

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 October 1991

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

**GOODS SECURITIES (HIGHWAYS FUND)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Clean Air (Open Air Burning) Amendment,  
Holidays (Labour Day) Amendment.

**DEATH OF THE HON. JOYCE STEELE**

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)**: I move:

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of the Hon. Joyce Steele, former member of the House of Assembly and Minister of the Crown, and places on record its appreciation of her meritorious service and that, as a mark of respect to her memory, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

During the brief period in which the House has not been sitting, we heard of the passing of Mrs Joyce Steele, and it is most appropriate on this first occasion of the sitting of the House to pay a tribute to her life and service as a member of Parliament and as a member of our South Australian community.

Mrs Steele entered the House of Assembly as member for Burnside in the 1959 State election. The significance of that was that, in doing so, she became the first female member elected to the House of Assembly in South Australia's parliamentary history. It is some cause for question as to why, having had the vote since 1894, it took so long for a female to be elected to the House of Assembly, there being a number of women over that time actively involved in the political process, and obviously opportunities may have arisen.

In fact, it took the election of Mrs Steele and at the same time to the Legislative Council the Hon. Jessie Cooper before that milestone was achieved. For that, if for no other reason, Mrs Steele certainly marked herself as an important historical figure in the parliamentary and political history of this State. She held that seat until the redistribution of 1970 and was the first member for Davenport in the ensuing Parliament, retiring at that election.

She did not simply occupy her place in this House as a backbench member or a representative of her district but was extremely prominent in her Party, first as Opposition Whip for two years prior to the 1968 accession to office of the Steele Hall Government, in which she then became Minister of Education, a position she held for two years. This was followed by a short stint as Minister for Social Welfare, Aboriginal Affairs and Housing. Again, somewhat more significantly than the occupancy of those portfolios would suggest, she was the first female to hold ministerial

office in this State, and she thus achieved yet another very important milestone.

As well as her parliamentary service and career, Mrs Steele was also extremely active in the community. In fact, she was awarded an OBE in 1981 for her services, particularly to the deaf. She was always concerned with disability and opportunity for those with disabilities. She was co-founder and President of the South Australian Oral School for Deaf Children for 22 years, a Vice President of the Phoenix Society and a President of the Australia Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled, a very important aspect of her life and community work. Among other achievements, she was the first woman radio announcer in South Australia—for the ABC, I understand—and was also the first woman member of the Council of the Institute of Technology. So, her very activity and her success in it led to some trail blazing and to some specific achievements in those areas.

Having drawn particular attention to Mrs Steele's gender and her achievements on behalf of that gender, I think it is fair to say that at no time did she see that as the reason for her eminence or success in various fields, and I do not think there is any question that her success was very much due to her own qualities and abilities. She did not like to be called a feminist and did not identify herself particularly in that vein; in fact, she probably disliked feminists as much as she disliked male chauvinists. Her personal interests and professional life showed a very strong interest in all aspects of the community. I had occasion to know Mrs Steele and speak with her on a number of issues, largely community issues, at a time when she had ceased to be a member of Parliament and active in the political processes, and I always found her very good to deal with, very capable and also very rigorous in pursuing causes. I noted also that she was extremely broad-minded in her approach.

She was reported in one article as saying in relation to me that I impressed her as I faced up to the tough job because I looked and dressed like a Premier. I am delighted to have had Mrs Steele's endorsement of my dressing with sartorial elegance and I would certainly very much like to return the compliment to her. I always found her very good to deal with as somebody whose whole efforts were devoted to ensuring that she remained active and in service. For that, I think our community should be very grateful indeed, and so should our Parliament. I would like to pass on our respects, particularly to her family.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**: I support the remarks made by the Premier and I must say that today we honour a true pioneer of this Parliament. In the first 102 years of responsible government of this State, no woman was elected to Parliament. In the 32 years since then, 13 have taken their seats in this House and in the other place. The pioneering path was beaten by the Hon. Joyce Steele. As the Premier has said, she was elected to the House in 1959 with the Hon. Jessie Cooper in another place. I believe that theirs was not an easy path to tread in those days. There was much prejudice around, although some of it was not ill-meant.

In the recently published Playford biography, Stewart Cockburn described how Sir Thomas Playford greeted Joyce Steele with 'Hello girly' on her first day in this House. I guess that that would not go down very well today with some members. On the same day, Mrs Joyce Steele had lunch with the Chairman of the Liberal Party. She described that occasion as follows:

I enjoyed that lunch, and after finishing I said, 'Thank you very much.' Pointing to the cashier's desk he said 'Pay over there.'

That action made me feel on terms of absolute equality, and that is how I felt all the time I have been here.

Mrs Steele very quickly endeared herself to all her colleagues. Again referring to Stewart Cockburn's book, he mentions the response by Mrs Steele to a toast proposed by Playford to the class of 1959. As Mr Cockburn has recalled:

She did not, she began, wish her colleagues to think she was totally unfamiliar with their new environment. After all, during her work for good causes in the community she had visited and become familiar with the conditions in many homes for old men. She paused; one of her male colleagues called out, 'She'll do. She'll do.'

Before her election to Parliament, as the Premier has said, she was very active in the community. He has pointed out that she was involved in the South Australian Oral School since 1946, she was President of the Australian Council for Rehabilitation for the Disabled since 1957 and, of course, was the first woman announcer of the ABC in South Australia. She was elected Opposition Whip in 1966 and became the first woman to hold an elected parliamentary position in our State. She was only the third woman in Australia's history to hold ministerial rank.

In her patient and well-mannered way she helped to break down prejudice. As a member of Parliament, she was a constant force for progress, gaining the admiration of members on both sides of the House. In her wake, the Liberal, Labor and Democrat Parties have all elected women to sit in this place. I believe that has been a great success and that they have been able to further break down those prejudices that some of us would have had. As a result, this Parliament is much the better for the service of Joyce Steele. While we mourn her passing and express sincere condolences to her son and daughter, we also express appreciation for a contribution that will live long in the history of this Parliament.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I stand to recall the very good times, the very friendly times that I and so many other members of the parliamentary fraternity had with the late Joyce Steele. I believe it to be a great honour to have been invited by her family to deliver the eulogy at her funeral service on Monday last week. On that occasion it was possible to outline a number of the firsts in which Joyce had been involved. One first that has not been referred to today is that she was the first Whip when the position of whip became a paid office of this Parliament. In the newspaper reports of that event she was dubbed 'Mrs Whippy', and a number of her constituents gave her a whip, which she hung on her office door so that her friends would know where she could be found.

I represent her son, Chris, who lives at Willaston in my electorate. Her daughter Jane is resident with her husband and family in Canberra. Her remaining sister, Pat, is in the home territory of Western Australia. Joyce was an import to South Australia. She came here with her husband, who had been particularly involved with Sir Sidney Kidman in a number of his earlier stations throughout the outback of Western Australia. Joyce Steele was a person whom many of us can remember with much affection, and I add my thoughts in that respect at this important time.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I support the comments of the Premier, the Leader and the member for Light. When I was first elected as member for Bragg, the Hon. Joyce Steele was one of the first persons to congratulate me and give me advice over many years on how I should look after my constituents and carry out my responsibilities as the member for Bragg. The Hon. Joyce Steele often met me in the street and reminded me that I was tending to waiver a little

on some of the traditional values that she believed in, especially concerning the family.

The Hon. Joyce Steele argued very strongly to me, and also in this Parliament, about the great necessity for the family to be recognised as the principal foundation and building block in our society. That was the issue about which she was most concerned until the end of her days. Certainly, the Hon. Joyce Steele was an important community worker in respect of the Burnside area. Not only was she involved as co-founder and President of the South Australian Oral School for deaf children but she was also a Vice-President of the Phoenix Society.

The Hon. Joyce Steele spent many years as President of the Australian Council for Rehabilitation of the Disabled and she spent many hours in the Burnside area and throughout the metropolitan area looking after the concerns of young people who were disabled. She was a great lover of music and spent many hours fund-raising for the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra and looking after the needs of young musicians both in our suburb and throughout Adelaide.

Both the Premier and the Leader have mentioned that the Hon. Joyce Steele was the first woman member in this House. Of her 13 years here, she spent many hours arguing the point and highlighting the advantage for women as to their representation within Parliament. She was the first member for Burnside and then, in her last three years in this place, was the first member for Davenport. I now represent both those areas in different ways because, as members know, boundaries have changed significantly, but the Hon. Joyce Steele spent all her political life principally representing the district that I now represent. She is well remembered in my district and constituents have asked me on their behalf to pass on their condolences, in addition to my own condolences, to her family.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services):** I cannot comment on the political contribution of the Hon. Joyce Steele: that is best left to the two previous speakers and any other members who knew of her political contribution. However, I do know of the contribution that she made to the South Australian Oral School, and I willingly pay a tribute to her work in that area.

Her pioneering efforts and consistently high levels of continuous work in that area were of a high degree of excellence and many hundreds of deaf children in this State received a much better start in life than if the Hon. Joyce Steele had not worked so tirelessly on their behalf. Those children and their parents owe her a debt of gratitude and, as one of those parents, it is appropriate that I express that gratitude in this Chamber on their behalf.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** I support the condolence motion. I speak as the late Joyce Steele's local member and as one who represents part of the district that she once represented. I also speak as her successor as the second woman Liberal member of the House of Assembly and as her successor as the second Liberal Cabinet Minister in this State.

I have a strong belief in the power of example, and no-one could have had a better example as an MP and as a Minister than I have had—indeed, as we all have had—in Joyce Steele. She gave me, as she gave the member for Bragg, wise advice upon my election. I vividly remember the burden of that advice, which was to try never to keep a constituent waiting and always to attend to every matter on the moment. Few pieces of advice could have been more sensitively given or more worthy of being followed. I attended her funeral last week and was privileged to sit next to the

Hon. Jessie Cooper, who was elected to the Legislative Council on the same day as Joyce Steele was elected to the House of Assembly, in 1959.

I think that Jessie Cooper described Joyce Steele's essential quality very well when she said that she was a gallant woman. She was, indeed, a gallant woman, possessing dignity, a lovely cheerfulness and an enormous vitality. Even into her eighth decade she was still interested in people, caring about people, was devoted to her family and friends, and was interested in State and national affairs. She was a woman worthy of being revered as a pioneer.

I extend my condolences to her son Christopher and her daughter Jane, and I know that I speak for those she represented in my district in expressing our heartfelt gratitude for the quality of her representation.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** In supporting the tributes paid to Joyce Steele, I would like to add a couple of notes for the historical record. First, in my capacity as Whip, I appreciate the way in which she pioneered the provision of a salary for that position whereas, in the nineteenth century, the Whip was dependent on passing a hat around the Ministry in return for the Whip's efforts in keeping the Ministry in office.

Secondly, I would like to add a more significant historical footnote regarding the context in which Joyce Steele pioneered the representation of women in this Chamber. In the nineteenth century four places gave women the vote: the States of Wyoming and South Dakota in the United States and the Sovereign Dominions of South Australia and New Zealand; and, of course, among those South Australia would rank as the second Sovereign Dominion to have given women the vote. However, we went further than was done elsewhere: we also allowed women to stand for office, and that was a significant achievement. The sad side of it was that it was 65 years before we actually got around to electing a woman to office, and Joyce Steele was the first woman to be elected in this House under those circumstances.

On the same day, as has been pointed out, Jessie Cooper co-pioneered the role of women in Parliament. As an indication of the context of the times, we should remember that after that election she was challenged by a member of the Liberal Party who had been defeated in preselection, and he challenged her on the ground that the Constitution referred to a person being elected to the Legislative Council, and a woman was obviously not a person! Naturally, that was tossed out of court. Times have changed since then, but nothing can ever take away the fact that Joyce Steele was the first woman to be elected to this House, and her pioneering role will always be on the record.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** It was only this morning upon returning to South Australia that I learned of Joyce Steele's death, and it was a source of great regret to me. Joyce was a member of this place for a considerable period, from 1959 to 1970, but it was from 1970 to 1973, when some of us were here, that we certainly enjoyed her company. Joyce Steele possessed some outstanding qualities which I, for one, will not forget. As has been pointed out, she was her own person, but she also seemed to me to have a great deal of courage. Joyce was confident in her own convictions and was quite fearless in expressing them. What I remember particularly about Joyce is just how comfortably she fitted into this scene. Although, as everybody has pointed out, she was a pioneer, the fact that she was a woman never deterred Joyce or seemed in any way to inconvenience her or affect her views: she fitted into this place as though born

to it, and I remember that very well. She was certainly no rabid feminist.

The only other thing I want to mention about Joyce Steele, and the member for Bragg mentioned this, is her contribution to the arts. Joyce was intensely interested in the arts and had a fine feeling for them. Even in her later years we saw Joyce at the subscription series of the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, and her contribution to the arts over the years, particularly to that orchestra, was very significant indeed.

I want to be associated with everything that has been said today about Joyce Steele. She was a quite outstanding person. As has been pointed out, her contribution was pioneering, and I for one very much regret her passing and wish to be associated with this tribute.

**The SPEAKER:** I thank all honourable members for the comments they have made, and I shall make sure that their remarks are forwarded to the family of the former honourable member. I now ask members to rise in their places to carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*[Sitting suspended from 2.26 to 2.31 p.m.]*

#### PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 935 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to decriminalise prostitution were presented by Messrs Crafter, Gregory, Rann, Allison, Atkinson, S.J. Baker and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, Ferguson, Gunn, Hamilton, Heron, Holloway, Trainer, Venning and Wotton.

Petitions received.

#### PETITIONS: COIN OPERATED GAMING MACHINES

Petitions signed by 480 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide for the administration of coin operated gaming machines in licensed clubs and hotels by the Liquor Licensing Commission and the Independent Gaming Corporation were presented by Messrs Klunder, Hamilton, Trainer and Wotton.

Petitions received.

#### PETITION: HEATING APPLIANCES

A petition signed by 77 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review the policy on the provision of heating appliances in Housing Trust dwellings was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: NATIONAL ROAD AND RAIL TRANSPORT AGREEMENTS

A petition signed by 217 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure that South Australia is not disadvantaged by national road and rail transport agreements was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

### PETITION: ALLENBY GARDENS PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 590 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to close the Allenby Gardens Primary School was presented by Mr Atkinson.

Petition received.

### PETITION: LICENSING ACT

A petition signed by 80 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to defend the intent of the Licensing Act against local government attempts to unduly influence its application was presented by Mr Atkinson.

Petition received.

### PETITIONS: WATER RATING SYSTEM

Petitions signed by 1 043 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system were presented by Messrs Becker and Wotton.

Petitions received.

### PETITION: PRAWN BOAT OPERATORS

A petition signed by 1 856 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reinstate the ban on netting in waters greater than two metres deep and to close Hardwicke Bay to prawn boat operators was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

### PETITION: ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to take a more active approach to environmental problems was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 4, 5, 15, 16, 17, 21, 24, 26, 27, 49, 59, 60, 75, 90, 95, 99, 101, 108, 109, 111, 114, 115 and 122; and I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

### ETSA

In reply to **Mrs KOTZ (Newland)** 28 August.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** In reply to the honourable member's question asked on 28 August 1991 concerning ETSA's contribution to the Government in 1990-91, I offer the following advice. The following table shows ETSA's total contribution to the State Government and SAFA for the year 1990-91.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE GOVERNMENT

	1991 \$M
5 per cent charge on revenue from sales of electricity .....	40 547
Charge by the South Australian Government Financing Authority on a non-repayable capital contribution of \$110 million	
1990-91 includes a charge of \$20 million in addition to the charge which is based on the common public sector interest rate (which averaged 14.5 per cent for the year). ....	35 950
Contribution by ETSA for the provision of electricity services to Aboriginal communities remote from ETSA's electricity grid. ....	1 762
	<hr/> 78 259

It will be noted that ETSA's figure for the 5 per cent charge on electricity sales of \$40.547 million for 1991 differs from the State budget figure of \$39 903 641 as shown on page 13 of Estimates of Receipts 1991-92, Financial Paper No. 2. The reason for the difference is that ETSA works on accrual accounting, whereas the Government's figure is based on cash accounting.

### WATER RATES

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)** 29 August.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The number of telephone lines to receive inquiries from customers has been increased from 10 to 14. The extra staff have been obtained by internal transfers of existing staff resources within the Customer Services Group. It is not true that up to 80 callers have been on hold at any one time. The maximum number of calls that can be placed on hold at any one time is 12. Any additional calls at that particular time would receive the engaged signal.

Statistics show that approximately 51 per cent of telephone calls received since 1 July 1991 were responded to within 60 seconds and that approximately 95 per cent of calls received either directly or placed on hold by the sequencer were in fact attended to. The publicity campaign was designed to address the misinformation within the community about the new rating system by inviting customers to call the hotline and discuss how they were affected personally. Some 33 per cent of telephone calls relating to the new rating system received during the period of the publicity campaign were directly attributable to the campaign. As this was one of the main aims it is considered that the publicity campaign has been successful.

### ROAD RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr BLACKER (Flinders)** 29 August.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Work recommenced on the reconstruction of the Tod Highway between Karkoo and Wanilla on 21 August following a break in work during the winter months. To date 22km of a total of 58km has been completed with a further 18km proposed to be completed this financial year. Based on current available resources, the project will be completed by January 1993. Subject to the availability of funds, the 11km section between Wanilla and the Flinders Highway will be reconstructed and this work completed by March 1993.

## RECYCLING

In reply to **Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh)** 29 August.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** In considering the potential for savings from using recycled ribbons, it appears that a rewound typewriter ribbon may be purchased at a cost of approximately 15 per cent less than a new item. Savings on computer ribbons may be as high as 30 per cent and a saving of 25 to 30 per cent is possible on laser printer cartridges. The quality of the products was of a low standard in the introductory stages and was an obstacle to the acceptance of recycled ribbons and tapes. Some manufacturers of typewriters and printers have suggested that warranties would not be honoured if these products are used on their machines. There are also difficulties associated with the collection and return of used ribbons and cartridges.

State Supply has assisted suppliers of recycled ribbons and cartridges by contributing to the preparation of flyers and the distribution of promotional material. A recent flyer for Australian Laser Charge has received a strong response and a recent edition of the Government Supplies Contracts newsletter included an advertisement for another supplier offering similar services. It was decided not to stock the recycled ribbons and cartridges at State Supply as the range is very diverse and therefore there are no savings to be gained from bulk buying, and high labour content and administrative costs are involved in the return of used cartridges and spools for re-inking.

The State Supply Board Policy Statement 4.4, 'Environmental Purchasing Policy' states, amongst other things, that 'Preference is to be given to the purchase of products containing 50 per cent or more of recycled material provided the product is fit for the purpose and is comparable in price to new material alternatives'. State Supply and the State Supply Board are firmly committed to the support of the 'Environmental Purchasing Policy' but very little is known about the size of the market or the perceptions of the prospective customer base. State Supply is conducting a survey of its customers to determine the potential market for recycled ribbons and cartridges, customers' perceptions of recycled ribbons and cartridges, and the viability of establishing a Government supplies contract for the supply of recycled ribbons and tapes, recharged laser printer cartridges and other similar products.

## BLANCHE HARBOR SHACK SITES

In reply to **Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee)** 12 September.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Two-thirds of shack lessees at Blanche Harbor will now have the opportunity to purchase the freehold of their sites and a management plan for the area has been approved.

Management plans are developed consultatively and address the key issues with respect to access, amenity, infrastructure (including septic systems) and environmental impact. The plan is initiated to develop and implement solutions to previously identified problems. The Blanche Harbor management plan was developed by the local council and addressed a number of specific issues, the major concern being the provision of environmentally suitable septic systems.

As Minister of Lands, I have consented to allowing the remaining one-third of lessees to hold 40-year leases which they will be able to sell or transfer. These shack areas will remain under Crown ownership, and it is not correct that 'unsuitable' shacks are now available for freehold.

## AVIATION

In reply to **Mr HERON (Peake)** 15 August.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Adelaide International Airport is currently served by 44 international services per week (22 arrivals and 22 departures) provided by Qantas, Air New Zealand (ANZ), British Airways, Garuda, Malaysian Airline Systems, Singapore Airlines and JAL under a code sharing arrangement with Qantas. ANZ is to withdraw two services per week but not until after the 1991 Grand Prix and Qantas will introduce four new services in December. This will give Adelaide 46 international services per week by the end of 1991. Since deregulation of domestic aviation in November 1990 only Compass Airlines has commenced scheduled services to Adelaide with 38 services each week, connecting Brisbane, Cairns, Melbourne, Perth and Sydney.

Australian Airlines commenced its Airlink service in Queensland, Northern Territory and Western Australia using BAC 146 aircraft leased from National Jet Systems based at Adelaide Airport. Maintenance will be provided by National Jet at Adelaide. Introduction of Airlink will result in Australian Airlines providing 48 more Boeing 737 services for Adelaide. Ansett services to Adelaide have increased from 160 services before deregulation to the current 210 flights. Load factors have increased on the national network since deregulation with Adelaide services connecting with Melbourne, Sydney and Alice Springs consistently recording the highest route load factors. The top 20 routes now enjoy an average load factor of 78.6 per cent in comparison to the corresponding period in 1990 of 71.8 per cent (Department of Transport and Communications weekly status report). The market is expanding due mainly to low fares. A recent Compass survey shows that 35 per cent of its passengers are first time fliers. Before deregulation only 18 per cent of the population had flown.

## STUART HIGHWAY

In reply to **Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart)** 22 August.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Construction of the Redhill bypass is an approved national highway project funded by the Federal Government. The work will be undertaken by contract, for which a specification has been prepared. Tenders will be called shortly (actual date 21 September) and will close in late October. At this stage, it is anticipated that construction will commence in January 1992 and be completed in October 1992.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Dental Board of South Australia—Report, 1990-91.

Chiropractors Act 1979—Regulation—Renewal Fee.

Controlled Substances Act 1984—Regulations—Cannabis.

Injecting Equipment.

Public and Environmental Health Act 1987—Regulations—Prescription of Diseases.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—

Recognised Hospital Fees—Glenside and Hillcrest.

Recognised Hospitals—Compensable Patients—

South Australian Mental Health Service.

- Auditor-General Prescribed Hospitals—South Australian Mental Health Service.  
 Medical Board of South Australia—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—  
 Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1990-91.  
 Soil Conservation Council—Report, 1990-91.  
 Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Report, 1990-91.  
 Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946—Regulations—Milk Prices.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—  
 Fences Act 1975—Regulations—Exemption of Land.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—  
 Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board—Report, 1990-91.  
 Department of Road Transport—Report, 1990-91.  
 State Transport Authority—Report, 1990-91.  
 Department of Road Transport—Approval to Lease Properties, 1990-91.  
 Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Applications to Lease—  
   28 August  
   11 September  
   25 September.
- By the Minister of Finance (Hon. Frank Blevins)—  
 Land Tax Act 1936—Regulations—Land Agents' Inquiry Fees.  
 Stamp Duties Act 1923—Regulation—Building Societies.
- By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—  
 South Australian Department of Housing and Construction—Report, 1990-91.  
 State Supply Board—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—  
 Racing Act 1976—Greyhound Racing Board Rules—Registration.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—  
 Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1990-91.  
 South Australian Museum Board—Report, 1990-91.  
 State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1990-91.  
 State Theatre Company—Report, 1990-91.  
 South Australian Waste Management Commission—Report, 1990-91.  
 Planning Act 1982—Regulations—Development Control—Land Fill.
- By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—  
 Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—Cyclist Helmets.
- By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—  
 Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—  
 Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Regulations—  
   Logging.  
   Commercial Safety—Health and First Aid.  
   Industrial Safety—Health and First Aid.  
   Construction Safety—Health and First Aid.
- By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—  
 Boating Act 1974—Regulations—  
   Fees.  
   Hire and Drive.  
   Blanchetown Zoning.  
 Harbors Act 1936—Regulation—Speed Limits in Harbors.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—  
 Local Government Finance Authority—Report, 1990-91.  
 Office of Tertiary Education—Report, 1990-91.  
 Parks Community Centre—Report, 1990-91.

- West Beach Trust—Report, 1990-91.  
 Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education—Corporate Review and Report, 1990.  
 The University of Adelaide—  
   Report, 1990.  
   Statutes.  
 Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—Regulation—Local Government Training Authority.  
 Corporation By-law—Henley and Grange—No. 14—Liquor Control.  
 District Council By-laws—Yankalilla—  
   No. 17—Vehicles on the Foreshore.  
   No. 20—Motor Boats.  
   No. 27—Fences and Hedges.  
   No. 28—Caravans.  
   No. 30—Tents.  
   No. 31—Animals and Birds.  
 Health Sciences Education Review—Report, September 1991.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: OPERATION HYGIENE

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I would like to take this opportunity of reporting to the House on the outcome of Operation Hygiene. All members will be aware of the major breakthrough in this operation announced by the Commissioner of Police on Friday. During the course of the day, 10 police officers were charged with a range of serious offences, as were two former police officers. A further two officers were charged with breaches of police regulations.

Mr Speaker, this has been a difficult operation for the police, not only because it has centred on allegations of criminality by fellow officers but also because an unauthorised release of information to an interstate journalist made it necessary to publicly announce the investigation. The judgment was made that it was better to be frank rather than have to deal with continual uninformed speculation. While I believe this was the correct decision, there is no doubt that it has added another degree of difficulty to the investigation.

The sequence of events, which began last May with the observations of an alert off-duty police officer, and the details of the charges have been adequately detailed by the Commissioner during the course of the operation and there is no need for me to repeat them here. What I would like to recognise today is the very obvious determination shown by police management and the Operation Hygiene task force to get to the bottom of these allegations of police criminality. The nature of the allegations made it inevitable that there would be the usual concerns expressed about police investigating police.

The Commissioner told me that he could have taken a decision to formally request a reference to the National Crime Authority or to have formed some other investigational or judicial process. However, he said he had complete confidence in the existing structures within the force to handle the investigation and gave managerial control of the operation to the Anti Corruption Branch. This was done because of the branch's capacity to assemble a multi-disciplinary task force and in the knowledge that the activities of the branch were subject to independent audit by former Supreme Court Judge, Mr Wells, Q.C.

At the outset, each member of the task force was asked to make a statutory declaration. This measure, subsequently misinterpreted by some members of the media as applying to officers subject to investigation by the task force, was designed only to ensure operational integrity and eliminate

any possible conflict of interest. Team members were required to indicate whether they had ever been stationed at the suspect locations and whether they had worked with officers under investigation or knew them personally. Under the direct control of the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner, the initial group, comprising 11 police officers headed by the Officer in Charge of the ACB, Commander Lean, assisted by a legal adviser from the Crown Solicitor's Office and with technical help from the NCA, began its investigations on 4 September.

Newspaper advertisements were placed urging members of the public to contact the task force if they had information relevant to the enquiry. Such was the volume of information generated from all aspects of the investigation that on 10 September the size of the task force was doubled. This action was taken to ensure that the inquiry did not bog down.

The Commissioner briefed the media on four occasions during the operation, to the extent that he could, without jeopardising the investigation. He also received considerable cooperation from the media in response to his requests for restraint in their reporting and avoidance of unnecessary speculation. As well, the Commissioner provided confidential briefings to me, the Leader of the Opposition, the shadow Minister of Emergency Services, the shadow Attorney-General and the Leader of the Australian Democrats. I would like to take this opportunity of thanking all members of the Opposition for their support of this investigation and their implicit acknowledgment that the distractions which would arise from a political debate would not be helpful to a successful conclusion.

