HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

19 November 1992

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the minutes of evidence given before the committee relating to the Courts Administration Bill and move:

That the minutes of evidence be received.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I bring up the fourth report of the committee on the inquiry into the accounting concepts and issues involved in the revaluation of growing timber by the Woods and Forests Department and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this House expresses its concern at the failure of the Government to provide a response to a question from the member for Morphett asked during the Estimates Committees on 24 September 1992 into the decrease in profit incurred during the 1991-92 financial year in the operations of the TAB and requests the Economic and Finance Committee to inquire into the following matters:

(a) the reason why the TAB increase in profit on operations of 28 per cent in 1987-88 on a turnover of $316 million has deteriorated each year to the extent that profit on operations has now decreased by 5 per cent in 1991-92 on a turnover of $496 million;

(b) the cause of the reversal and identification of those areas of TAB administration which have eroded the earlier profit base;

(c) the negative implications of this 5 per cent decrease in profit on operations on Government revenue both in the past financial year and in the future;

(d) the impact that this decrease will have on future distribution of profits to the three racing codes; and

(e) any other matters of a financial nature which the committee may deem appropriate.

This motion brings to the attention of the House the concerns of the racing industry about the operation of the TAB. The racing industry and the administrators of the three racing codes believe that this is an appropriate matter to refer to the Economic and Finance Committee so that it can use its expertise in a financial investigation to assess the management structure of the TAB, its profitability and where management costs are being eroded, and make final recommendations on any rearrangement of financial administration.

The Government will probably argue that it is already conducting two inquiries into the TAB, one into allegations against the General Manager and the reason for his suspension and another (where it has engaged another officer) looking at the TAB's management structure.

My reason for wishing to refer this matter to the Economic and Finance Committee is quite apart from the inquiry that is being conducted at the moment by Government management. There has been ongoing concern for some years in racing circles about the declining turnovers and profits of the TAB. I bring to the attention of the House the figures for the past past five years. In 1987-88 the TAB had a turnover of $316 million which was an increase in profit of 27 per cent.

In the following year, 1988-89, turnover increased from $316 million to $394.4 million, and the increase in profit was 25 per cent. In the 1989-90 year turnover increased to $465 million, but we saw an increase of only 18 per cent in TAB profit. In 1991 turnover increased to $494 million, but the percentage increase of profit decreased to only 6 per cent. In 1991-92 turnover increased to $496 million—nearly $500 million—but we saw the TAB's profit on operations decrease by 5 per cent. That is the trend over five years. We had an initial turnover of $316 million and an associated profit of 27 per cent, but the profit percentage has gradually dropped from 27 per cent to 25 per cent, 18 per cent and 6 per cent, and in the 1991-92 year the profit on the board's operations decreased by 5 per cent. When these surplus funds were distributed, the Government in the past financial year received $23 million—a drop of $1.4 million. The racing codes received $25.3 million, which was a drop of $1.3 million, and warning bells started to ring.

During the Estimates Committee I asked a series of questions on behalf of the racing codes, seeking information that would placate their concerns. I received no reply and I raised this matter again in the House but still received no response, and so I gave notice of this motion. I am pleased to report that within a couple of days of giving notice of this motion a reply arrived. In fact, it covers about two pages but contains little detail. I would be surprised if Ken Tauber prepared this reply. Ken Tauber is Chairman of the TAB and I believe that he would have taken the questions seriously and would have prepared a detailed response to be forwarded to the department and the Opposition.

We have here a laundered down version that tells us absolutely nothing. If that is the original version of the reply, I would be most surprised because it does not say anything. If this is all the Government can produce and hand over to the Opposition in response to legitimate and serious questions about the operations of the TAB, it makes me all the more determined to try to get the Economic and Finance Committee to take up the matter.

The Minister's reply gives some sketchy detail about the major initiatives introduced by the TAB. I refer to one paragraph, as follows:

To take advantage of potential increased business offered from the availability of Sky Channel satellite racing telecasts and TAB Teletext, the number of race meetings covered by SA TAB and the number of TAB agencies established on licensed premises has increased accordingly. This is illustrated by the following table:

I seek leave to have a small table of a purely statistical nature incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

RACE MEETINGS

Years	Meetings Covered
1987-88	1 420
1988-89	1 548
1989-90	1 659
1990-91	1 849
1991-92	1 932

Mr OSWALD: The table lists the five years from 1987 to 1992 and the number of meetings covered by the TAB on each occasion. The reply also shows the increases that have occurred in turnover over five years: a 56 per cent increase in turnover, an increase in customer transactions of 74 per cent, an increase of 43 per cent in betting tickets issued, a 36 per cent increase in race meetings covered, and the number of cash selling outlets established increased by 66 per cent.

It does not tell us anything else. The questions asked in the Estimates Committee were very wide ranging, and they have been picked up in the text of the resolution. I remind members that we were asked to ascertain the reason why the TAB profit deteriorated to the extent that it was showing a 28 per cent increase in profit on operations five years ago and is now showing a negative increase in profit on operations; what caused the reversal; what impact this reversal is having on the proper distribution out to the codes; and the impact that that reduced profit is having on stakemoney and on the flow-on effect down to owners, trainers and breeders. We want to know the impact that this increase will have in the future for the racing codes in the administration of racing, trotting and greyhounds and any other matters that the committee may pick up in its inquiry that it considers worthy of following up.

I will not delay the House; I have made my point. The fact is that the TAB is now on a declining profitability curve. We have sought information, but the Government has not provided it. It has sent me a very bland document which I do not believe originated from the TAB; I would be surprised if the TAB board originated this. It could easily have been cobbled together in the Minister's office just for the sake of getting a quick reply in because I put this motion on the Notice Paper.

The future of the TAB is a serious matter in relation to the three racing codes. The racing industry at the moment is extremely concerned about its future. They are not talking in terms of two or three years to sort themselves out: they are referring to the next 12 months. If we do not come to grips with the TAB distributions to the three racing codes, we will see some of the codes start to fold and fall over. We have racing stables that in the past employed several dozen employees now shedding staff, horses and greyhounds at an alarming rate. We are finding some of the large traditional trainers that have had large stables no longer having the good horses coming in from interstate. The breeders are no longer breeding the good horses because they cannot afford it. It all hinges on and goes back to TAB distributions and the decline therein. It is a very important subject in the racing industry, which is the third or fourth largest industry in the State.

The role of the TAB is absolutely crucial, and I believe, given the scant information the Government has provided, that it is now a most appropriate time for the Economic and Finance Committee to take up the challenge of an investigation into the financial management of the TAB and take its inquiries out into the realms of distribution and the impact it is having on the codes and, therefore, the profitability of the codes; and to pick up this whole question of stakemoney and the viability of the three racing codes, and what we as a Parliament can do to assist the galloping, trotting and greyhound codes.

The industry is in dire trouble at the moment. The TAB distribution is crucial to it and, if we are to have a TAB which is suddenly on a negative profit curve, it should be ringing alarm bells both here and in Government. If the Government is not prepared to pick up the inquiry, then it should be done by this House. I do not accept that, because the Government has one member from Government management looking at the finances of the TAB as a result of the Barry Smith inquiry, that is enough. It is not enough. It will require a large, in-depth inquiry, which this House should support. It is not asking for a select committee. We could have gone to that extreme, but I have stopped short of that. I am simply asking for the matter to be referred to the Economic and Finance Committee so that there can be a measured assessment of where the TAB is going and then report back to the House. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I want to remark as a member of the Social Development Committee that I would have thought that this topic came within our jurisdiction and not that of the Economic and Finance Committee. Rather than the Social Development Committee's continuing on its course of monumental social analyses, the committee would be better served dealing with topical problems of the day. As a punter and a member of the Social Development Committee I would be most happy to deal with this reference.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BUSHFIRE PROTECTION AND SUPPRESSION MEASURES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 25 November 1992.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LAW AND PRACTICE RELATING TO DEATH AND DYING

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin) brought up the final report of the select committee, together with the minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I move:

That the report be noted.

In speaking to the noting of the report I should, first, remind members of the procedure that has been followed in this matter because it is quite some time since the day that the member for Coles rose in her place and moved the motion that eventually led to the setting up of this select committee. The committee has already issued two reports. The first was a general canvassing of the material which had been placed before the committee up to the time of the delivery of that report. The second, which was brought down, as I recall, on the last day of sitting of the last session of this Parliament, was what we called our substantial report—the one which contained the major recommendations—and it was accompanied by a draft Bill. We indicated in the report that perhaps it was fortunate that we were not able to debate the Bill at that time because the House was rising and it would give the South Australian community a further opportunity to look at this matter with us and to make comments on the specifics of both the committee's recommendations and the Bill.

That is what we have been doing since that time, although it has been perhaps a less intensive period of activity for the select committee than was the period leading up to the bringing down of the second report. The House now has before it the third report. The report in effect contains three items: first, it contains the normal reporting about the number of meetings that the committee had and so on. Secondly, it provides for members a schedule of the changes we have made to our recommendations in the light of the further material that we have collected since that time. It is not my purpose this morning to take the House through that schedule. It may be that other members of the committee will want to refer in some detail to some aspects of that schedule and to some of the things that have more interested them. I may take the opportunity before I sit down to highlight one or two points.

I draw members' attention to that section of the report that is easy to read and collated in such a way that members and the public generally can refer back to our second report so that our changes are made crystal clear. I also point out to members that a Bill is attached to the report that will be the subject of a formal introduction by the Minister of Health, I would hope before the House rises for Christmas. This introduction will be accompanied by a second reading explanation, which will extensively canvass the clauses of the Bill and the reasons for them. I commend all of it to members.

We have taken the opportunity since the bringing down of our substantial support to consult with the South Australian community about that report and to fine tune its recommendations. I pay tribute to the work of the Southern Cross Bioethics Institute which convened a very useful public meeting in North Adelaide during the break. Some members of the committee attended that meeting and indeed the Minister of Health, the member for Elizabeth in his role at that time, and I sat on the panel and answered questions from the body of the meeting. We more or less committed our colleagues to a couple of changes on the spot, minor though they were. The select committee readily agreed to those changes. One, as I recall, was the fine tuning of who could and could not exercise medical power of attorney and the suggestion that a medical practitioner—somebody who was attending upon the individual in a professional capacity—should not be able to exercise that power. That seemed to be an eminently reasonable suggestion, one which we should have thought of ourselves and, accordingly, it is taken up in the changes before honourable members.

