Grand Prix, Royal Visits, Papal Visit and anti-uranium demonstrations.

Many of the above members work in and with the community on a regular basis. Although not required for direct response to the public's needs in an operational sense, they nevertheless are closely linked to the department's operational responsibility.

WORKER REHABILITATION

141. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

1. What are the guidelines established between WorkCover and rehabilitation units in the programs set out for the rehabilitation of injured workers?

2. Are the wages/salaries of injured workers reduced 20 per cent after 12 months on WorkCover and, if not, why not and how many cases are there where reductions have not occurred?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

1. WorkCover, through its Rehabilitation Department, is responsible for the provision of rehabilitation programs to the injured worker. It does this through commercial contracts with specialist rehabilitation organisations which manage and coordinate individual rehabilitation programs for workers. These organisations (contracted rehabilitation providers) deliver vocational rehabilitation services to injured workers within the framework of a practical rehabilitation model which has been developed and approved by WorkCover. This vocational rehabilitation model is unique in Australia and provides a system based on job placement. The key aspects of the model are as follows:

It uses the Australian standard classification of occupations which was developed by the Commonwealth Department of Education, Employment and Training and the Australian Bureau of Statistics to match a worker's assessed employment capacities objectively against the known demands of 1 870 Australian occupations to identify new jobs which injured workers are realistically capable of performing.

It ensures that any barriers to returning an injured worker to work are identified and dealt with as they occur, by ensuring a high level of knowledge on the part of the employer, injured worker, treating medical experts and others of all relevant information regarding the injury and return to work prospects.

It ensures that the task of incorporating all necessary information to achieve a return to work outcome is undertaken in a structured and efficient manner by clearly assigning responsibility for coordination to the WorkCover contracted rehabilitation provider.

The WorkCover model identifies a series of ways of getting injured workers back to work. These are:

return to full pre-injury duties;

return to alternative permanent duties with pre-injury employer;

return to new job with new employer through job seeking assistance;

return to new job following retraining.

These return to work options are in order of priority, and each successive strategy will only be attempted where it has been clearly established that the previous strategy cannot reasonably be expected to achieve a return to work.

The system encourages employers and workers to work together to identify ways of getting the injured worker back to the workplace, including:

job modification;

graduated return to work;

work hardening;

involvement of supervisors and other key workplace personnel in identifying return to work options.

It is only where the rigorous application of vocational rehabilitation services has failed to get the worker back to work that WorkCover will shift the emphasis of a rehabilitation program to that of helping the injured worker to live an active life in the community in a non-employment context.

WorkCover, through its rehabilitation advisers, closely monitors the quality of work done by contracted rehabilitation providers, and renewal of contracts with WorkCover is contingent upon the achievement of an appropriate standard of work.

This monitoring covers all aspects of the work carried out by contracted rehabilitation providers, including:

the adequacy of training provided by contracted provider management to their staff;

the efficient management of rehabilitation programs so that workers are returned to work in a cost effective and equitable way;

the maintenance of adequate file records and the use of clear and explicit program plans which form a clear record of how the goals of rehabilitation programs are to be achieved, who will carry out the work to achieve the goals and time frame in which that work will be carried out;

ensuring that the activities of everybody involved in the rehabilitation process are planned and complementary; appropriate, prompt and effective use is made of all relevant community resources;

contracted rehabilitation providers must be seen to actively involve employers and other key players in designing and carrying out return to work programs for injured workers in an ongoing way which involves regular consultation from the date of injury to the effective return to work of the worker.

Making sure that everybody knows what is going on and agreeing on how best to get the injured worker back to work is the central idea in WorkCover rehabilitation approach. It is only by working in this way that the substantial problems experienced under the old adversarial system will be avoided.

WorkCover is currently engaged in carrying out a review into the operation of its rehabilitation approach. This review involves a high degree of community involvement, and it is envisaged that through open consultation with all those affected by WorkCover rehabilitation (but in particular employers, unions, doctors and service providers) the opportunity will be provided to refine and improve aspects of the way in which this important work is done. WorkCover is committed to making whatever changes and modifications to its rehabilitation systems are necessary to achieve

the goal of getting injured workers safely back to work in a cost effective way.