The Democrats Leader, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, decided that some aspects of the conduct of Operation Hygiene were not satisfactory to him and lodged a complaint with the Police Complaints Authority. This matter has been registered as a formal complaint under the Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act and I understand the authority is monitoring the operation and will take any action which the Act requires. The Commissioner has advised me that any reports relevant to the investigation will be provided to the authority, as required. It is not for me to judge the merits of Mr Gilfillan's complaint, but the fact that he has the PCA to complain to—and the fact that the entire conduct of Operation Hygiene will be subject to audit by a very experienced judicial figure—are substantial safeguards. The necessary checks and balances are in place.

Although the achievements of the Operation Hygiene task force and those who assisted it are important, there is more to be achieved. There is still the underlying concern that some police officers—a relatively small number to be sure—become involved in criminality. The Commissioner has recognised this and has secured the interest of the Australian Institute of Criminology in researching the causative factors of police criminality. A project proposal has been prepared for the National Police Research Unit, which will be able to draw on both national and international expertise to undertake the research.

The Commissioner will be discussing this proposal with his interstate counterparts at a meeting in Sydney and seeking their support to make it a national project which could benefit policing throughout the country. Such a project would require the approval of the Australian Police Ministers' Council and it would certainly have my support. In preparation for such a project, the Commissioner has also established a special police project group, chaired by Assistant Commissioner John Lockhead, with the following terms of reference:

1. to identify and examine the causative factors that may have contributed to the criminal behaviour of police personnel investigated during Operation Hygiene;
2. to identify and discuss sociological, criminological and other relevant aspects that influence police personnel to commit criminal offences; and
3. to formulate and recommend strategies that will minimise criminal behaviour by members of the South Australian Police Force.

In addition, each Assistant Commissioner has been directed to assess the performance of their officers in relation to anti-corruption strategies, management and supervision. Finally, it is my understanding that Operation Hygiene is likely to wind down within a few weeks, having ensured that all avenues of inquiry have been exhausted. The Commissioner will report more fully when the operation has been completed.

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I rise on a matter of privilege. I allege that the member for Hayward is in contempt of the House in that during Estimates Committee A on Thursday 19 September he said the following in a question to the Minister of Education:

Three weeks ago senior sources in the Education Department privately confirmed that the Premier had done a deal with the independent member for Semaphore to ensure his support in the critical no-confidence motion moved against the Government.

This related to the proposed closure of schools on the LeFevre Peninsula. I find the allegation that, in effect, my vote can be bought to be not only personally repugnant but also has the effect of bringing the office of the Speaker into disrepute. Before I rule on this matter, does the member for Hayward wish to give an explanation or an apology?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I challenge your right to adjudicate on your own case. I challenge that right from the point of view that no person should adjudicate on his or her own case, because there is a conflict of interest.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The Speaker of the House is not adjudicating on this case: the Speaker of the House is laying a complaint before the House for decision of the House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! All decisions made in this House are under the control of the Parliament and the Speaker is only an arm of the Parliament. As the Speaker, I will not be making any decision beyond what Parliament makes, so I rule the point of order out of order. Does the member for Hayward wish to make an explanation or an apology?

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I do, Sir. I rise conscious of the gravity of the matter that you have just placed before this House. I acknowledge that the words attributed to me are, to the best of my recollection, an accurate record of the statement made by me during Estimates Committee A on Thursday 19 September.

However, I deny emphatically that any assertion I made was calculated, inadvertently or otherwise, to bring either you as a member of this House or the office of Speaker into disrepute. I believe that your speakership has been exceptional, in the calibre of leadership, in its commitment to service to this House and in your resolve to deliberate impartially from the Chair on all matters. You will recall, Sir, that I have consistently and publicly stated that I did not impute improper motives to you but, rather, an admiration of your service to your electorate.



Indeed, I believe I said to a group of media representatives in your presence that, rather than reflecting improperly upon you, I would suggest that all members in this Chamber should seek your advice so that we might serve our electors as well. An examination of my words in the Estimates Committee supports this contention. I did not say that you had done a deal; I did not assert that your vote can be bought. At no time did I ascribe any motivation to, or enter into any discussion in respect of, the way your vote was cast on any matter that came before this House. The word that I used was 'ensure' and you quoted that word. I can find no reference in any dictionary that gives the word any meaning that is even vaguely similar to the charge that I am now brought to answer, that is, that your vote can be bought.

Every day we do things calculated to win the support of others. We might buy flowers for our partners to endeavour to ensure some favourable consideration, but that does not mean—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is not a favourable consideration. What is at issue here is not whether or not I did a deal with the Premier but that members are not allowed to cast reflections upon or impugn, in particular, in this case the Speaker's character or indeed any other member's character. All members have the right by way of a substantive motion to air any concerns they have about my or any other member's conduct, but the Standing Orders of the House and the practices in all other Westminster Parliaments preclude such reflections during the course of a debate.

I am not denying the honourable member his right to raise issues of concern to him, provided he does so within the Standing Orders. Indeed, as Speaker of this House, I would defend his right to do so, but it is the basic fact of impugning or alleging—even in the honourable member's own words, in what he has just contributed—favourable consideration that is close to what we are talking about today. The member for Hayward.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I am endeavouring to explain by way of explanation, to you, Mr Speaker, because I know that you must rule *prima facie* on this matter before you place this matter before the House and, therefore, you will be adjudicating on it; it is to you that I am addressing remarks calculated to try to show you, Sir, that I did not impute improper motives to you. I am endeavouring to explain that point to you Sir, and I hope that you will let me continue.

I respect, without qualification, your absolute right to vote in any way that you choose without hindrance, without conjecture and without ascribing any motive to your decision, and I do not believe that I did that. In respect to both you and your office, rather than out of any other consideration for any other parties involved, I was very careful in the words that I did use, and I could have used others which I now, in some ways, regret that I had not. It is a matter of public record, in explanation, that you wrote to the Premier objecting to the possible closure of schools in your electorate. It is also a matter of record that you informed the Premier that you would use every political means at your disposal to prevent this occurrence. It is also a matter of fact that the Education Department suddenly and subsequently rethought its position—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member cannot debate the substance of the motion, only the reason for it.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I did not suggest that deals were made over lunch or that you had any direct contact with the Premier on this matter. However, having clearly laid down in writing your position, I believe that the Premier reacted to your letter, and that was the purport of my statement—that the Premier could be said to have done a deal.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BRINDAL:** Given the circumstances outlined, I do not believe that that term used in that connection in reference to the Premier could be held to compromise your office or to lead you to be in any way criticised or imputed in respect to your motives. I can neither recant nor withdraw my words without breaching the highest duty of every member in this House, and that is the duty of every member towards their constituents and this State as a whole, rather than to any particular section thereof.

However, I have meant and do mean no offence towards you, either as the member for Semaphore or as the Speaker, and in the use of those words I meant no offence. I honestly believe that the words as stated do not constitute an imputation of improper motive upon you, reflect on your high office or bring it into disrepute. But I must believe that truth must remain a defence in all aspects of my statement.

In submitting myself to your adjudication and to the deliberations of my peers according to the usages and customs of this Legislature as it is now constituted as the high court of Parliament, I claim my ancient right of privilege, Sir, and that is the privilege of favourable construction. But for judgment, Sir, I submit myself to a court that is higher than this House and to a court to which we are all accountable, and that, Sir, is the people of South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** As the honourable member directed his remarks to me, I must say that the words that the Premier had done a deal with the independent member are, to me, totally direct and not sustainable in any way. The honourable member does know—and I have explained to him and to the House previously—that any matter of concern can be raised by medium of a substantive motion, and any matter at all can be debated. The matter of truth or otherwise, or whether there was a deal—which there was not—or whether any arrangement was made is not at question here. There is no dispute. The fact is that the Standing Orders, as practised in the Parliament, provide that members cannot reflect. It is reflection, and I rule that a *prima facie* breach of privilege has occurred. I call on the Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If anybody has a dispute with the Chair, there is a medium for that as well. I sat somebody down under the normal procedure, which is side by side. That is the practice agreed to in this House; it is the practice of this and every other House that I am aware of. I call on the Deputy Premier.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, when this debate started and you raised the matter of privilege, I said that it was wrong of you to adjudicate on your own case and, indeed, you have done exactly that, Sir, and I find that to be a contempt of the Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I believe that we are breaking tradition. We are talking about the maintenance of natural justice,



and you, Sir, have adjudicated. You have found a member of this House guilty on your own case. That, Sir, is intolerable.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There are 46 other members in this House to make a decision. I have found that there is a *prima facie* case. This House will make the decision—not me.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Sir—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This does not close the debate. Members are that eager to get a bit of blood they will not listen to what is going on. The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I move:

That this House finds the honourable member for Hayward guilty of contempt.

I do not move this motion with any—

**Mr Gunn:** This is worse than Singapore.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I do not move this motion with any relish at all, Sir. I guess in my 21 years of membership of this House I have sometimes been eager to be a trailblazer in certain circumstances. Unfortunately, I think I find myself in that position right now and I am not particularly eager about assuming that role. However, I believe that all honourable members have a responsibility to the practices and the Standing Orders of this House and I believe that we have no course open to us than to support the motion that I have put before honourable members.

The member for Hayward has endeavoured to explain himself by an extraordinary interpretation of the meaning of the word 'deal'. He suggests that somehow or other the Premier is guilty in this matter, Sir, and you are not. So, on the one hand he imputes improperly to the Premier or, alternatively, he simply does not understand—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** —how normal people use the word 'deal'. A deal is an arrangement freely entered into by two parties. If there is any element of blame or guilt involved, then clearly it must involve both parties and not simply the one. Secondly, in endeavouring to whitewash, in endeavouring to sanitise, the word 'deal', the honourable member clearly does not understand ordinary Aussie English. 'Deal' is used in those sorts of circumstances where something underhand, something rather shabby, is implied. That is the way it is used on the terraces at the footy, that is the way it is used in the pub, and that is the way it is used in the boardrooms around this town and in many other towns like it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The honourable member may indeed have been perfectly sincere in endeavouring to raise a particular matter. I can understand that. I am puzzled that he did not understand that there was a means whereby, under Standing Orders, he could legitimately do so, and I find it incomprehensible that, having been led through this matter, having been given advice by a number of people associated with this place, he refuses to apologise and refuses to take whatever the normal course of action would be available to him in those circumstances.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Members opposite know that I, on behalf of the Government, have sought some means of accommodation on this particular matter. As recently as this morning I sought some means to try to ensure that we would not be brought to this point.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am seeking not to embarrass an honourable member on the other side of the House—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am seeking not to embarrass an honourable member on the other side of the House—and I am not sure that it is an embarrassment to him in any way. I see that he agrees with me. I rang the Deputy Leader of the Opposition this morning and I indicated to him that the Government would prefer not to be placed in the position of having to move the motion that I am speaking to right now. I discussed the matter with him. I also suggested that the Opposition might seek to further discuss the matter with you, Sir. If that information was not conveyed to the honourable member, that is totally out of my league. But I think I was perfectly within my rights in conveying that information in the way that I did. Had there been a member on this side who was subject to some sort of action this afternoon in the House, then quite clearly I would have expected, as Leader of the House, on the part of that honourable member, to be informed.

I am not pointing the finger at the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at all. I did not want to raise that matter at all. I merely raised it because there was a howl of interjections from members opposite in relation to this matter. Again, I make the point that, while the Government does not shrink from its responsibilities in this particular matter, it does not welcome these circumstances. It would have preferred to be able to avoid these circumstances if at all possible, but it is quite clear that a breach has occurred and any reasonable person need only examine these words to see that that is the case. The honourable member could have got out of it. He could have simply apologised today to you, Sir, and he is still within his rights to use certain forms of the House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Obviously there is some misunderstanding. I did ask from the Chair for an apology. I know what I wrote; I know what I said.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You didn't say that, Norm!

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kavel is out of order. I did say that and *Hansard* will prove it.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** That is the plain fact of the matter. There can be no argument that a breach has occurred. One need only look at the *Hansard* record, and it is there. As I understand it, the honourable member has confirmed that the *Hansard* record is correct. I simply conclude, because I do not want to further detain the House, by again quoting the very words:

Three weeks ago senior sources in the Education Department privately confirmed that the Premier had done a deal with the Independent member for Semaphore to ensure his support in the critical no-confidence motion moved against the Government.

**QED.**

**The SPEAKER:** Is the motion seconded?

**Government members:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** When you sat me down, Sir, I was about to move that this House accept the explanation given by the member for Hayward, and that is, of course, what should happen. I am violently opposed to what the Deputy Premier has said and the motion he has moved. I want to explain that by quoting three parts of the explanation given by the member for Hayward to this House, and then provide some further explanation. First, he said:

However, I deny emphatically that any assertion I made was calculated, inadvertently or otherwise, to bring either you as a member of this House or the Office of Speaker into disrepute.

That is very clear. He also said that he has an admiration of your service to the electorate. He makes that very clear. He then went on to say:

I did not say that you had done a deal—

and that is very clear. There has been a lot of talk by the Deputy Premier and a lot of media speculation about deals. I might take you back to the *Advertiser* of 5 December 1989 which carried the front page headline, 'No deal yet with key MPs'. On the same day, a prominent headline in the *Australian* stated, 'Bannon fails to strike deal on majority'. On the next day, 6 December, the *Advertiser* carried this front page headline, 'Bannon's trade-off wins MPs'. They are very clear headlines. A subheadline on that day stated, 'Deal for stability may force an early poll'. In the story under those headlines, you, Sir, are quoted as saying:

I will support them but if there are any conditions or issues that badly affect my area or the State, I will vote against them.

I put these matters on the record because it is obvious that the word 'deal' was used all through. It has been used in the press, and it is quite obvious that there is a widespread public perception that a deal was done. At no time has the member for Hayward said or ever claimed that you, Sir, have in any way acted in a corrupt manner. The venom in the question was that the Premier was prepared to put his survival in making those deals above the higher priority of the general interests of the people of South Australia. In fact, this Government has survived on deals.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** It did a deal before the last election to keep interest rates down—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is wandering very far from the subject at hand here today.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The matter here today is a breach of Standing Orders providing the rules of conduct of the Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Any deals the Leader is talking about have nothing to do with a breach of Standing Orders in this case, and I ask him to be very careful in his choice of words.

**Mr LEWIS:** Is not the debate we are now having on a substantive motion that the member for Hayward is in contempt of Parliament? If that is so, where does privilege come into that, in terms of your claiming that the Leader is digressing? He is not digressing from the substance of that at all, in my judgment.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I believe he was beginning to digress. The subject at hand is the Standing Order that provides that no member may impugn any other member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The motion now is that the *prima facie* case be upheld.

**An honourable member:** No, it's not.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The motion deals with contempt. I do not know whether the member for Hayward comes into a matter of an alleged deal by the Premier and some other party. The motion deals with the member for Hayward being guilty of contempt.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The Government made a deal after the election to maintain itself in office, notwithstanding that a majority of South Australians wanted an alternative Government.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I really have great difficulty in linking this to any contempt by the member for Hayward. A deal made by the Premier or anyone else has nothing to

do with contempt by the member for Hayward. If the Leader links up his remarks, I will allow him to continue.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** In justification, then, of my remarks, Mr Speaker, I will invoke the words of your immediate predecessor, the member for Walsh. I refer to his report to the 1990 Annual Convention of the ALP as Secretary of the Parliamentary Party, as follows:

With a 47-seat Chamber containing only 22 ALP members, 23 Liberal-National Party members and two Labor Independents, a tenuous working majority could only be obtained by accommodating the two Independent members who occupy what were previously 'safe' Labor seats: Norm Peterson who won Semaphore from George Apap in 1979; and Martyn Evans, who won Elizabeth, Peter Duncan resigned in 1984. Initially, both Independent Labor MPs were seeking Ministries.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Again, there is no relevance to the contempt of the member for Hayward.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair has absolutely no discomfort with this. It is a matter of public record.

**An honourable member:** Why are we debating this?

**The SPEAKER:** Exactly; why are we debating this? It has nothing to do with the motion before the Chair. Again, I draw the Leader's attention to the motion before the Chair, dealing with the member for Hayward's being guilty of contempt.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** May I finish reading this quote to the House?

**The SPEAKER:** No.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** We were saying that your predecessor, Mr Speaker, had said that the Chair had been used in negotiations to preserve this Government in office. If you are to find against the member for Hayward, you would have to find against that member over there for what he said about you. I think it is about time we laid a few facts on the table about this. You are conducting in this House a kangaroo court about the rights of a member of Parliament to defend himself in his electorate at any time he chooses. You could have taken this up on the day of the Estimates Committee, but you failed to do so. I implore this House not to find the member for Hayward in contempt of the House.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I wish to pursue the points that have already been made but, to be quite explicit, you have trampled on the rules of this House, you have trampled on the rules of debate, and you have trampled on the rules of good chairmanship. Sir, in all good conscience, you should have ruled yourself ineligible to stand in judgment in respect of this matter. That is my first point: you should have asked for a suspension of the Standing Orders and said, 'I shall not take my place in the Chair; I shall call upon the Deputy Speaker to take my place while this matter is adjudicated.' Sir, you broke the rules. Nowhere do we find that a judge—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is very close to going down the same road. He is alleging that I broke the rules. If the honourable member really believes that, there is machinery in this House for him to take action, and I strongly recommend that that be the course he takes instead of taking the floor and alleging that the Chair broke the rules.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** It is important that the conventions of Parliament are upheld, because without those conventions there are no rules. It is important that if the convention has been broken—as it has been in this case—it should be righted. In fact, it is important that, if the honourable member is found to be in contempt for all the wrong reasons, that decision be overturned, and I wish to address myself to that. I will return to the substantive point. You,

Sir, have no right as Speaker of this Parliament to stand in judgment upon yourself and a member who you believe has breached privilege. The principles of chairmanship, good law and natural justice demand that you leave the Chair—just as a judge cannot sit in judgment of himself or herself, or as an organisational chairman must leave the chair when that position is in conflict. Whether we are talking about boards, churches or tribunals, the precedent is set that the chairman or, as in this case, the Speaker should absent himself from the Chair.

Secondly, this is totally out of court. You, Mr Speaker, had the opportunity on the day that the matter was raised in the Estimates Committees to take advantage of that occasion and, indeed, to ask through your presence at that committee that the remarks be withdrawn. You did not take that opportunity; you deliberately did not take that opportunity. In fact, let us go back through the circumstances—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair cannot hear the allegations. The honourable Deputy Leader.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The circumstances were that on the day in question the member for Hayward did indeed make the comment that has been referred to a number of times during this debate. In fact, you, Sir, spoke to the member for Hayward about that matter on the steps of Parliament House. You are well aware of the Standing Orders that govern the Estimates Committees. You had a right after the luncheon break to enter that Estimates Committee—as you did on 24 September. I have the record here which shows that you participated in the debate in the Estimates Committee and that you were not listed as a member of that Committee. You had a right to be heard under the Standing Orders and you had a right to enter the Committee. Indeed, you had a right to present a case to have the comment withdrawn. The Chairman of that Committee could quite rightly have recalled the member for Hayward to withdraw any remarks that you found offensive. You did not take the opportunity to do that.

In *Erskine May* we find that there is no breach of privilege and that is central to the argument. I refer you to page 136 of the 21st Edition of *Erskine May* which states:

A matter alleged to have arisen in committee but not reported by it may not generally be brought to the attention of the House on a complaint of breach of privilege.

It is quite clear that each Committee shall deliberate on the actions of its members at the time or, indeed, at the end of that Committee, the Committee shall resolve that, if there has been a breach, it shall be reported for the Parliament to take action. That was not done on this occasion and therefore it is out of court, it is out of time and, indeed, it is incompetent for this Parliament and you, Sir, to rule on this matter.

Sir, if you are concerned about the rules of Committees and their relationship to the Parliament, I refer you to Standing Orders 271 and 145. Sir, you are out of court on a number of matters, whether it be the principle of whether you can rule on this matter and, certainly, on whether it is appropriate for you to do so. There is a whole range of other issues. I refer you to *Erskine May* and a number of pages on privilege. Indeed, *Erskine May* talks about when it is responsible for matters of privilege to be brought before Parliament. I refer to pages 125 and 69 of *Erskine May*. It talks about the relationship between privilege and the House of Commons since 1675.

I am not going to take up the time of the House in discussing those matters, except to say that, if you, Sir, did have a grievance about what the member for Hayward said at the time, you were duty bound to raise it at the time and

not wait until now to do so. I will move an amendment to the motion before the House. Accordingly, I move:

Leave out all words after 'thin' and insert in lieu thereof 'matter be referred to a privileges committee'.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the amendment seconded?

**An honourable member:** Yes, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Will the honourable member bring up the amendment in writing to the table?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I would certainly support this matter going to a privileges committee. The whole matter should have been forgotten, quite frankly. I have come into the debate fairly cold, but I think that I have grasped the salient facts. The facts are that during the Estimates Committees the member for Hayward said something that obviously upset the member for Semaphore. Today, in this place—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Just to clarify the situation, the House is debating whether or not there has been a breach of privilege and not whether a particular member has been upset. I am acting as the elected Speaker of the House. As Speaker I must do the job as laid down by Standing Orders and the rules, and that is the basis of the complaint.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not contesting anything that you said, Mr Speaker. I want to make a few comments relevant to this debate. Events began when you invited the member for Hayward to make an 'explanation or an apology'. I think you will find that my memory is endorsed by everyone on this side who listened to what you said. I was particularly interested in the event because I endorse most of what the member for Hayward said in paying a glowing tribute to you as Speaker.

I endorse those sentiments and I was particularly interested in what the row was about. Initially, you said, 'I ask the member for an apology or an explanation.' I listened carefully to the explanation. During the explanation, the honourable member made perfectly clear that in no way had he reflected or would he wish to reflect on you as Speaker of this place. In fact, he paid a glowing tribute to you as Speaker, which I endorse, as you know. For the life of me, having done everything possible to give an adequate explanation, which he was invited to do, I do not know what else he could have done.

**An honourable member:** Apologise!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** He was not asked to. He was asked to explain or apologise. Leaving aside all the arguments advanced by other speakers as to the propriety of your actions and their validity, I cannot understand why you did not seek to accept the honourable member's apology.

**An honourable member:** The explanation.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Sorry, the explanation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** You will not catch me up on that technicality—I have been around here too long for that. I could not understand, when such an adequate explanation was given, why it was not accepted. It was made perfectly clear that the honourable member did not wish to reflect on the Chair and that, indeed, he believed that you were a first-class Speaker. That will puzzle me for a long time.

Having said that, I do not believe for a moment that natural justice will be done in this place this afternoon, and it will take me a long time to be convinced otherwise that natural justice will ever be done if the Deputy Premier's motion is carried. How on earth can anybody here believe that they are doing justice with respect to this situation?

Mr Speaker, at the very least, this must go off to a privileges committee. As I said, I cannot for the life of me understand why you did not accept the honourable member's very fulsome and adequate explanation. However, having said that, the matter must at least go to a privileges committee. There is no way in the world that we can sit here and hang, draw and quarter a member in an area as doubtful as this. It has never happened in my 21 years. It is unheard of. Mr Speaker, I urge everybody to support the amendment to at least refer this matter to a privileges committee where I trust that, in the long run, commonsense may prevail.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** One of the hallmarks of a decent, democratic society is that we allow people elected to the Parliament to speak on behalf of society. The only people who can suspend them from Parliament are the electors, not some kangaroo court. If Parliament proceeds down this particular track today, a very dangerous precedent will be created, because in the future a Government will be able to use its numbers not only to have a member convicted of a breach of privilege but also to then suspend them from Parliament for its own political benefit. That is what takes place in countries like Singapore, which has very little regard for the democratic process. Mr Speaker, we have a minority Government which does not have the support of the overwhelming majority of the people of this State and which now seeks to take a course of action to deny the honourable member for Hayward his right to sit in this Parliament. That is the long and the short of this argument.

The only people who should have that right are the electors of this State. If this Government tears up the rule book today, we should make no mistake about what will happen in the future. When we have at least two or three members who are lawyers in this State, who practise at the bar and who are prepared to go along with a course of action as dangerous, as unprincipled and as unprecedented as this, heaven help our legal system. Will the Minister of Education, who represents Her Majesty's chief law officer in this State, go along with this disgraceful conspiracy to deny the honourable member his right to speak in this Parliament? If the member for Hayward makes irrational or improper comments in this Parliament, the people will judge him at the next election and get rid of him. The role of this Parliament is not, has never been, nor should it ever be to sit in judgment of members of this House in respect of their conduct. That is the role of the electorate, and so it should be.

Therefore, I appeal to your better judgment, Mr Speaker, to the Premier and to members of the Government to be very careful as you proceed today, because remember that, in the future, this very same tactic can be applied to you when in Opposition. To my knowledge, this is the first occasion that this Parliament has gone down this track and, having once adopted this course of action, there is no telling where it will end. Like the member for Kavel, I have been in this House for over 21 years, and during that time I never dreamt that this Parliament would vote the Opposition one member short. That is what the Government is doing: it is attempting to suspend an Opposition member from the Chamber and prevent him from participating in the debates today. If members of Parliament cannot take criticism, they should not be here.

Mr Speaker, the member for Stuart made the wildest allegations, which have been proven to be untrue, against the Leader of the Opposition, but she was not brought before a privileges committee, charged or suspended. The Leader had to take it and wear it. All the member for

Hayward did was exercise his due and democratic right to raise a matter of concern before an Estimates Committee of this Parliament. Are we now going to have a situation where members of the Opposition will be gagged in committees?

If that is the case, we might as well not waste our time attending committees. The process of parliamentary democracy is going to be tested this afternoon. The responsibility is on the shoulders of the Premier and of the members of the Government to see that they do the decent and right thing, that is to protect the honourable member for Hayward against a most unfortunate, unwise and undemocratic process that has been put into place. I appeal to the House to use some common sense, good judgment and fairness, and to reject this motion, as it is undemocratic and contrary to the best interests of the people of this State.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** The Opposition seems to completely misunderstand the situation. In many respects, what has arisen today is not any different from the naming of a member, which can, in due course, after consideration by the House of the offence that may or may not have occurred, lead to that member's suspension. In the case of a naming, the member has the opportunity to apologise or to retract and to have that apology or retraction taken into consideration by the Presiding Officer or by the House.

In this case, an honourable member is in contempt because he has refused to provide an appropriate apology or withdrawal to you, Mr Speaker. You did not accept his apology or explanation because it did not constitute the contrite withdrawal of his unparliamentary remarks that is required by the House. There are various occasions when the Speaker, on behalf of the other members, can demand of a member that he or she withdraw unparliamentary language or that he or she withdraw imputations or reflections on another member or, worse still, on the Chair. This is one of those occasions.

This situation could be resolved right now by the member for Hayward. I would say, Sir, that even now, at this late hour, the member for Hayward, with your consent, could resolve this situation by an appropriate withdrawal or apology. If the member for Hayward insists that he has the right to express a particular point of view—and this was something that was taken up by the member for Eyre—he will not be gagged. If he has a particular point of view that he so strongly wishes to put before the House, the Standing Orders provide for him to do so by way of substantive motion.

But the Standing Orders do not provide for him to make that point by way of mud-slinging references to another member—and, in particular, the Chair—without that substantive motion. Sir, you are completely within your rights to be insistent on a withdrawal and/or apology by that honourable member. If he believes that he has an obligation to his electors to put forward a point of view, he can do so by way of substantive motion. But we cannot have a situation where members can just freely make mud-slinging accusations and throw them around the Chamber, simply because they feel like it.

The honourable member was clearly in breach of Standing Order 127 parts (2) and (3), which refer to a member imputing improper motives to another member or making personal reflections on another member. The honourable member is probably also in breach of Standing Order 119, concerning reflecting upon a vote of the House. It is bad enough for a member to reflect on the standards of another member; it is even worse when the member reflected upon

is the Speaker, who is charged with the responsibility of upholding the standards of the House.