The Bill, which arises out of our report, will be in the hands of the Minister of Health. That is fortunate, and one might even say providential, because of course the honourable member has not only been a member of the select committee from its very beginning but also has had a good deal to do with the drafting of the Bill itself. Although I remained the Chairman of the committee at the generosity of the committee, I am no longer Minister of Health. The committee has not lost anything in terms of the direct input of the committee into the development of the Bill and its passage through this place. Let us as a committee be not more modest than we need to be. We think that we have done a pretty good job. We think that we have developed an *esprit de corps* as a select committee and have indeed worked hard and approached our task in a constructive way with a gravity that is appropriate to the substance of things we were investigating whilst at the same time showing patience and good humour, as is reflected in the report itself.

Let me be not more vainglorious than I should be on behalf of my colleagues on the select committee, because we have been very fortunate. First, we have been fortunate in having a great deal of assistance from people in the community who have a good deal of expertise in this area. Those people were appropriately referred to in the second report and in speeches in this Chamber at that time, and I will not further expand on that. However, we have certainly been fortunate in having a great deal of active assistance from people in the community.

Secondly, we have been fortunate in that we were able to uncover something very close to a consensus in the community, and in some ways I think that in our activities, very public as they have been, we have helped to consolidate that consensus. I will return to the matter of consensus later.

An intellectually respectable position was put to us with some enthusiasm which, as we indicated in our second report (and we are not resiling from that), we have not felt we can recommend to the House and the people of South Australia. That relates to the doctrine of active voluntary euthanasia. The committee developed a great deal of respect for the organisations and people who were placing this set of recommendations before us. We understand the motivation of people, highly motivated as they are, who continue to urge that course of action on Governments not only in Australia, but around the world. However, for reasons set out in the second report, the committee could not accept that such a suggestion should be placed before the Parliament for changes to the law in this State. I know that those people respect the position that we have taken, though they do not resile from their position any more than we resile from ours.

That aside, I think we have identified a consensus in the community and in some ways we have helped to consolidate that consensus. That consensus makes quite clear that a vast majority of people in our community want death with dignity, not what some would now want to call unnatural procedures artificially to prolong living

when it is clear that the end is very near. Only this morning I visited a friend in hospital who has accepted that he almost certainly is dying. He said to me, 'I want to die with dignity. I do not want to be put in a position where I am used as some sort of guinea pig, pin cushion or receptacle for tubes going all over the place. If the end is near, I am prepared to accept it.'

The other thing that we uncovered was that the consensus is already widely reflected in medical practice and accepted by the people, but it is not adequately reflected in the law. We reported on this in our second report. We recommended amendments to the law which would reflect the practice, reflecting in turn as it does the consensus in our community, and in our third report we do not resile from that in any way. We think that the Bill is better as a result of what we have done, but it is still substantially the same legislation.

No doubt there will be those who will be able to identify sins of omission on the part of the select committee. There will always be people who will ask, 'While you were about it, why did you not do this, that or something else?' I think the committee accepts that that is inevitable. We know that we could have remained in session for another year, heard more argument, and so on, but eventually we had to come down with a set of recommendations that our colleagues here and in another place can get their teeth into. We do not believe that we can be accused of sins of commission and we have been at pains to make absolutely clear our intention and the intention of the legislation.

I believe that legislation very accurately reflects the intentions in our recommendations. One or two muted concerns were expressed during the break. We think that we have been able adequately to convince those people who raised concerns that indeed their concerns had already been met in the changes to the legislation which we are recommending.

I conclude on this note: I have probably been a fairly slow and late convert to the active use of the select committee mechanism in this place. I think it can still be over-used. I think there were probably times, if I may venture an opinion, when in the other place they went fairly close to debasing the coinage. As a person who, in his early days in this place, ran away as far as he could from serving on select committees, I nonetheless have found myself serving on some very significant select committees indeed. One need only list the Stony Point select committee, the select committee into the Olympic Dam mine, and more recently during the term of this Government—or at least the Labor Government generally—the select committee into the Tea Tree Gully/Golden Grove project. I have to say that of all those—and they were all significant and learning experiences for me—this one has probably been the most significant that I have been involved in.

It has touched upon some of the most serious and challenging matters which men and women have to face during their mortal life. That has brought, as I said, an essential gravity to what has taken place but at the same time has also immensely strengthened many of us in our appreciation of the strengths of human nature. One of the things that I find in visiting people who are near the end of their life is how easy they make it for one. One tends to tiptoe to the bedside with some considerable misgivings as to how one is to adequately play what one might call a pastoral role, yet there they are, only too happy to make it easy for the one who, in fact, is supposed to be ministering to them.

That is an enormous piece of reassurance to us all about many of the essential good things about human nature, and it strengthens my resolve that those who are close to the end of their mortal existence should have the very best and most appropriate services that can be available to them. We as a committee in our recommendations have probably gone a long way towards making that, for those people and eventually for all of us, a reality.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the motion, and I would like to commence by commending the member for Baudin on his chairmanship of the committee, which amounted to more than chairmanship: it was true leadership of the committee. Every member of the committee would echo the honourable member's sentiments when he said that it was an enriching experience for all of us. I certainly had to test my own intellectual and spiritual attitudes to death and dying at various stages along the way of the committee's deliberations. So, I can agree with the member for Baudin that one is a better person for having served on that committee. Each member had something unique to contribute and, in acknowledging the contributions of all members, I mention particularly the present Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, whose legislative skills were brought to bear in identifying the principal issues which required legislative amendment and in helping the committee in the preparation of instructions for counsel for the drawing up of those amendments.

We are just two weeks short of two years since I moved the motion for the establishment of the committee, which was supported in the following week. The committee met 38 times and I am told that it received about 400 submissions. I think there was very great diligence on behalf of members in analysing and assessing those submissions. We all know that Parliament has a legislative and a representative role. Its representative role has evolved over the centuries and, in my opinion, that role has diminished greatly in recent years. However, I see that lack now being compensated for by a movement towards what I would describe as a consultative role—and I think the work of the death and dying committee was a splendid example of that consultative role.

At all stages, the committee's work was open: public meetings were held and witnesses were given every consideration. The process of issuing three reports followed by the introduction of the Bill, which will lie on the table over the parliamentary recess and not be debated until next year, will give every member of the community the right to express his or her view on what is being proposed. It is certainly one of the most thorough consultative processes in which I have ever been involved. In acknowledging the work of the committee, I would also like to thank the staff: the Secretary of the committee, Mr Anthony Murphy, and other staff involved in the preparation of the reports and the Bill.

I turn briefly to the recommendations. I suspect that this is the first time ever that a select committee's recommendations have been submitted to public scrutiny and been open to amendment as a result of public suggestion. I freely acknowledge that the amended recommendations are all the better for the public input that has been taken into account in framing the final report. I believe the Bill, which I thought was excellent when it was tabled as part of the second report, is all the better for having the opinions and suggestions of witnesses taken into account in its amendment.

The principal changes made to the Bill have been to introduce an objects clause in plain language so that the intent of the Bill is self-explanatory, to rearrange the provisions in order to clarify the application of the Bill to the different aspects of consent and treatment, and to make other amendments to definitions as a result of suggestions made by witnesses. The principal purpose of the Bill, which includes existing provisions for consent to medical treatment, is to make provision for a power of medical attorney and to ensure that doctors practising palliative care can do so without fear of criminal liability. In that respect, as the member for Baudin said, we want to ensure that the law reflects proper standards of medical care and practice. I use the word 'proper' as distinct from the word 'prevailing' because I think that is the right distinction to make.

I wish to conclude by saying, as I did in the beginning, that my intellectual and spiritual approach to death and dying has been tested on various occasions throughout the discussions and debate on this matter. I suppose we could all say that, as the years roll by, as individual politicians we get used to being misrepresented on matters. I believe that my intentions in moving this Bill have been misrepresented. I was grateful, therefore, to have on the record of evidence an acknowledgment by representatives of the principal Christian churches in this State that the work of the committee was valuable and that its general policy direction was in accordance with the attitudes of the Christian churches. In support of that statement, I refer to evidence given to the committee as part of the report of the Social Development Committee of the Victorian Parliament. I quote from a 1983 statement by the Church of England, Church Information Office, *On Dying Well: An Anglican Contribution to the Debate on Euthanasia,* London, Church Information Office, 1983, as follows:

> There is in all medical treatment a degree of risk to the patient which has to be assessed in relation to the good which it is hoped to achieve. When the patient is in the terminal stage of a fatal illness and there is no longer any hope of a cure or of a worthwhile alleviation of the disease, the good to be achieved is his [the patient's] comfort and peace of mind. The appropriate treatment is therefore good nursing care and the use of pain-killing drugs where necessary.

That attitude is reflected in the evidence of the Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, the Most Reverend Doctor Sir Francis Little. In a comment on the Declaration on Euthanasia issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, he states:

> With admirable clarity and deep sensitivity, the document speaks both of the meaning of suffering for Christians and the use of pain killers. It recognises that if no other means exist, and if, in the given circumstances, the action does not prevent the carrying out of other religious and moral duties, the use of narcotics for the suppression of pain and consciousness is permitted by religion and morality to the doctor and the patient (even at the approach of death and if one foresees that the use of narcotics will shorten life).

I want to make it clear that, having examined all these issues and having gone through the Bill with extreme care over a period of months, I will enter debate on the legislation with a clear conscience that my own beliefs are in no way compromised by anything whatsoever that the select committee has recommended or proposes that the Parliament should adopt. I say that not only in respect of the Bill but also in respect of the recommendations, and I endorse the words of the Chairman that the work of this committee may well stand as an example to Parliaments and health systems throughout this country and the world of ways in which we can help people to achieve in their last months, weeks and days what we all want—the ability to die with dignity. I support the motion.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): As a member of the select committee for nearly two years, as the member for Coles has said, it is with pleasure that I rise to support the motion to note the report. I am interested to note that it was that period of time, because the work of the select committee has been quite fascinating and has certainly benefited each of its members personally. I believe that, in the end, the work of the committee will be of substantial benefit to the community as a whole.

I would particularly like to address the provisions of the Bill, because I think my colleagues on both sides of the House have, both today and in the past, more than fairly dealt with the actual terms of reference of the select committee which, of course, extend well beyond the Bill. I think it would be unfortunate if we did not draw attention again to the wide ranging recommendations which the committee has brought forward and which as Minister of Health, Family and Community Services I will examine very closely to see how they can be implemented in normal medical practice in the community.

Of course, it is inevitably true that one of the most controversial and publicly discussed results of the committee, at least in the short term, will be the legislative proposals which are attached to the Bill. As Minister of Health, Family and Community Services I will also examine those proposals very closely. It is a Bill with which I am already more than familiar, but in my official capacity as Minister for the House I will need to take the matter to Government. I place on the record at this point that the Government as such has not seen the Bill in its final form and has yet to make a decision in relation to the measure, but I will place the Bill before the Government at the earliest opportunity with a view to its early introduction so that the community may have before it a legislative proposal which it can debate in detail, as the member for Coles suggested, over the Christmas break and we can have a further look at the matter in February.