2. Where a worker suffering a compensable disability is incapacitated for 12 months, the amount of weekly payments is reduced to 80 per cent of the worker's notional weekly earnings. Forty-three cases have been identified where the reduction had not occurred. These cases are all currently being actioned, to ensure weekly payments are made in accordance with the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986.

WORKCOVER

142. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: What is the length of time taken by WorkCover to respond to a claim and has that time been reduced or extended in the past three months and in either case, why?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: For claims received for March 1990, 82 per cent were determined within 21 days. For June 1990, 66 per cent were determined within 21 days. The lower rate in more recent months is a reflection of WorkCover undertaking significant development and technical training for claims staff in the months of June/July 1990. Measures have been taken in July and August to ensure that the turnaround time for claims determinations continues to improve.

SAFETY COMMITTEE

143. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

1. What constitutes a safety committee in a factory?
2. If a safety consultant is appointed to a safety committee, why is that appointment not recognised by WorkCover and the Department of Labour?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:
 1. Section 31 of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986 provides for the establishment and constitution of a health and safety committee at the workplace. A health and safety committee must be established at a workplace, which has at least 20 employees, at the request of (a) a health and safety representative; (b) a prescribed number of employees.

The prescribed number of employees, set out in Regulation 4 of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare (General) Regulations, No. 252 of 1987, is five. Membership of the committee is determined by agreement between the employer, relevant health and safety representatives and interested employees. At least half the members of a committee must be employees.

2. Only persons who are employees at the workplace are eligible for appointment as employee representatives on a workplace health and safety committee. It follows that a consultant who is a member of a health and safety committee has been appointed to it by the employer and presumably at the employer's expense. Recognition of all members of health and safety committees is embodied in section 31 and in the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare (General) Regulations, No. 252 of 1987, of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986.

WORKCOVER

144. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

1. Have any allegations been received that WorkCover claims have been lost in the past 12 months and, if so, how many claims have been lost and why?

2. How many additional employees have been taken on by WorkCover in the past 12 months and what are their specific roles?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

1. 'Initial claim documents sent to WorkCover'

There were approximately 65 inquiries of allegations that initial claims documents have been lost over the previous 12 months.

Of these, approximately 30 were subsequently located on the claims system as: (a) name discrepancies between the document and computer record; (b) name difficulties due to illegible handwriting and cultural and nationality name differences.

Of the approximately 35 remaining, WorkCover was unable to locate the documents allegedly sent and had no record of receiving the documents. Copies of the claim documents were requested.

'Existing claims files of WorkCover'

There were approximately 11 existing claim files in the previous 12 months where allegations were received of the files being lost. WorkCover has approximately 55 000 current claim files and, with the various departments of the corporation which may require the claim file from time to time, there is the potential for files to be misplaced, misfiled or temporarily unable to be located.

2. For the period 1 July 1989 to 30 June 1990 there were an additional 182 employees taken on by the corporation.

Their specific roles are as follows:

Number of Employees	Specific Role
5	Internal audit of corporation activities
7	Recovery of transitional claims
57	Claims assessment and payment
3	Rehabilitation consulting/monitoring
10	Consulting on prevention programs
12	Injury management policy development and consulting to exempt employers
6	Conciliation on disputed decisions
1	Migrant Injury Management Officer
1	Employer Liaison Officer
1	Mining and Quarrying Committee support
7	Levy policy and review
24	Levy collection and administration
5	Personnel, payroll and training
1	Librarian
1	Amendments to legislation/policy review
5	Customer Service Officers
6	Internal consulting/strategic review
5	Statistical services/accounting support
7	Fraud prevention
15	Computing services
3	Review of disputed decisions
<hr/>	
182	

WORLD UNIVERSITY

148. Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide), on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What are the details of the expected links between overseas universities and the proposed World University and how will they differ from existing links available already between universities in Adelaide and other universities in the world?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The World University is a key part of the MFP project. It will provide the knowledge and skills base to underpin the technological advances that will be developed at the MFP. It will not become a fourth university offering traditional undergraduate courses and competing with existing Australian and South Australian universities. Instead, it is proposed that a consortium will be developed involving the three South Australian universities, and a range of other institutions and groups. In this way the World University will build on the existing strengths of tertiary institutions, and will act as a catalyst for shared resources, enhancing the role of the tertiary sector in South Australia.