The Deputy Leader is totally unfamiliar with parliamentary procedure to suggest that the Speaker, the highest authority in the Chamber, should be leaving the Chair. There is no analogy with the position of a judge, because this House as a whole is itself the court. The Speaker himself has not ruled on the guilt of the member for Hayward; he has ruled that an apparent breach has occurred, and it is the House that then ultimately rules on the guilt or otherwise of the member for Hayward.

I will repeat the point that I made before. The Standing Orders require that if there is any imputation against another member it can only occur by way of substantive motion, not by mud-slinging reflections on other members of Parliament. That is why that particular Standing Order is there amongst the Standing Orders, to prevent exactly that sort of reckless and irresponsible behaviour. I call on members opposite, through you, Mr Speaker, to cooperate with you and not support a disgraceful attack on the Speaker's authority. Attacks like that, if allowed to continue without the House taking any sort of action, will ultimately undermine the Parliament itself.

Through you, Mr Speaker, I call on the member for Hayward to have enough sense in this case to apologise and withdraw. If he wants to put his views, as I said, he can put them by way of substantive motion: if he refuses to apologise, if he will not have the commonsense to apologise and withdraw in an acceptable manner, this House must uphold the Speaker's authority against this breach of Standing Orders. I support the motion of the Deputy Premier and remind the member for Hayward that ultimately this matter rests in his hands.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** In my view, both the motion and the amendment ought to be dropped in the interests of this Parliament. We have all sat here and listened to this debate, and it has got totally out of hand. Speakers on both sides of the House have packed their impressions and ideas with emotion, I think unnecessarily, and it is further aggravating the situation.

I was a member of the Tonkin Cabinet between 1979 and 1982, and one thing we did, which has proved to be a bit of a damn nuisance since, was to introduce a system of Committees into this Parliament. For better or for worse, subsequent Governments have maintained that system. One of the rules introduced at the time was that, if a dispute or a matter which may lead to a dispute arose during the course of those Committees, on the following day the full Parliament would be assembled for the purposes of sorting out such matters. That did not occur on this occasion. Whether it was remiss of you, Sir, or any other member of this Parliament for not carrying the matter through, whether it was for other motives or other reasons that it was not carried through, is now quite historic. The situation is that the opportunity was lost. To try to cultivate this matter weeks after the event—in this instance, 19 September this year in Committee A—I think—

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Is a farce.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** My colleague from Kavel says, 'It is a farce.' I think it is highly undesirable. What it has done already in this debate (and it is not over yet) is drawn out some other breaches of practice in this Parliament. When the Deputy Premier rose to move his motion in this House today, he breached another very long-standing arrangement. Before the media assembled in this place,

before the *Hansard* for the purposes of recording, and before a large public gallery, he referred in this House to a practice that we have traditionally avoided, and that is reference to private discussions in the corridors. He relayed to this House a discussion that he had had in private with a member of the Opposition—indeed, a senior member of the Opposition—about what should or should not occur in this instance.

Whether those discussions are held in the bar, in the corridor or anywhere else in this premise, on both sides of the House the practice of referring to private discussions between members of this Parliament has been avoided in this Chamber, and for very good long-standing reasons. Already there is an example of where this debate has drawn out from a member—in this instance, the Deputy Premier—a breach of that practice. If we continue in the vein and the climate that has prevailed in this House for the past 20 minutes, I venture to say that further breaches will be made before there are repairs.

It would seem to me in your interests, Mr Speaker, and more especially in the interests of the office of Speaker, and in the interests of the Parliament at large, that we should drop this issue and get on with the business of the Parliament. I do not say those things lightly, but I have sat here and listened to members on both sides of the House in their attempts to contribute, and the situation is getting worse rather than better. I do not believe that it is appropriate for you, Sir, for the member for Hayward, or for any other member to apologise; we should put this episode down to experience and make sure that, if such an event or anything similar that leads to a dispute in Committees occurs in the future, it is dealt with within the boundaries of those Committees and not preserved and kept over until after show week or at some other later date for the Chamber to exercise in the way that it has been exercised, if not exploited, today.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** In the absence of any substantive motion from the member for Alexandra or any indication by any other member to pursue that course of action, I feel compelled to urge all members present to support the amendment. There is no question about the fact that the member for Walsh, in the course of his contribution to this debate, engaged in the kind of hypocrisy that I never thought I would witness in this place. He, of all people, used exactly the same terminology—

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think we have gone down an unfortunate path today far enough as it is without the member for Murray-Mallee reflecting on another honourable member in the way that he did.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is the honourable member asking for a withdrawal?

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** I would request, through you, Mr Speaker, a withdrawal of the word 'hypocrisy'.

**The SPEAKER:** The word has offended the honourable member; will the member for Murray-Mallee withdraw?

**Mr LEWIS:** I withdraw the word 'hypocrisy'. I point out to the House that the double standards that the honourable member exercises in his mind amaze me, as I am sure they amaze a number of other members. The very words of which complaint is made of the member for Hayward, and the allegations supported in the remarks made by the member for Walsh, are the words germane to and associated with 'deal', in spite of the fact that the member for Hayward said that the real nub of the argument is about 'ensure'. If it is about 'deal', the member for Hayward certainly did not intend that you Sir, should be seen in any more or less

a light than many other people, including the member for Walsh, when they use the same word.

We have tried no journalist at the bar for the use of that term to describe what they observed was occurring. We have tried no other member in this place who has alluded to the arrangement—and I will not call it a 'deal'—yet today we have a motion before the House, albeit amended, stating that we find the member for Hayward guilty of contempt without our having taken the same action against any other member of either this place or the public. That has got to be a kangaroo court.

It is more so a kangaroo court for the second and more important reason that the sessional orders of the Committee state, as the member for Eyre, and the member for Alexandra in support of him, has said—and the member for Kavel before him—that the point shall be taken then and that the House will be reconvened on the following day. No-one in the Committee attempted to do that, and neither did you, Mr Speaker, within your rights as a member of the House, the member for Semaphore. No-one can dispute that you are a member of this place and that, as such, you are entitled to participate in those Committees. It is already a matter of record that you have participated in those Committees.

In addition to that point, we are now looking at the prospect of a vote to find a member in contempt of Parliament, not as has been the case in more than 10 years of my experience in this place when such matters of gravity about members' behaviour are being debated, not when a member has defied a ruling of the Chair. This is not a vote about defying the ruling of the Chair. It is about the contempt of Parliament. The two are very different, and through you, Mr Speaker, I remind the member for Walsh of that point. They are very different indeed.

As you would no doubt be aware, Mr Speaker, whilst the member for Walsh misquoted you and said that you required the member for Hayward to withdraw and/or apologise, you did not. You invited him to apologise or explain. The member for Hayward has explained. The member for Kavel has alluded to that explanation and, from my experience in this place, I support the remarks made by the member for Hayward about your conduct of business in this place as Speaker in this Parliament. Indeed, the member for Walsh makes a mistake by presuming to condemn the member for Hayward because he did not do what the member for Walsh would like him to have been required to do. He was not required to withdraw or apologise: he was required, indeed invited, to apologise or explain.

Finally, let me say that, if the Parliament proceeds with this proposition and defeats the amendment, if the Parliament proceeds along that path, it will indeed have come to a very sorry pass. It is a kangaroo court, on that proposition, for a Government to use what numbers it may have to silence an Opposition member when that member is guilty of no offence to this place greater than that of many others here or many public commentators on the actions taken in this place by this Government, in this Parliament, for the purpose of securing its present place on the Government benches. To my mind, to condemn one member and leave others not even tried and therefore presumed innocent is a gross abuse of justice.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I rise to say a few words on this issue, because I think it is one of the few times in the period I have been in this Parliament that an issue of such complexity has been considered. I raise the point because it puts in question any future debate that should arise in this House and the ability of any other member to be able

to quote another source and to use that as part of a debate. I presume we are referring to page 185 of the *Hansard* record of House of Assembly Estimates Committee A of 19 September, when the member for Hayward said:

However, at about the same time the Liberal Party began to hear disturbing stories that certain political deals had been done by the Premier and that the whole process would be affected in relation to the schools, particularly those on the LeFevre Peninsula. Three weeks ago senior sources in the Education Department privately confirmed that the Premier had done a deal with the Independent member for Semaphore.

The part that worries me is that on this occasion the member for Hayward was quoting examples to the Parliament that were related to him.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BLACKER:** I will go on with that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BLACKER:** Whether or not we call it a deal and put it in inverted commas, that was the issue related to Parliament: it was a matter that came from a third party—another source—and, if that is to be outlawed or ruled out, never again can a member raise in this House an issue they hear from a third party. That issue is of very grave importance. I do not believe the Deputy Premier's motion should be accepted; like the member for Alexandra, I would like to see both the motion and the amendment dropped. However, in order that that point might be clarified, it is appropriate that it be referred to a privileges committee so that we can determine, first, whether the words used were offensive and, secondly, whether any member has the right to relate to a reference on an issue that has been brought before them.

On many occasions, I for one have stood in this House and quoted constituents and their reference to the adverse way in which other members of this Parliament—probably including me—have behaved. Any member has a perfect right to relate that to the Parliament and then to go on. In relation to this issue, first, the Liberal Party was hearing disturbing noises about certain political deals. The honourable member went on to say that three weeks previously senior sources in the Education Department had privately confirmed. He then went on to say that, obviously, the deal about which we are talking and which had been previously introduced into Parliament by way of reference to a debate had infuriated many other schools that would face closure as a result. That was the deal which had been referred to him by an outside source and which he had a perfect right to raise in Parliament.

I am worried that we may well be setting a precedent that will create this sort of debate every day of the week—whether there is a right to bring before this House an issue that has been referred to members irrespective of the terminology used. Every reference to 'deal' as I read the passage in question makes specific reference to those two instances and how it was introduced to the honourable member. I strongly support the amendment that has been moved, because the matter is confusing and it has long-term effects. I urge the House to accept the amendment that the matter be put to a privileges committee so that it can be properly debated.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** I am aware that time is marching on, so I will be brief. A couple of things need to be placed on the record in this place but so far they have not been mentioned. I put to you, Mr Speaker, that it is widely known that in fact you were greatly pleased by the media publicity generated by the comments of the member for Hayward that have resulted in today's events. I put to you, Sir, that it is also widely known that you hoped that other



questions of a similar nature would be asked during Estimates Committees. With this said, Sir, I speak on behalf of those who have expressed great concern that today's events are a set-up to attract more media publicity for you. I urge this Parliament to throw out this motion against my colleague the member for Hayward. If this motion is to be passed, it must be passed in its amended form. I and others would welcome the Premier's being hauled as a witness before a committee of privilege to address these issues.

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** I wish to make a brief contribution. I think the public of South Australia would be largely ashamed of their Parliament in its behaviour today—to think we are wasting time when our economy is in a very serious state of disarray. We should be focusing on issues of great importance to the State rather than embarking on what appears to be somewhat of a witch hunt. I believe it is unfortunate that you, Mr Speaker, did not accept the explanation given by the member for Hayward. I do not believe it is necessary for him to eat humble pie or to put on rags and scatter ashes. I believe his explanation has been quite adequate. It should have been accepted at that point but, somewhat analogous to what we saw in the football on Saturday, we are now seeing members slugging it out here, wasting the time of the Parliament when it should be addressing more serious and urgent issues. I wish to put that on the record. I feel ashamed to be here today, partaking in this exercise, and I feel sure that the community would feel much the same way. Members of the community expect more of their representatives in Parliament; they expect more of their Parliament than this sort of childish nonsense that has been going on here today.

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** I seek your advice and guidance, Mr Speaker. I refer to the report of the 1990 Annual Convention of the ALP, and I quote in part the comment of the member for Walsh in relation to several positions of this House:

They [Norm Peterson and Martyn Evans] were instead offered the positions of Speaker and Deputy Speaker at the expense of John Trainer and Don Ferguson.

At page 128 *Erskine May* under the heading 'Contempts and Improper Influence' states:

Attempts by improper means to influence members in their parliamentary conduct may be considered contempts. One of the methods by which such influence may be brought to bear is bribery and in 1695 the House of Commons resolved that 'the offer of money, or any other advantage—

and one could read into that a position of high office in this House—

to any member of Parliament . . . tends to the subversion of the . . . Constitution . . .'

I ask you, Sir, whether *Erskine May* is to be followed in this instance, in which case it would appear that the Premier has been in contempt by offering you a position, as indicated in the 1990 report by the member for Walsh. I seek your guidance as to whether this is the case.

**The SPEAKER:** I really do not know that the Chair has to respond, but I will. I remind the honourable member and the House that it was a unanimous decision of the House that voted me into the Chair, and it will be a majority vote of the House that puts me out.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** It is indeed a sorry day for the Parliament of South Australia. My colleague the member for Davenport has been in this place for 23½ years, and the honourable Deputy Premier, the members for Kavel, Eyre, Hanson and I have been here for 21½ years: in all that time this is the first occurrence of this nature. Where

a consideration has been seen to reflect upon the Chair, the matter has been discussed and attacked in an entirely different way. I fully appreciate that the Speaker can never be wrong in the context of the parliamentary debate and the vote. However, that does not deny wisdom, and I do not believe that a lot of wisdom has been shown in the circumstances that have been allowed to unfold here today.

There is a natural form of justice—whether it be on the football field, in the church, the courts or anywhere else—wherein Caesar does not sit in judgment upon Caesar. Unfortunately, that is a criticism by me of the Speaker of this House, and it is put forward not in that particular context but as a statement of fact that a decision has been taken and a *prima facie* case made out to this House by the person involved, and that will be seen anywhere across the world as not an act of natural justice.

The circumstance arose here earlier this afternoon wherein my colleague the Leader of the Opposition sought your attention, Mr Speaker, and was sat down and not recalled to respond to the request that you made of the honourable member for Hayward. As *Hansard* clearly shows, the honourable member was offered the opportunity to make an apology or an explanation. He sought to give the explanation and as my colleague the Leader has said since, the Leader sought to rise and move that the House accept the explanation. That opportunity was denied at that point by your not coming back to the person who had sought your attention—and obtained your attention previously—and by your giving the call to the Leader of the House. So, we have a tragedy of errors here, which has done nothing for the parliamentary system whatsoever, and that irks me a great deal, as you, Sir, would appreciate, and also as the member for Walsh would appreciate, having occupied the Chair.

I come back to the point: the Speaker cannot be wrong, but the Speaker can be wise. I would hope that out of this situation we will find a deferment to another day, when the matter can be considered in the proper context, because the Standing Orders allow for the Speaker to decide to address the issue on another day. It is quite a simple matter for the Deputy Premier, by leave of the House, to seek to withdraw the motion before the House, for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to seek to withdraw the amendment to the motion, and then, Sir, to leave you the opportunity of considering the matter and coming back to it on another occasion. I certainly hope that on that other occasion there will have been the opportunity of discussion with people who want to see the dignity and the importance of the role of Parliament preserved for the future.

As the member for Flinders so rightly said a few minutes ago, if this motion is carried today, no member of this House now or in the future will ever have the opportunity to stand and debate the issues that are important. You, Sir, can shake your head; it is a matter of opinion. My interpretation, and clearly the interpretation of a lot of other people and those people out in the wider community who believe in natural justice, is that it is important that the matter be considered without heat, without emotion, and that it be considered in such a way as to find a solution, which is the expectation of a democratic society. What we are doing at the moment is not democratic.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I rise to support the amendment and I do so for simple and very natural reasons. It is obvious to me and I believe to everyone listening to this debate today that there is a great deal of confusion about what the House should do, the appropriate manner in which it should do it and the usages and customs that have been



followed. I refer the House to Standing Order No. 1, which states:

Usages of the House of Commons to be observed unless other provision is made.

The 21st edition of *Erskine May* clearly states that when a *prima facie* breach of privilege is ruled by the Speaker it is then referred to a committee of privilege. If Standing Order No. 1 is relevant to this House and if we have not forgotten that Standing Order, then the precedent of the Palace of Westminster and the House of Commons is quite clear. There is in every case of a *prima facie* breach of privilege being ruled by the Speaker reference to a Standing Order.

Sir, I acknowledge and accept your decision in this matter. It is your absolute right to rule *prima facie*; it is now the absolute right of this House to sit in judgment upon me. It is an ancient and honourable tradition and, whatever else I might do, I honour the traditions of this House. However, I implore this House, if it is to sit in judgment upon me, let it do it fairly. There is but one fair way and that is to adjudicate the matter carefully, as my friend the member for Kavel said, 'in the cold light of reason', and then make a deliberation, and I shall submit myself to the considered deliberations of this House. But I will not, as my Leader says, feel that I have been justly treated if I am to be adjudged by a court that does not know what it is doing.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Much has been said about this, and I think that there is a lot of merit in not making a decision today. I think that people now realise that some matters need to be considered in a cooler climate than the one we have at the moment and that we will be setting a precedent whereby a Government in the future—regardless of its political philosophy, especially when numbers are tight—will be able to manipulate the House on particular occasions to suit itself if it so wishes. For that reason in a moment I will ask whether the House is prepared to adjourn the matter to a date to be fixed, whether it be left to you, Sir, to fix the date or left to the House. Members may wish to consider that, but I think the matter is so serious that that is the action we should take. It gives us the opportunity, if people so wish, to set up the privilege committee and to discuss the matter; it gives us the opportunity, if we so wish, to leave the matter until it can be more formally discussed, and perhaps we may end up rescinding both motions.

I believe it is very important that we do not set this precedent now; it may cause a lot of people in the future—and some of us may still be here in the future—much embarrassment. It is an unusual step. There is no doubt that what the honourable member for Walsh said at another venue also involves a breach, and there is no doubt that if we look through recent records we will find that other people have committed breaches when they have talked about or reflected upon individuals as members of Parliament. That is what we are talking about: a reflection, as you have said, Sir, in other words, a contempt of Parliament. I therefore wish to move that this debate be adjourned, and if that is carried—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not think it is possible for the honourable member to move that motion. He can certainly seek leave to continue his remarks.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I seek leave to continue my remarks.

**The SPEAKER:** Is leave granted? Leave is not granted.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I ask the House to reject the amendment and to support my motion. First, I do not know what there is for a committee of privilege to investigate. It is quite clear that there has been

a breach of the privileges of the House, and that has been admitted. In any event, it seems that this is quite illogical, because such a move transfers the heat from the member who improperly raised the allegations to another member on whom the reflections were made.

Were that process to be followed, privilege could well become completely debased, in that any member could raise quite scurrilous allegations against any other member and then insist that the innocent member defend himself or herself in a privileges committee. Where does that get us? There is a proper mechanism where a member wants to question another member's conduct and that, as we said on a number of occasions, is by way of a substantive motion. It requires a quite deliberate process to be followed, rather than off-the-cuff debate, and ensures that the dignity and decorum of the place is kept at a civilised level.

I return to the substance of this matter and remind members, Mr Speaker, that your concern and that of a number of members in this place—I would hope, a majority—is that not only were the words 'a deal was done' used, but let me go on to quote, as follows:

... to ensure his support in the critical no-confidence motion moved against the Government.

In other words, what was being alleged was not simply that you were using whatever vigorous and persuasive methods any local member might want to use in order to further the interests of your electors but, indeed, that you voted corruptly in the no-confidence motion in this House. That is the gravamen of our concern in this matter.

A number of members have made the point that the two hours since the House was called together for business today could have been used rather more productively than they have been used. I would certainly say 'Amen' to that, but I remind members that that is because a procedure that has been followed in this House previously was not followed today. I remind members of a matter involving the Minister of Employment and Further Education, when you ruled in that matter in exactly the same way as you have ruled today: against a member of the Government—a Minister. What then proceeded, what saved us on that day from the procedure that has been followed today, was that the Minister rose in his place and apologised and withdrew. That is all you have asked from the member for Hayward today, but he has not been prepared to accede to that request and I believe that this motion automatically must follow and be carried.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—Messrs Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker (teller), Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Pair—Aye—Mr Allison. No—Mr Mayes.

**The SPEAKER:** There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I cast my vote for the Noes. The amendment is negatived. Will members resume their seats, as there is a further vote. As a division is required and as no member has left the Chamber, the Chamber messengers can lock the doors and we can vote.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Noes (22)—Messrs Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker (teller), Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Mayes. No—Mr Allison.

**The SPEAKER:** There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I do not wish to labour the House much at this time but, as I understand it (and I seek your advice on this), on occasions upon which the Speaker directs that the House, and since no member has left—

**The SPEAKER:** I am sorry, but I missed what the honourable member is saying.

**Mr LEWIS:** On previous occasions when the Speaker has directed that, following the call for a division, it is not necessary to ring the bells, there have always been 47 members in the Chamber. On this occasion the members for Unley and Mount Gambier were not present, but you directed that the doors be locked without calling for the bells to be rung. Whether or not any of us believe that we have knowledge of their whereabouts or arrangements is not for us or for you to presume, Sir, and I seek your guidance as to whether that has set a precedent that, in future, if not all members are present, the doors can be ordered to be locked without the ringing of the bells.

**The SPEAKER:** There are 45 members present, and I was advised of a pair. I put the question to the House and nobody responded.

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

That the member for Hayward be suspended from the sitting of the House for the remainder of this day of sitting.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

Leave out all words after 'be' and insert 'reprimanded'.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—Messrs Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker (teller), Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Pair—Aye—Mr Allison. No—Mr Mayes.

**The SPEAKER:** There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Noes (22)—Messrs Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker (teller), Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Mayes. No—Mr Allison.

**The SPEAKER:** There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the member for Hayward, having been found guilty of contempt by the House, to leave the Chamber.

*The member for Hayward having withdrawn:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Sir, I rise on a matter of privilege—your own. I refer to a matter that was raised during debate, and I would ask you, Sir, to investigate that matter, to see whether in fact there has been a breach of your privilege in this Parliament. I refer to the report of the 1990 annual convention of the ALP and to the comments contained therein by the member for Walsh, which have already been repeated before this Parliament. I ask that you investigate that matter, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I am not sure what the point is that the honourable member raises.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Well, for the very reasons that you, Sir, felt somewhat outraged at the statements that were made by the member for Hayward and said that they had impugned you in some way and reflected on you. I refer to the statement that is contained in the member for Walsh's report to the 1990 annual convention of the ALP, as the Secretary to the Parliamentary Party, and I quote:

With a 47 seat Chamber containing only 22 ALP members, 23 Liberal/National Party members and two Labor Independents, a tenuous working majority could only be obtained by accommodating the two Independent members who occupy what were previously 'safe' ALP seats; Norm Peterson who won Semaphore from George Apap in 1979 and Martyn Evans who won Elizabeth when Peter Duncan resigned in 1984. Initially, both Independent Labor MPs were seeking ministries. They were instead offered the positions of Speaker and Deputy Speaker at the expense of John Trainer and Don Ferguson.

Mr Speaker, there is obviously some reference in there that you have been bought off.

**The SPEAKER:** I disagree.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I might remind the House that I was elected as the Chair of this House by a unanimous vote—which, to make it very clear, means that the Opposition voted for me as well.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is there some implication that I made a deal with the Opposition as well?

**Mr S.J. Baker:** Sir, is that a question to me?

**The SPEAKER:** I am saying that I will not investigate it, because I was elected to this Chair by a unanimous vote of the House—which included both sides of the House.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** Sir, we can count—24 does beat 23.

**The SPEAKER:** I feel that the Deputy Leader is very close to some trouble.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! He is very close, but I again draw attention to the fact that it was a unanimous vote.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, in relation to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's moving for a breach of privilege by the member for Walsh, he was not moving against the vote in this House but he was asking you to move a breach of privilege against the statement of the member for Walsh. It was nothing to do with the vote in this House. The breach of privilege upon which we are asking you to investigate—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have a grasp of what the honourable member is saying. However, it cannot be true, because, as I point out again, I was elected by a unanimous vote of this House.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Walsh quite clearly said in his speech to the 1990 annual convention of the ALP that you and the Deputy Speaker were accommodated: whether that is true or not, that is a breach of privilege. It is an allegation—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The ALP conference, or the Liberal Party or the National Party or the Independents here, all have one vote per member, and every person in this Chamber, if my memory serves me correctly, supported my nomination in this House. I was not nominated at any State conference: I was nominated on the floor of this House, the Parliament of South Australia, and that was voted on by the members of this House, and I was elected. While I am here, I will uphold the Standing Orders. Are there any questions? Start the clock.

## QUESTION TIME

### INCOME TAX

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** On this very sad day, Mr Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Why does the Premier not support his Labor colleagues, the Premiers of Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland, as well as the New South Wales Premier, in their proposals for the States to share income taxing powers with the Commonwealth, and will he outline to this House his alternative solutions to the fiscal problems facing this State?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** First, it is not correct that all those names support the proposal to which the honourable Leader refers and which has been canvassed in the papers recently. There has been a working party of officers looking at the taxing powers of the States and the Commonwealth respectively for some considerable time. Certain findings or certain matters that they have been exploring have been reported. In relation to one of those, namely, the question of whether the State should be imposing its own income tax, I am on the record—and have been consistently and will remain so—as saying that that is not in the interests of South Australia or the taxpaying public.

What I do support is a system, which in fact was devised in 1942 and agreed to by the Commonwealth and the States, whereby the Commonwealth would collect a uniform personal income tax, which in turn would be distributed between those on whose part it was collected, namely, the States and the Federal Government of Australia.

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, since when is the Minister of Transport found to be in order discussing matters with members of the public across the gallery?

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The Minister of Transport is out of order and will resume his seat.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** To return to the issue of double taxation, which apparently the Leader of the Opposition is very keen to support: I find it quite extraordinary; he is also on the record as supporting the goods and services tax, which will increase the cost of living to ordinary Australians, and particularly those most in need, by a very considerable sum of money. I am opposed to that, too. The important thing about the income tax system of this country—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** These are the people who support South Australia and its interests! These are the people who, faced with the threat that is represented by this system—

**Mr D.S. Baker:** Wimp!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is out of order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** There is a threat to South Australia under the underlying principle that is being explored which will undermine fiscal equalisation in this country and which will mean that those States, including South Australia, that joined the federation in order to see an equitable sharing of income, and that established a Grants Commission procedure to bring it about, will see that equalisation principle undermined. I urge all South Australians, and the Opposition in particular, to support us in attempting to ensure that that principle remains intact. That is why I made the remarks about income tax. However, if it is a fact that the Leader of the Opposition wants to have a State income tax as well, let him declare it clearly. Let him say what rate and how it will be levied. Mr Speaker, I do not agree with that.

### HEALTH SCIENCES EDUCATION REVIEW

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education outline to the House the main thrust of the health sciences education review?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The review follows the university amalgamations last year and public controversy over whether the School of Pharmacy at the former South Australian Institute of Technology, now the University of South Australia, should become part of the University of Adelaide. Members will remember that the need for an independent review of health sciences education was agreed upon by this Parliament in those discussions. The review was chaired by Emeritus Professor Malcolm Whyte, the internationally renowned clinical scientist from Canberra, assisted by Dr Jean Blackburn, a noted South Australian educationalist and Chancellor of the University of Canberra.

The 111-page review does not support earlier calls for a transfer of some schools and courses, or for the unilateral concentration of facilities and courses in one health sciences centre. Instead, it states that South Australia will benefit more from a truly cooperative approach which involves all institutions and courses. The main thrust of the review's 19 recommendations is for a closer integration within education and between practice and education in South Australia's health system.