The Bill has varied from that which was presented initially to the community. It now includes an objects clause which well sets out the purposes for which the Bill

has been prepared. A number of the other measures contained in the Bill are adapted or simply transcribed from other legislative measures currently in force. The House has already adopted measures in relation to the emergency treatment of children and adults, and these form part of our existing law. The committee thought it desirable to refine those and re-present them in this Bill in a way which we think is much clearer for the public to understand and which allows them to flow much more logically from the format of the Bill.

The committee has also restated what constitutes 'informed consent', and that is a significant move forward from the law at present. I am sure that all medical practitioners would seek to provide that kind of information to their patients, but if this Bill were adopted it would become an obligation on the medical practitioner to explain to a patient the nature of the consequences of the proposed medical procedure, the likely consequences of not undertaking the procedure—that is a very important part of the process—and any alternative procedures or courses of action that might be reasonably considered in the circumstances of the particular case. So, those three legs to the test of informed consent would become part of our statute law if this Bill subsequently is approved by both Houses of Parliament.

Whilst that imposes an additional obligation on medical practitioners, it is one that good medical practitioners would have adopted already, and one which the community would seek to have extended as far as possible. The Bill also provides existing protection for medical practitioners who act with the appropriate consent in good faith and without negligence and in accordance with proper professional standards of medical practice. It is essential that this kind of legislative protection for doctors be included in the Bill. It extends to those who are providing treatment or care of the patient under the medical practitioner's supervision. That is intended to extend to health professionals right across the field where they are acting in accordance with proper medical practice and instructions. The omission of other particular professionals by name in this context does not imply any lack of respect for those professions by the committee but simply codifies the law as we believe it is appropriately stated and extends the protection to them that the committee believes is essential if medical practice is to have the freedom to care for our patients in the way they would wish to be cared for.

The other important aspect of the committee's work is the very novel and important innovation of the appointment of a medical agent. The whole of the committee's work is founded on the principle of patient autonomy, on the right of the patients to choose which medical procedures will be performed on their body and which will not, and that right is one which each of us holds intrinsically as an individual. Neither society nor medical practice has the right to impose treatment on us which as conscientious and conscious patients we choose not to have. Our reasons are our own in that respect, and a patient is not required in our view to justify their decision in relation to medical treatment. They may make that choice, and any consequences that flow from that flow for the patient particularly.

It is essential that appropriate legislative protection is available for the medical practitioners where they wish to provide a patient who is in pain (which may flow, for example, from a terminal condition) with adequate palliative care, be that in the form of pain control drugs or other measures to relieve distress. They are protected if they take those steps with the informed consent of the patient or their agent without negligence and in good faith, and for the purpose of providing for pain control or the relief of distressing symptoms for the patient. That is the essential difference.

Those who have looked at this Bill and sought to read in it matters which the committee does not see exist, and sought to see matters in this legislation which may provide opportunities for what we would all view as unlawful, inappropriate and illegal acts to occur, I do not think will be able to do so, under the words which the committee has very carefully chosen. Intent is a vital part in all our criminal law in this State, and western law in general. The committee has chosen to focus on that question of intent in looking at the protection provided to medical practitioners who, as a secondary effect, an unintended consequence, hasten the death of a patient through the provision of pain killing drugs or other palliative care measures. Their primary purpose in administering those medical procedures is for the relief of pain and distress.

If their primary purpose were to be for an unlawful reason—in other words, the killing of that patient—the ordinary law of homicide would immediately take over, and that medical practitioner and any other person participating in the process would find themselves, I am sure, charged with homicide and subject to the normal processes of the law of this State. It is the intention which is critical here. Intention forms that vital part of all criminal tests when deciding whether or not a person has committed a crime. Where the intention is for the relief of pain and distress, that is not a crime. Indeed, it is something we would want to see occur.

I have briefly covered a number of important parts of the Bill. I certainly do not indicate that I have covered all of the important aspects of it; time does not permit that. However, a subsequent debate will do that, I am sure. The Government will consider the recommendations of the select committee at the earliest practical opportunity, and I certainly look forward to the opportunity, subject to the agreement of my colleagues, to bring this matter back before the House in an official capacity. I support the motion.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 25 November 1992.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON RURAL FINANCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Ferguson:

That the report be noted.

(Continued from 11 November. Page 1348.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the noting of this report. Before speaking to the report, I would like to place on the record my congratulations to the Chairman of that committee, Mr D.M. Ferguson (the Deputy Speaker and member for Henley Beach), for the very sympathetic way in which he chaired that committee. There was much trauma involved for the witnesses who appeared, and it was necessary to have a sympathetic Chairman. I think he did an excellent job in that capacity.

I would also record my appreciation for the work done by our research officer, Mr Graham Trengove, and our Secretary, Mr Gordon Thomson. I also record my appreciation for the work done by *Hansard* who were required to travel with the committee to Jamestown, Berri, Pamdana, Wudinna, Port Lincoln, Pinnaroo and Naracoorte. I also support the comments made by the member for Baudin about the importance of the select committee structure. It can be very important in that it enables the committee to actually go out and speak with people in their own area and obtain a much better idea of the problems facing them.

Too often we sit in here and do not get enough information about what is happening out in the country. This was one occasion where it was a very profitable activity. It also helped all the people we needed to consult, because there can be no doubt that the rural industry in South Australia and nationally is in a difficult situation. It is true that many of the farming communities with whom we spoke have never previously been in such a position and have never experienced a series of events that made them rely on the Government to assist them, and in some cases to a large degree.

For people who have not been used to seeking assistance, it can be difficult. I believe it was a fruitful committee, because a large body of evidence was taken and people giving the evidence were frank with the information provided. It could not have been easy in all cases to provide such confidential evidence concerning their everyday circumstances. The problems that arose in the rural community can be attributed to a number of factors, not the least of which was the deregulation of financial institutions in Australia, which was the start of the whole problem in many rural areas. There seemed to be a tendency by financial institutions to go out and seek market share and, in doing so, they pushed the availability of money far too much, based on my experience as a member of the committee.

I further believe that the banks offered the farming community advice that was not wise. That raised another question about the financial expertise of farmers to deal with a different financial structure, because previously farmers had not had to deal with that and had relied heavily on their bank manager to offer them sound financial advice over the years. I was concerned that the financial advice was not always the sort of advice that should have been offered to the farming community. I can cite instances of advice given to farmers to aggregate their properties. In other words, they were told, 'There is plenty of money around. You buy the property next door and the one over the road. Big is beautiful, and you will go ahead very quickly.' That did not occur and, as interest rates increased and as the equity of farmers in their properties decreased, it put them in an invidious position in respect of repaying both the principal and the interest.

In many cases they were unable to pay the interest, let alone anything off the principal, but that was not the only problem facing the farming community. They also faced problems associated with successive drought years, and farmers on the West Coast were more badly affected by that than farmers in other areas. Also, the reduction in commodity prices was a problem. Farmers seemed to be hit on all fronts, which is why the farming community is now in such dire straits. Both Federal and State Governments tried to assist, but one thing that came out through the committee—and I am sure other committee members will agree—was the fact that information about the help available was not well known. There were avenues to assist farmers, but application guidelines for assistance were not well known. Again, we had a combination of circumstances where perhaps some farmers could have obtained assistance but, because they did not know what assistance was available, they were not able to get it.

I now refer to rural counsellors and the role that they have played in this difficult time experienced by the farming community of South Australia. I must pay a tribute to all rural counsellors who work in country areas. They have one of the most difficult jobs imaginable. They deal with trauma in a family situation. They are compassionate people and they have a body of information and expertise in the area of financial advice to offer to farmers. It is important that they have independent status, and I believe that should always be the case. The work done by counsellors is excellent. Members of the fanning community cannot speak too highly of rural counsellors and how appreciative they are of what has been done for them. Rural counsellors devote much time and effort to individual cases. I understand from my conversations with them that they have heavy workloads and really need more time to devote to other cases which, while perhaps not involving farmers on the border line in respect of being able to continue, include people who also need assistance.

A number of matters arose from the inquiry and I support all the committee's recommendations, particularly with regard to the continued funding of the rural counselling service. We need to monitor that continually, because we will need rural counsellors for some time to come and, of course, the fanning community needs them. Recommendations are also made about education, and I would like to commend the role that the TAFE organisation has played in providing education for the farming community. Speaking for my own local TAFE, I know it has done much work in providing the type of financial education—basic but important financial education—needed by farmers and which is often taken up by the property owner's wife. I believe a lot of credit should go to those unsung heroes. We have made some good recommendations in respect of the education area.

There were many complaints about the Rural Finance and Development Division, but I am sure the member for Mitcham will agree with me that, on checking out those complaints, it was found that they were not justified.

Nevertheless, the division does need to review the forms it uses because of the difficulty people had in dealing with them. The division should also look at the way it communicates about what assistance is available to farmers through the division. It should also liaise with the Department of Social Security in order to have some continuity and multiplicity of use of application forms. It was a productive select committee and I was proud to be a member of it. Given the difficult task that we had, I believe our recommendations are the best possible in the circumstances, especially as much of the work had Federal connotations and it was an area in which we did not have any authority to make decisions. With those few words I have much pleasure in supporting the motion to note this report.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I support the report and pay a tribute to the Chairman of the committee for the diligent and sympathetic way, as the member for Stuart said, in which he conducted and controlled the committee's deliberations. It was a pleasure to be on the committee and to be working with my parliamentary colleagues from both sides of the House in looking at the vexed problem relating to rural finance. Basically I support the committee's report, but I would like to till some of the turf that has been turned over. As to the recommendations, there is no doubt that the banks have a lot to answer for. We saw many examples where people were misled and were almost forced to take money. When times became a bit difficult the banks tended to enter into unconscionable practices which worsened the situation.

I refer specifically to penalty interest rates that were applied when farmers were in difficulty and to the additional charges that were placed on accounts at a time when farmers needed every semblance of help that could be provided. They deserved some help, but the banks suddenly took on a different role to the one that they had played previously, which was to shovel money out to the rural communities. So, the committee ruled that penalty interest rates and charges and the way they are applied by banks is absolutely inappropriate. We also ruled that all banks, when they are dealing with the financing of customers—in this case the rural sector, but it could be translated cross the board—should be required by Federal legislation to provide a schedule to a borrower of exactly what terms and conditions apply to any loan being taken out with that financial institution. To do otherwise is untenable, because it leaves the borrower at the mercy of the financial institutions and the decisions made by the central authorities of those institutions—not local bank managers or regional managers but people who are far distant from the problems, as we found on a number of occasions.