This consortium of existing (and future) centres of educational and research excellence will blend together innovative work presently being undertaken in South Australian tertiary institutions and, under the banner of the World University consortium, located within the MFP, will provide a hub for researchers from throughout the world to cooperate together in new ventures. In this way we will be able to access a much wider and larger network of research institutions than would be the case if each of the tertiary institutions unilaterally, or severally, sought them out. The working party on the World University consortium is examining processes to enhance linkages with major Australian and overseas institutions, but has not, as yet, developed the details sought in the question.

GRAND PRIX

150. **Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide)**, on notice, asked the Premier: What was the dollar value of tickets purchased on the actual Sunday of the Grand Prix events in each year from 1985 to 1989?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

Year	No.	\$
1985	495	54 965
1986	3 913	103 175
1987	7 267	197 551
1988	10 973	305 627
1989	11 308	397 436

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FIRE BRIGADE

152. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. How many false call outs were attended by the South Australian Fire Brigade in 1989-90?

2. What can be done to reduce the incidence of false call outs?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. In relation to false call outs from automatic fire alarms installed in premises and connected to the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, the following were attended in 1989-90:

Automatic Sprinkler Faults	520
Thermal/Smoke Alarm Faults	2 423
Total	2 943

In 1988-89 the total was 3 217.

Therefore, a reduction of 9.3 per cent was achieved in 1989-90.

2. Since January 1989, the SAMFS has required a device called Alarm Verification Facility to be installed on all new smoke and thermal fire alarms. The purpose of the alarm

verification facility (AVF) is to allow the alarm system to be automatically reset once to check that the alarm is other than a faulty signal. If the alarm is activated again within 120-300 seconds of the original signal, the Fire Service is alerted to respond. The initiative by the SAMFS in having the AVF installed on all new fire alarms connected to the fire service and on previously existing fire alarms which have created frequent false alarms, is a positive step in reducing unnecessary false calls from automatic fire alarms.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

153. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Why were there only two passengers on the bus registered UQW 676 at Adelaide Oval on Saturday 23 June 1990 and what was the full cost of the use of the bus for that day?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: See answer to Question on Notice No. 69.

154. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of the motor vehicle registered UQX 056 carrying out on Sunday 29 July 1990 at 2 p.m. in Fullarton Road, Rose Park, and who was the female passenger in the car?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The vehicle is allocated to ETSA's Manager Residential Marketing who was driving to his place of work to attend to a backlog of work. He was doing so of his own volition and without pay which is verified by reference to the security system.

The passenger was the manager's partner who attended with him rather than remain at home for the afternoon. However, as a matter of policy within ETSA, transport of private individuals is not allowed, except in extraordinary cases (that is, husband and wife travelling from Leigh Creek to Adelaide). The officer concerned has been reminded of the policy and counselled accordingly.

WORKCOVER

155. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

1. Why does WorkCover pay compensation fortnightly in arrears?

2. Why is it that for a payment due on the 10th of the month, a cheque is drawn on the 13th, posted on the 15th and might not be received until a week after the due date, and why cannot WorkCover pay employees on the due date?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The reply is as follows:

1. The payment of weekly benefits continues in the same manner as the worker had been receiving prior to the disability. Accordingly, weekly benefits are paid in arrears to maintain this payment cycle. We believe this approach is consistent with the current wage payment practices of employers, which is to pay workers at the end of the pay period.

2. Generally, payment of weekly benefits is processed four days prior to the due date. This allows a built in time factor for payment authorisation and postage. Instances may occur where weekly benefits may be delayed pending clarification that a worker's incapacity for work is continuing.