South Australia has much to be proud of in the health services area. The review indicates recommended changes which it believes could bring added renown, greater attractiveness for funding and put South Australia in the forefront of health education in Australia. The review stresses the changing nature of the health care system and the fact that education, and particularly the field work experience component, must be funded properly and work efficiently if it is to keep up with change. In addition, the review also argues for greater rural-based education of health personnel, with specific emphasis on Whyalla health services organisations and Modbury Hospital as possible sites for enlarged activity, in concert with South Australian universities. The review, which also reported to SAGE (a committee including the Chief Executives of the three universities) will be discussed at that committee's November meeting, and I look forward to hearing the results of those discussions.

### ADELAIDE INFLATION RATE

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Is the Treasurer aware that the State Bank has predicted an inflation rate of 5 per cent for Adelaide this financial year

compared with his budget assumption of 3.3 per cent? Does the Treasurer agree that, if the State Bank's forecast is correct, it will represent an additional cost to the State budget of about \$44 million? Will he explain how this will be funded, given that there is no round sum allowance for price increases in this year's budget?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I suggest that the honourable member look at the basis of that calculation and the time over which it is conducted, and compare that with the budget estimates.

### NATIONAL RECYCLING POLICY

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** In light of the recent announcement of South Australia's support for a national recycling policy, will the Minister for Environment and Planning give any consideration to abandoning South Australia's container deposit legislation?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The very short answer to that is 'No', I am not giving consideration to abandoning South Australia's highly successful container deposit legislation. Indeed, I put it to the House that it is the most successful anti-litter legislation in Australia. It also provides the best possible means of recovering nearly all the steel, aluminium and PET which is used in the production of drinking containers. I see no reason to suggest for one moment that South Australia should abandon its container deposit legislation, even though we are supporting and being part of a national recycling strategy. Indeed, in its own policy document issued in May, the Opposition states:

Container deposit legislation, which is widely accepted by the public, should continue to operate in conjunction with kerbside collection.

So, any suggestion from the Opposition that we would be moving away from deposit legislation would be counter to its own policy. Container deposit legislation is the most effective litter minimisation and resource conservation scheme presently operating in this country, and it will most certainly be maintained by me as Minister for Environment and Planning.

### MINISTER OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** My question is to Minister Klunder. Does the Minister agree—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Ministers will be referred to by their area of responsibility.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, but I thought he might be ashamed of it. My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Does the Minister agree that there seems to be a double standard when the Police Commissioner sees the need for a senior police officer to resign after admitting the theft of \$10 worth of seedlings 16 years ago while the Minister admits responsibility for losing \$60 million of taxpayers' funds through the Scrimber failure and faces no penalty?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** Basically, that question is beneath contempt.

### DEATH OF DIMITRIUS I

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** Will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs be conveying (and, if so, in what way) the condolences of the South Australian Government to the orthodox patriarchate following the death last week of His Holiness, the ecumenical patriarch Dimitrius I?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Of course, we all recognise, in South Australia quite correctly as a State that our history is one of separation of church and State, and this Parliament is based upon the very self-same principle. Nevertheless, there has always been the desire and willingness of governments to recognise the activities of great and significant individuals in our times. I know that many South Australians would share with me and other members in this place their sadness at the passing last week of His Holiness Dimitrius I, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who ranks amongst the first amongst equals in the Orthodox church.

I had the honour and pleasure to meet and dine with His Holiness on 4 May this year when I was in Istanbul, and very much appreciated the chance to talk with him on matters of interest to all people, whether they be members of the Orthodox community, Christians or simple citizens of the globe. At that time I received his greetings that he extended to all in South Australia. This evening I will be representing the Government at a memorial service to be held at St Georges in Thebarton to convey the condolences of the Government and of all South Australians who wish to share in recognising the contribution that this particular person has made to better understanding around the globe. It is one of the sadnesses of humanity that divisions very often arise and are fermented by some who see some benefit out of that.

The history of Christendom is no less than the history of other people whereby through our time divisions often rate more highly than attempts to try to bring people together. The great split between the Orthodox church and the Catholic church is amongst such cases, dating from the first ecumenical council in AD325 through to the great schism of AD1054. However, the spirit of His Holiness Dimitrius I was one of trying to bring people together, regardless of the divisions that they may have felt in the past. He strove to give a message of relevance not only to those within Orthodoxy and Christendom but, as I said before, to all human kind. Indeed, I can repeat a message he gave at Easter 1989 when he said:

... we address to those near and to those far off the greeting of love and our warm wishes, together with the reaffirmation that this throne of the Protoclete is always ready, from its age-old cathedra in the royal city, to minister to its children everywhere, to all Orthodox and all Christians, as well as to all human beings of good will who wish to cooperate with it in fulfilling the sacred will of God on earth and, finally, to place itself at the disposal of all those who are in need of its assistance and understanding.

I am certain that all South Australians, regardless of the divisions that might have existed in the past and may still exist between sections of the community, would certainly wish to pay tribute to the work of a great man and what he tried to do to help heal those divisions and look forward to a brighter future. I will be conveying condolences at the memorial service this evening.

### MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I direct my question to the Minister of Forests. Under the Westminster system of ministerial responsibility, and as a Minister in South Australia, how would the Minister define the circumstances in which a Minister should resign?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** If the Opposition indulges in this sort of attack as a peculiar way of going about it instead of going straight to the nub of the matter, I suppose I must try on the spur of the moment to give some kind of definition. Clearly, where a Minister deliberately does something which is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I did not hear that interjection.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** Where a Minister deliberately does an act of some kind which is clearly against the best advice he has received and that then backfires, the Minister needs to seriously consider resigning. I guess I really ought to take this down to the line where—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** The honourable member really is being—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** We are really getting to some of the sour grapes of the Opposition, and I guess I ought to try to deal with some of those. In terms of the reports the honourable member mentioned by interjection, those were not reports that as a Minister I was required to read. They were never sent to me; they were never intended for my consumption. If the honourable member really suggests that Ministers ought to appoint boards and then read the advice provided to those boards, thereby short-circuiting the boards in the first place, he really does not know much about the way in which either private enterprise or Government operate. Really—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** The honourable member is probably aware that I put out many more reports of the Public Accounts Committee than he did.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** Mr Speaker, I will have to ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark. The honourable member is suggesting that I covered up things whilst I was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. That is disgraceful and I ask for a withdrawal.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hanson.

**Mr BECKER:** I apologise to the House for interjecting. I was interjecting in response to a comment from the Minister alongside the Minister of Forests. If the Speaker is asking me to withdraw that remark I will do so. But the Minister cannot deny that they were inquiries which I wanted but which were not pursued.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member has withdrawn.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** To get back to the main point, that is, the action that I took with regard to Scrimber, which action, I presume, is at the back of these nasty little questions, in April of this year I took an action which in effect led to the cessation of further expenditure on the project, when, as a result of the action I took, it became obvious (and it had not been obvious previously) that there were severe doubts as to the quality of the product that would eventually be produced. Under those circumstances I think I am in a position to be able to say to the House that I saved the expenditure of further amounts of money and I do not intend to apologise for that in any way whatsoever.

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Can the Minister of Labour advise the House of the dates for daylight saving this season and whether any special consideration has been made for the 1992 Festival of Arts?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Yes, I can. Daylight saving in South Australia will be extended by three weeks this

season for the 1992 Festival of Arts. Yesterday, Cabinet decided that daylight saving will begin on Sunday, 27 October 1991 and conclude on 22 March 1992, the fourth Sunday in March. Daylight saving would normally have finished on the first Sunday of that month, 1 March. The 1992 Festival will run from 28 February until 21 March, so the extension means that the entire Festival calendar will operate with the benefit of daylight saving.

I am sure this will be welcomed by local Festival-goers as well as the many thousands of visitors from interstate and overseas. Daylight saving is very popular—more than 70 per cent of voters supported it in the 1982 referendum—and we believe there is a lot of community support for extended daylight saving especially during the Festival. I know that the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, the Hon. Anne Levy, has welcomed this decision, and I am sure that the Minister of Tourism, the Hon. Barbara Wiese, and the tourism industry will also welcome it.

#### OPERATION ARK

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** Has the Minister of Emergency Services now read the Operation Ark report prepared by Mr Justice Stewart? If not, why not?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I think I reminded the House some time ago that that report was not directed to me; neither was it directed to the Attorney-General. It was an internal report of the NCA, which the NCA withdrew rather than forward. As I also indicated at the time I was asked a question, I have read the recommendations of that report in order to ensure that the allegations of police corruption that had surfaced were negated by that report, and that report indicated that there were no allegations of police corruption. At that stage, since it was not an official report to the Government, and since it was not a report directed to me, I believed I had done my duty by reading that much of the report to ensure that the major allegation against the police was followed up. However, since the Opposition insisted on making a great play out of it, I did afterwards call for the report again and I did read it, and the body of the report did suggest that the recommendations were, in fact, correct.

#### WASTE AND OIL RECYCLING

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning provide the House with details of proposals to encourage the recycling of used tyres and waste lubricating oil? I have seen reports that Australians replace about 14 million tyres a year, of which 10 million are scrapped. Similarly, only 35 per cent of waste lubricating oil is recycled. In addition to wasting non-renewable resources, these practices create significant disposal problems.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest and the research he has undertaken with respect to the whole question of recycling, waste minimisation and the conservation of our non-renewable resources. I am delighted to inform the honourable member that in July this year I presented to the Australian and New Zealand Environment Council Ministers Conference in Australia the final report of a task force set up to establish options for reusing both those products. The recommendations of the task force are: a target of 70 per cent recovery for waste oil should be met by December 1995; waste oil be utilised as a fuel or in other industrial processes

or could be refined as motor oil; a levy be placed on new motor vehicle tyres to help pay for the disposal of used tyres; used tyres be shredded and converted to other rubber products; and Governments throughout Australia be asked to consider giving priority to the purchase of retreaded tyres for Government car fleets in order to make the retreading of used casings more economical.

I am delighted to inform the House that we in South Australia are already moving forward to implement a number of those recommendations. We can no longer afford to adopt an 'out of sight, out of mind' attitude or the continuance of the practice of a throwaway society with respect to waste oil and used tyres. We must accept that there are more economical and environmentally responsible alternatives rather than simply disposing of oil and tyres in the way in which we have traditionally done in this country. I will be seeking the support of the industry in finding both new and creative ways in which to utilise these materials and, indeed, this process is already under way.

### POLICE SALARIES

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** Will the Minister of Emergency Services indicate on what date he sought Cabinet approval to treat the police salary increase as a separate case this financial year and on what date did Cabinet agree to do so?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** That is something that took place within Cabinet. I do not actually lack witnesses to the fact that it happened; there was quite a number of them. However, I am not entirely sure that I am able to give the honourable member dates, times and documents, because Cabinet does not disclose such information.

### GRAFFITI OFFENDERS

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether consideration has been given to enacting legislation to enable bus and train drivers to search and, if necessary, to detain graffiti offenders? I have been approached by constituents who read an article in the *Advertiser* on 19 September that quoted the Hon. Diana Laidlaw as advocating such measures. My constituents requested that I bring this matter to the attention of the Minister, just in case he had missed reading the article, knowing he is a busy man.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Napier for his question and also for the acknowledgment that Ministers are very busy people. However, this was one article that I could not miss because, quite frankly, I could not believe that such an irresponsible statement could be made by a member of Parliament. It was totally irresponsible and I will tell the House why. The honourable member concerned is suggesting that bus operators of various ages untrained in security ought to be able to detain, or attempt to detain, anyone they see committing an offence. The stupidity of that proposition has been demonstrated and clearly put down by the bus drivers' own union. It does not want the bus operators involved in any way in such practices as attempting to detain offenders on buses or people who they believe are committing an offence. The reason for that ought to be obvious to anyone—without the training and without the equipment, it can be very dangerous.

I recommend that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw talk to the member for Newland, because I distinctly remember that on 12 September the member for Newland gave a very good example of why bus operators ought not to involve them-

selves in this kind of practice. The member for Newland (page 840 of *Hansard*) described an incident where a bus driver was assaulted. She stated:

This spree of violence reached a disgraceful climax at the beginning of July when a bus driver at the Modbury bus interchange was attacked by a gang of youths when he tried to detain them until police arrived.

It is the height of irresponsibility for a member of Parliament—in this case a member in another place—to suggest that that situation be brought about on numerous occasions. I congratulate the member for Newland on putting on the *Hansard* record clearly the dangers of going down this particular track. I hope that the member for Newland will speak to the Hon. Diana Laidlaw and point out some of the realities and some of the nonsense that the honourable member is promoting in the community.

As regards the other part of the quote referred to by my colleague the member for Napier in relation to bus and train drivers being given the power to search and detain suspected graffiti offenders, the Government has announced its intention to bring into Parliament legislation to give our transit officers, who are trained and equipped to deal with these kinds of offenders—not bus operators who are not so trained—the power to do that very thing. I look forward to the support of the House when that legislation is introduced. It will give the transit squad more power to prevent that type of graffiti and the annoyance and damage that is done. People have been asking about the civil rights of the graffiti artists when they want to get on the train with their bags; people ask why they should be searched.

I will tell the House why. Why, if one is a passenger on a train, does one have to deal with sitting down on a seat that has been sprayed with paint the same colour as the seat by one of these characters? These people seem to feel that it is smart or that it is a joke, but passengers have paint all over their clothes. What civil right do people have to do that: to expect to be able to walk onto trains and buses with the equipment to do that—and it is no good for any other purpose on trains and buses? At present the law may not allow the transit squad the right to prevent that. In summary, I hope that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw will speak with the member for Newland about the question of detaining people who are allegedly offenders and I also hope that the House will completely support the Government when it brings in the legislation to ensure that our transit officers can, on suspicion, search people who come onto our system with graffiti implements.

### MINISTERIAL WORKLOAD

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Does the Premier agree with his Minister of Forests that more Ministers are needed to reduce the Ministerial workload to allow them to do their jobs properly? In an interview on Channel 7 on 20 September the Minister, when explaining why he had not read the Scrimber report, said:

If you are arguing that there should be more Ministers, then I think you are probably right.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** There is no question that government is becoming very much more complex and that the volume of work, both in constituencies and generally, has increased remarkably. It is also true that there has not been any change in the size of the South Australian ministry since 1978. In fact, compared with Western Australia, we have five fewer Ministers with a population of similar size. Indeed, Ministers in the South Australian Government are expected to work over a range of issues to a far greater



extent than their colleagues. Having said that, I recognise the workload that is on the Ministers, but I am very satisfied with the way they are discharging that work.

In particular, I have certainly been satisfied with the way in which the Minister of Forests—if we are talking about forests in particular—has picked up his responsibilities and made decisions that, in fact, have benefited this State enormously. If the Scrimber situation had been allowed to drift on—as well it might in the face of the sort of reports that were coming through and the hope that the process would come right—the liability would have been very much greater. The Minister was prepared to step in and demand certain targets and certain results and to say that, if they were not forthcoming then, indeed, a decision had to be made about the future of the project. He did that, and in so doing he indicated not only how responsible he was as Minister but how effectively he was discharging his portfolio.

### NEW BUSINESS

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology inform the House whether there are any prospects for attracting new business to South Australia?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Certainly, a number of opportunities are being examined at this stage by the Government, and in particular by the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. At all stages we are in the process of pursuing avenues; indeed, later this evening I will be receiving a deputation from a regional group keen to see a woollen mill established in their area. For some time the Government has argued strongly that there is a need for more processing of wool within this country, rather than seeing so much of our wool clip going offshore in the greasy form that it does. In fact, about 87 per cent of our wool goes offshore in that form.

As to other major prospects, I have previously reported to the House on the tioxide proposal. It is more than a proposal and has reached the stage of being accepted as one of the two sites in the world where a tioxide plant will be established. Whyalla came out well ahead of other potential Australian sites. Likewise, other developments in the petrochemical industry in that area are being further pursued, and a number of initiatives in the automotive industry, despite the very difficult time the automotive sector faces at the moment, are also being pursued.

There are a large number of other examples that one could list. An exciting one is the work that the Government is doing with a major United States construction rail company, Morrison Knudsen. The proposal we are discussing with it is to have the company base its Australian operations in South Australia. Morrison Knudsen is committed to establishing a significant locomotive rebuilding venture in Australia, and all indications at this stage are pointing towards South Australia, despite the fact that in the first instance its interests were in other parts of Australia.

The company has identified a substantial export market within the Pacific rim area for rail-related products and services, and we are expecting a firm commitment on the location in the near future. If we are successful on this project, Morrison Knudsen has indicated that the operation is likely to employ between 100 and 300 people in the short term.

### JUVENILE DETENTION CENTRE

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Will the Minister of Family and Community Services withdraw and review the Govern-

ment's plan for its new youth detention centre at Cavan in view of the fact that for over \$11 million it will provide only 36 places, which is \$300 000 a bed? Since the plans were commenced there has been a serious escalation in juvenile crime. Also, will the Minister take into account the fact that the House of Assembly has a select committee that is to report on juvenile justice and the committee could possibly find that the planned building and its size may not be appropriate for South Australia?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I understand that the project has gone through the normal process of the Public Works Committee, which has given approval for it to proceed.

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am sorry, I understand that the matter is still before the committee. I will be guided to a degree by what the committee might find concerning that matter. Can I say, without wanting in any way to influence unduly any members of the committee who might be sitting here, that the design of the facility is based on the best advice we can get from around the world as to what juvenile detention facilities should be.

It is based on the assumption that, despite diversion into the sort of very useful community work that is now finding favour with the courts, we will need detention facilities, and it is also with the understanding that further facilities may indeed have to be built in the future. Subject to what the Public Works Committee may determine, I can see no reason for withdrawing from our present plans, although I accept that there may be a necessity for further planning to occur, as we have to accept in relation to the adult justice and detention system.

What might emerge from the Public Works Committee is another matter, but I point out to the House that at present the means whereby we are detaining juveniles is not a cost effective system and that almost certainly the site now used for SATAC can be put to far more productive use at some return to the taxpayer, and that needs to be taken into account with the simplistic analysis of the cost that has just been placed before the House by the honourable member.

### MILLIPEDES

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Can the Minister of Agriculture explain what is the current situation in respect to biological control of millipedes and indicate what residents can do to try to control these pests?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Daventry. The member for Henley Beach.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr FERGUSON:** I did not think it was all that much of a question. I have been approached by residents of Henley and Grange concerned about the increasing number of millipedes appearing in their houses this season.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am concerned to hear the member for Henley Beach say that he is receiving reports of increasing numbers of millipedes appearing in the homes of constituents. I must say that yesterday, when Cabinet visited the southern suburbs, someone came to me at the reception and reported exactly the same finding. That, too, was of concern to me, and I intend to ask the department to examine again whether or not there has been an increase of late in the numbers, because the evidence seems to have been that we were seeing a decline in the numbers.



In the area where I live—in the northern suburbs—we have seen a marked decline in the past couple of years. They made their way finally that far north about four years ago, but in the past two years the numbers seem to have been down on what happened about four years ago. Because the evidence I am now hearing from the member for Henley Beach and from the person who spoke to me yesterday indicates that something of a resurgence may be taking place, I will approach the department.

To repeat what has been happening, we had the research program that looked at two biological control methods, one was the nematode and one was the parasitic fly, which was released in 1989 and which, I have to say, turned out to be something of a failure. It seems that the Portuguese millipedes in this country do not grow to the size that they do in Portugal and, therefore, it seems that the flies—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Perhaps you have not seen the size of them in Portugal. Whatever the case, the flies that are parasitic on these millipedes in Portugal did not seem to take too keenly to them here and either fasted or starved to death. The flies seem to have died out. However, the nematode has been more successful. It seems to have taken on attacking the millipede and controlled its numbers. There is no need for further research to be done on that, because we have identified success in that part of the program and we have discontinued further releases of nematodes at this stage.

Householders who wish to obtain them can get them from a commercial operator, Mr Peter Stevens of Coromandel Valley. Because of these recent reports that have come to me, I will ask the department to update the situation to determine whether or not we will need to look at a future release program by the department or at some other means of promoting the release of these nematodes, or whether further research could usefully be done given the fact that it has been difficult to find successful biological control methods for this nuisance.

### WATER FOWL

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning seriously consider making funds available as a matter of urgency to the E&WS Department from the Wildlife Conservation Fund for the preservation of water fowl on the Noora evaporation basin? The Noora basin is a Government created wetland and, as a result of saline irrigation being disposed of in the Noora area and as a consequence of three years of good flow in the Murray, only a minimum quantity of saline irrigation effluent has been pumped to Noora, and the Minister would be well aware of the reason for that. It is anticipated that the basin will be dry within three weeks. Since it is not the intention of the E&WS Department to pump sufficient effluent in the foreseeable future to sustain the wildlife population in the basin, additional pumping will be required to save from certain death thousands of young water fowl—swans, in particular—which are not yet able to fly.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for raising this matter because, quite obviously, it is one of concern. I have not been made aware of it, and I am very pleased that he has raised it with me. I would also be very happy to seek a report, both from the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, indeed, from the Department of Environment and Planning, with respect to the suggestion that the honourable member has made.

Quite obviously, I cannot make any commitments. I do not know the kind of resource commitment that I would

be asked to contribute in terms of the amount that would be required to provide sufficient water for the ongoing maintenance of the wildlife that has been bred in the Murat basin area, so it would not be appropriate—and I am sure that the honourable member is not asking me—to make that commitment. However, I will be very pleased to investigate the situation and look at a possible range of solutions with respect to the problem that the honourable member has highlighted.

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** At this point, I will make sure that it is done first thing in the morning.

### FOSTER CARE

**Mr De LAINE:** Can the Minister of Family and Community Services outline the situation in South Australia in relation to foster care? I refer the Minister to a recent newspaper article concerning foster care in Victoria, headed 'Foster care doubles in recession', which states that the number of Victorian children placed in foster and residential care has doubled because of high unemployment and the recession.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I read that article and decided that, in fact, I should check the South Australian position, and I found that it does not reflect the Victorian position at all. Obviously, families suffer stress during a recession, but the South Australian figures do not show the sort of increase that Victoria has experienced in the number of children entering foster care over the past 12 months. Indeed, the figures show no increase at all. The figures for emergency foster care—care for less than three months to meet family crisis—and respite care—regular short-term care for families at risk—show a reduction in the number of placements in 1991 compared to 1990.

From January to June 1990 the figure for emergency foster care was 1 036, and for the same period in 1991, 919; and respite care in 1990, 1 220; and in 1991, 1 014. Clearly, there has been a reduction this year. As to residential care, the number of non-disability children who can enter such care in South Australia is 18 and, of course, this is because over the past few years the number of residential units was reduced from 13 to three. Children entering these units must be under the care of the Minister or the Chief Executive Officer of the Department for Family and Community Services. They are not able to be placed into foster or residential care without the involvement of a social worker from the Department for Family and Community Services.

### ADELAIDE CASINO

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Will the Minister of Finance give this Parliament a guarantee that he will exercise his powers to prevent the installation of an EFPTOS facility in the Adelaide Casino? The 1990-91 Annual Report of the Casino Supervisory Authority states on page 13:

Following a submission by the operator to provide an EFPTOS facility in the casino, the Lotteries Commission considered the matter and resolved not to give approval for the installation and operation of a stand-alone cash dispensing machine on the main gaming floor, with the present arrangements remaining unaltered. The authority is monitoring closely ongoing discussions between the operator and the Lotteries Commission on this subject.

A number of people have expressed concern to me of the potential disastrous effects that could occur to a number of families if this facility is included in the casino. They understand that an EFPTOS facility would also permit the with-

drawal of funds against a credit card, and hence effectively allow gambling by credit card. They hope that the Minister will do all in his power to prevent such a situation from occurring.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** To the best of my memory, I have had no such request. When I receive such a request, I will consider it and will talk to my Cabinet colleagues about it but, certainly, the prospect of that does not fill me with any enthusiasm at all. I saw one such machine in the Wrest Point Casino in Hobart. Every bank had a composite machine, which did not seem to me to be doing any great harm. I did not need to use it myself, although it would have been very handy. That was nothing to do with the casino: not being a gambler, I am not interested in gambling, but I find these bank teller machines to be extraordinarily handy, and the presence of one in the foyer of the Wrest Point Casino was something that I thought was an excellent idea. Nevertheless, the gambling connection is a legitimate concern, and I am sure that the Government would take note of not only the honourable member's concerns but, I imagine, also a lot of other concerns in the community that such a request should come to the Government.

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT RESTRUCTURE

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Will the Minister of Education report to the House what the Education Department restructure is hoping to achieve, and does he agree with statements made that the running down of the northern area office, in particular, will reduce chalk face facilities?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in education generally. I am pleased to receive support generally on this matter from the Opposition spokesperson and, indeed, from many schools and sections of the Education Department in South Australia. It is an important review of the non-schools structure of education in South Australia and, to that extent, it does not alter or reduce chalk face facilities, as the honourable member indicated some fear that it may. It deals with the non-schools structure of the Education Department. It is aimed at providing a strengthening factor for the role of the school as an entity and, indeed, the specific role of the principal and the school council in the administration of schools. Indeed, it is aimed at the provision of educational services, generally, in the State. Its aim is to provide a greater degree of efficiency in our education system, and I am sure that all members would applaud that goal, although that is not the sole aim of the review.

I think it is appropriate that we look at how we can provide the most effective way in which schools can be administered, and the recommendations with respect to personnel administration in the department are very important indeed. Once again, personnel and payroll would be a centralised function in the Education Department and, with the new technologies available to the department, a much better service can be provided, particularly to our teachers and school-based staff in the department. In any one year more than 20 000 group certificates are issued in the Education Department. It is the State's largest single employer and, therefore, we must be very vigilant that our personnel function is effective, that it is serving our teachers well and, indeed, that we have a personnel function that cares for our staff, who provide a very difficult and important service in our community.

Those are the general aims of the review. It brings about very substantial structural change to the administration of the department. It provides for a much flatter management

structure than the department has enjoyed in the past, and I very much appreciate the widespread community support for these proposals. They are not easy to implement. For example, those proposals relating to quite substantial issues of one line budgeting will obviously take some time to implement. We are currently engaged in discussions with the key industrial organisations whom I want to commend for their attitude and willingness to participate in these important discussions. It is important that we take on bold initiatives such as this in order to provide the best education system we possibly can for the youth of our State.

#### RURAL CARE WORKER

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** Will the Minister of Family and Community Services review the position concerning the provision of a rural care worker on Eyre Peninsula as soon as possible? For three or four years after the drought crisis began on Eyre Peninsula, it was the role of a rural care worker, operating under the department, to rove within the rural community and pick up areas of crisis. In so doing, that person provided a very valuable service.

Some months ago the department withdrew that position, and although undertakings were given that the position would be replaced in some other way, such a rearrangement has not occurred. My constituents are concerned that, with the absence of such a worker, there is a very great need for the reinstatement of that position. I would be pleased if the Minister could have the case reviewed, to have that type of position reinstated as soon as possible.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will be happy to ask the CEO to give me an urgent report on the matter. The honourable member might be aware that as of 1 October the new scheme came into force in the Department for Family and Community Services, and a large number of people are at different desks. There are now far more field-based officers than was the case prior to this very radical restructuring, a restructuring which, I might say, has drawn a good deal of favourable comment for the department in a number of circles. It may be that, in the process, this matter is still being worked through. Anyhow, I will certainly have the matter reviewed and get a report for the House as soon as possible.

#### INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELDERLY

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Has the Deputy Premier received any information on the success or otherwise of the granting of widespread concessions to the elderly citizens of our State to mark the International Day for the Elderly? I have received a number of letters from constituents asking me to pass on their thanks to the Minister in being able to use the many concessions that were available on that day to enjoy themselves. They have asked me whether many other elderly folk took advantage of this generous offer.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I have some reports that suggest that people took considerable advantage of this well-merited scheme. In some areas I simply cannot comment. I have no idea how many people rocked up to the Kelly Hill caves for a free look at the wonders of the limestone formation on those marvellous caves over there in the Alexandra electorate, and there are a number of other areas on which I cannot comment. However, the people at SACOTA, which I remind the honourable member is the peak body for older people in this State, indicate that the

telephones were running hot and that they were run over in the enthusiasm of people requesting further information or assistance, in getting into concerts and the various other facilities that were made available. I think it was a considerable success and I hope that we will be able to repeat it in the future.

#### WILDERNESS PROTECTION LEGISLATION

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of concerns being expressed that the proposed wilderness protection legislation will not be effective unless it contains provisions which include independent assessment by experts of what constitutes wilderness areas, a clear decision-making process open to public comment, consultation with Aboriginal groups and preservation of their heritage, legal access through the courts to enforce wilderness protection, and application of the Act to both private and other interests and, if so, what action is the Minister taking to address these concerns?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I note that there are about six or seven aspects to that question. I managed to jot down a couple of them. As the honourable member knows, there is widespread community consultation occurring. Indeed, I have made very clear, in consultation with my colleague the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, and indeed with the Interim Wilderness Consultative Committee, which I have re-established, that we must ensure ongoing community consultation and discussion to the very fullest extent. We must ensure that Aboriginal communities, and in fact the councils representing them, are fully and appropriately consulted.

In terms of assessment of the particular areas, yes, indeed, when I bring the legislation to the Parliament I shall want it to very clearly delineate the criteria in the legislation that will be applied in order to assess wilderness areas. I have appointed a committee to draw up those criteria, to ensure that it does have support across the entire spectrum of the community. The exciting thing about the proposed wilderness protection legislation is that there has been widespread consultation and communication with pastoralists and with the mining and exploration industries.

Indeed, I want to pay credit to all those involved for that support and communication, and particularly in terms of those groups that may well have opposed these matters for the sake of it. They have been involved in the consultative processes. I ask the honourable member to note that there has been no dissension within the media or within the community generally about such a proposal.

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** As to some of the things that the honourable member has listed there will always be perhaps some degree of concern and, as I have just said in my answer, the Interim Wilderness Consultative Committee will be addressing those concerns while it is developing the legislation. That will be the next stage of the whole process. At the end of the day, we might not be able to thoroughly address every single concern or indeed reconcile every group, but I can give an assurance to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia that no stone will be left unturned to ensure that every group that wants an input will have an opportunity and will be listened to sensitively.

At the end of the day, the Parliament might have to make some decisions whereby every single-interest group in the community will not be 100 per cent happy and supportive. That is the nature of our job. I am sure that the honourable member will be looking to support the wilderness legislation.

He has already given that indication, and I thank him for that. I can give an assurance that there will be very full and open consultation on those matters of concern that the honourable member has highlighted.

#### HORWOOD BAGSHAW SITE

**Mr HERON (Peake):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning give an assurance that plans to develop the Horwood Bagshaw site at Mile End will ensure that sufficient open space is provided to meet the needs of the local community?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I can indeed give that assurance, and in doing so I acknowledge the work that the member for Peake has done in ensuring that his existing constituents as well as future constituents will have the kind of open-space facilities that are vitally important. Members who know the location of the Horwood Bagshaw site will be aware that there is no open space in that whole large, square area. Indeed, we will move to provide an open-space facility for existing and future residents of the area. In acknowledging the contribution and the work of the member for Peake, I indicate to the House that the honourable member has attended public meetings and he has also attended a number of small meetings that have been held in between the holding of the public meetings.

Kinhill Engineers Pty Ltd has been appointed to undertake an urban design study, to establish the guidelines for the future development of the Horwood Bagshaw site. I have undertaken to ensure that the best possible development is achieved on this site and I have directed that the project must proceed as quickly as possible and be given a high priority. I have also given a commitment to ensure that the extensive public consultation that has already begun will continue and that it will be an integral part of the urban design study process.

---

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PERSONAL ASSISTANCE

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I seek leave to make a brief personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** When I came into this place in 1973, an elder statesman and former member of this House for a very long period said a few things to me. One of them was, 'My boy, in the corridors and in the bars of this place you will find different members will have different friends at different times for different reasons.' I wondered about that comment for a long time; but, indeed, it has proved to be true that, on a number of occasions, we seek or gain different friends, for different reasons, at different times.

I refer to a set of somewhat different circumstances in which I found myself on 9 August this year when I was rendered indisposed from this Parliament and because wired up to monitoring equipment in the Ashford Hospital. Therefore, for different reasons, a range of different people made contact with both me and my family. It is in that context that I seek to refer to members on both sides of the House and thank them, on behalf of the family, for the good wishes that were extended, first, by the Leader of the Opposition and, secondly, by members of both major political Parties, including a number of Ministers who offered not only good

wishes but vehicle and driver access during that period of some difficulty.

The sorts of good wishes on that occasion came not only from members on both sides of the Parliament but also from within the ranks of the staff, including the Library, *Hansard*, the parliamentary attendants, the caretakers, the caterers and others who provide service in this place irrespective of our political persuasion. It was recognised and seen by my family to be important enough to offer to this Chamber our thanks on the record for that indulgence by those who wished us well in that difficult period.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for the completion of the following Bills:  
Appropriation,  
Pay-roll Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment and  
Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment  
be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: OPERATION ARK

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** When answering a question earlier today from the member for Newland, and in referring to the Ark Report, I finished my answer by referring to the body of the report backing up those parts that I had read previously. In order to avoid confusion, I would stress to the House that I intended that comment to refer only to the area of non-corruption in the Police Force.

### CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Read a first time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Correctional Services Act to permit the taking of urine samples from prisoners suspected of consuming non-therapeutic psychoactive drugs and to permit the taking of urine samples from prisoners for the purpose of a random check of some or all prisoners in an institution. The use of illicit drugs in the prison system has long been recognised as a serious problem. The Department of Correctional Services has implemented a wide range of measures designed to assist in achieving the goals of reducing the contraband entering the prison system and deterring the use by prisoners of illicit drugs. These measures include:

- the use of searches of prisoners, cells, prisoners' property, and visitors;

- use of dogs to assist in searches;
- use of prison design to maximise security and prisoner observation;
- perimeter security.

Urine analysis will give the Department of Correctional Services another measure to combat drug use. In addition to these measures, therapeutic programs are provided by the Prison Drug Unit to help prisoners reduce their reliance on drugs.

It is proposed that individual prisoners will be able to be tested when correctional staff suspect that a prisoner may have used an illicit drug. Random testing of prisoners will be able to be used to establish accurate indicators of the level of drug use within a prison. Total population testing will be able to be used to give a 'snapshot' of the total drug use in a prison at a given time. A prisoner who records a positive specimen will be liable to disciplinary action before a visiting tribunal. Failure to comply with a request for a test will result in disciplinary action that may be more severe than if the prisoner recorded a positive test result.

The information from positive testing of a prisoner will be considered in the individual case management of the prisoner and will also be utilised for management purposes in relation to the development of drug use strategies. It is proposed that correctional officers will be responsible for the collection of specimens. Procedures will be adopted, in consultation with staff, to cover all occupational health and safety issues. Specialised training will be provided to enable staff to recognise the effects of drug usage, to collect samples, ensure infection control and document to maintain the chain of evidence.

There will be a requirement that officers observing the taking of samples must be of the same sex as the prisoner. Urine analysis is in operation in both New South Wales and Victoria. Departmental officers have visited both jurisdictions to study the program conducted there. Problems observed in the New South Wales system include the practice of swapping samples by prisoners, high level of non-compliance by prisoners, problems with the accuracy of the test results, and lack of understanding of the purpose of the program by staff. The Department of Correctional Services believes that it has now had the opportunity to study interstate and overseas experience and has now determined the most appropriate approach to introducing the scheme into South Australia.

It is proposed to introduce urine analysis into South Australia in two phases. Phase 1 would be the testing on suspicion that a prisoner may have used an illicit drug. Phase 2 would involve adding random sampling and total population testing. The Government is committed to minimising the use of drugs in our prisons system and the importance of this Bill in the gaol cannot be overstated. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement of the Act on proclamation.

Clause 3 inserts a definition of 'drug' in the interpretation section. A drug is either a drug of dependence or prohibited substance (as defined in the Controlled Substances Act) or a prescription drug specified in a notice published by the Minister in the *Gazette*. The Minister is given the power to publish, vary or revoke such a notice.

Clause 4 amends the provision dealing with the power to search prisoners in certain circumstances. It is provided that a prisoner may be searched preparatory to giving a specimen of his or her urine pursuant to the Act.

Clause 5 inserts a new section empowering the manager of a correctional institution to require a prisoner to provide

a urine specimen if the prisoner is suspected of unlawfully using a drug or if the manager is carrying out a random check of all or some prisoners in the institution. Subsection (2) spells out that a prisoner uses a drug if he or she smokes or consumes the drug or administers it to himself or herself, or permits another person to so administer it. Subsection (3) is an evidentiary aid—an analyst's certificate as to the presence of a drug in a specimen of urine is proof of that fact unless the defendant proves otherwise.

Clause 6 provides that regulations may be made dealing with the collection of urine specimens and the directions that may be given to prisoners for that purpose. Penalties for offences against any such regulation may be prescribed exceeding the maxima already set out in the Act for breaches of regulations by prisoners. The penalties cannot exceed by more than three times those maxima.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### GOODS SECURITIES (HIGHWAYS FUND) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Goods Securities Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The Goods Securities Register, operated by the Department of Road Transport Road User Services Directorate, provides prospective purchasers of motor vehicles (or other prescribed goods) with information on any prior financial encumbrances which might affect the title that a buyer could acquire. Where a buyer obtains a certificate as to that title he or she is entitled to compensation under the Act for any loss suffered in relying on an inaccurate certificate. The costs of maintaining the register, and the payment of compensation, are met from the Goods Securities Compensation Fund. Following the merger of the Highways Department and the Motor Registration Division (Department of Transport) into the new Department of Road Transport the need for a separate fund no longer exists. This is so since the Registrar is now part of the new department.

This Bill abolishes the Goods Securities Compensation Fund, and transfers the current balance to the Highways Fund, established by the Highways Act 1926. The Bill also transfers the responsibility for the cost of administration of the register to the Department of Road Transport and directs any fees paid under the Goods Securities Act into the Highways Fund. To date no successful claims have been made against the Goods Securities Compensation Fund. However, should any successful claims be made the Bill provides that any award of compensation would also be made from the Highways Fund.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends the definition of 'fund' in section 3 of the Act to substitute the Highways Fund for the Goods Securities Compensation Fund.

Clause 4 repeals sections 15, 16 and 17 of the Act, which establish the Goods Securities Compensation Fund and pro-

vide for the keeping of accounts of the fund and annual reporting in relation to it. A new provision is substituted which authorises the deposit of money collected under the Act into the Highways Fund, and the payment out of the Highways Fund of the cost of administration of the Act and any compensation which is payable under the Act.

Clause 5 inserts an additional transitional provision into the schedule of transitional provisions to transfer money currently in the Goods Securities Compensation Fund into the Highways Fund.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ABALONE INDUSTRY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Wednesday 16 October.

Motion carried.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Tuesday 22 October.

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. G.J. CRAFTY (Minister of Education): I move:

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

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): It is rather ironic that I should lead the debate in this instance, because it was on only one of the days that the Committee met that I was able to be present. On 24 September, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Fisheries was before the Chamber with his respective officers, and my colleague the

member for Custance stood aside to enable me to be involved in that Committee. The matter I raised with the Minister on that occasion involved the proposed licensing of aquaculture practices on the farm. Without recanvassing the details of that approach to the Minister, I do want to say that correspondence from the rural community in my district has indicated some concern already about the proposed licensing of that diversified practice.

There is no question that people are bleeding, and bleeding hard out there in the rural arena. I think we all know that. What we do not know, I fear, is the extent to which that bleeding is occurring. I know of families who, two or three years ago and beyond, have been regarded as good farmers, long term in the practice, sound business people, and financially sound as well. However, through circumstances in many cases beyond their control, they find themselves in extremely embarrassing circumstances now, if not on the brink of bankruptcy. It is in that climate that this Government, or any other Party that may be in Government during periods of this kind, should be realistic and sympathetic towards that sector.

In fact, they produce the food and fibre that represent in the market a return for this State which is a large proportion of our export income. I believe that the time has come already—and we are not at the end of this general recession yet—when we ought to be looking at relieving those people of some of the costs that they are incurring.

Those costs fall into a number of categories, not the least of which is the registration of their vehicles on those properties where in many cases the vehicles are seldom used, if at all, on the public thoroughfare but, just in case they may be required on the public thoroughfare, the law provides that they shall be so registered. In those circumstances, the registration fees could be reduced substantially without any great burden on the State, as a form of assistance to those growers.

Accordingly, I believe that some of the regulations that apply to their practices could be relieved from those people in those circumstances, as well. On top of that, and more importantly, I believe the matter of council rates, which are currently based on property valuations, is an area in which the Government can assist. I do not mean that it should assist the primary producers by way of handouts but certainly that it should assist the councils by extending to those authorities in South Australia the lowest possible interest rate loans that are available to the Government itself.

We have a situation in Alexandra—and I do not want to identify farmers or groups of farmers in particular—which I believe is applicable across many areas of the State. This involves farmers who simply cannot pay their current council rates. On all the indications of their income in the immediate future, they will not be able to pay their council rates in the forthcoming year. On behalf of those people, I believe that the Government needs to stand by and stand ready to assist the respective councils in the situation in which they find themselves at the moment. I do not believe that group or pack action by rural communities or rural organisations should demand subsidies in payment of such rates.

I do not believe that such demand should be made of the councils necessarily to reduce their services in order to reduce the rates suddenly or outside what might be good business and community service practices. However, I do think that the Government must be available to those councils to give advice and, more importantly, the lowest possible interest rate funding in order to ensure that council structures and essential services in the communities are maintained and at the same time the appropriate relief is

extended to those in genuine hardship who individually qualify under the Act.

Ordinarily I would be extremely cautious about any sort of handout or any sort of financial relief that became a burden on or represented a subsidy by the other ratepayers. I believe that group or pack action should not be allowed to prevail in insisting upon councils jumping to the tune of those ratepayers, but that the whole matter be approached rationally in preference to the emotional stance that is rapidly developing. I understand that on Kangaroo Island at the moment some 120 ratepayers have been incited to the point of signing a petition-type letter demanding of their council that it reduce their rates by 50 per cent or, in other words, advising their council that they intend to pay only 50 per cent of the rates levied upon them in this 1991-92 financial year. That sort of practice will then turn ratepayer against ratepayer; it will turn ratepayers in general against the local authority and it will breed the sort of bitterness that we can well do without in this current climate of recession.

So, I think that, whilst we all know that there are matters prevailing out there in the field, we do not quite know the depth or extent of them. I do not raise this subject to reflect upon my colleague the shadow Minister of Agriculture (the member for Goyder) in any way. I know the intensity in which he has addressed this very subject on many occasions insofar as the plight of the rural community is concerned. I do so rather in support of what he is doing, because whether or not as a biased rural district representative and as someone in the practice of agriculture I support him, it is one of those areas in which I think metropolitan and country members can well serve the community at large by offering their support.

So, in the short period that is available to me to respond to the committee activities of this Parliament in recent weeks, I urge all members of Parliament, if they are not already aware of it, to seek to become aware of the depth of damage and the depth of impact that this current recession has had on our rural communities at large; not just the farmers, but on those who service them in the villages and towns throughout the State and, when the occasion arises, which I believe will be soon in this place, the structure will be put up to enable our Government in South Australia to assist those people in need.

There is provision in the Local Government Act for councils to spread the load and to arrange for term payment for their ratepayers, and I am sure councils with any degree of sensitivity towards their communities will extend that service to their ratepayers. There is provision in our Local Government Act for councils, where cases of hardship are demonstrated on a single ratepayer basis, to remit all or part of the rates payable. It is a practice that needs to be handled extremely sensitively. It is a practice that needs to be approached with great care, bearing in mind that, if a council has cut its expenditure to the bone and therefore has to maintain a certain level of income, what it gives away to one has to be paid for by another. That in itself breeds a climate of discontent in the community which we can also do without. I would hope that councils exercise their powers and responsibilities under the relevant sections of the Act with great care and that the Government falls in behind local government with great care and sensitivity in this instance to offer the sort of assistance that can and has by precedent occurred in the past in this sort of arena.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I rise at this time when members traditionally give brickbats or bouquets to indicate that, whilst there are bouquets available to the Minister for



Local Government Relations for the speed with which answers have been brought back—they have been circulated already and they are quite informative—the brickbats must come in relation to the presentation on the day. There were lengthy Government questions and even lengthier Government replies.

In the early 1980s we all approached the whole idea of the Estimates Committees with a degree of scepticism but with a hope that after a year or two the difficulties that might be expected with a new system would be ironed out and the Parliament would genuinely be able to obtain the additional information that was required to make the budget document a worthwhile public document and to allow not only members of Parliament but also the public who have an interest in these things to better understand the budget, the way in which it had been constructed and the expectations that might flow from that point.

Unfortunately, that has not happened. Last year was quite farcical in the sense that the supplementary *Hansard* volume containing the questions and the answers made available by the Ministers did not come into the possession of members of Parliament until July 1991, notwithstanding that the questions had been asked in September 1990. Not denying that a number of those answers had been made available through *Hansard* in the duplicate form, or in the photocopied form, I point out that the totality of the information that members may want was denied—certainly, the information that was wanted out in the wide world was also denied to those people.

I take the opportunity of carrying on from where my colleague the member for Alexandra left off in relation to the difficulties in the area of local government at present. More specifically, he was referring to the difficulties that are besetting the agricultural areas. When we talk of agricultural areas we should recognise that we are referring not only to those people who are on the land—whether it be for grazing, for cropping or any other form of agricultural activity—but equally to those people who are providing the services in many of the towns frequented by those involved in agriculture. One has only to move around the country areas of South Australia at the present time to see the number of shops, garages, welding businesses or other establishments that are closed or that have services available on only a limited basis because the people have found it necessary to go elsewhere to get employment or, alternatively, are seeking to do two or three jobs. They are in equal difficulty in meeting the costs directly related to local government.

Unfortunately, local government is experiencing increasing difficulty because of the additional financial load being placed upon it by the State Government. I will canvass this matter at some length. A question was asked of the Minister for Local Government Relations during the Estimates Committees in relation to information that was given to the Mid North Local Government Association Region 8 quite recently by a member of the executive of the Local Government Association that there was a series of additional costs, many of which were not notified to local government authorities until after they had set their budgets. The Minister said that those additional costs were put in place almost 12 months ago. It is an indictment on the Minister and on the Government if those increased costs had been in contemplation almost 10 or 12 months previously but not made known to local government, with local governments having no opportunity to construct their budgets based on those increased costs that were to be demanded of them for services rendered by the State Government.

It is now a fact of life that the councils pay more for the valuation process that they have embraced. It is a fact that local government is paying more for its CFS facilities because of a reduction in the subsidy scheme. It is a fact of life that there is a whole host of areas where local governments are being asked to pick up a greater proportion of costs directly associated with their activities on behalf of their ratepayers and that these are not costs that have been negotiated or discussed with local governments in the series of discussions taking place in respect of the Local Government Association or some arrangement with the LGA taking over many of the roles previously undertaken by the Local Government Department.

Councils are only now starting to come face to face with the realities of the consequences of the agreement that was entered into in October 1989—the heads of agreement on the changed aspects of local government responsibility and local governments taking up a number of Government activities. A clear indication was given in those earlier discussions that local governments would not be disadvantaged in that they would not be tethered quite so closely to a department as they had been in the past. Whilst that was a feature welcomed by all local governments, there are other financial aspects, to which I will refer after the dinner break.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** As to the problems occurring in local government, I drew attention to a recent regional meeting at Robertstown, where an executive member of the LGA had drawn attention to the number of increases in respect of fees charged to local government by the State Government. The list raised at that meeting indicated increases to local government in areas such as the Animal and Plant Control Commission, the Waste Management Commission, the Valuer-General's Office and the Country Fire Services, and the withdrawal of funds to local government by the CFS was referred to at some length because of the implications.

Yet another member told the conference that the Valuer-General's Department has implemented a minimum charge of \$2 000 for a valuation exercise, which really places a minimum value on properties. It is surely against the spirit of the Government to say that there should be no such thing as a minimum rate. Any valuation undertaken by the department will involve a minimum charge of \$2 000, and whether a property is worth \$100, \$150, \$1 000 or \$1 200, it will have a notional value of \$2 000. We find that the Government, through local government, is forcing a new form of minimum rate when the Government seeks to be lily white and suggest that a minimum rate is not a form of taxation or revenue collection that the Government wants to have any part of.

Again, this is an indication of the two standards that are frequently drawn to the attention of members by people outside who cannot understand or countenance the State Government's attitude in riding roughshod over the community. The member for Alexandra referred to the problems of the rural scene, but we cannot stay with the rural scene alone because we recognise the difficulty that many people in business in the Adelaide sector are having. Every time the Government increases the pressure on local government, it invariably increases the pressure on individual ratepayers, because accounts have to be met.

It was refreshing—and here is one of the bouquets, just as I said there would be some—that in answering the questions about the levying of additional costs on local government, the Minister for Local Government Relations (Hon. Anne Levy) stated:



I am quite happy to agree that there have been some cases where the degree of consultation has not been as great as we would have wished.

Full marks to the Minister for having identified and acknowledged that position. She went on to state:

The fact that the memorandum of understanding was signed and the State Local Government Relations Unit was established in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet does not mean that instantaneously every Government agency was aware of the implications of the memorandum. Certainly, the unit has worked very hard with Government agencies on the necessity for consultation with the Local Government Association in such matters.

That is the nub of what is happening with so many departments at present. I am highlighting that which was exposed in the local government examination, and I know that other colleagues were able to expose it in respect of a number of other departments. We have had evidence this afternoon, during Question Time, of Ministers indicating that they were sure consultations had taken place but, when one gets down to the nitty-gritty of it and seeks to find out how deep or worthy the consultation has been, one finds that it has been somewhat superficial, or that the decision has been taken on the assumption that the consultation that has taken place was adequate. Adequate to whom? It was not always adequate to the people at the tail end, where the buck stops and, for example, local government, the Country Fire Services and various other utilities within the community have many questions about the Government's recognition of what is reasonable consultation. It is not there in many cases, and the public is suffering as a result.

Another area that took a degree of questioning related directly to the libraries system. The Government is on record and the Minister was able to identify (and given the information made available by way of answers to questions asked on 24 September, delivered by *Hansard* today) that the Government has fulfilled the commitment to provide library funds for local government on the basis of the previous arrangement.

When questioned closely on this matter, because a number of public statements have indicated that local government is all right until 30 June 1992 in relation to libraries, the Minister was able to agree that, notwithstanding the public statements clearing the way to 30 June 1992, the Government's commitment to make subsidies available for libraries through the local government system would stay in place and would be met during the life of this Parliament.

For many local governing bodies that will be refreshing news, but there is already a clear indication that given the cost of maintaining and keeping local government and community libraries going when the demands for the council dollar need to be spread wider and wider, a number of local governing bodies may not be able to match dollar for dollar the sum the Government is prepared to make available. Therefore, libraries will suffer as a consequence.

The Government pays only up to the equivalent dollar expenditure by local government. While in normal circumstances one would not expect the Government to do otherwise, because this Government is of the same ilk as that which sits in Canberra and which is responsible for the economic depression, recession and all the other consequences that are with us at the moment, I believe it has a duty to make sure that, regardless of whether the individual local governing bodies can make their full sum available, the Government at least makes its full sum available so that there is some relief for those people, in particular young people, who are seeking the value of libraries for the purpose of their ongoing education.

No-one on either side of the House criticised the expenditure by both the Liberal Government and subsequently Labor Governments on the provision of library services in

the country. Indeed, I talk of 'country' as being the whole of South Australia, because the commitment applies equally in the city as it does in country areas. There was a keen desire by Parliament to make sure that all people—young and old, but particularly the young—would have access to books and publications necessary for their education. The circumstances in many areas at the moment will qualify the amount of assistance that local government can give to its own community, both for libraries and in other areas.

Let me pick up another area where the Government, through one of its instrumentalities, is bearing down on local government. I asked the Minister whether, when it was agreed that council rates may be paid by instalments, it was ever envisaged that one of the applicants for instalment payments would be the South Australian Housing Trust. Yet, in the financial year 1991-92, the South Australian Housing Trust has lined up and is seeking the payment of rates to individual councils by way of instalments. It is not seeking to reduce the overall amount it is liable to pay, but it is seeking to pay by instalments, thereby reducing the amount of funds immediately available to local government, as well as reducing the benefit that local government has always enjoyed in the past of being able to put those funds to grass or into a fund that raises interest and allows for some of the other benefits which flow on to any council area.

Whilst the Housing Trust will benefit by meeting its accounts over an extended period, local government in general and the whole community it encompasses will suffer as a result, because the same degree of benefits flowing from the availability of these funds will not be possible. I have made the point that there is a long way yet to go in relation to the final summing up of matters that will be undertaken by local government, whether it be individual local governing bodies or the Local Government Association, as from 1 January 1992.

I laud the work that has been undertaken by individual local governing bodies and by the Local Government Association, but there is a clear indication that the period available to undertake all this integration of services and activities will mitigate against the best interests of local government. I rather suspect that, come 1 January 1992, the speed with which the Government seeks to escape its overall responsibility to local government will accelerate and that local government will be left holding the baby, without the baby necessarily being properly clothed.

Whilst it may not be impacting upon individual members at the moment, it is a matter that will become more and more apparent, and there will be less and less opportunity for local government to provide a service to the community. I foresee that more and more community organisations will come to members of Parliament, through their elected officers, asking what can be done to assist in the provision of social justice in the community, which has been promised by the Government but which, by various means, will be seriously impeded. I support the expenditures as referred to the Estimates Committees, but I draw attention to the deficiencies that exist.

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** I think the Estimates Committee procedures are a very useful aspect of parliamentary activity, although the answers given often tended to be unnecessarily lengthy. I think that traditionally, in such Committees, the emphasis is on economics, and it is very important that we not lose sight of the fact that economics is not an end in itself. We should always bear in mind that, whether we are focusing on it in Estimates Committees or elsewhere, economics should be seen as something intended for the

benefit of people rather than an end in itself. I think there is a danger for political Parties in particular to become trapped in their own ideology and to forget that they are here to serve the people rather than to worship at the altar of economics.

The first issue that I would like to address briefly tonight relates to health, particularly the Flinders Medical Centre. I am a strong supporter of that hospital and, as members would know, I have tested its quality and been suitably impressed. I believe that it is a very efficient and caring hospital, but one of the concerns that has been drawn to my attention and reinforced recently involves the provision of services in the southern area relating to the needs of children. This was recently brought home to me very strongly by David Lines, the Director of Paediatrics and Child Health at Flinders Medical Centre. Mr Lines wrote to me and was quite agreeable that his comments be made public. Omitting the preamble, part of his letter states:

In southern metropolitan Adelaide there are 19 689 children aged 0-5 or 24 per cent of all metropolitan children. The number of those aged 6-14 is 41 014 or 28 per cent of all metropolitan children. Adding those together, there are 60 703 children aged 0-14 years or 27 per cent in southern metropolitan Adelaide. However, there are only 11 per cent of the metropolitan paediatric beds in southern Adelaide. In 1990 the Adelaide Children's Hospital had a budget of \$61 million, while that of the Paediatric Division of Flinders Medical Centre was \$2 million, and yet there were 8 545 inpatient children (including newborns) at Flinders Medical Centre compared to 18 351 at Adelaide Children's Hospital. While there are some ways in which the F.M.C. Paediatric Division is subsidised (for example, the X-ray Laboratory Division of Flinders Medical Centre conducts the tests on children at F.M.C. and have their own budget) it would appear that the Paediatric Division at Flinders Medical Centre is deserving of greater support.