We do believe that the days of the farmer growing up in a rural community, learning how to plant crops, control weeds and to practise good animal husbandry are gone. Those skills are simply not enough. There is an imperative to have a structured scheme of finance; there is a need for farmers to look at their financial situation in a much more professional fashion than they have in the past. This situation has suddenly arisen. If we harked back over the past 30 years and worked out what has happened to commodity prices and farm viability over that period, we would see that it should have happened sooner. But the crisis really has produced an imperative, and that imperative has to be met. It is not sufficient for farmers to have the skill to grow, to stock and to produce products for the market; there is a need to ensure that they understand the vagaries of finance markets; there is a need for them to understand how to do cash balance sheets as well as to look at future contingencies so that they can manage their resources in a way that provides a buffer in the event of further crises.

The committee found a lot of matters that it would have liked to pursue, but they were outside the jurisdiction of the State. I believe everyone felt that the Federal Government should be looking at a long-term strategy relating to the viability of farming communities cross the whole of this nation. The rural sector is an important and integral part of our community and a significant contributor to our health and well-being, whether it be for the food we have on our plates or the moneys that come in through exports. It is a critical and important sector, but it has really received little or no attention from past Federal Governments of both persuasions. We believe that strategies should be in place, that recognition should be given to the importance of the sector and that Governments should sit down and look at the long-term prospects of a very vital industry to this country and not pay lip service to problems created quite often as a result of the monetary policies or high interest rate policies pursued by the Government. Governments should understand what they are doing.

We also believe there is a critical need to have younger people return to the farm. For those who are already on farms we know there is a need to retain their skills and to allow them to follow in the footsteps of their parents. Every indicator at the moment suggests that the times ahead will be little different from the times we have just seen. There will be continuing pressure on the rural economy. The rural economy will be subject to the vagaries of the seasons and commodity markets and international political manipulation. So, life will not be easy. It is important that that is recognised at the Federal level.

The farmers do not want handouts or any special consideration. What they want more than anything is for their particular situation to be recognised and understood and for national strategies to be put in place. We must get younger farmers into the industry so that they can broaden the range of crops sown, change the land usage and increase the conservation contributions in order that we see a rural community come of age in terms of its capacity to meet the new challenges. The committee agreed that the language used in documents and in instructions given by the various authorities, including the Rural Finance and Development Division, the banks and the Department of Social Security, are absolutely inappropriate. I know I have talked about plain English in this Parliament on a number of occasions. I look at the legislation and it gets more complex every year. It does not give the battlers a chance to understand what they are reading, let alone comply with the responsibilities set down.

My colleagues have already commented about the RFDD and the way in which it is managed and operated. There is tremendous demand for improved

communication and responsibility in relation to the way that division manages its loans. There must be increased accountability in relation to the contacts being made by farmers and increased responsiveness to applications being received. So, there is a need for dramatic change in that area. It was a pleasure to serve on that committee. I too pay tribute to the people who assisted us; that is, Mr Gordon Thomson and Mr Graham Trengove. Their efforts were unstinting to ensure that the committee worked smoothly. I believe the final outcome was a credit to the committee.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I also wish to speak briefly on the Select Committee on Rural Finance. As the member for Mitcham has just said, it was a pleasure to serve on the committee. I think it was a very constructive committee. Even if it achieved nothing else, I believe the very existence of the committee had some impact on the banks. There is no doubt that the publicity given to the activities of the committee had some effect in curbing some of the excesses of the banks, particularly in areas such as foreclosure. Of course, the select committee was limited to some extent because many of the issues in respect of bank behaviour and our financial system are Federal issues—they come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. There is a limitation to what any State Government can do about such matters. First, the committee recognised the reasons for the rural crisis which was basically the cost price squeeze that has faced agriculture, particularly during the 1980s.

This cost price squeeze was exacerbated by the deregulation of the banks, which led to a great expansion in finance. Many banks were encouraging farmers, along with other areas of the business community, to expand. It would be no exaggeration to say that they were literally throwing money at some of these people at the time. Then towards the end of the 1980s we had higher interest rates as a result of efforts to contain the booming economy and that was combined with falling commodity prices. So, at the very time that farm costs were going up, particularly interest costs, we had falling commodity prices, especially wool and wheat prices.

In some areas in this State, particularly the West Coast, matters were made even worse by poor seasons. Some of these factors are no longer so much in force. For example, we hope that this season will be good for many of those farmers who have suffered so much over the past few years. If the season continues the way that it has to date, there is a chance of very good returns. Interest rates have also fallen considerably over recent years, and there is at least some indication that prices for the major rural commodities are starting to stabilise and improve slightly.

One matter in relation to farm viability is the need for research and development. The committee took some evidence on that matter, but not much reference was made to it in the report. I should like to quote an economist from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics who appeared before the committee. That economist, Mr Morris, pointed out that 'farm research gives extremely high returns both for scientific marketing and other research.' If farm viability is to be continued in the long term, we must ensure that research and development in those areas that I have mentioned continues. The committee had evidence that, if farmers are to cope with the cost price squeeze, the only way is by improving productivity, and that can come only with research.

Other members have commented on the behaviour of the banks, and I will not go over much of what has been said. However, there is evidence that there has been a lack of competition in country areas. Although deregulation might have improved competition in some areas of the economy—and even that is highly debatable—there is evidence that, even if that is true in the city, in country areas it has had the reverse effect. That has led to problems for many farmers who have no alternative source of finance. There is plenty of evidence that the farming community has suffered greatly because of that. Unfortunately, that matter cannot easily be remedied.

There is no doubt that the Rural Finance and Development Division has some PR problems; its image is not particularly good in country areas. However, it is fair to say that the business of the Rural Finance and Development Division is such that demand for its loans well exceeds supply. The RFDD has the unenviable task of trying to ration rural assistance. In my view, one of the problems over the years has been that the Rural Finance and Development Division has concentrated on making loans rather than providing interest rate subsidies. The changes that have recently been made to the rural assistance scheme have encouraged the State authorities that provide rural assistance to move more towards interest rate subsidies. In fairness to the RFDD, I should say that it has been a fairly prudent manager. With the administrative changes suggested in the report, I believe that the RFDD should continue to play an important role in the rural sector.

I should like to comment on rural counsellors and the positive role that they play in the rural community. The select committee had a great deal of evidence about the work of these rural counsellors. I believe that they should be complimented on the work that they have undertaken.

Finally, I compliment you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your efforts as Chairman of the select committee. I also compliment the other members of the committee for their work. It was a very productive committee and I enjoyed the experience of serving on it. I also thank the research assistant to the committee, Graham Trengove, for his work and the Secretary, Gordon Thomson.

Hopefully, as a result of the efforts of the select committee, some improvements will be made in areas where we have jurisdiction. Above all else, I hope that conditions in the rural community improve so that farmers can look forward to a much rosier financial future. I support the motion.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion. In doing so, I add my commendation to the members of the committee who entered into this matter in good faith and spirit and, I believe, set out in a bipartisan way to address a very important and serious problem in the community. I commend the member for Eyre, because this select committee arose out of a motion that he brought before the House. Although the motion was slightly amended, the basic content of the idea for the select committee originated with the member for Eyre and it was picked up by the House from that point on.

I thank Graham Trengove for his support. Graham was able to bring research and scientific expertise to the committee and to follow up many of the queries that members wanted answered. I also thank Mr Gordon Thomson for his assistance in trying to keep us all together and arranging so many meetings at that time.

The committee met on 20 occasions and took public evidence at Jamestown, Berri, Parndana, Wudinna, Port Lincoln, Pinnaroo and Naracoorte. Those meetings were an eye opener to all committee members, because we were able to hear at first hand the plight of so many people, not only farmers and share farmers but some business people who were directly associated with the rural community. I do not think I would be wrong in saying that Government members who did not have first-hand experience with the rural community were quite shocked and certainly surprised by what they heard. I commend those members for the attitude that they took on hearing the evidence, which in many cases was disturbing, and for the serious way in which it was taken up. That was reflected throughout the whole committee at all the meetings. That genuineness and seriousness is to be applauded. I hope that every select committee will proceed in that way.

The issue that brought this matter to a head stemmed from to the deregulation of the banks and the freeing up of money that occurred at that time. Interest rates skyrocketed, but prior to that there was ready availability of money effectively being shovelled out to the rural community. The committee heard instance after instance where clients were almost begged to take the money, because it was so freely available, in many cases not even on as much as a handshake. There was a quarter of a million dollars to buy this or half a million dollars to buy out one's neighbour. That sort of comment permeated throughout the community at that time. It created a false impression that all was well and there was a massive increase in land prices because of the ready availability of money. Deregulation of the banks and the willingness of the established banks to hand out the money freely to prevent new banks coming into the community added further fuel to the fire.

The problem with all that is that, instead of banks and bank managers being highly respected, as they were a decade or more ago, they are now despised, because many of the problems perceived within the community are seen to have stemmed back to that irresponsibility that occurred within the banking infrastructure at that time. Sure, we cannot blame bankers for all that, because there must be two parties to a contract and the farmers in many ways perhaps should have known that they were heading down a dangerous path. But, as I said, they respected the advice of the bankers, and that is when things started to go haywire. Furthermore, bankers were becoming involved in farm management practices. They were advising farmers which stock they should run and which crops they should grow. The moment bankers start to do that, they must accept some responsibilities for failures if failures occur.

I know from my own experience as a member of Parliament that one client who was heavily dependent on wool, long before the downturn of the wool industry, went to the bank and said, 'My income is 80 per cent dependent upon wool; I want to diversify; I want to quit some of my sheep and get into cattle.' The bank refused that; it refused to finance the acquisition of cattle. Had the intuition been accepted at that time, that farmer would not have any problems. As it is now, he has considerable problems because of his high dependency on wool. That is a clear indication where the bank said 'No' to what was a logical farming practice; that farmer now has problems. In many instances, members of the committee heard that bankers had put a line through the budgets for land management practices, weed control and many other such practices where bankers deemed those items to be relatively insignificant. But in the same way they encouraged the farmer to commit breaches of other Acts of Parliament, namely the Native Vegetation Act, the Vertebrate Pests Act, and so on.

Another issue—and probably one of the real issues—that allowed this committee to be established (and I say 'allowed', because one would have expected the Government to defend against a motion such as this) is the very fact that financial institutions were giving different stories to different people. They indicated to the now Premier, the then Minister of Agriculture, that they did not impose penalty rates. We had bank managers tell us that in the committee, but we all know that, whether we call it a penalty rate, an add-on charge or whatever, the bottom line is that it is still a penalty rate. I know for an absolute fact that, at the same branch of the same bank, the interest rates for two different farmers were 6.5 per cent different.