MATRICULATION AND ADULT RE-ENTRY COURSES

156. Mr MATTHEW (Bright), on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education:

1. At which TAFE colleges will year 12 courses be offered in 1991 and what subject ranges will be offered at each college?
2. Which TAFE colleges offering year 12 courses in 1990 will cease to offer them in 1991?
3. Which Education Department schools will be offering adult re-entry education to compensate for the loss of matriculation courses at each TAFE college?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The reply is as follows:

1. Year 12 courses will be offered at Kensington Park, Adelaide, Kingston, Port Adelaide and Elizabeth in 1991 and current planning assumes the same range of subjects as 1990.
2. Panorama College of TAFE offering year 12 courses in 1990 will cease to offer them in 1991.
3. A network of senior colleges or senior campuses on 8-12 school sites will be established during 1991. Senior colleges will provide an adult-style delivery much as is presently done by TAFE colleges and will have entirely adult enrolments or years 11 and 12 and adults. Senior campuses will be located in years 8-12 schools but will deliver a separate adult-style delivery.

The proposed network is:

Senior Colleges	Senior Campuses
Elizabeth West	Hamilton
Edward John Eyre	Christies Beach
Thebarton	Le Fevre
Marden	possibly Thorndon

The transfer will be prepared during 1991 and effected as from 1992.

RECYCLED PAPER

159. Mrs KOTZ (Newland), on notice, asked the Premier: In relation to the recent changeover of stationery to recycled paper in Government departments—

- (a) what was the cost of the new stationery;
- (b) what other costs were involved in the change;
- (c) what amount of existing stationery was discarded;
- (d) was any attempt made to recycle this stationery and, if so, how was this done and, if not, why not; and
- (e) have all departments changed over to recycled paper and, if not, which ones have not and why not and will they change over soon and, if so, at what cost?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There has been no directive to Government agencies to change over stationery stocks to use recycled paper. State Supply has recently made recycled paper available as a contract item. However, the decision as to the future use of recycled products rests with individual managers. Two important factors need to be taken into account by managers. 100 per cent recycled paper is between 20 per cent and 60 per cent more expensive than standard paper, and recycled products are not always suitable for use in certain stationery items. Officers of State Supply and State Print are available to advise agencies of the latest recycled products available and the cost impact of the changeover to these products.

MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION

162. Mrs KOTZ (Newland), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to the introduction of a new computer system into the Motor Registration Division—

- (a) what is the cost of this system to date;
- (b) why were the workload specifications underestimated and who was responsible for estimating specifications for workload;
- (c) what is the current situation within the division with regard to effectiveness of the computer system; and
- (d) what is the current location of the new computer as opposed to the back-up computer?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The reply is as follows:

- (a) \$2.214 million as at 30 June 1990.
- (b) The estimated capacity required was based on the best available information at the time. The estimate was prepared by the drivers project team.
- (c) The computer is effective. Motor Registration is now able to provide an efficient service balanced to the demands of the public.
- (d) The Motor Registration computer is back with Motor Registration after having its capacity increased. The Justice Information System (JIS) computer is in the JIS computer centre.

AMDEL

163. Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Minister of Lands: Was a contract signed with Amdel for the purchase of Lands Department property on West Thebarton Road and, if so—

- (a) was the price in excess of \$410 000;
- (b) has the contract been repudiated by Amdel because a pug hole previously existed on the site and, if so, what reasons did Amdel give for not taking the pug hole into account before entering into the contract; and
- (c) has a new contract been negotiated with Amdel at a price lower than \$250 000 or is one being negotiated and, if so, prior to renegotiation, were the other offers on the property reviewed in order to obtain the best price available?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The reply is as follows:

- (a) Following the passing in of the property at auction, offers were made to the department's agent, who recommended Amdel's offer having regard to price and settlement time. In March 1989 an option to purchase, not a contract, was signed and the purchase price agreed to was \$428 000.
- (b) The option to purchase was renegotiated after soil testing carried out by Amdel revealed the site to be filled. It was not known by this department, the vendor or agent that the site was filled until the results of the soil test carried out by Amdel became available.
- (c) The cost of restoration of the site to enable suitable development was determined by consultants to Amdel at \$183 000. This was verified independently by the Department of Lands. A contract has now been negotiated with Amdel Ltd at a price of \$245 000. The other interested parties were not approached with a view to submitting revised offers. Those parties which were still interested and followed up with further inquiries were advised that it had been ascertained that

the site was filled and that an option to purchase was still in place. On finding that the land was filled, these parties were reluctant to pursue the matter, even to the extent of submitting a revised offer.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE

165. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of the motor vehicle registered UQT 837 carrying out that necessitated the driver's presence at a residential property auction in Gover Street, North Adelaide on the morning of Friday 17 August 1990, and why was the vehicle left unattended in a 'no parking' area with the hazard lights flashing?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Government vehicle UQT 837 is a vehicle permanently allocated to the Valuer-General's office. The Valuer-General provides annual valuations for rating and taxing purposes based on the most recent and relevant sales information on all types of properties. Valuation staff from his division are therefore required to attend auctions and open inspections to keep up to date with the latest sales information. On Friday 17 August 1990, an officer from his division attended the auction in Gover Street, North Adelaide, as part of his normal duties. However, the vehicle used (UQT 837) should not have been left in a 'no parking' area and, as a result, the officer has been suitably reprimanded.

HOSPITAL BED NUMBERS

168. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: How many public and private hospital beds are there which comprise the respective totals of 834 and 549 beds in each of the southern and south-western suburban hospitals?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In the Minister of Health's reply to the member for Mitchell on 16 August 1990, the word 'public' after the figure of 834 was omitted in the sentence, 'They are made up of 834 (public) and 549 private hospital beds.' The figure of 549 private beds includes Ashford Community Hospital in the Southern Planning Area, as the hospital draws the majority of its patients from the south.

VANDALISM

171. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What was the total cost of rectifying vandalism to STA vehicles, bus stops, tram stops and train stations including labour, equipment and materials for the periods 1 January to 30 June 1989, 1 July to 31 December 1989 and 1 January to 30 June 1990 and how many personnel were employed as transit police, including both STA and police employees during the periods?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Early in 1989, the STA began establishing an accounting system to record costs involved in rectifying vandalism. However, the account did not include cleaning and painting costs formerly part of normal maintenance activities which would not have to be undertaken so regularly if graffiti did not occur. Therefore, action has been taken recently to record the cost of all maintenance needed because of graffiti attacks. In addition, capital expenditure on security projects, such as the instal-

lation of security fencing around depots, will be recorded. A full year's details will therefore be available in September 1991. In relation to Transit Police, for the periods mentioned, I advise as follows:

	SA Police	STA Special Constables
1 January to 30 June 1989	7	12
1 July to 31 December 1989	7	10
1 January to 30 June 1990	7	20

N.B. During May 1990 four Aboriginals were employed as special constables.

An additional four STA special constable positions have been advertised and selections will be made in the near future. In addition to the special constables, there are four security guards with two further positions currently advertised.

ON-THE-SPOT FINES

174. **Mr GUNN (Eyre)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services: How many on-the-spot infringement notices were issued by police officers in 1989-90; what was the increase, if any, over the previous year; and are there targets for revenue from expiation fees set by either the Government or the Police Department?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There was a total of 134 922 traffic infringement notices issued for the 1989-90 fiscal year which was an increase of 6 225 or 4.8 per cent over the total of 128 697 for the 1988-89 fiscal year. As part of formulating budget estimates, revenue is forecast based on the previous year's experience, fees proposed, and any changed traffic policing strategies. This is normal procedure, and a requirement of the Parliament to be informed of both expenditure and revenue estimates from all sources for the forthcoming year. This forms part of the budget documents tabled in the House by the Premier when introducing the State budget.

INTERSTATE LOTTERIES

175. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Treasurer:

1. Are the promoters of interstate lotteries permitted to advertise in South Australia and, if not, why not?
2. What action has been taken to prevent interstate promotion encroaching on the tight charity raffle dollar in South Australia and, if none, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Fundraising organisations in each State are encouraged to restrict such promotions within their own State boundaries. Negotiations between interstate authorities responsible for regulating the conduct of small lotteries have so far failed to reach common ground on which such restrictions can be enforced. Nevertheless, representations will continue to be made to ensure that the interests of charities in South Australia are not compromised.