An urgent matter is funding of the Children's Assessment Team. This team evaluates children with multiple problems such as school difficulty, minor behavioural problems, speech difficulties etc. (It is very similar to the Child Development Unit at A.C.H.). Because of lack of funding despite strenuous approaches to S.A. Health Commission, it is likely that this valuable service is likely to cease at the end of this year. Its value is testified to by the waiting list to March of 1993 plus the fact that it was independently evaluated by a student undertaking the Diploma of Community Child Health where a high degree of client satisfaction was demonstrated.

Mr Lines spoke to me at great length and pointed out that he was in no way attacking the Adelaide Children's Hospital but merely emphasising that the needs of children and young people should be more seriously addressed in the southern metropolitan area, and I believe that his letter, with its statistics, speaks for itself. Mr Lines also indicated to me that at the Flinders Medical Centre there are 39 paediatric beds and at the Noarlunga Medical Centre there are eight beds to accommodate children, but they are not specifically paediatric beds.

I appreciate that an announcement was made yesterday about increased funding for the Noarlunga Medical Centre facility and I hope that, within that increased funding, some provision is specifically made for paediatric needs. I do not profess to be a medical expert, because I am not, but I am told that there is a significant difference between what is classed as a paediatric bed and what is classed as a bed that can accommodate children, particularly in terms of treatment for conditions such as asthma. The Flinders Medical Centre is undergoing a review at the moment which will highlight that hospital's efficiency and effectiveness, and I believe that it will also reinforce its just claim for an expanded facility for better addressing accident and emergency needs.

I now turn to matters of education. I sat through the Estimates Committee dealing with the education lines—the committee that was referred to earlier today in debate in this place. Recently, the Associate Director-General was

reported in the press as saying that in relation to teaching in the primary schools there was, to use his words, a great amount of crap. I did not see the original article, so I do not know whether he was quoted out of context. However, as a former primary school teacher, many years ago, and having maintained an interest over the years in primary school education, I would reject the notion that our primary schools, particularly those in my area, come into that category. Whilst it is true that we can always improve and that schools can always do better, I believe that, particularly in the primary school area, we have many examples of excellence.

Recently, in fighting for better facilities, I highlighted that excellence in many of the primary schools within my area. We have seen press coverage about a lack of facilities to accommodate students in Spence and Heysen schools. It must be emphasised that, in raising that issue, I was in no way being critical of the staff or of the school councils, or of the programs. I was merely going into fight to get a better deal for the children in my area. I make no apology for doing that, and I will continue to do it.

In respect of schools specifically, in my electorate we have a situation where the Sheidow Park Primary School is very much at capacity, or close to it, with approximately 700 students enrolled. That is a very large enrolment for a primary school, and I am encouraging the State Government to take up the offer of the Hickinbotham Group which, I understand, is prepared to build and lease a primary school at Woodend to cater for the growth that is occurring in that area. Clearly, that sort of offer, and it would be in the form of houses that could be sold off later when the demand for the school diminishes, is worth while. I would encourage the Minister of Education to actively cooperate and pursue that, so that the people living in that area of Woodend (Sheidow Park: Trott Park) can have a state of the art school, which the Hickinbotham Group is prepared to build and lease to the Education Department. I shall do everything in my power to encourage that development.

On a related issue, I refer to the question of the safety of children, and I am disappointed that once again the Bellevue Heights Primary School has been denied a school crossing. This might seem a small issue to some people, but to parents and children it is a very important one. Whilst I am delighted that neighbouring Coromandel Valley school has, after a 14-year battle, finally got a crossing, that school being in the electorate of my colleague the member for Davenport, I am disappointed about the crossing for the Bellevue Heights Primary School and I will continue to fight to ensure that the children there get a crossing in due course.

Turning to matters relating to the Children's Services Office, I indicated during the Estimates Committee hearing my pleasure at having pre-school facilities in my area that are of such high quality. I make no apology for being proud of that. I believe that they are excellent. During the Estimates Committee I indicated the concerns that have been relayed to me by parents who feel that the review that is underway between the Federal Government and State Government might result in a lowering of the quality of pre-school education. South Australia has a very high standard of pre-school education. I sought an assurance from the Minister that he would resist any attempt to lower the quality of pre-school education. I trust that all members of this place would be supportive of any attempt to resist the lowering of the quality of our pre-school education. As a community and as a Parliament we should be seeking to enhance the quality of pre-school education.

**Mr Ferguson:** The only cuts have come from the Liberal Government.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SUCH:** In respect of child-care facilities, the area that I represent is a growing area and has a young population, and has some very good child-care facilities, but unfortunately we do not have enough. Once again I draw to the Government's attention the need to examine the provision of child-care facilities, particularly in the Happy Valley/Aberfoyle Park area. I have had many requests from residents seeking quality child-care facilities. At the moment the child-care facilities in my electorate are at capacity and there is considerable unmet demand. I urge the Government to look vigorously at the needs that exist, particularly in respect of suburbs in the Happy Valley council area.

There has been much talk in the media recently about the Australian Taxation Office seeking to have new buildings in the heart of the city. Although this is obviously a Federal matter, I believe that it is very undesirable for the Australian Taxation Office to do this. It should be seeking to relocate to areas like Noarlunga, Marion or Aberfoyle Park. The State Government should use all its influence to try to bring that about. With so many of our local residents working for the Australian Taxation Office and other Commonwealth Government instrumentalities, it is ludicrous for them to be travelling to the heart of the city to work when they could be involved in a genuine decentralisation program, with the Australian Taxation Office set up in regional centres in suburbs.

To this end, I am pleased that the Government is in the process of establishing a Family and Community Services Department office at the Hub Shopping Centre. It is taking a while and I am trying to encourage the Minister to push the project along, but the more genuine decentralisation we can get in the suburbs, the better. I want to pay a tribute to the officers of the Department for Family and Community Services who work in my area, led by Marj Ellis. I have found them to be dedicated and responsive people, more than willing to assist at any time when I call upon them.

In the few minutes remaining I want to refer to a couple of other issues. Like other members, recently I was notified of grants to seniors within my electorate. It is a matter that I want to pursue further, because I was surprised to find that none of the retirement villages received a grant. At this stage I do not know whether that is a deliberate policy on the part of the Government, whether there has been a change of direction, but it is an issue that I shall take up. People in the retirement villages in my electorate have received no allocation whatsoever. As I say, I shall take up this issue with the Minister.

Sport is a matter close to the hearts of most South Australians, and to that end I want to highlight the excellent work being done by the Happy Valley BMX Club and the tremendous work that it does amongst young people. I have been very impressed by the caring attitude and the genuine interest taken in young people by members of that club. As I understand, they are catering for something like 200 young people and giving them vigorous and exciting activities to do, which are quite productive and constructive. Recently I wrote to the Minister of Recreation and Sport seeking his support for the BMX Club at Happy Valley to host the State titles in the near future and, in the not too distant future, the national titles. I cannot think of a club that is more worthy of hosting those titles, and I trust that the Minister will be responsive in assisting a club that has done such an enormous amount for itself and for the young

people of Happy Valley and surrounding areas. I commend that club and its activities to the Minister.

Another sporting activity which is seeking a home in the southern area is that of ice skating. I will be in contact with the Minister in the near future asking for his assistance in trying to provide a home for this legitimate sporting activity. I understand that the Happy Valley council will be doing the same. Those who live in the south know that too often we have missed out in respect of sporting facilities. I see the thrust in respect of BMX and ice skating as part of that quest for the south to get a fair go when it comes to the provision of sporting facilities.

I was a member of the Estimates Committee looking into matters relating to Aboriginal Affairs. It is an area in which I have had an interest for a long time, having been to school with Aboriginal people and having worked with them for many years in my previous occupation. I look forward to the time when Aboriginal people can genuinely control their own affairs, and I have some concerns about our approach towards Aboriginal people in terms of funding. I am not too sure that we are not destroying Aboriginal people by trying to overcome some of the guilt that some Europeans have towards them through literally throwing money towards Aboriginal causes. In the long run we may well be doing them a disservice.

One thing I mentioned to the Minister in the Estimates Committee, and which I understand he will take up, is that as a community we should give more publicity to some of the achievements of the Aboriginal people. Too often we hear the negative aspects promoted, and very little is said about the success being achieved, particularly at the tertiary level, among Aboriginal people. We are not talking about large numbers, but there are quite a number of quiet achievers among Aboriginal people, particularly at the tertiary education level. It would be good for that success to be publicised within the community.

Another issue of great interest to me involves correctional services, and I also served on that Committee. I have seen the inside of many of our gaols on more than one occasion, not through any wrongdoing but because of my previous employment. The best thing that can be said about gaols is that we should do all in our power to keep people out of them. We should reserve prisons exclusively for the worst type of offender. Apart from being detained once sent to prison, the thing most likely to happen to inmates is rape, and that is the sad situation in our prisons. I would encourage the Government to do all in its power to provide alternatives to prison. Not only is it cost effective but it is in the best interests of the community and the offenders. We should reserve prisons for those who pose a real threat to the community. The more people we can keep out of gaol, the better.

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

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** The recent Estimates Committees have produced some historic results. It was the first time that representatives from the State Bank appeared before the Committee to answer questions from members of Parliament. I believe it is appropriate that members of Parliament should be able to question officials of the State Bank about their affairs because of the huge effect the State Bank has on the Parliament and Treasury, and because of the guarantee extended to the State Bank by this Government. Much has been said about the State Bank, and much more is about to be said by way of the Royal Commission into the State Bank's affairs. It is not my intention, Sir, to mention anything that has been said in respect of the Royal

Commission, as I know that you would not allow me to do so.

However, I have been astounded in recent weeks to listen to the pronouncements made by members of the Liberal Party, particularly members of the Federal Liberal Party, in relation to the State Bank's problems and the way the Liberal Party would address those problems. I have been astonished and alarmed by the suggestions made by Mr Ian Wilson, a member of the Liberal Party, who suggested that Beneficial Finance should walk away from its offshore wholesale funding. The consequences of what Mr Wilson has proposed should be brought home to every member of the Liberal Party.

I assume that members of the Liberal Party support what Mr Ian Wilson has said, because I have heard no public statements from them to the contrary. Mr Wilson suggested that Beneficial's domestic debentures provided only 15 per cent of the company's funding, and that Beneficial was predominantly offshore funded and paid very high prices for its offshore funds by debenture issues. It is my understanding that all those statements are incorrect. As at 31 August, Beneficial had \$455 million in offshore debt, not \$1 billion as claimed, and of its total borrowings at the same date about 65 per cent involved domestic operations, not 15 per cent as claimed by Mr Wilson.

The worst effect of the suggestions by the Liberal Party through Mr Wilson would be that South Australia's reputation in the international financial markets would be absolutely shattered. One could only describe this proposition as absolutely irresponsible. Yet this action has been backed up by the Liberal Party and certain members of the Adelaide press. One has only to look at the experience of the Development Finance Company in New Zealand to see how ridiculous it would be to suggest that debt to overseas investors should not be paid. Once Beneficial had refused to pay money owed to overseas investors, the chances of any other overseas corporation lending money to other State institutions would be very poor indeed.

One has to go back a long way in Australian history to see what happened when this was tried in earlier years. I probably do not have to remind members of this House who take a deep interest in history, more than perhaps the average person, that the Lang Government in 1936 reneged on its overseas debt and created such a crisis in Australian financial history that the Australian Government had to move in. We saw the collapse of the then State Bank of New South Wales, and that was the start of what we know now as the Commonwealth Bank. This action would immediately bring into question the Government's guarantee to the State Bank, and overseas investors or, indeed, investors of any sort would immediately question whether they could lend to the State Bank or to any of the State institutions because of the doubt that would be put in their minds that the Government would default on its guarantee to the bank. This in turn would probably trigger a retail run on the bank and all the consequential difficulties that would follow.

I believe that we would see the same result in South Australia in 1991 as we saw in New South Wales in 1936, and the misery that followed. Can anybody in the Opposition imagine overseas financiers investing in SAFA, for example, had the State Bank not been prepared to back up the debts of Beneficial Finance? The collapse of the Development Finance Company in New Zealand had ramifications for the financial world as far away as Australia. Although there was no connection between any of the Australian financial institutions and the Development Finance Company in New Zealand, overseas investors, particularly Japanese investors, were raising questions about how the

collapse of the Development Finance Company in New Zealand and its failure to pay overseas investors related to lendings to Australian institutions.

If we had a collapse of a similar nature on our own doorstep, could anyone imagine overseas financial institutions being prepared to lend to State institutions? This is the disaster that the Liberal Party wants to bring down on this State. Not only would this have put pressure on financial institutions in South Australia, it would have put pressure on all finance companies that were associated with other banks within Australia. When we look at what has happened to other finance companies in Australia, we can see that when there has been a connection between a bank, be it a private enterprise bank or a State bank, under the present situation those institutions have had to inject money into their subsidiaries.

Westpac took over the management of AGC's joint venture property book, it indemnified the company for any loss and subscribed \$150 million of capital to AGC. The ANZ boosted Esanda's capital base by \$100 million in subordinate debt in March 1991. The National Bank injected \$60 million to boost Custom Credit's capital base in June 1991 and took a substantial volume of the finance company's loans into the bank's balance sheet. That is exactly what the State Bank is doing, so far as Beneficial Finance is concerned. We have a lot of friends in Australia who are doing the same, particularly the private enterprise banks.

The Commonwealth Bank injected \$5 million of capital into its subsidiary Australian European Finance Corporation in 1988-89 and, during 1989-90, \$700 million in loan assets were transferred from AEFC to the Commonwealth Bank, which is exactly what has happened in South Australia. None of these institutions, including the private banks in Australia, dare to renege on their debt to overseas corporations. What stupidity from the members of the Liberal Party to suggest that this is the way out of our financial troubles in South Australia. Can anybody suggest that the multifunction polis would get off the ground if we were so stupid as to renege on our debts to overseas borrowers? Mr Wilson spoke about the gnomes of Zurich, which just goes to prove how stupid he is, because most of our money does not come from Zurich. Most of our money comes from Asia, particularly Japan.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

Mr FERGUSON: I have great admiration for the member for Coles; she should be the Leader of the Liberal Party, but I cannot concede to her any time during my precious debating time on this particularly important subject. However, I wish her well in her endeavours to get on the front bench, which is where I think she should be. It can be seen that it is generally expected that banks will provide support to their finance companies. The State Government's and the State Bank's action to support Beneficial Finance is no different from the support provided by private banks. I cannot understand the Liberal Party and some sections of the press supporting what I consider to be politically motivated comments by Mr Wilson in respect of the State Bank's support of Beneficial Finance. If Mr Wilson's comments are not politically motivated, he should also call on the Federal Treasurer, Mr Kerin, to explain why the Commonwealth Bank has supported its merchant bank subsidiary AEFC.

I think the Commonwealth's support of AEFC was eminently sensible but, if Mr Wilson believes that the State Bank has not done the right thing in supporting Beneficial Finance, why does he not ask the same of the Commonwealth Bank and its subsidiaries? We know the answer: if he were to stand up in Federal Parliament in Canberra and

make that stupid suggestion, he would be howled down, not only by members of the Australian Labor Party but also by members of his own Party, many of whom are more skilled in banking administration and other matters than he is. We know that this was a politically motivated and opportunistic attack on the State Bank and State matters, but I do not think Mr Wilson knows a great deal of what he is talking about.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I know that Mr Wilson comes from an establishment family, and I know that it is the duty of the Liberal Party to support the establishment families in South Australia; that is why people are coming to his defence at this stage. However, I have not heard much support for the stupid statement he made about reneging on Beneficial Finance and, if the member for Coles thinks that is such a great idea, I challenge her to stand up in this Chamber and say that we as a State ought to renege on all our overseas obligations. She will not do that, because she would realise what a stupid thing that would be.

I repeat: had the State Bank not supported the overseas debt by Beneficial Finance, this State would have faced a financial crisis, the likes of which we have not seen since the 1930s. I cannot understand how a member who represents a major political Party in this country and a member of a Party that seeks to govern South Australia can suggest such an irresponsible course of action. I hope that members of the Opposition dissociate themselves from the remarks that have been made by Mr Wilson so that at least they can be judged on the basis of financial responsibility when they seek to hold office in South Australia in the coming years.

How anyone could support a proposition that would bring down every financial institution in this State leaves one in bewilderment. I reject criticisms that have been made by members of the Opposition about the State budget, and I hope that they look to their laurels and to their own Party to produce something better than the carping criticism that has been produced so far. I hope we hear some policy statements from members opposite. Opposition policy statements have been very few and far between so far as the financial situation is concerned. The only thing we have heard so far from the Leader of the Opposition and the potential Treasurer of this State is that he wishes to sell the State Bank—and he has even gone quiet on that proposition.

One of the by-products of the problems that occurred in New South Wales was that Mr Griener's plan to sell the financial institutions of that State to rid it of debt have now been placed on ice because overseas borrowers are very wary about transactions in Australasia as a result of what has happened in New Zealand. I hope that we never hear another irresponsible statement like that and that the Liberal Party comes to its senses and provides us with some positive statements about the way it thinks the financial crisis should be handled instead of the stupid statements that we have heard in respect of reneging on overseas debt.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** This Appropriation Bill is one of the most important that has been placed before this Parliament for more than a decade. It has been introduced at a time of severe economic recession and hardship in the midst of the near collapse of many State Government institutions. The budget provides the Government with an opportunity to implement significant change in an attempt to turn our State in a direction that would start to leave economic hardship behind. Instead, the budget has turned our State further down the path of economic hardship. We are aware that the State Bank has lost \$2.2 billion and,

indeed, possibly more. We all know that, but we are also aware of the dismal performances of SGIC, WorkCover, Scrimber and other organisations.

The Government itself has finally recognised these disasters. After all, it had no choice because the Opposition has exposed them one after another. However, the Government did have a choice over the way it tackled the problems presently before it. It could have taken the sensible approach advocated by the Opposition through our Leader, Dale Baker. The Liberal Party obviously would not have got into this current mess in the first place. Our Leader outlined a strategy in this Parliament and I think it is worth recounting in part. Faced with the current situation, the Opposition would have brought down a budget that cut recurrent expenditure rather than capital expenditure. To reverse the massive debt burden that Labor has placed on our children, would have implemented a coordinated medium term debt reduction strategy. We would have done that by selling unneeded assets, privatising loss-making and high-risk Government institutions, contracting out jobs with the private sector when, in fact, that would be a cheaper alternative, and reducing duplication with the Commonwealth.

The Liberal Party has also announced that it would have privatised the State Bank. We have also announced that we would have privatised the SGIC and freed it from the constraints that it presently has upon it of having no capital, so that it could expand and compete fairly with private sector insurers. These sales would no doubt enable employees of those organisations and, indeed, all South Australians, to have a share in these key institutions and force them to be accountable instead of the Government—under the leadership of the present Premier—being the sole shareholder. We have also announced that we would hand organisations such as the State Clothing Factory over to the employees and privatise a range of other institutions, such as the Central Linen Service, Samcor and the State saw mills. All of the proceeds of that rationalisation of State Government institutions would have been used to retire the debt burden brought about mainly as a result of the State Bank problems.

The Liberal Party alternative to the present budget of illusion, irresponsibility and indebtedness would have been a tough but fair budget of action that would have reduced debt and provided real hope for the future. After all, that is exactly what South Australians are looking for. However, rather than taking this path, the Government has chosen instead to prop up its ailing institutions. First, we saw the Government sink \$970 million of taxpayers' money into the State Bank. Now it has sunk a further \$2.2 billion with the possibility of still more being needed. The problem is that this money has effectively been borrowed as an interest-only loan and, while nothing is paid off the principal, the interest payments amount to a staggering \$220 million a year. This equates to almost \$603 000 a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year for all of this century and, indeed, at least 20 years into the next century.

In the meantime, while all this is happening, while this money is being thrown down the drain, the Government vainly hopes that miraculously the State Bank will be restored not only to profitability but to a profitability that is so great that it will reduce the \$2.2 billion loss. The completely ridiculous situation in which the State Government has placed itself is well illustrated by the amount of money that has gone into the State Treasury since the State Bank was formed. In other words, if one goes back to the 1984-85 financial year, one finds that to the present day only \$163.9 million has been sunk into the Treasury from the State Bank. This is less than one year's worth of the interest on the State Bank loan. That is one year's worth of the \$220

million, and yet the State Bank's total input to Treasury has been only \$163.9 million. Clearly, the Treasurer is living in cuckoo land if he expects this budget to get the State out of the mess in which it currently finds itself.

**Dr Armitage:** Alice in Wonderland!

**Mr MATTHEW:** As the member for Adelaide says, 'Alice in Wonderland.' But, by borrowing more to refloat the bank our State debt has rocketed from \$4.31 billion a year to a staggering \$6.642 billion. This amounts to a \$4 500 debt per South Australian, and that is up from a debt of \$3 000 per South Australian only 12 months ago. That is a 50 per cent increase, and that is the legacy that this Government has left. That is the equivalent of every South Australian effectively having a bankcard on which they can afford to pay only the interest and cannot do anything to reduce the debt. That is what this Government has given to South Australians through this budget.

The responsibility for this dreadful situation lies with no-one else but the Treasurer and Premier of this State. The State Bank bail-out is an unwarranted legacy that may never be paid off. This Opposition has put forward a constructive alternative budget that will eliminate the financial legacy that has been left to us by the Socialist Bannon Labor Government. As members of this Parliament are aware, part of that strategy involves the inevitable sale of the bank, as I detailed, by floating it as a public company. Such a move would provide greater security for State Bank employees and employees of SGIC.

Government members have disputed this before. We know that they do not like what we are saying, because they find it too hard to accept the truth and they have not got the guts to make the hard decisions that are needed to turn the economy around. Certainly, they might protest that the bank has a new board, a new Chairman and a new Managing Director.

It can also be argued, and quite rightly so, that the State Bank provisions for bad and doubtful debts are probably the most severe of those of any Australian bank but, at the end of the day, these things by themselves simply are not enough. We all remember the Premier's assurances in this Parliament on 4 December 1990, when he said:

I am satisfied that the bank is conducting its financial affairs in the appropriate way.

Just 69 days later the Premier was forced to announce potential bank losses of \$970 million. If that was not bad enough, just 200 days later the loss became \$2.2 billion. A number of South Australians have been worried about what is to come next and, with that in mind, I questioned the Premier in the Estimates Committee on 17 September 1991.

When I questioned him, the Premier refused to rule out the possibility of a larger loss with even more money needed to be poured into the State Bank and, in the Estimates Committee on that day, the Premier said to me:

The situation will depend very much on the overall state of the economy. If the economy deteriorates markedly over the current year, we will not have a South Australian or a State Bank problem but rather a very big national problem.

Losses seem to be synonymous with State Government institutions. The budget papers reveal that SGIC reported a pre-tax loss of \$81 million. The commission's net assets have been slashed by a \$70 million write down in the value of its infamous property at 333 Collins Street, Melbourne. A further \$20 million was written off another SGIC loss-making venture, the Terrace Hotel on North Terrace. To cap it all off, we had SGIC's \$11 million investment in radio station 102FM and its \$30 million investment in the Scrimber project being assessed as being absolutely worthless.

I persistently questioned the Premier during the Estimates Committees over SGIC investments in Scrimber and, as usual, the Premier ducked, dodged, weaved and avoided the issue as he normally does. I asked the Premier a question that to this day I believe is legitimate. I asked the Premier:

Before the Government's decision last month not to invest any further funds in the project, did SGIC make any representations to the board of the Timber Corporation about the management of the Scrimber project and, if so, are any of those representations in writing?

The Premier in his reply said that he would take the question on notice, because he was not aware of representations. I asked him again, if he found out and if they were in writing, whether the Opposition could have a copy. The Premier said it would depend on whether it was appropriate to do so. Naturally, I pointed out that the project had lost South Australians much money and I hoped that it would be appropriate to do so. The Premier replied to me today and in his written reply, in part, he stated:

I have been informed by SGIC that the information being sought is of a commercial nature and that it would not be appropriate to release copies of any representations made.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** As my colleague the member for Coles says, we have heard that before: the old commercial confidentiality routine. It is the usual duck for cover, 'No, we cannot tell you that; we cannot let the people of South Australia know what is really happening, because that is commercially confidential.' I do not believe that South Australians will wear that: they demand to know what has been happening with State finances, and they have a right to know because they are expected to foot the bill for this legacy. As I have already said tonight, it is \$220 million a year, almost \$603 000 a day on the State Bank interest bill alone, with nothing being paid off the principal. That is the legacy that gives the people of South Australia a right to hear answers.

In addition to serving on the Estimates Committee examining the portfolios of the Premier and Treasurer, the Minister of State Development and Legislature, I also served on a number of other committees examining the budgets of the Attorney-General, the Minister of Corporate Affairs, the Minister for Crime Prevention, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Emergency Services, the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

In the small amount of time remaining to me, I will refer briefly to the responses from some of the Ministers to my questioning on those Committees. One interesting response was received in respect of Emergency Services. I asked the Minister about the implementation of a new computer system that appears to have caused a myriad of problems for the Police Force in processing crime data. I advised the Committee that I had been told that the backlog in just one division was in excess of 1 000 reports, and so serious was this backlog that it would undoubtedly have a consequence of distorting crime figures by making them appear artificially low. Initially, the Minister of Emergency Services said:

These matters are not within my purview and consequently should not be asked here.

Fortunately, he had his adviser present. The adviser tapped him on the shoulder and obviously said, 'Yes Minister, it is your responsibility.' The Minister said, 'However, this deals with the criminal incident system and I will ask Brian Meadows to answer that question.' The Minister's staff member confirmed that there were problems with the computer system, that there was a backlog problem and hence that obviously the crime statistics must have been artifi-



cially low. That means that we have more shock crime statistics to come out.

I also asked a question pertaining to a small monetary allocation, a sum of \$2 000, in the Attorney-General's portfolio relating to the budget of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. That sum was allocated to lesbians to make them aware of their rights under the Equal Opportunity Act. I do not dispute the right of that or any other group to know of their rights under an Act, but it is probably insulting to the intelligence of that group to allocate that money. The Attorney seemed to know nothing about it; he questioned the Commissioner; there was a fairly hostile exchange between the two and, finally, the Attorney-General confessed that there was \$2 000 allocated—\$500 for pamphlets and \$1 500 for administration costs. As I said, a small amount, but that money could have been more appropriately used for some other purposes.

I also asked a question of the Minister of Consumer Affairs regarding the Casino. I referred in particular to page 242 of the Program Estimates; it was stated:

Expand the facilities for closer hands-on control of ongoing financial transactions and security of video gaming machines.

That statement in the budget papers alarmed me, because a number of times we have heard from the Minister of Finance in this House that there is no problem with the security of video gaming machines in the Casino. I have raised this matter on a number of occasions and, having seen money allocated to improve the security, I wanted to know the position, because there was not supposed to be a problem. The Minister of Consumer Affairs said:

Specific serious problems had not been identified with respect to this issue but rather matters have been identified which would streamline the administration in this area.