They are the sorts of things that bring disrepute and disrespect to the banking institution. More particularly, it puts that person who has the additional 6.5 per cent rate at a considerable disadvantage and almost certainly targets that farmer, taking him out of the farming industry, because there is no way in the world that he could service a debt at an interest rate which was, at that time, 23 per cent.

This committee has served a useful purpose. It has meant that the banks do know they are on notice; they do know that someone has been watching them. The committee suggested that there should be a review of certain aspects of the recommendations within two years, and I trust that that will go ahead. We have reached the stage where I would hope that, given the lower interest rates at present, our leaving money in a bank is no longer a viable investment option. I hope this will free up moneys to be invested in land and agricultural pursuits. We know that land values have lowered, and I hope and believe that land values have bottomed out. What we need now are genuine land sales, land sales that take place without financial pressures and without banks forcing the issue so that we know what the real and genuine floor price is.

The recommendations of the committee should be noted. I hope that they will be implemented; as other speakers have said, it is difficult, because some of the issues are within the realms of the Commonwealth Government. Nevertheless, this Parliament must act as a watchdog to make sure that we do keep a very careful eye on banking practices. I believe we are serving notice that, if the financial institutions do not act responsibly within the farming, business and private communities, re-regulation of the banking institutions will eventually take place. It is really up to the banking and financial

institutions. If they play the game fairly and properly, they will not be hassled by parliamentary process: if they do not, almost certainly they are inviting the parliamentary process to re-regulate the industry. I support the motion.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I went on this select committee with some degree of trepidation. Members will recall that, during the debate on the establishment of the select committee, I asked whether it was worth it, because it had seemed to be done time and time again. If we went into the rural community as a select committee, we could raise the expectations of those people who had been affected, and they would expect the Parliament and the Government to deliver some sort of subsidy or succour to them in their plight. However, I did go on the committee, and I would like to pay tribute to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your tireless leadership. Most of us at some time wanted to throw up our hands in despair and ask, 'What can we produce in the final report that would be of benefit to the community?' The tales that were coming through to us were in some cases horrific. I am pleased to see that in the final report we did not apportion blame: we were critical in certain areas, but we did not apportion blame.

I would like to thank Graham Trengove, who certainly taught me a lot about agricultural activities, as well as the members for Eyre and Flinders, who gave me the benefit of their practical experience when I was grappling with a particular problem. I also thank Gordon Thomson, our very able secretary. Most of the report has been canvassed, so I will be very brief in my comments. The member for Mitchell talked about the current crisis. Those in the metropolitan area can always talk about the whingeing cockies but, given the factors that have come together over this period, we cannot put the blame on only high interest rates. High interest rates would have been bad enough, but most farmers could have overcome that problem through negotiation with their bank.

Then we had high inflation, and the terms of trade for the South Australian farming community actually plummeted, so many farmers were planting their crop knowing full well, given the current situation—and there was indication that it was getting worse—that there would be literally no return for the product. That combination of factors created a situation in which many genuine people in the rural community, through no fault of their own, found themselves, although some were in that position because of their own inexperience or because they listened to the wrong advice.

Much has been said about the role of the banks. The committee found from the evidence that, prior to deregulation, the bank manager was a respected member of the community, the one who, if you wanted to borrow money to, say, increase your holding, gave you a lecture on what it was all about and sent you away with a flea in your ear. If you passed the test with your local banker you were pretty sure that, despite all the other adversities that may occur, you had got pretty sound advice. After deregulation, that situation disappeared. Whilst there was no direct evidence to show that it was the policy of head office to encourage the local manager to go out and drum up business, evidence from individual farmers showed that that was very much the case. In fact, if a farmer wanted to borrow, say, $200 000 to increase his holding, in most cases the bank manager would offer a further $20 000 to buy another car.

Despite the evidence of banks that their managers were well equipped to give sound professional advice on agricultural matters, whenever the committee went out into the field and asked farmers whether this was so, most of them started to laugh at the thought of the major banks sending bank managers with that kind of experience into country areas. Worse than that, not only did the banks put farmers in that situation because of bad advice—encouraging them to increase their holding or to get big to be viable; and I am sure that many members opposite who come from farming areas could provide me with more horrific stories of what went on during the 1980s—but when a farmer could not meet a debt—and the member for Flinders touched on this—they actually got involved in farm management practices.

The committee received evidence in Parliament House from farmers who were too ashamed to give evidence at the locations we visited because they did not want to be seen as incompetent by their peers in the community in which they lived. So, we made a special effort to see those people here in the anonymity of Parliament House. I do not think that any member of the committee would not have been moved by the stories those people told us.

I recall a young couple who were trying to battle on and make a go of it, but at every move the bank manager would tell them to sell something. They would plant a crop and then have to sell the machinery that they would have used to harvest it. It was only because of the good nature of their neighbours who actually supplied equipment and manpower to harvest their crop that they were surviving. But they were just surviving; they were never going to get out of it. In fact, their friends and neighbours were doing them a disservice because they were just prolonging the agony. That situation is highlighted in the report.

The committee has not come up with a remedy. Despite your insistence, Sir, that the committee must recommend something to this Parliament that will be of benefit to people in rural communities, I think we have come up with a very good report but we have not come up with any remedies. The only remedy that we have produced—and again this was touched upon by the member for Flinders; we must be on the same wave length—is contained in our conclusion where we recommend that this matter be looked at further by the Economic and Finance Committee to let people in the rural community know that this is not just another select committee that has gone around the countryside, spoken to the people, heard evidence from a stream of witnesses and then produced a report that will be talked about for an hour and then forgotten.

Perhaps this report and this debate will be forgotten, but the basis of the report will be a guideline to which the Economic and Finance Committee can refer in two years time and say, 'Have things changed?' I would like to think that attitudes will have changed, but I doubt very much that banking institutions will change their attitude, because they denied from the very beginning that they were guilty of the crimes of which they were accused.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

TOURISM INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): I move:

That this House, recognising the adverse effect that a goods and services tax will have on the tourism industry, supports the industry in its rejection of any proposals to impose such a tax in Australia.

I do not think we need much convincing of the importance of the tourism industry in this country as a worldwide industry in the current structure of economic development in the world. It is becoming increasingly a centrally important industry. As productivity in all sorts of manufacturing processes in agriculture improves, people have access to the fruits of that productivity. Those fruits can be distributed in the form of leisure, recreation and tourist activities and, by so doing, create in turn further economic activity and development. That is why tourism is no longer—if it ever was, and perhaps it was in days gone by—a fairy floss, cream on the cake industry; it is an essential and basic economy driver. Anything that works against that industry has to be considered very carefully indeed and balanced against the supposed benefits that it may bring.

In two particular areas, tourism is fundamentally vital for this country. In relation to jobs, it happens to be a labour intensive industry, one where machines cannot be substituted for people. Personal service in all its aspects, not just in terms of domestic services, restaurants and things of that nature but in terms of guided tours, park rangers and all those other aspects of the tourism industry, require a personal, human and individual touch. That means that expansion of and investment in that industry, unlike some others, does not mean the shedding of jobs as productivity is improved but, on the contrary, that more people are employed.

The other very important aspect is that, unlike the manufacturing industry where some of the jobs that are being shed have been dirty and repetitive or have had no future, tourism provides jobs that are extremely attractive to people. Young people of today look upon that industry, the personal contact, services and skills involved, as very desirable. This State leads in the training that has been built around that industry. Recently, the Minister of Tourism announced a major coup that linked South Australia with the international *Cordon Bleu* school, the first such centre in the southern hemisphere. That is just one of many examples of South Australia's particular niche of world class excellence in this industry. I have not even mentioned in that context conventions and things of that kind. These are desirable jobs that young people like—they like the training and skills involved.

It does provide a career structure, a widely diverse career structure. You can start in the kitchens, breaking the eggs for the breakfast and end up as the manager of an international hotel. You can have an international career or a very regional and local career in your own community. The opportunities that tourism provides are infinite. That is why it is particularly important to this country at this time, as our agriculture and manufacturing industry consolidates and increases productivity, that we have to find jobs for those displaced. Tourism will provide those jobs.

In relation to another important item for Australia, tourism is one of our biggest export earners. Members should look at the very possible or achievable targets that are set for the rest of this decade. Over the next eight years, it is estimated that the number of visitors to Australia is expected to reach 6.8 million—a very large group of people—from all countries with diverse backgrounds, diverse incomes and diverse expectations. That is vital for Australia, geographically located as it is in a part of the world which is not on the way to anywhere. Obviously, we must have a competitive product to attract those 6.8 million visitors. Look at the benefits they will provide: export earnings of $14 to $18 billion creating up to 200 000 more jobs. That is an extraordinary effect and again highlights the direct economic importance of this industry.

However, it is a vulnerable industry. It is vulnerable to competition. There are so many places around the world that recognise those same benefits, and they are improving their tourist product, their advertising and attraction. We are off the beaten track. We are more expensive to get to from other parts of the world, so we have to be very competitive indeed. We are vulnerable to our competitors around the world. Secondly, tourism expenditure is discretionary expenditure. The bottom line always is: if you are finding constraints on what you can do, you look to the basic essentials such as food, clothing, education and housing, and it is what is left over that you can devote to your recreation expenditure. Again, any impact on costs in tourism sees its product being the first one taken off the list from households which are under any kind of financial pressure. Again, it makes the industry very cost sensitive indeed.

That is the conclusion. Costs are vital, and the control of those costs is vital. It needs capital infrastructure and spending up front to provide the facilities for the tourists. The cost of transport is an essential element in a successful tourist industry. The more competitive and varied it is, and the cheaper it is, particularly in Australia where people have to come a long way from overseas, the better the industry goes. Of course, the goods and services which the tourism industry consumes to a huge extent are cost sensitive.

In all those cases, a goods and services tax has a very strong negative impact. It is staggering that the Federal Opposition and its State counterparts, in looking to develop jobs and opportunities in this country—in fighting back as they say—have picked on the tourist industry for treatment that will in fact cause it enormous problems and prevent those targets I was talking about being reached. At all points, the GST increases costs. It makes it cheaper to leave Australia than to travel internally: what an extraordinary effect! Because the GST will greatly increase the cost of transport in this country, it is cheaper to travel out of the country and spend your tourist dollars. For those whom we are trying to attract in, it is much more expensive. Surely that, if nothing else, indicates the sheer idiocy of the proposed policy.