RONALD McDONALD CHARITY LOTTERY

176. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Treasurer:

1. What action was taken against the *Advertiser* and the promoter of the Ronald McDonald Charity Lottery for not including the licence number, number of tickets to be sold

and where the lottery would be drawn in the advertisement which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 25 July 1990?

2. When was the lottery originally to be drawn and what were the net proceeds?

3. Which charities benefited from the lottery?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Although it is common practice for the promoters to include such information in advertisements for lotteries, there is no mandatory requirement under the Lottery Regulations for them to do so.

2. 22 July 1990. Details of the net proceeds are not yet available.

3. The Ronald McDonald's children's charities organisations.

SANFL PLAYER RETENTION LOTTERY

177. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Treasurer: What action was taken against the promoters and advertisers of the SANFL Player Retention Lottery which appeared in the advertisement on page 48 of the *News* of Wednesday 25 July 1990 for not including the lottery number, the number of tickets for sale, when the lottery closes, when it would be drawn and where?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Although it is common practice for the promoters to include such information in advertisements for lotteries, there is no mandatory requirement under the Lottery Regulations for them to do so.

SIDS DREAM LOTTERY

178. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice asked the Treasurer:

1. What action has been taken by the Small Lotteries Branch against the advertisers of the *Sunday Mail* SIDS Dream Lottery for not including the number of tickets to be sold in the lottery advertised in the *Sunday Mail* of 18 August 1990 and, if none, why not?

2. What was the total value of prizes available?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Although it is common practice for the promoters to include such information in advertisements for lotteries, there is no mandatory requirement under the Lottery Regulations for them to do so.

2. \$48 200.

TOYOTA TWINS 2 CAR LOTTERY

179. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Treasurer:

1. What action has been taken by the Small Lotteries Department against the organisation that advertised Toyota Twins 2 Car Lottery in the *News* of Monday 23 July 1990 which was to be drawn on Friday 27 July and omitted to state the name of the promoter and/or charity/organisation benefiting from the proceeds, the lottery licence number, the number of tickets, the prize value and the closing date?

2. Why were tickets sold in the final week before the draw?

3. Who organised the lottery, when did it commence and who received the proceeds?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Although it is common practice for the promoters to include such information in advertisements for lotteries,

there is no mandatory requirement under the Lottery Regulations for them to do so.

2. Ticket sales to that time were very poor. Rather than see the beneficiary suffer it was decided to give the promoters the opportunity to sell tickets at the Central Market during the week leading up to the date of the draw. Permission was given subject to the promoters undertaking to monitor closely all ticket sales.

3. IQ Promotions on behalf of the Australian Kidney Foundation. The lottery commenced on 16 April 1990 and the proceeds went to the Australian Kidney Foundation.

QUEEN VICTORIA HOSPITAL

180. **Mrs KOTZ (Newland)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health:

1. Will the new Queen Victoria Hospital building have rooms with a 'baby room' providing space essential for multiple births and so that babies requiring phototherapy can stay with their mother and, if not, has an alternative location been provided and, if so, does it provide for mothers to be accommodated with their babies during phototherapy?

2. Will accommodation be provided for private hospital patients transferred because their babies need special care?

3. Will the new building provide improved facilities in the high risk child birth area so that mothers of babies requiring intensive care do not have to share accommodation with mothers of healthy, full-term babies?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The proposed bedrooms can be used for multiple births. If necessary, the second bed in a two-bed room can be removed to provide additional space. The bedrooms will not have a set area for the baby. In comparison with existing bedrooms, the rooms will have greater usable patient space, providing a more flexible arrangement for the baby's care and the mother's comfort. Babies requiring phototherapy can be accommodated within the mother's bedroom.

2. Yes, this presently is the policy and there are no plans for this to change.

3. Both mother and child will experience improved facilities. The increased proportion of single rooms will enable the mother of a baby requiring intensive care to have privacy if this is necessary. The planned intensive care for neonates provides, by comparison with existing facilities, additional space and greatly improved technical facilities.