If money is allocated to 'expand the facilities for closer hands-on control of ongoing financial transactions and security of video gaming machines', it suggests to me that there is a problem. I repeatedly questioned the Minister, who continued to deny that there is a problem. I gave a specific example of where there had been a problem, where someone had gone to the Casino and pulled out an EPROM chip in the presence of supervisors at the Casino and then replaced it.

That problem caused a considerable fuss in the Casino at the time. There is a problem. Why does the Government deny it? Why does it not level with the Parliament and say, 'Yes, we have a problem with security of video gaming machines in the Casino.' It is important for that problem to be addressed, because it is likely that we will have coming before us in the future a Bill providing for video gaming machines in clubs, hotels and other organisations. This matter must be addressed, and I will continue to follow it up.

I also asked a question of the Minister of Transport that provoked an interesting reply. The question that I asked him related to moneys that have been paid to the company Finlaysons as a result of its media monitoring during the recent train dispute. Today I received a written reply from the Minister of Transport. It states:

No transcripts were obtained from media outlets by the STA or anyone acting on its behalf. As per normal, Warburton Media Monitoring were retained for media monitoring services during the rail dispute. The cost of media monitoring and copies of tapes of electronic media coverage throughout the four week long dispute was approximately \$6 825. No payments were made to Finlaysons, as they were not engaged by the STA.

The Minister's words are very carefully construed. He is telling me that Finlaysons was not engaged by the STA, but he is not telling me that Finlaysons was not engaged by, perhaps, the Department of Transport because, indeed, the Minister knows as well as I do that Finlaysons was engaged

to reveal the extent of media coverage during the train dispute. In fact, I have in my possession a letter sent by Finlaysons to at least one media outlet requesting details of numerous media coverage at particular times on particular days. There is no doubt that the Government has paid for some information pertaining to media monitoring through Finlaysons, and that is the question that I will be putting back to the Government at a later stage to have answered.

At the end of all this, I believe that, after being a member of these Committees, I am qualified after my short time in this Parliament to pass some small judgment on the budget estimates process. The process was introduced on 27 August 1980 by Premier and Treasurer David Tonkin. The procedures laid down were intended to restore to Parliament the means by which it could more effectively discharge its constitutional responsibilities. Regrettably, some members continue to ask Dorothy Dix questions to deliberately waste time. Ministers reciprocate by wasting time with their answers, and there is no doubt that some reform of the Estimates Committees process is needed. It may be that time limits should be placed on ministerial responses and, indeed, that an independent and competent chairman should be appointed to each Committee in order to ensure that Ministers adhere to the time limits that are applied. These things will need to be considered either through the present system or through a new one.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** I support the motion for the noting of the reports of the Estimates Committees. I must say that I found my membership of the Committees on which I sat to be a somewhat depressing experience, and I refer particularly to the Committee which examined the education lines and which seemed to indicate to me that the Government's education policy has lost its way and that this Government is more interested in equality of outcome than in equality of input in order to encourage outcomes appropriate to the gifts, talents, energy and motivation of each child. I found many of the answers given by departmental officers to be discouraging to anyone who is concerned about quality and, indeed, excellence.

In the time available to me tonight I want to concentrate on three aspects of the budget: first, the manner in which the budget gives us indicators of the state of the economy; secondly, the manner in which the budget gives us indicators of the decreasing power, status and autonomy of South Australia as a State of the Commonwealth in a Federal system in which we should be an equal partner; and thirdly, the indicators that the budget gives us of the lack of accountability of the Premier and his Ministers.

Looking at the indicators of the economy to be found in this budget, we know that at least one in 10 people in this State who want work cannot obtain a job; we know that one in three young people cannot obtain a job; and we know—and the Minister of Education seems to be almost proud of it—that almost one in three school children is eligible for the school card and thus for Government assistance. I regard that as a quite horrifying figure and an indictment of a Government that claims to have managed the State's economy.

On a broader scale, we know that, nationally, one child in five in this country is dependent not upon the income of parents through employment but upon a social security cheque that arrives each fortnight. One child in five in this country cannot depend upon his or her parents but must depend upon the taxpayer for succour and security. Again, that is an indictment of Labor Governments. The figures have never been so high. The dependency figures of children, the weak and the helpless in this country, have never



been so high, and the figures for the unemployed are higher than they have been in the lifetime of most of us in this Parliament.

If we look at other measures, we note that South Australia has about one quarter of all applicants in this country for public housing. On a population basis, it should be somewhere near 8 per cent or 10 per cent, but it is nearer to 25 per cent which, again, is an indicator of the poverty-stricken state of a large percentage of citizens of South Australia. On that basis, we would think that employment and jobs would be the prime goal of this Government; we would think that the budget would reflect that goal, but it does not; and we would think that commonsense would demand that, if these people were to be able to look after their own children, to support them at school, to sustain their own families, to own their own homes, or at least to be able to afford to pay rental in private accommodation, the first requirement would be the self-sufficiency that comes from earning an income from a job. But there is little or nothing in this budget that will do anything whatsoever to encourage employment or job creation.

Any of us, from our electorate office experience, would know that WorkCover is one of the greatest deterrents to employment in this country, and the cost of workers compensation in this State is higher than that in any other State in the Commonwealth. We also know from our electorate office experiences that land tax is punitive and very savagely affects small business. Again, that is a deterrent to employment. If we were looking at what a Government itself could do, of its own initiative and aside from its taxation and cost structure, we would be looking towards capital works. And what do we find? On pages 166 and 167 of the financial statement, Consolidated Accounts Capital Payments By Agency, we find that, over the past few years, particularly over the last year, there has been a dramatic drop in the capital funds made available by the Government which could, in themselves, create substantial employment. If those funds were made available to do what needs to be done to restore the infrastructure of this State, to clean up our national parks and to build what is required in the way of schools and hospitals, there would be job creation, and it would be job creation in the private sector.

The House should be aware that in 1988-89 the sum made available on the Consolidated Account for capital payments, including all State Government departments, statutory authorities and other bodies, was \$570 598 000. In 1989-90 it was \$599 505 000 and in 1991 it was \$564 526 000. In this year's budget it is \$494 230 000. That is a very substantial drop, at a time when the Government could have seized the initiative to create substantial numbers of jobs, and to create them in the private sector through contract employment on projects that are badly needed. But it has not done that. Looking at the other department where one would expect to find some kind of hope that the Government was interested in providing jobs, one of course looks to the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education. But on page 66 of the Auditor-General's Report we see that, out of a budget of something in the region of \$5 billion, the Government is willing to spend only a measly \$10.2 million on employment opportunity programs. From a Party that claims to represent the workers, I regard that as a reprehensible neglect of duty.

They do not even bother with the rhetoric any more, let alone with the reality of job creation. They have simply forgotten the unemployed. They are too embarrassed to talk about them. They might be interested in trying to control inflation, because inflation affects everybody, but unemployment seems to just affect that one young person in

three or this one in 10 people, and the Labor Party appears to have forgotten about them, well and truly. We on this side of the House have not forgotten about them, though, because they come to our offices in acute distress, on a whole range of matters. I think that, if ever it could be said that Labor had abandoned its heartland, it is now, both federally and on the State scene, in the current budgets brought down in the past two months in Canberra and in Adelaide.

I want to go on and talk about indicators of the lack of power and autonomy that are besetting this State. I do this briefly by reference to the Commonwealth payments, both specific purpose and general. In the mid-1970s, which is not so very long ago, specific purpose payments by the Commonwealth to South Australia represented 37 per cent, if my memory serves me correctly, of total payments to the State. In other words, approximately one third of what we were paid was predetermined by the Commonwealth Government as to how it would be spent. It was too much in terms of our own autonomy, our own decisions as a State Government, in relation to our responding directly to our own priorities and to our expressing directly the values of our own citizens, but, nevertheless, it was still only one third of the total payments to the State.

In this budget, and represented in tables on pages 160 to 161 of the Financial Statement, in an enormous and detailed list we can see that the Commonwealth Specific Purpose Recurrent Payments to South Australia this year total \$1.098 billion, and that is not very different from the total of the Commonwealth General Purpose Recurrent Payments to South Australia, which total \$1.498 billion. Our capacity to choose how we spend and what we spend on is determined not by the Government of South Australia but by a distant Government in Canberra, whose priorities in very many areas may well be different from those of South Australians.

Just looking at that list of Commonwealth Specific Purpose Recurrent Payments, we see the Hospital Enhancement Program. I have not seen much evidence of the benefit of that. We see the National Better Health program, which is now spending \$206 000—which has exploded from \$72 000 in 1988-89. We see the following references: Aboriginal Advancement, Water Treatment and Quality Research, Non-Government Business Colleges, Home and Community Care, Legal Aid, Children's Services, Fertiliser Assistance, Refugee Children, Save the Bush Campaign—and so on down the list.

It may well be, and undoubtedly is, the case that South Australia values those programs, but should not the State Government be able to choose how we spend taxpayers' money? Do we need a national government to tell us what our values and priorities are? I do not believe we do. It is very interesting to me that the Premiers of Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia, all Labor Premiers, see merit in retaining some semblance of independence and autonomy as governments and see merit in sharing taxing powers with the Commonwealth. This Premier and this Government see no merit in that. They appear to be content to allow their responsibilities to be determined by others. I do not believe that that is the way that responsible government is achieved, and I think that those Commonwealth specific payments to the State, as evidenced in this budget, are a very sad indicator of the complete lack of will, lack of independence and lack of sense of direction of this Government, in simply lying down and accepting what is determined by Canberra.

Speaking of responsibility, and as my concluding topic, I want to share with the House some indicators of the lack of accountability, most of which members of the House

will be well and truly familiar with but they have been put in a rather fresh and original way in this month's *Adelaide Review* by a visiting professor from England, Professor Mervyn Lewis, Midland Bank Professor of Money and Banking at the University of Nottingham and Visiting Professor in Economics at Flinders University and Visiting Scholar at the Bank of England—in short, no mean intellect and no mean credentials. He has written for the *Adelaide Review* an article entitled 'Why Mr Bannon Should Resign'. He sets out three reasons:

First, in a democratic system there has to be accountability, and the electorate must be able to identify who is responsible for mistakes.

Professor Lewis then goes on to give a list of the Premier's excuses for not intervening to ensure that the management of the State Bank did not lead to a collapse, which has demanded \$2.2 billion in the way of guarantee by the taxpayer. In relation to Professor Lewis's second reason for considering that the Premier should resign, he states:

But let us consider Mr Bannon's proposed 'solution', for its improvidence constitutes the second reason for seeking his resignation. No plans have been announced to amortise the extra Government borrowings, and we can only presume that the intention is to finance the debt in perpetuity. Thus when present borrowings mature, replacement borrowings will be made, and so on forever. The interest cost of servicing the debt is to be borne by our offspring until kingdom come.

This, of course, is precisely what the Liberal Party has been condemning and what the Leader of the Opposition in his budget speech indicated would be rejected by a Liberal Government, with alternative solutions to ensure that that debt was not passed on. Professor Lewis goes on to say:

There is a long-standing principle of good public finance that if costs are imposed upon future taxpayers then they should receive at least some offsetting benefits, otherwise access to debt issue might lead to irresponsible decisions on the part of elected officials.

We in this Parliament certainly know all about irresponsible decisions on the part of elected officials. Professor Lewis continues:

What value will future South Australians get from the State Bank borrowings? Sixty-two per cent of the 'dud' loans were in fact to out-of-State entities—some as far away as Tampa, Florida. These are the people whom the member for Henley Beach believes that South Australian taxpayers should bale out. Professor Lewis goes on to say:

The third ground for resignation is that Mr Bannon may be responsible for an even more damaging legacy than his negative fiscal bequest, and that is to anaesthetise the electorate to political impropriety.

That is something that worries me greatly. I have the horrible feeling that \$2.2 billion is such an enormous sum that it is too much for most people to comprehend.

They therefore tend to shut out the enormity of it and attempt to get on with their lives in the manner in which they can comprehend. To me, this is a great moral issue of this budget. It has attempted to blind people and make them forget what has happened. In doing so, it has condemned future generations to debt-ridden poverty, and that is the moral issue for which this Government and its supporters are responsible and from which the people of South Australia will suffer.

That is the biggest worry of this whole budget. The moral question has not been addressed. The responsibility for paying the debt has been cast aside, and the political impropriety that goes with that will remain with this Premier as long as he stays in office. As far as I am concerned, another 24 hours is too long.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** As this budget emerges from the Estimates Committees, we can

now see that the most important factor about it is its impact on the people of this State, especially on individual South Australians. I will start off by paying a compliment to the Government. I refer to the Minister of Labour's Estimates Committee and, in particular, the Government program where the public sector is giving employment to people who have physical and intellectual impairment. The Minister mentioned a young blind man who is now working in the Police Department workshops, and the immense pride that this man's parents now have as a result of that employment.

He mentioned a profoundly deaf person who is now a data entry operator in the Attorney-General's Department, and a hearing impaired person working as a computing technical officer in the Department of Lands. In all, the Minister said that the Government's original intention was to employ 15 people in this category, but only six so far have been placed. In commending this program, I express the sincere hope that the number the Minister wants to employ can be employed and that it will not become just another budgetary cut so that these people are disadvantaged because of the financial mismanagement of the Treasurer of this State.

The Estimates Committees highlighted many programs of equal worth which were previously promised by this Government and which now cannot proceed. Some examples include the inability of the Daw Park Hospice to open all its allocated beds; the closure of the rehabilitation unit at Queen Elizabeth Hospital; and the reduction in the number of speech pathologists in the Education Department. Further, the Premier tells us that we have to become the clever State, but he then turns around with his Minister of Finance and cuts out free travel for university students so they cannot further their education. We then find from the Estimates Committee that 6 218 students cannot obtain TAFE placements. What will that do for the future of South Australia?

Quite obviously, there are two budgets: one that has been fed out to the public for public consumption, and the other that is severely damaging students in this State—students who are the future of this State. Then there is the 'Minister of Unemployment and Fabrication', etc., with his Kickstart program, which is really a kick in the guts to the unemployed. It does not offer any further assistance: it merely brings together all the existing spending under one of those new and wonderful dreams offered to us by the 'Minister of Unemployment' which purport to do something for the unemployed in South Australia. It will do little to help the 42 per cent of Aboriginal people who are unemployed in the Minister's electorate, or the 60 per cent of unemployed in Munno Para. It is just the old, tired rerun of the press release to try to con the public, especially the unemployed, that this Government (a) cares about them, and (b) will do something about it.

The Estimates Committees also highlighted the axing of the public sector youth recruitment program which is denying employment to 300 young South Australians. It emphasised the uncertainty over the employment of the promised number of Aboriginal police aides in Ceduna, Coober Pedy and Port Lincoln which we believe is vital in those towns. That program is working very well but, unfortunately, the people living in those country areas will be disadvantaged because of the cuts necessary due to the economic mismanagement of the State.

The Estimates Committees highlighted the impending closure of more Murray River ferries which will bring further dislocation to local communities, and the impending closure of some metropolitan rail stations which, in particular, will disadvantage and inconvenience many of our senior citi-

zens. Of course, the Estimates Committee concerned highlighted on the sporting front the election promises that the Government made in 1985 and 1989 to build the international baseball complex: once again we find that that will be put off. I guess the press release will be rewritten and get a rerun in time for the 1993 election, if this Government lasts that long.

It shows that, when more people than ever are having to rely on Government assistance because of the economic recession caused by the Federal and State Governments, people are not able to obtain the assistance they need. This budget fails in its basic test of serving the people of South Australia, and we should keep ramming that home. It is not a budget that has anything to do with helping people in South Australia. It is a budget about preserving the credibility of the Treasurer of this State. It is a short-term budget, as if the Government just wants to get through to the next election, hoping that something will happen in the meantime. Indeed, something will happen, because there is a long time to go in the royal commission, and much evidence has to come out as to how this State has been mismanaged and exactly who is to blame for that mismanagement.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** That is quite right, as the member for Mount Gambier says. He arrived back today at 5 p.m. and apologised for being late, but he still arrived during Question Time. That is the latest that Question Time has been for a while. What happened in this House today is unprecedented, and it is something that I believe will take many years for this House to get over. It was a disgraceful exhibition by members opposite in not allowing that motion to be withdrawn. That matter will live to haunt them, and when they come back on this side of the House after the next election they will just have to accept that. I want to see all members opposite squirm in their seats as they live with what they did today, because it will last for a long time.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will direct his remarks to the matter before the Chair.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Since the Premier brought down this budget, other State budgets have been brought down and it gives us something to compare. It shows the lead weight that the taxpayers of South Australia have around their necks with the management of the economy in this State. At the very time when businesses in this State want maximum incentive to survive and prosper, it is the very time that the Government is walking away from them. It did not have the guts to make the tough decisions necessary to cut down the State's debt. All it has done is load onto business in this State further tax burdens that will mean that fewer people will be employed in South Australia and fewer businesses will survive under the present management. All of a sudden—

**An honourable member:** How's Greiner?

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I will tell the honourable member about what Greiner is doing in a minute, and I will be very happy to do that. Privilege will not cut me out of doing that, either, so I will be able to tell him about it. Under this Treasurer's management, South Australia's public sector debt is now 25.3 per cent of gross State product. That is a massive burden on the shrinking South Australian economy. Public sector debt in South Australia is now five times greater than it is in Queensland. It is 10 per cent above the New South Wales level and 3.6 per cent above the Western Australian level. It is nudging up very close to the Victorian level, which is a catastrophic 29.1 per cent of GSP.

The interest bill alone on our debts in this State is \$700 million per annum, and that is 44 cents in every tax dollar. That interest bill is three times the budget allocation for our Police Force. So, if we had managed this economy better, we would have had the extra money to do all the things we have been talking about and we would have been able to carry out many of the promises which this Government has made and which it has now had to withdraw. It all gets down to this level: the Government did not have the guts to make the cuts that were necessary in the State's debt to provide the incentive necessary for business to prosper.

All the Government has done—and it has become quite obvious as we question the budget in Estimates Committees—is to transfer the burden of its own mismanagement through to individuals and businesses. Let us just look at the other State budgets and see what has happened in those areas. Current outlays are rising in this State 3.7 per cent more than the average of all the other States, so we are spending more, but capital spending is down more than 20 per cent. We are the only State that is budgeting in 1991-92 for a reduction in spending on vital infrastructure such as hospitals and roads.

On the revenue side, the impact of the massive increases in taxation that were foisted on the public of South Australia are now starting to bite into our economy. Fees, fines and taxes have risen 11.4 per cent per capita in South Australia this year. Again, that is the highest of all the other States in Australia. Another massive reason for this rise is the growth of the Government in the economy. We have gone through this charade about how GARG will cut some Government employee numbers and what else it will do. If we look at the facts, we find that it is coming up to an election, so more votes are bought with sleazy little deals. The number of Government employees goes up each time this Government gets near an election; it has done this ever since it was elected. Then we go through this charade where the hapless Minister of Finance is now trying to cut down. The Government had intended to do a lot last year but, of course, nothing happened and we are now told that this year the Government will start saving some funds, which may be of the order of \$27 million.

However, gradually in South Australia we are falling behind all other States. Once we were a very proud State; we were the cheapest State and we provided an incentive for people to prosper in this State and to come from interstate and overseas to do business here. Because of the financial mismanagement of the Treasurer of this State, we now have costs level with or higher than those in any other State. This is having a very serious effect on what we can do. If we had maintained our share of national employment at our 1982 level, 28 600 more South Australians would be in work today. If we had retained our share of the national population when the Premier came to office, 68 300 more people would be living in South Australia. The trade within our shops would have been worth an extra \$128 million a year if we had retained our share of retail sales. All those things are happening because, very slowly, individuals' ability and business enterprises are being strangled in this State as this Government's mismanagement bites deeper and deeper.

This budget assumed that there would be an inflation rate of 3.3 per cent—that was the assumption on which this budget was framed—yet the State Bank's official forecast came out at 5 per cent CPI in South Australia for 1991-92. Today the Treasurer gave some nebulous answer that it depends on the time we took it. Obviously, he did not understand the question. That will mean a further blow-out

of about \$44 million in the budget which, quite frankly, is one of the most shaky and rubbery documents that have ever been brought to this House on behalf of the people of South Australia.

Let us just look at the SAFA surplus, which is the major balancing item for the budget. The Estimates Committee revealed that the underlying surplus is much lower than has been budgeted for. In fact, last financial year the surplus from SAFA was boosted by one-off items, one of which is bleeding ETSA for \$45 million. No-one has been able to explain to us exactly what that is about, but it is another tax in disguise. It means higher electricity tariffs and an added cost to business. This whole budget has been framed on disguised taxation and dubious numbers, which are the hallmarks of a budget that will blow out dramatically. As the year progresses and we keep the pressure on the Government to explain how it framed the budget, I can see that there will be some very red faces on the other side of the House.

I want to talk for a moment on South Australia Incorporated. The Premier said it does not exist but the State Bank says that it does exist. We note already in the Royal Commission that SAFA and Treasury say it does exist. A similar situation existed in Victoria and it failed there; a similar situation also existed in Western Australia and it failed there. We are now seeing the tentacles of SA Inc in every area of Government management and Government business in this State, and we see exactly what it is doing to the viability of this State. It was very interesting that in the Treasurer's Estimates Committee we established that Ayres Finniss, which is a subsidiary of the bank, had been a corporate adviser to SAFA, a corporate adviser to SGIC, an adviser to the Timber Corporation as well as an adviser to the bank. There is already evidence that Ayres Finniss has given the bank some very bad advice, but let us look at some of the losses of SA Inc and some of its other clients.

SGIC has been in the news a little lately. First, its losses were \$25.5 million on Scrimber. This is the Scrimber operation at Mount Gambier about which, when we asked a question of the Premier three or four weeks ago, he retorted to the House, 'If only it had worked.' The experiment that this State has been through in the past nine years is aptly described by the Premier: 'If only it had worked.' The Treasurer's management of our economy has been the biggest financial failure of any State Government in the history of Australia.

'If only it had worked.' Those words will come home, day after day, not only to haunt the Treasurer but also the front bench as they claw their way through taxpayers' dollars and burn them up as they further mismanage the running of this State. There has been a \$20.1 million write down in the value of the Terrace Hotel and an \$8.3 million operating loss—not a bad little event just for the past two years.

**Mr Ingerson:** And no interest payments.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Yes, with no interest payments. There was a \$23.1 million write down in the value of Centrepoint—another transaction which has all the stigma of South Australia Inc. attached to it. That was questioned at length in the Estimates Committee. There was also the \$70 million write down in the value of the notorious 333 Collins Street, and the \$50 million annual holding costs on this massive mistake. There was \$10.8 million in the write off of First Radio shares, and a \$7 million write off in the value of Health and Life Care shares. SGIC Health has lost \$3.8 million over the past four years, and the Treasurer keeps telling us, 'If we make a loss in this area, we will have to get out of it'. I do not know how many more years we will

have to prop it up. This adds up to more than \$200 million of losses by SGIC—all part of SA Inc.

The Timber Corporation's share of the Scrimber debacle was some \$33.4 million. The Auditor-General said three years ago that this should be resubmitted to Cabinet with a new economic feasibility study to see whether it was worth pouring in any more taxpayers' dollars. What did the Government do? It snubbed its nose at the Auditor-General and here we have today the Minister of Forests saying what a good job he did with it, and the Treasurer of this State saying that he commends the Minister of Forests because he saved us a lot more money because he closed down the project. The way that the Premier and the Minister of Forests are dealing with the Scrimber operation is in absolute contempt of this House.

It has not been easy for the member for Mount Gambier and me to continue to ask the Government to ensure that its feasibility studies and that its management of that project are in the best interests of taxpayers because it could mean many jobs in the South-East. However, from day one both of us have been criticising the project as a lemon. It was always going to be a lemon, and \$60 million later we still have the Minister of Forests and the Treasurer trying to defend the operation. Worse than that, they are trying to tell us what they have saved the taxpayer by closing the project only now.

In addition to the Timber Corporation, which is another of those great ventures into the private sector by South Australia Inc. through the Treasurer of this State, the Government lost \$14 million on its New Zealand investment. Of course, it went into that investment buying a company with unaudited accounts which, I would have thought, is unheard of in commercial business practice throughout the world. That is another first for South Australia. The Treasurer—this gentleman who knows all about fiscal management—went into the investment based on unaudited accounts. Of course, there is also the closing down of the Williamstown mill in the member for Kavel's electorate. That cost \$800 000. We found during the Estimates Committee that the operating losses of the Timber Corporation total \$40.6 million, and the Minister of Forests says that it is not his fault.

During the Estimates Committees we identified a lot of other commercial losses and failures by the Government. The Centre for Remote Sensing lost \$1.9 million over the past four years despite repeated warnings by the Auditor-General that this project was not viable. However, once again, the Auditor-General's findings are snubbed as the Government fails to take the tough decisions to implement the cost-saving measures that the Auditor-General believes are in the best interests of the taxpayer.

The Clothing Corporation is right under the nose of the Minister of Finance—it is right in his electorate; he could walk down to it and run it himself. It lost more than \$1.4 million over the same period and nothing is done. It would be very interesting to have a look at the Clothing Corporation to find out what is the transfer price of its product to those hapless Government organisations that are forced to deal with it for their clothing as compared with what can be bought through competitive tendering in the open market. I would have thought that the Minister of Finance, who is also in charge of GARG, might like to report to the House about how he is going every morning when he looks at the Clothing Corporation and tries to make it run profitably. He might like to put on the table whether he could buy more profitably or at a greater saving to the taxpayer those garments made by the Clothing Corporation. We have been unequivocal; we have said we will give the corporation

to the employees and management. If they can run it profitably, it is theirs for peppercorn rental and we will see some enterprise bargaining and some enterprise. If they can compete with the private sector, I will give them full credit and full backing, but it will be their money and their jobs on the line.

Radio 5AA has now accumulated losses of some \$5.5 million. The justice information system—that famous system that was to cost \$50 million—has now been substantially reduced and, of course, it is way out of kilter with its budget. The Motor Registration Division computer, which has been the subject of questioning in this Parliament, has cost \$10 million, has had a few hiccups getting going and now has a blow out of more than \$3 million. The STA operating loss cost the Government almost \$130 million last financial year, and that is expected to rise to \$136 million in 1991-92 despite repeated promises from the Government that it will contain costs. When this Government came to office, the equivalent cost was \$55 million to run the STA. However, despite a massive 161 per cent increase in revenue from fares, the losses have escalated dramatically. People might say, 'Are we providing a better service to the public of South Australia?' Of course, the answer is, 'No.' It is all about the management of STA and having the ability to take the tough decisions and, especially, the tough industrial decisions that are necessary to make it an efficient and viable operation on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia.

The cost of workers compensation in the public sector continues to escalate, despite repeated assurances that corrective action is being taken. It is very hypocritical of the Government to complain about work practices in the private sector when its own performance is so abysmal. Yet, into the bargain, with WorkCover, which the shadow Minister is now questioning in a select committee and in this Parliament, the blow out of unfunded liability is expected to reach \$500 million when time and again over the past two years we have told the Government that WorkCover is a fiasco—do something about it. Once again the Government does not have the guts to take the decisions necessary to manage the taxpayers' dollars.