What are some of those cost increases? It has been estimated that domestic airline costs, for instance, would increase by $250 million: that is an 8 per cent increase if the GST is applied. Incidentally, Ernst and Young has

done a major study for the industry. These are not my figures—they are not the figures of the Labor Party or some partisan body—they are figures determined by proper and adequate assessment. Restaurants and meals will increase by 10 to 14 per cent; alcohol will increase by up to 8 per cent; accommodation will increase by up to 13 per cent; and building supplies, taking all factors into account, will increase the cost of projects by approximately 50 per cent. They are extraordinary imposts on this very sensitive but vital industry. Added to that is the double tax effect. Let me read from one of the findings:

> New hotels and other tourist accommodation facilities will be subject to import tax on building materials but will be unable to claim a credit for this tax against GST liability incurred on goods and services that are supplied to tourists. Thus, they will be subject to double taxation.

What an extraordinary and repressive outcome that is envisaged there. Dr Hewson, the Federal Leader of the Opposition, and his colleagues will say, 'Ali, but you are being unfair. There are cost offsets by the GST. We are eliminating a range of taxes that will mitigate this effect.' I think they are honest enough to concede that it will not eliminate it, but they say, 'That's just bad luck for the tourist industry. Everyone else is getting cost imposts so you can too.' But they do say there will be these offsets. Well, that is nonsense when you analyse it. For instance, payroll tax will be abolished. 'A huge benefit to the tourist industry' says the Opposition. The fact is that 85 per cent or so of tourism and hospitality operators do not pay any payroll tax. It is a small business industry. It is a business of family and owner-operators, a plethora of them around the country. They fall beneath the thresholds of the payroll tax in nearly every State. For them, that is no relief and of no significance whatsoever. So much for the offset of costs to them in that area.

The fuel tax is another classic example. At the moment, aviation fuel is not taxed, but it will be under the GST. As a result, transport user charges will increase greatly. There are other charges as well, because the Opposition, in abolishing certain registration and other charges for vehicles, will introduce this cost for road users. Who will be right at the cutting edge of the imposition of those? The tourist industry, in particular. Again, there is no offset there. On the contrary, there is an increased cost.

What about the training guarantee levy? The Opposition claims that that would benefit tourism operators. However, many tourism operators, as with payroll tax, are too small to be subject to that levy. These operators already put much effort into training, but they are not liable for the levy because of that offset. They do not pay it, so where is the benefit for them? There is none. It is outrageous to say there will be cost offsets. No way will this happen. It is an added and total imposition.

What has happened overseas? Surely in preparing this Fightback package, the Opposition could look at the very adverse effects that have taken place overseas. If it had done so, it would have looked at the experience, for instance, of Sweden, which introduced a new consumption tax in 1990—an impost on its tourism industry, the consequence of which was a fall in bed night numbers by a massive 13 per cent. According to the Economic Intelligence Unit assessment, that was wholly attributable to the introduction of that tax. What a blow to the industry. The Swedish Government quickly recognised the error of its ways and overturned the decision in January 1992. There is a good precedent. That should be looked at.

Of course, that is not news in the OECD. France has a GST of 18.6 per cent, but its tourist rate is only 2 to 5 per cent depending on the service. In Canada, the general rate is 7 per cent, but tourism has a zero rating. Those countries have woken up to the fact that you cannot discriminate against this industry. The Opposition will not. When I say 'the Opposition', I am not just talking about Dr Hewson and his colleagues. Dr Hewson described the industry as just an industry that will create jobs for bell hops and shoe shiners. What an extraordinary and derogative comment. Not only is it a bad reflection on those who perform vital essential services at that level in a career structure that can lead a long way, but it completely misrepresents the skills base of the industry. He dismisses the industry like that, but so indeed does his colleague the Leader of the Opposition. What was he saying on 19 October on ABC Radio when interviewed about this?

I have just mentioned the overseas experience and the way in which other countries have either had to repeal their tax or do something about it, but to the Leader of the Opposition that is nothing. He is oblivious about that because, when questioned about that, he said, 'First, I can say that when I travel overseas, even where the accommodation has been purchased here in Australia, I have always have had to pay the full bed tax and GST throughout the world, and I see no difference there.' The fact that we are a lot, further away and need a lot more competitive costs may have something to do with that. He also said, 'There are some aspects of it that I want to clarify with Dr Hewson and, seeing that the issue has only blown up during the weekend, I haven't had a chance to do so. We'll be doing it this week.'

First, he dismisses the concern by saying that he has been subjected to this form of taxation overseas and does not care—that is great on his income and the business travel that he was undertaking. Secondly, I want to know what he has said to Dr Hewson and what he has taken up. Can he provide details of his representations and tell us what he has done to honour that policy or is he slavishly following it as in fact he said in this interview, as follows:

> I am getting further information. I want to clarify the situation. Yes, from what I see, the GST should apply.

His starting point is that it should apply.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER QUALITY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House strongly supports the establishment in South Australia of a Cooperative Research Centre for Water Quality Research to provide solutions to major water quality problems through the conduct of strategic and applied research, to develop innovative treatment processes to meet the needs of the Australian community and the water industry and provide a

platform for this technology to benefit Australian industry internationally.

It is timely that this motion be debated in the House now because within the next two weeks the proponents of the Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) will be taking this matter to the Commonwealth Government. This facility will be a major boost for South Australia, in an area where it is particularly important, and I hope that I have the support of all members of the House in respect of this important facility for South Australia. The mission statement in support of the establishment of the CRC is as follows:

To provide solutions to major water quality problems through the conduct of strategic and applied research, to develop innovative treatment processes to meet the needs of the Australian community and the water industry and provide a platform for this technology to benefit Australian industry internationally.

I refer to the submission of the proponents of the centre, as follows:

The primary theme underlying the research activities of the proposed centre is the improvement of water quality, with an emphasis on drinking water. It is often assumed that, since most of the treatment processes employed in the water industry are well established, there is little opportunity for significant improvement. This assumption is, however, largely incorrect.

There is considerable demand throughout the world for improvements in water quality. This drive arises out of an improved understanding of the health and environmental consequences of water pollution. The increased awareness of [a number of the problems that we now find in our water supply] is one of the more obvious examples. In recent years, there has been a marked increase in the resources applied in many countries to address a wide range of water quality issues and to develop techniques to meet increasingly stringent water quality guidelines or standards.

The cost of supplying good quality drinking water to communities is significant and there is great scope for the development of innovative techniques to achieve the required standards of performance and for reducing the costs incurred in conventional processes. Lower costs and improved quality are not necessarily incompatible objectives in the water treatment industry. These aspects should be jointly pursued with more vigour as the existing costs of water infrastructure are significant to the Australian economy.

The value of water assets in South Australia alone is about $11 billion. The submission goes on:

Experience with the existing research program in South Australia has demonstrated the potential for large capital and operating costs savings in water treatment and there is good scope for commercial development in the area. Research into the adverse water quality effects of nutrients and organic material will form an important part of this program. These two factors are closely linked to a number of Australia's more serious water quality problems.

The submission then goes into some detail about that but, unfortunately, time does not permit me to refer to all of those problems. The submission continues:

The CRC will adopt an integrated water quality management approach to provide solutions to these major problem areas. As part of this integrated approach, the CRC will examine processes in the hydrological cycle which have a direct effect on the quality of water reaching consumers' taps, namely, those processes occurring in water catchment areas, storage impoundments, water treatment facilities and distribution systems.

That is why it is vitally important that this facility proceed in South Australia, because it will be beneficial for this State, in particular. The submission further states:

This approach will be realised through a set of coordinated, collaborative research programs conducted by the participating organisations in the CRC, which possess the necessary multi-disciplinary expertise to achieve this objective. The research programs are strongly inter-related and consequently they will provide complementary information. The proposed Cooperative Research Centre, to be known as CRC for Water Quality Research, will operate as an unincorporated joint venture, bringing together the expertise of four highly regarded Australian research organisations to provide a focus for programs designed to address the major water quality problems facing the Australian water industry. The additional involvement of two major industrial water treatment companies and three other water industry partners in the CRC will ensure that the commercial application of CRC research remains a high priority. Scientists directly involved in the centre will be drawn from the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Of course, the section of that department with a particular interest is the State Water Laboratory. They will also be drawn from the University of South Australia, the School of Chemical Technology and Civil Engineering, the University of Adelaide, and I refer particularly to the Botany Department and the Laboratory of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), and the CSIRO Division of Water Resources, Griffith and Canberra laboratories.

I referred earlier to the two industry partners, and it is important that I make reference to them in this contribution today, because the CRC will collaborate formally with two commercial companies in the water industry, namely, ICI Watercare Pty Ltd and Australian Water Services, an important international company. The submission continues:

This collaboration will extend to both financial and in-kind support for the research programs of the CRC, particularly in the field of water treatment technology. The international scope of these companies will greatly enhance the prospects for commercial application and marketing of CRC research in Australia and overseas. Several areas of CRC research (for example, magnetic-based ion exchange resins and the activated carbon regeneration process) have the potential to generate export revenue for Australia within a relatively short timeframe.

We would all be aware of the importance of that move. The submission goes on:

The Urban Water Research Association of Australia, the Water Board (Sydney) and Melbourne Water will also provide financial (and in-kind) support to the CRC. The involvement of these agencies will provide a further mechanism for information and technology transfer throughout the Australian water industry. The support of these three organisations, in addition to the key role of the E&WS Department, underlines the very strong support for the CRC from the Australian water industry.

I think we are very fortunate that such organisations have been prepared to give such strong support to the introduction of a facility of this magnitude in South Australia. The submission continues:

The proponents of this application have an established record of high achievement in water quality research. This proposal builds on existing collaborative links established in 1987 through the Australian Centre for Water Quality Research. This centre,

formerly known as the Australian Centre for Water Treatment and Water Quality Research, was established under the Commonwealth Government 'Centres of Concentration in Water Research' initiative. Currently, the operating budget of the ACWQR is approximately $1.25 million *per annum.*

The existing centre is highly respected in the Australian water industry and staff are national authorities in a number of areas of water treatment and quality research, including: the transport of natural organics, pesticides and nutrients through catchments; the effect of organics on water treatment processes; development of water treatment technology . . . effects of pesticides on water quality . . . ecology of wetlands; surface and colloid chemistry . . . Under the proposed CRC, the scope of the research program will be augmented by the inclusion of the expertise of the Botany Department of the University of Adelaide, which will further strengthen the biological research program. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) of the University of Adelaide, already recognised as a world expert on the health effects of algal toxins, is establishing a laboratory to continue this work following his recent transfer to Adelaide.

May I say how very fortunate we are to have Professor Falkner in South Australia. We all recognise the devastating effect that blue-green algae and other forms of algae can have on our waterways, and we are very fortunate that Professor Falkner in this important position is able to carry out much of the research right here in Adelaide. The submission goes on:

The laboratory, which will be established by mid-1992, will be staffed by researchers funded from research grant sources and by the University of Adelaide and will also involve research students. The focus of the laboratory will be on the long-term toxicity of blue-green algae to the human population, with particular emphasis on the study of correlations with tumour promotion and growth.