HOSPITAL STAFF

181. **Mrs KOTZ (Newland)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: How many staff have been made redundant at Adelaide Children's Hospital and at Queen Victoria Hospital as a result of amalgamation?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No staff at the Adelaide Children's Hospital or Queen Victoria Hospital have been made redundant as a result of amalgamation.

182. **Mrs KOTZ (Newland)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: How many personnel from Adelaide Children's Hospital and Queen Victoria Hospital, respectively, have had overseas trips to view similar hospitals in relation to amalgamation; what costs were involved and are any more trips planned; and, if so, what are the estimated costs?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: To date, two persons have travelled overseas to view similar hospitals in relation to amalgamation. In 1987 Mr P.A. Sheedy, then Chief Executive Officer at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and Mr G. Sam, then Chief Executive Officer at the Queen Victoria Hospital, travelled to Buffalo and to Kapiolai, Hawaii, USA, to view hospitals which had been formed from the amalgamation of women's and children's hospitals treating both women and children. Our records show that the total cost of the trip was:

	\$
Airfares and accommodation	10 534
Incidentals additional expenses	3 371
	13 905

These costs were paid for from the hospital's capital funds and did not involve public sector funding. The board of the AMCWC has agreed that it would be appropriate for the Chief Executive Officer and Project Director to visit these hospitals at an agreed time. However, no submission for such a trip has been prepared as yet for the board's consideration.

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLE

183. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of the motor vehicle registered UQU 140 engaged in on Friday 17 August 1990 between 2.45 p.m. and 3.15 p.m. in Harry's carpark, Mile End?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Government vehicle number UQU 140 is registered to the Electricity Trust of South Australia and is allocated to their Substation Department. On the afternoon of Friday 17 August 1990, an ETSA officer was dispatched in this vehicle to Harry's hardware store at Mile End with a view to purchasing tools for normal maintenance work. This is standard practice for some ETSA departments.

STA TRANSIT POLICE

186. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many apprehensions have been made by STA Transit Police during each of the years 1987-88 to 1989-90 and of these how many were charged, how many were successfully prosecuted and, of those prosecuted, what sentences were handed down for each individual?

2. How many personnel were employed as STA Transit Police during each of the same years and of these personnel how many were officers seconded from the South Australian Police Force and how many were STA employees?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. During the periods indicated, the following apprehensions were made:

	Arrests	Reports	Total
1987-88	488	629	1 117
1988-89	307	360	667
1989-90	359	496	855
Total	1 154	1 485	2 639

The prosecutions for these apprehensions are conducted by the South Australian Police Department Prosecution Services, at the Adelaide Magistrates Court and each of the suburban courts. It is almost impossible to trace each apprehension through the various recording areas to determine which are actually charged, how many were successful, and what each sentence was.

2. The number of personnel employed at the STA Transit Squad is as follows:

	SA Police	STA Special Constables
1 January to 30 June 1989	7	12
1 July to 31 December 1989	7	10
1 January to 30 June 1990	7	20

N.B. During May 1990 four Aboriginals were employed as Special Constables.

An additional four STA Special Constable positions have been advertised and selections will be made in the near future.

In addition to the Special Constables there are four Security Guards with two further positions currently advertised.

SOUTHERN WOMEN'S HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CENTRE

188. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Minister issued instructions to the Women's Health and Community Centre at Christies Beach that it is not permitted to assist men in any capacity?

2. Has the Attorney-General's Department lodged a complaint that a male was refused JP services at the Centre?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. No such instructions have been issued. The Southern Women's Health and Community Centre provides primary health care to women in the southern area. Services are not provided to men in their own right, although men sometimes attend the centre with their partners for consultations.

2. The centre has received a letter from the Attorney-General's Department informing it of a complaint made by a man who was refused access to a JP. The letter asked that the centre bring the matter to the attention of any JPs on staff 'with particular attention to the fact that justices of the peace are appointed on the understanding that they are willing to serve all members of the community without discrimination'. This incident apparently arose from a misunderstanding at the reception desk. The person making the request entered the centre in error, as he had in fact been directed to a nearby Legal Aid Office. The matter has been clarified within the centre, and the justice of the peace in question is available to provide assistance to all members of the community.