**Mr Ingerson:** I thought the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology was going to get involved in that.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** It is very hard to get anyone to stand up on that side of the House. All the mistakes that I am highlighting mean that, by commission and omission, adding to the State Bank's losses of a couple of billions of dollars—and I will use round figures—South Australia is now an extra \$4 billion in the red because of the Government's financial mismanagement and because, quite frankly, I do not think the Government cares. As the member for Coles said, all the Government thinks about is putting it off to the next generation or after the next election and letting someone else pay for it. The Government will rejig a few press releases to make it sound good and then see how it goes and whether it can keep its position up in the polls. As the member for Coles said, this Government is leaving a legacy that will take until kingdom come to repay. That is an absolute indictment—

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The member for Henley Beach would be very good on the front bench, too. It was one of those sleazy deals that put him on to the back bench, and I can see how embarrassed he is about it. I know the honourable member is constrained by his colleagues not to say anything, but we feel for him, because he would make a good Deputy Speaker. The Treasurer has left this legacy to be paid by future South Australians.

The other interesting thing that came out of the Estimates Committee concerned the fact that 62 per cent of the State Bank's non-performing loans are outside South Australia or overseas. This is after repeated assurances from the Treasurer over the past two years that the State Bank was there to look after South Australians and that it invested outside South Australia only if it was a good commercial risk. So much for the Treasurer's view of it all—62 per cent of the bank's loans are outside this State.

Worst of all, we are going through a recession in our agricultural industries. One paper reported this week that it is the worst recession for 100 years. Farmers have been desperate for help and they have obtained only a pittance from this Government. In fact, they have just been wiped off, while the Government burns up dollars in respect of Scrimber, the State Bank and all the other ventures that have no hope of ever making a return to taxpayers. The farmers have been left to wallow in poverty when they are the only ones with the ability to get us out of the mess we are in. Further, only 3 per cent of the bank's non-performing loans are farming loans. We hear all the hype from the Government about what it is doing for farmers and that the Government is sorry for farmers, yet farmers operating in South Australia are paying their way and doing their bit. In fact, as I said, only 3 per cent of the non-performing loans in the bank that has the biggest share of lending in this State—some 35 per cent in South Australia—are attributed to farmers.

We have been saying consistently that this Government does not have the ability or will to start to dismantle South Australia Inc. South Australia Inc is no different to what has gone on in the other States of Western Australia and Victoria. The more the Premier stands in this House and tells us that it does not exist, all the more at the end of the day he will have a red face because, in the next couple of months, if members pay particular attention to what comes out in the royal commission, they will know that what the Premier has told this Parliament over the past two years is an indictment.

When the royal commission hands down its findings, the Premier will have to meet his maker in this Parliament and explain to us why he was telling us for that period that everything was all right, why he was telling us there was not an SA Inc. and why he was telling us that supposedly he did not know what was going on. Frankly, the Treasurer does not have any of the necessary solutions. He cannot even take firm action in his own department. Last year he told us that he was going to save \$750 000 by amalgamating the functions of the Premier's Department with the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations. That sounded pretty good and we questioned him about it in the Estimates Committee last year. However, this year we have established that these changes have already cost \$300 000 and the possible savings are now two years off. What hope have we got of his managing the economy when he cannot even arrange a small amalgamation?

When one puts industrial relations on the end of it, we can understand why the Premier did not take the necessary decisions to pull those two departments together. We have already heard of the wonderful GARG exercise. Many Opposition members have commented about what a farce it is and about how the level of public sector employment goes up and down as we get closer to or further away from an election. GARG was supposed to save \$20 million this financial year. In February, when the Treasurer was frantically trying to explain how the State Bank was going to cost the State only \$970 million, he laid down at that time savings of \$140 million. What happened? They disappeared

out the window, and now we find that GARG is going to save only \$27 million. As the member for Hartley said, 'What about New South Wales?' New South Wales took the tough decisions and will save \$600 million based on those decisions.

**Mr Groom:** He has a \$1 billion deficit.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** You lost \$2.2 billion in one deal.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** We have the member for Hartley who is supposed to be one of the more intelligent members being thrust on the back bench while we have these fiscal fools sitting down the front. I can understand why he is getting provocative and talkative on the back bench. He is having enough difficulty with his Privacy Bill. I want to put the GARG exercise in South Australia into perspective: it will cost \$400 000 in 1991-92, which means that GARG will spend \$1 for every \$68 it saves. Government members think that is value for money, but I think it is a charade. The Minister of Finance, who is in charge of GARG, gets up here and beats his breast—

**Mr S.G. Evans:** What were those figures?

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I will repeat those figures for the Whip: GARG will spend \$1 for every \$68 it saves. Its estimated savings are costing much more than envisaged and the Government is not willing to take the tough decisions. New South Wales saved \$600 million by taking the tough decisions. It got somewhere. In South Australia GARG will save \$27 million, and the member for Hartley should remember that his Government lost \$2.2 billion in one year. Never forget that.

What has happened in South Australia? It is virtually paralysed because no-one can take the necessary decisions. I was interested in the recycled press release that the Premier put out after the \$2.2 billion loss when he said, 'Do not judge me on what has happened, judge me on how I get you out of it.' All he has done is get us further into it, because he did not make one decision. All the Premier did was borrow money, which is why the Estimates Committee this year became a greater facade, especially in respect of Dorothy Dix questions. We all sat through them and had to put up with them. Repeatedly we heard Ministers telling us how hard they work. The Minister for Environment and Planning claimed that, after the Premier, she was the hardest working member in Cabinet. The Minister of Forests is overworked—he is so overworked that he has no time to read.

A facade is being created that everyone is overworked. If Ministers never make decisions, of course they are overworked. We saw the typical ego trip that we have come to expect from the 'Minister of Unemployment'. He told the Estimates Committee that he carries a range of passports. I suppose that that gives one a warm inner glow. We learned that he was brought up in the East End of London as a kid and that he used to travel around Petticoat Lane. I do not know why he did that, but that is what he did. It is a pity that it did not broaden his mind a little, because he might have been able to find some realistic solutions to the unemployment problems we have in South Australia, instead of concentrating on rehashing the tired old press releases from his office and that of the Premier every couple of months over the past nine years. South Australia has to make sure that it has a Government in place that can make decisions. The only Party that can do that in this State is the Liberal Party.

**Mr Groom:** Ho, ho!

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I would not laugh. If ever we have seen a sinking ship, we are seeing one now. First we saw

Mr Guerin jump off. He knows that he might get walking instructions about the first day we come to Government. We now see the Premier's very loyal Press Secretary, who has been there for eight years, having helped put the Premier where he is and having helped drag him down, jumping ship. If ever we have seen rats jumping off a ship, it is starting to happen on the Government side now. Any minute there will be a reshuffle and the poor old member for Hartley will be asked to go on the front bench.

I do not know what he is going to say. He would be shaking like anything, and the member for Henley Beach—the only one who knows anything about finance—is, privately, terrified that he might be asked to come forward. If he is as intelligent as I think he is, he will say, 'Thanks very much Mr Premier, but I am going to have enough trouble defending my seat without getting onto the front bench of this lot.'

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** That is right. I have heard rumours about that. Of course, you never believe rumours, and I know that the honourable member would not spread any of them. But what I and the Liberal Party have said in the budget reply speech is that we will take the tough decisions that are necessary. We have made a commitment to get this State's debt down to a level where we can provide some incentive for people to prosper in South Australia.

**Mr Groom:** Tonkin said that, and look what happened to him.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** If the honourable member will listen for a minute, I will announce a few more proposals that he may have to defend if he takes that jump down. I know it means more money, and this place is falling apart at the seams. We can see what is happening under Labor management. Even the Parliament is falling down. That could be just a result of some of today's events. We will set up an expert, independent agency to look at all Government services that have a monopoly, and what we have at present (and the people of South Australia are getting sick of it) is Minister after Minister getting up and saying 'It is user-pays.'

I do not mind the user-pays concept, provided that the service delivered is efficient, but all the inefficiencies evident over there and the lack of decision making that is built into the cost of the services provided in this State are being passed onto the consumer. We are saying that we will set up an independent body into which we will allow the public to have an input; we will make sure that all the monopoly services provided to the taxpayer and by the taxpayer have a competitive edge, and we will make sure that they are efficiently managed.

**Mr Groom:** Who are you going to appoint?

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I can assure the member for Hartley that, if he loses his seat, he will be in the front line and, if he moves down to the front bench, I would say that he has every chance of doing it. Secondly, we will have a comprehensive program of competitive tendering. It always amazes me why this Government will not take the plunge necessary to put some competition into the running of its services. It is quite clear that the research undertaken by the Industrial Commission indicates that South Australian taxpayers could save \$100 million a year if the Government entered into competitive tendering.

**Mr Groom:** It is Tonkin recycled.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** It is much better than Scrimber recycled, I can tell you because, first, there is a lot more of it and, secondly, it will work. But, most importantly, if we are to contain the expenditure of the taxpayers, we must



make sure that the service provided is efficient. In conclusion, we have led this debate from day one. We have said that there are problems in the State Bank; we have said that there are problems in SGIC; we have said that Scrimber is a disaster; and we have said that WorkCover cannot function efficiently in the best interests of workers or employers in South Australia. In fact, in comparison with the levies in New South Wales, it is a disincentive to employment.

There has been no choice for us than to continue to highlight the inefficiencies of the Government, but all this Government has done is to protect its own and push the burden onto the taxpayers of South Australia. Every taxpayer in South Australia is demanding a return to themselves of some of that control; they are demanding that some incentive be given back to them to employ people, to prosper and to create more jobs in this State, because the Government cannot do it: it has failed every time. Show me a Government program that has been profitable for the taxpayer in the past nine years.

**Mr Ferguson:** SACON.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The member for Henley Beach mentions SACON. If we introduced competitive tendering in SACON, we could halve the cost to the taxpayer. I am appalled that the member for Henley Beach—the most knowledgeable member in financial matters on that side of the House—has now been disillusioned by his mates on the front bench. It is a worry, although, with woolly thinking like that, he could qualify to come forward; it is getting to that stage. However, I want to close with a couple of comments.

**An honourable member:** About Greiner.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I could close with a comment about Mr Greiner, and I will save that for the member for Henley Beach. A comment was made by the United Trades and Labor Council in response to this budget, and I think it is well worth reading. The council said:

Workers and the community in South Australia will pay for the State Bank debt by way of job losses, wage constraints and cuts to community services.

When the support of Trades Hall is lost, members opposite want to start to worry, because that is where a lot of the financing comes from. All we are saying, after the budget has been subjected to the Estimates Committees, is that the Government has produced a budget that is based on rubbery figures, false assumptions, one-off 'drags' out of the Electricity Trust and one-offs from SAFA which cannot be sustained; and all it will do is to blow out dramatically in its losses over the next 12 months and therefore be a greater burden to South Australia, all because the Government was not prepared to take the tough decisions necessary for the future of South Australians. All I can say to this House is that the Liberal Party will take those tough decisions and, when that is done, it will be in the best interests of the long-term future of this State. The sooner the Premier resigns, the sooner we can get on and do that.

**Mr OSWALD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I want to refer to a group of people whom I believe the Parliament, and particularly the Government, do not consider as much as they should; they leave them in the community to be cared for by parents

who should not have to carry the burden on their own, because it is not the parents' fault that those siblings carry disabilities. First, I refer to the people in our community who have multiple disabilities. In some cases they are blind, and in other cases they are deaf and, because they are deaf, they are unable to speak. Quite often the cause of the disability is at birth. In real terms, they have an age of possibly 18 months to 2½ years. Their parents take on the responsibility of caring for them when they are young but, when the parents reach the age of 50, 55 or 60 years and their child is an adult, it is mainly the female, the mother, who must spend most of her time caring for that sibling. If they take the choice at the time that the child is born and the disabilities are recognised and say to the State, 'Here, it is yours; we do not want it', the State looks after it totally, without the parents having that responsibility, with the exception of social welfare benefits coming from the Commonwealth to support those individuals, in particular when they are adults.

Let me draw a comparison. We spend, on average, \$69 000 a year to keep a prisoner in gaol, with good facilities, with television, swimming pools and gymnasiums. These amenities are often better than a person has in normal day-to-day life. This is what we provide in respect of those who commit crimes against society, whether against individuals or property. Yet, to hazard a guess, there are about 200 families in this State who have a burden placed on them, through sheer bad luck, in having to look after a disabled person. In some cases these people virtually still have to wear nappies. If one partner is away at work—and it is usually the male—the mother, for example, is the one who stays home to look after the sibling. That person might have grown to be an adult and could be six foot tall and weigh 12 or 13 stone. What chance has that woman got at getting a fair deal, in having to look after that person?

I know that the State is in debt, but even when we appeared to have some money we did nothing about this matter. It is now certainly time to do something about it. There is a group of people in my electorate who are fighting for such a service. Many of these people have reached a stage in life where they start to wonder who will look after their sibling when they pass on. They do not have the peace of mind of knowing what will happen to their sibling. Surely the rest of society should take up this challenge in bringing this before the Government and insisting that something be done now.

There is nothing unreasonable about these people having such peace of mind. The cost to provide the service that is required is about \$50 000 a year per person. This is necessary to provide the support staff and the buildings. In some cases three or four of these siblings can occupy one dwelling, with separate rooms, although in some cases this is not always necessary, and some parents argue that some of these people would get on all right together with two to a room, if there is sufficient compatibility as individuals. So, the cost is about \$50 000 a year per sibling, plus the social welfare benefit, if the person is an adult, that comes from the Federal Government.

Something is being done in this regard and perhaps part of the argument is being won. At Blackwood, the Housing Trust is building some homes on the old school site in Gladstone Road. One home is being made available for three such people. It is important for us as parliamentarians to realise that this group of people urgently need help. It was perhaps different 20 or 30 years ago. Families tended to keep a sibling with a multiple disability, say, hidden in the home, because in those days society had a way of thinking that it was a slur on the family, that there was

insanity in the family, or something like that, or some horrible hereditary disease. However, quite often the cause was too much oxygen at birth, or being damaged at birth by some other means, quite accidentally, or damaged after the mother had contracted some contagious disease during pregnancy. Also, it might have been through non-compatibility of blood, which we now know sometimes causes a disability.

This is not the fault of the parents, and they now know that they do not have to hide. In society we now say that both partners have a right to go to work. With these siblings, it is usually the mother who stays home and looks after them, and so they are denied the opportunity to go out and earn a salary. This places an even greater burden on the family, with only one income coming in. Surely, each and every one of us in this Parliament knows that that is a disgrace. There should be sufficient social conscience amongst all of us to say that there would be no squeals if the Minister suddenly announced that over the next two years we were going to make sure that these disabled people had an opportunity to be looked after by full-time staff in appropriate accommodation, provided through a Government agency. Not all the people involved want this; some families would be happy if some respite care could be provided, while some might be happy if full-time staff were provided five days a week, when both partners could work and then they could look after the sibling on the weekends.

Alternatively, the partners might be happy to have just the one income, while on the weekends have respite care for the person, so that they could have the opportunity to be together and not have to carry that burden seven days a week. This would also allow the parents to spend some time with the rest of the children in the family. We must not forget that there is often a problem with the other children in the family. They might not like taking their friends home because they feel a bit embarrassed and humiliated about their brother or sister being in that state. This again places an extra burden on the family and on the mother and the father to be good parents and to be able to handle that situation.

I will not go through in this speech details about the huge amounts of money that have been lost or found to do certain things in recent times. We all know the situation. The amount that I am talking about to help these families is minuscule, in terms of the State providing assistance to do it. Some members of this House, present and past, have experienced some of these difficulties—in some cases not the worst, while in others quite serious. I know that the wife of a former Minister—he has now left this place—spent many hours looking after their son. She did not go to functions and devoted herself to their son who carried a disability.

I hope that everyone who is listening, from the ALP, from my side, and you, Sir, and your Independent colleague, will say to the Government that it is time to act. We need a set program over the next two years. We might not need to cater for 200 people in the first two years, because some families want just part help. However, I certainly would not like to carry the burden that some people carry. I know that my wife would take up the challenge if she had to, but it would not be within my capacity to put up with what some of these people put up with—and nor do I believe that most members of Parliament would be prepared to do it.

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** In the time I have available, I would like to speak about a project currently taking place in Port Pirie within my electorate of Stuart. It is a program which is being monitored by the Environmental Health Centre in Port Pirie and which could actually result in the

greening of a vast area of what is now virtual wasteland. As part of its decontamination work in the city—and I am sure all members would be aware of the vast amount of work that has been done in Port Pirie over the past few years with regard to decontamination of the lead problem—the Environmental Health Centre is developing several strains of salt-resistant trees for planting in low lying areas of Port Pirie. The benefits of the research could blossom not just in Australia but throughout the world. It is really quite an important project for Port Pirie.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** The environmental officer, Dale Hare, is acclimatising the native trees for planting in Port Pirie West—and the member for Murray-Mallee will get more information on this in a few minutes, if he would like to wait. The soil salt and chemical levels are high because of the gulf tides and many years of dumped smelter slag. It is quite a unique environment in that respect. The program will provide hardy vegetation to stabilise the soil around that area and provide a wind-break from the dusty, lead-carrying north westerly winds that are prevalent in that area of Port Pirie. It is also a very dull and unattractive part of the city, and this program will make it look a lot better and obviously will enhance Port Pirie as a city.

At the centre's nursery, which is actually on the Pasminco Metals-BHAS property at The Terrace, Mr Hare is growing a number of species, gradually altering their watering from fresh to ground water, which is about one-quarter saline. He admits that it is not an easy task, and obviously it would not be. The stock is made up of those species which are supposedly the most salt tolerant. In Mr Hare's terms, the trees are not 'molly-coddled', and have been dying off at the rate of about 20 per cent in the first few weeks, but they are not even planted in potting mix: they go straight into clay from a nearby lagoon and are mixed with a bit of peat moss. Obviously, they are not molly-coddled. Those that survive are fairly tough strains.

He expects that a good number will grow well once planted out into the areas where they will be eventually. He is caring for about 4 500 young trees at the nursery with a further 2 000 being propagated in glasshouses as part of a 12-month planting of about 10 000 trees in one area of Port Pirie West in which this planting program is concentrated. The species used include tea tree, wattle, gum and about 2 000 young sugar woods—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** They are only a few centimetres tall, but are already flowering. I am sure the honourable member could tell me that. They are being trained to drink salty water through their capillary bed. Mr Hare says that the project is not limited to any specific species: they look around for any trees that seem to tolerate high salt. He actually found a sheoak only a metre from the high water mark at Port Broughton a while ago and has collected seeds from that. Those seeds will eventually be used for the program as well.

Dale Hare says that the Environmental Health Centre is receiving inquiries about its progress from agencies throughout Australia and overseas, so obviously this project is generating quite a bit of comment not only in South Australia but throughout the nation and overseas. He believes that the information they discover will be of benefit to the multifunction polis in Adelaide, because Gillman is a contaminated site, and the technology could be of use overseas in similar landscapes, such as Israel.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** He believes that Port Pirie is at the forefront of this type of research, because it is innovative

and they are very keen to find something that will help Port Pirie to provide employment for people. I do not think it is a laughing matter, as the honourable member opposite obviously thinks.

**Mr Lewis:** Research has already been done—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** He seems to feel that his knowledge is better than everyone else's and that he is an instant expert in these things. I believe that Mr Hare is doing an excellent job at the Environmental Health Centre, and I would be pleased to invite the honourable member to my electorate when these trees are all growing in the local soil and providing shade.

I will now deal with another matter relating to the Port Pirie area of my electorate. I refer to a young lady who has excelled at her sport. Her name is Kathy Gould, and she is a very good table tennis player. However, she is experiencing a lot of difficulty in obtaining sponsorship. She points out some of the problems which occur for young country people who are talented in the sporting area but who do not have the opportunities that their city counterparts have in attracting funding to assist them in their sporting areas.

This young lady is 18 years old and has been playing table tennis for approximately 10 years as a member of the Port Pirie Table Tennis Club. She has represented South Australia on six separate occasions—this may need to be updated—and Australia once in a junior team to tour Hong Kong and China. Obviously, a great deal of funding is required for her merely to cover the costs of training and travel to put herself forward in her sport. She is currently a member of the Australian Table Tennis Academy based in Victoria, and it is vital that she travel to Victoria in order to receive the type of training she needs to be able to improve and excel at her sport.

Travel costs are a major portion of her expenditure. It is difficult for her to keep full-time employment, because she requires a lot of time for her training. She is very dedicated and committed to that training, having spent about \$8 000 on training in one year, and obviously that has been a high cost to her parents, who have supported her throughout her sporting career. She currently trains between 15 and 25 hours a week and works part-time, but that part-time job has recently been lost, I believe, because of the additional time she needs for training.

Her current goals are to achieve a national ranking in the open women's competition and to achieve selection for the 1992 or 1996 Olympic Games. That goal could be put at risk because of the fact that she has no sponsorship to enable her to travel to Victoria to continue and maintain her training. In 1989, at the age of 16 years, she was ranked No. 1 in South Australia for the under 17 and under 19 girls; No. 3 in the under 21 category; and No. 5 in the senior women's group. That is quite an achievement at the age of 16. She received a national ranking of No. 2, which enabled her to be chosen in the Australian junior team to go to Hong Kong and China.

In 1990 she competed in several Victorian tournaments throughout the year where she had very good results. In South Australia she won the under 19 women's and women's doubles State titles. At the under 19 and under 21 nationals, she made all six finals, and that was a first for anyone. She actually took out four of those titles, winning the under 21 women's singles, the under 19 and under 21 women's doubles, and the under 21 mixed doubles. She was runner up in the under 19 women's singles and runner up in the under 19 mixed doubles. At the conclusion of all that, she was ranked No. 1 in the under 19s nationally. At that time she was still only 16 years of age.

At the senior nationals, she gained selection in a squad of nine women from which teams to represent Australia at the Commonwealth and world titles were to be selected. She also attended the New Zealand open nationals and won the under 19 women's title and the under 21 women's doubles, being runner up in the under 21 women's singles and the under 19 mixed doubles. The reason I put this information to the House is that I am quite concerned that young people with that amount of talent, dedication and commitment cannot obtain assistance in terms of sponsorship because they happen to come from the country.

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

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** It was interesting during the recent Estimates Committees, particularly those on marine, to hear the Minister give details on how his department has improved its productivity. I am happy to pay compliments where they are due and certainly there has been some increase in some areas. I refer to some of the things that the Minister said. He cited the total shipping trade through South Australian ports as being 19.4 million tonnes in 1990-91 which, as he indicated, was a slight increase on 19.3 million tonnes in 1989-90. We have a long way to go in terms of the tonnage going through; we cannot afford to have such small increases, but I recognise that in a rural downturn year tonnages will be down significantly. Let us hope that this will improve as soon as possible. I will not judge the ports' operations on those figures.

The Minister later referred to the department's expenditure, which he indicated had decreased by \$1.673 million from the level incurred in 1989-90. This represents a 3.9 per cent decrease in the department's expenditure which, compared with the CPI increase of 4.7 per cent in the same period, represents an effective saving of 8.6 per cent. That sounds reasonable; at least the figure is going in the right direction. Further on he said that the department undertook a major restructuring initiative during the 1990-91 financial year, incorporating the payment of voluntary separation packages to those eligible employees who wished to leave the department. The cost of this initiative totalled \$5.538 million.

It is heartening to see that at least our ports are starting to make some progress, but tonight I wish to draw attention to some of the things that are occurring elsewhere. I think Australia has to take into account how other countries are performing in relation to Australia. Only three years ago the New Zealand and Australian waterfronts were very similar, with Government-owned ports, centralised waterside employment systems and, in many cases, widespread rorts and restrictive work practices. We have heard a lot from the Federal Government about how it intended to set about completely restructuring and improving the efficiency of Australian ports, but Australian ports were and remain only 50 per cent as productive as European ports and only 40 per cent as productive as ports in Asia.

New Zealand, however, has introduced reforms which have seen the corporatisation of its ports and the decentralisation of waterside employment and wage fixing. The result is that New Zealand has achieved a 100 per cent increase in productivity and its waterfront costs are more than 60 per cent below Australia's. When we hear those figures we realise that Australia has a long way to go and that the Port of Adelaide has a long way to go. Whilst our figures are heading in the right direction, we can never hope to be an efficient port if we do not do something about it.

Let us look briefly at the chronology of New Zealand's waterfront reform. It started back in 1988, when New Zealand corporatised its ports. Ports were transferred from the

nationally-run Harbour Authority to regional government. Business people rather than bureaucrats were put on the boards; ports were given a commercial charter; cross-subsidisation was removed; ports were encouraged to compete and in this respect they were distanced from political influence. In October 1989 the New Zealand Waterfront Industry Commission was abolished; employment pooling was abolished; stevedoring companies re-employed those wharfies who were required, keeping in mind that redundancy packages had been negotiated which cost some \$45 million, averaging \$40 000 per worker and the work force was reduced by 45 per cent.

What were the results of that restructuring? The positive outcome is that normal employer-employee relationships were established or, should I say, re-established; a better attitude occurred between managers and employees; ports became better managed, artificial demarcations between waterside and harbor workers being removed; the work gang size was halved from 12 to six; flexible working hours were introduced and a 24-hour, seven day a week operation occurred—and, in fact, five days in seven were worked. Multiskilling was introduced, giving the ability to do other tasks in the slack time, and many part-time employees were used at peak times.

As I said earlier, 100 per cent productivity increase was achieved. The financial outcome of all this was that direct savings of \$48 million were achieved in the first year, which more than offset the \$45 million redundancy package and a saving of \$10 000 was made on each loading of a roll-on, roll-off ship, which is a total saving of approximately \$600 000 per ship per year—phenomenal savings. Stevedoring costs for the New Zealand Dairy Board fell by 30 per cent, or \$5 million; and, for the New Zealand Apple and Pear Board, by 50 per cent.

Members opposite may be wondering where this information comes from. It comes from people who have been to New Zealand and examined the information, and this is a compilation of some of the material brought back.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** It is a pity that members opposite are not applauding this information; they seem to be critical of it. It appears that they do not want proper reforms here, but I will not be sidetracked in the three minutes left to me. Certainly, many other positive reforms occurred. We can compare this with what has happened in Australia after two years. Ironically, Minister Collins himself on 6 May 1990 promised to resign if significant reform was not completed within 12 months, but 12 months has gone by and we see

that he is still in his position, so he did not become the sacrificial lamb. He realised that he had not achieved it but in true Labor Party style he refused to resign and he continues to try to oversee waterfront reform, which is not working. In fact, we see that after two years of negotiations Australia's waterfront remains largely unchanged, compared with New Zealand's 100 per cent productivity increase. We have seen—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** These figures are available anywhere.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** I am trying to give them to you, but you will not listen.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MEIER:** Only 762 of the promised 3 000 redundancies have been taken up so far, despite the \$100 000 golden handshakes being offered. During this time some 213 new wharfies have been employed; at a time when we are trying to decrease them. The numbers are being increased. It would appear that only half a dozen enterprise agreements are in place so far, out of the possible 40 that should be in place.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I understand from Standing Orders that the Parliament provides a reasonable amount of latitude to members in terms of contributions to the House. The honourable member has been reading this document for at least three or four minutes; could you give a ruling on this?

**The SPEAKER:** I am not aware what he is quoting from. I assume it is his notes, and I would ask the honourable member not to read but to refer to his notes.

**Mr MEIER:** It is disgraceful the way Government members are behaving here. They are obviously very embarrassed by these figures. I have been referring to statistical information which in most cases is freely and easily available from New Zealand authorities and which has come to me from New Zealand sources from Liberal colleagues, in the main. Well may members opposite laugh. They do not want to see these sorts of waterfront reforms occur. They do not want to see increases in productivity of 100 per cent. They would rather see the State wither further into its debts. They would rather see the State go under, which the Liberals do not want to see. We want to see it go from strength to strength.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 October at 2 p.m.