As I said earlier, we are very fortunate to have Professor Falkner in South Australia carrying out that work. The submission also deals with the proposed CRC management, as follows:

The expertise and knowledge of the scientists participating in the CRC is unique in Australia and will provide a substantial platform for the proposed research program. The centre will bring together the expertise of scientists with a specialist knowledge of water quality and water treatment, gained over many years of experience in the water industry, academia and research organisations. The proponents of the CRC recognise the need for a person with a high profile in the water industry, excellent management skills and preferably with research experience to head the centre. Accordingly, the board will appoint a director with suitable national and international standing in science and/or the water treatment technology industry. Until the board can consider an appointment, Mr Don Bursill, currently the Group Manager Scientific Services, E&WS Department, will be the interim director of the CRC.

Mr Bursill is held in very high regard in this State for the excellent work that he is carrying out in the E&WS, and I think in the interim he will do an excellent job. The submission continues:

It is envisaged that the centre will be managed by a board of management, the director and a research program management group.

The submission gives the proposed membership of the board, and it is intended that that board will meet at least quarterly. The submission goes on:

The tangible benefits of collaborative research have been clearly demonstrated over the past five years of operation of the existing Centre for Water Quality Research. During this time, highly productive interactions were developed between the State Water Laboratory, the University of South Australia and the Waite Agricultural Research Institute (University of Adelaide) . . . The centre will also provide a diversity of opportunities for education and training of postgraduates and post doctoral staff, including staff and student exchange programs with other academic and research institutions in Australia and overseas.

I believe that the introduction of this facility in South Australia is a very important move indeed and I hope that all members of the House will support the motion.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

BRIGHTON AND MAWSON HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House rejects the proposal to amalgamate Brighton and Mawson High Schools, recognises the need to build on the success already achieved at both schools through academic excellence and Brighton's specialist music program and recognises the need to develop Mawson High as a specialist school with a focus on technology.

It is with some sense of irony that I move this motion in the House just a few hours after this Parliament has debated a motion of no confidence in the Government; indeed, a motion that followed the disastrous losses of the State Bank. It was explained during the debate that we would see many examples of the effects on our State from the State Bank fall-out. What we are debating here is one of those many examples and just one of the examples that will be put forth by many members in this Parliament.

I would like to refer briefly to the manner in which the two schools that are referred to in this motion were first formed. In so doing, I refer to page 359 of a book entitled *The Vanishing Sand,* which is a history of Brighton and which was first published this year. The book says in part:

There was great interest in the community when the first high school in the district was opened in 1952. Twenty-three years had passed since the councils of Brighton, Glenelg and Marion had first approach the Government regarding a high school to serve all three municipalities. With an enrolment of 219 students and 11 staff, teaching began on 12 February in an unfinished building of which only the top storey was complete. As the first Headmaster, Sydney Tregenza recalled 'it was rather perilous for the students climbing up stairs without any rails.' It was the first high school to have hot showers installed for girls. The Education Department economised and the boys went without.

There were 219 foundation students, but within 10 years this had risen to 1 400. Permanent additions were added over the years to the school, which had been built to accommodate 400 students. In 1971 a large assembly hall was built with the aid of the parents association, and in 1986 a gymnasium was erected with a $40 000 grant from Brighton council.

That was part of the history of the development of Brighton High School, which had very much become part of the community and which today has 1 150 students

and is so much in demand by parents and students that each year there is a waiting list. I and other nearby members are inundated with calls from parents whose children missed out on enrolment into the school seeking assistance to have their children enrolled in year 8.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Morphett indicates that he gets many calls, too. As a member sharing the catchment area for that school, I can imagine that he would. The book also refers to what finally became the Mawson High School. In part it states:

> The Brighton Boys' Technical High School was built in Colton Avenue in 1967. The teaching concentrated on manual skills with less emphasis on the academic structure. Within eight years it was no longer considered educationally or socially acceptable to have such differentiation and in 1975 it became the Mawson Comprehensive High School. At the same time it was made co-educational.

Mawson High School is also referred to in some detail in a report prepared by the Educational Review Unit of the Education Department on 10 April 1991. That report, in part, states:

> Mawson High School is situated in leafy, attractive grounds between Brighton Road and the beach at Colton Avenue, Hove, 15 kilometres from the GPO. Located adjacent to the Noarlunga railway line and several bus routes, the school is readily accessible to students from a wide area in the southern suburbs.

It goes on further to say:

> Extensive grounds of 6.5 hectares include an oval, soccer and hockey pitches, netball, basketball, volley ball and tennis courts and grass leisure areas. An ongoing landscaping project has provided extensive plantings of native trees and shrubs with outdoor facilities for students. Covered walkways and leafy pergolas enhance the local school environment.

That 6.5 hectare site, leafy surroundings and close proximity to the railway line proved too tempting for the State Government, a Government looking for something further to plunder to prop up its ailing coffers. I will come back to that in a while.

Mawson High School has an enrolment of 400 students, but that enrolment has dropped through this Government's quite deliberately embarking on a program of rumour and innuendo. That program was deliberately designed, as some of its programs in the past have been, to cause concern to parents to the extent that they will enrol their students at other schools for fear that the school would close part way through their children's education.

Each of those two schools has a problem that needs to be addressed and solved. The refurbishment of Brighton High School has not been completed. Indeed, a couple of years ago, $6 million worth of refurbishment was opened, including a specialist centre in music, which has received not only Statewide but national and, to some extent, international acclaim. What have not been completed are the tech studies and home economics centres, which have structural damage, which have been declared dangerous and which therefore cannot be used. The member for Hayward has raised concerns about the state of these buildings in this Parliament and has reminded the House of previous, as yet unfulfilled, Government undertakings to complete those buildings and make them safe and useful again.

Mawson High School has a problem, because its numbers have dropped as a result of the Government's campaign of rumour and innuendo. As a consequence, the school is unable to provide the broad curriculum choice to the extent that would be provided by a larger school. As an interim measure, and as a result of extensive negotiation involving concerned members of the community and me, a bus service operates between the two schools. The bus service takes students from Mawson High School to Brighton to undertake studies that are not included in the Mawson curriculum, such as languages. It also transports students from Brighton to Mawson to undertake tech studies, home economics and the like.

Obviously, that is not a desirable situation. There have been problems and they needed to be addressed. Regrettably, the Government seized on this as an opportunity to sell off Mawson High School, that area of prime real estate, to bolster its ailing coffers and, having done that, to utilise Brighton High School. The Government believed it could do that, because in excess of half of the students who attend Mawson High School come from as far afield as McLaren Vale or McLaren Flat and, indeed, from the north of the city as well, because that school has a special focus on students with learning difficulties. More than 70 of the students fall into that category. The school has a very good success rate in taking students who have had difficulties in literacy and numeracy and assisting them to overcome those difficulties and further their education.

When the Government's plans became known and the community understandably became hostile, and because the Government's plans backfired, they formed a forward planning group to solve the problem and undertook what could loosely be called a community consultative process in the hope that it would back up their plans. That forward planning group has recommended to the Government that both schools be amalgamated and that that amalgamation should take the following form: Mawson High School should be retained as a year 8 and year 9 campus of Brighton High School and Brighton High School should be the educational centre for year 10 and upwards.

Mr Speaker, as you can imagine, the 1 150 or more students at Brighton High School and their parents are not particularly happy that their school is being tampered with in this way. The students and parents associated with Mawson High School have taken some solace from the fact that their school would be retained by this program but, I would argue, not for a long time, because this Government has a very poor track record for splitting schools in this way. Inevitably, the Government's ultimate objective would be to have the communities agree in frustration that only one school should exist so that it can get its grubby hands on the Mawson site, which it would sell off in order to prop up its ailing coffers. There is no justifiable reason for tampering with any school in this manner.

In the remaining time I should like to share with the House extracts from some of the many letters that I have received from angry parents regarding this debacle that has been forced on the local community by this Government. One letter, which I received from a Marino resident on 1 September 1992, states in part:

I am most concerned to learn of the proposed amalgamation of Brighton and Mawson High Schools and seek your assistance in raising this matter in Parliament in an endeavour to rescind the decision. Brighton High is steeped in tradition, being the fifth school established in the Adelaide metropolitan area and since inception has produced outstanding academic results and is generally regarded as being a most prestigious school. Why then is it necessary for Brighton High School to amalgamate, thus losing its name, uniform and most important its sound traditions?

I heard one member say 'Hear, hear!' to the fact that it is a most prestigious school, and I wish to reflect on that, because I have been absolutely appalled by the attitude of some members of the Education Department staff who have openly told me and the community that this amalgamation proposal provides the department with a golden opportunity, an opportunity to destroy Brighton High School, and an. opportunity to bring that school, in their words, into this century.

What these departmental representatives have said is that this school is behind the times. Some have said it is operating under terms and conditions one would have reasonably expected in the last century; others have said it is operated in a way one would have expected to see two decades ago. They referred to the uniform, they referred to the school tradition, as being things that are not in keeping with today's modem methods of education.

The facts are these: 1 150 students attend that school. There is a waiting list every year for students to attend that school. Local members of Parliament consistently are approached by parents of students who are not successful in getting into the school because they want to get there, but staff of the Education Department, supported and encouraged by this Government, are running around to parents in the community saying that Brighton High is not the sort of school that they want to see in this community and, as a result, this is an opportunity for them to get rid of it. I certainly will not stand by and see that sort of arrogant attitude prevail. It is an attitude that is unacceptable, and I look forward to other members—particularly the member for Mitchell—standing in this place and dissociating themselves from those comments, because they are not acceptable and they are certainly not in accordance with the wishes of the community. Another letter that I received from a Seacombe Heights resident on 15 September 1992, in part, states:

It is with great concern that I read about the suggested amalgamation of Brighton and Mawson High Schools. I believe that with amalgamation comes the creation of a new school identity, and the existing schools lose their traditions, reputation, name, uniform, motto and badge. Brighton High is and has been a successful school and has no trouble attracting student clientele. Currently, it has a student population of over 1 100 and is limited only by the ceilings placed on it by the Education Department.

I received another letter on 31 August 1992 from Kingston Park residents, and it states:

As the parents of two students attending Brighton High School, it is with concern that were are forced to write re the proposed amalgamation of Mawson and Brighton High Schools.

Further the letter states:

It would appear that public servants are once again making the decision for the hand that feeds them. We want our school, not some hybrid or new traditionalist school, whose only testimonial would be its conception by the forward planning group in education.

Mawson High students took a different tack: they requested that a petition be presented to the Parliament, and I was pleased to present the following petition on their behalf:

We are concerned about the future provision of education at Mawson High School and believe in the importance of retaining schools with a caring environment providing a focus on learning difficulties, technical education and also general education curriculum.

At a time when this Government has been advocating the advantages of an MFP, and given that this is one of the few schools in this State that has the opportunity to develop excellence in technical education, the Government wants to throw away that opportunity, because, after all, we know it is not really serious about what it says in this place. This motion is vitally important—one of many that will come before this Parliament as this Government moves in its attack on schools in our community. I commend this motion to the House.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That this House reaffirms its decision of 22 March 1978 when it carried the following motion moved by the then member for Morphett, now the Minister of Primary Industries: 'That this House commends the State Government for continually refusing to permit extensions of the Adelaide Airport beyond its present boundaries and for its insistence that the present flying time curfew be retained and obeyed.'

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1122.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

Leave out all words after 'House' and insert in lieu thereof:

1. Notes the State Government's approach of favouring initiatives that lead to improved air access to Adelaide and enhance the State's economic development prospects, provided that public sensitivities to operations at Adelaide Airport are properly taken into account;

2. Calls upon the appropriate authorities to ensure the noise reduction measures accompanying the dispensation for Qantas to operate within the curfew at Adelaide Airport are closely monitored and extension of this dispensation beyond 1993 occur only if unreasonable noise pollution problems have not occurred;

3. Calls upon the Adelaide Airport Consultative Committee to consider and make recommendations to the Federal Airports Corporation and the Federal Government enforcing the airport's noise-abatement procedures and encouraging the maximum use of low-noise certified aircraft.

It is indeed a strange motion that the member for Hanson has moved, because he is dredging up a motion that was moved by the member for Morphett, now the Minister of Primary Industries, some 14½ years ago. Time has not stood still. Much has happened in that time at Adelaide Airport. Indeed, one of the more momentous events at the

airport has been the establishment of an international gateway, which occurred during the term of the Tonkin Government, with which the honourable member was associated. While I accept that the member for Hanson must respond to the needs of his constituents, we must also be mindful of the importance of Adelaide Airport to the economic development of this State. Perhaps I will be able to say more about that after the luncheon adjournment.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

PETITIONS

LINCOLN NATIONAL PARK

A petition signed by 5 212 residents of South Australia requesting that the House support the retention of the management plan for the Lincoln National Park was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

SCHOOL COUNCILS

A petition signed by 260 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to prevent the devolution of responsibility from the Education Department to school councils was presented by Mr Heron.

Petition received.

QUESTION REPLIES

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Newland recently asked me to report on answers to a number of questions without notice. The status of the relevant answers is as follows: a full up-to-date report from the State Bank on Pegasus—answer tabled in *Hansard* on 13 October; the State Bank's alleged harsh treatment of the Lovering family on Kangaroo Island—answer tabled in *Hansard* on 17 November; a full report on any State Bank Group sale deal including the Henry Waymouth building—answered by ministerial statement delivered on 21 October; Treasury revenue estimates before and after the change in stamp duty legislation—this is still going through the House, but an answer will be provided incorporating the most recent amendments; full details on the $53.5 million paid to the Tax Office in respect of Luxcar Leasing and the status of Federal police inquiries—answer tabled in *Hansard* on 17 November; a report on any gaming machine monitor licence—answer tabled in *Hansard* on 11 November; full details of the deposit of unused indemnity moneys paid to the State Bank—answer tabled in *Hansard* on 17 November; the total write-off and current provisions for the Remm-Myer centre—answer tabled in *Hansard* on 17 November.

PROWSE, MR BERT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In the light of the State Bank Royal Commission report, the former Under Treasurer, Mr Bert Prowse, has offered his resignation from the boards of the State Bank of South Australia, SGIC, Enterprise Investments and various subsidiary companies and committees associated with these bodies. The Government has accepted Mr Prowse's resignation with some regret. Mr Prowse had a long and distinguished career in public service as a university teacher, as a senior public servant in various departments of the Commonwealth, as Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund and, of course, as Under Treasurer in this State from 1985 until his retirement in May 1990.

There is no doubt that Mr Prowse's appointment to the boards of the State Bank and the SGIC around the time of his retirement were seen by all concerned as a strengthening and broadening of those boards. There is equally no doubt that he has served extremely well as a member of those boards. That is consistent with all the advice available to us. It needs to be emphasised that the Government's decision to accept Mr Prowse's resignation is based entirely on his assessment of the correct thing to do following the commission's report. There is in no way any adverse reflection on his performance as a member of these boards. As I have indicated, the opposite is the case. The Government acknowledges Mr Prowse's commitment in public service over a long period and wishes him well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association study tour consisting of two members of each of the Parliaments of the Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Cook Islands. I welcome the delegates to this House and trust that they find their visit to South Australia informative and enjoyable.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government accept the finding of the State Bank Royal Commissioner that 'both the Government and the bank lost sight of the bank's statutory charter and of their respective statutory obligations; from an early stage in its history, the bank had put stability at risk in pursuit of growth in the hope and expectation that in due course growth itself would ensure stability; the bank was

encouraged in the course that it took by a Government that, according to circumstances, was either supportive or indifferent'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We had a very lengthy discussion on this matter in the motion yesterday, and a number of views were expressed on both sides of the House about the various findings of the Commissioner. On the matter of the motivation of the bank in driving its growth, I canvassed that in my contribution yesterday and made it quite clear that it was not the Government that had driven that. I commented on the dividend policy of the bank. In fact, there has been much debate and confusion about the dividend payments and return on capital and the assessment made as to what was the motivation of the bank's growth policies.

There have been claims that there was pressure for an inappropriate level of return. In this regard, it is worth reflecting, as was done yesterday, on the former Opposition Leader's speech in the Appropriation Bill debate on 4 September 1990. In that speech, the member for Victoria criticised the Government for not achieving at least a 15 per cent rate of return. Had that been the case, I suggest that the Commissioner may well have made other comments, even more extensive than he made on this matter. The Government's expectations for return on the bank were quite modest and appropriate. Indeed, the Government agrees with the Opposition and believes that it would be inappropriate not to expect a sound performance and return on the Government's capital in the bank. The point we are trying to make is that we believe that the Government's expectations in this matter were—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! Wait for the call. The Premier will resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: My point of order is to a matter of relevance. I have simply asked whether the Government or the Premier accepts the finding of the Royal Commissioner on this very specific matter. He is now off talking about some other matter totally unrelated to the question. I ask him to come back to the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and ask the Premier to be specific in his response.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, the point is that I made substantial comments on the general matters yesterday and I refer the Leader to those comments.

The Hon. Dean Brown: Do you accept it?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We still have to see further reports from the Commissioner on the management of the bank and we will look to see whether that is happening. We are in the process of considering all the findings. As I said, broadly speaking, we accept the key findings and the summary and conclusion. As to each of the details, we have had some points of difference of interpretation and understanding. I made my comments yesterday on whether differences in understanding on some of those matters took place.

ECONOMY

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Does the Premier believe that investment in South Australia will be damaged by comments made in recent days by the Opposition and, more particularly, comments made by the Vice President of the Liberal Party in South Australia, Mr Robert Gerard, on the Channel 10 news last night?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, we will come to Mr Rob Gerard in a minute and, whatever his status, we are busily being told what he might not be, but I think we all know what he is. We all know that he is an active member of the Liberal Party, one who keenly supports the Liberal Party. I do not hear any interjections denying that assertion.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Of course the Deputy Leader says he is a very good member of the Liberal Party. He may well be a good member of the Liberal Party, and I will not dispute that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The question was about the impact on investment in this State. It is starting to become quite clear that an orchestrated campaign is being run by the Liberal Party to talk down this State and damage the investment potential of this State and actually frighten away investment, and to say to investors that there is no value in coming to South Australia because conditions are simply not good enough.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You have constantly ruled about debating the answer to questions. I believe the Premier is debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: The Chair's attention was momentarily distracted. I ask the Premier to be specific and I will listen to the answer.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I certainly will be specific. The question to me was whether I believe that investment will be damaged by comments made in recent days by the Opposition. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition on the Ray Fewings program yesterday morning, and it is quite clear that this orchestration campaign to try to drive investment away from the State is already starting in the campaign of the Leader and those who support him. The Leader stated:

> ...and because after this royal commission report no-one, and certainly potential investors, will have any confidence whatsoever in the Labor Government in South Australia, in the Arnold Government, and so this State is now a crippled State until we go to an election and can have a new Government that can give confidence again and a new purpose and direction for the State to head in.

What the Leader is trying to say to all investors—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. This wall of sound coming up will not be accepted. The Chair cannot hear the answer. Sometimes it cannot hear the question. Order will prevail.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: What the Opposition is saying to potential investors in this State is, 'Stay away; just do not come here unless we are in Government. Stay away as long as this Government stays in power, regardless of the costs to South Australians who are looking to a growing economy in this State.' I mentioned before that this is an orchestrated campaign, because it is interesting to note from where other voices of support come for that point of view. Television reporters were approaching people in the street and asking their views about various matters associated with the royal commission report. That was all very interesting and certainly a worthwhile exercise in reporting. However, one point was particularly interesting because it was said 'investment is under threat in this State'. It was then that Channel 10 decided to turn to one particular section of the business community.

At this stage one could be forgiven for thinking that it would be a dispassionate view, that Channel 10 would approach someone from the chamber who could be regarded as having a credible view on these matters. I am certain that any of the Presidents of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry over the years could have been approached and could reasonably have been expected to give a dispassionate view on the role of the Government and investment attraction in this State. I have the fullest confidence in them to put not just a Government line—and they would not do that—but a fair line. I would expect them to fairly criticise and fairly praise. Interestingly, Channel 10 did not go to the President or the General Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry who on many occasions has put fair comments on the public record about this Government's record. Instead, Channel 10 chose to go to the Deputy President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and the Deputy President is none other than Rob Gerard, who was then part of this campaign of orchestrating the talk down of investment potential in this State. The worry is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—that the Deputy President of that organisation, as with many other organisations, has the potential to become President.

An honourable member: Rubbish!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Someone says, 'Rubbish.' Well, I certainly hope that many people in the Chamber of Commerce and Industry acknowledge that it would be rubbish if with his present stated views he were to become President of the chamber, because the person who does take over that job needs to be dispassionate and fair in considering the options of various Governments. I can say this much: we are not prepared to accept this kind of orchestrated campaign with the Leader of the Opposition and other leading people in the Liberal Party trying to talk down investment in this State, because that will cost South Australia and South Australians dearly.

The SPEAKER: Order! I indicate that the Minister of Public Infrastructure will take questions normally directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management.

STATE BANK

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government accept the finding of the State Bank Royal Commissioner, as follows:

> The Government in general . . . had from the outset been myopic in their vision of an appropriate relationship with the bank?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I actually wondered about the strategy of the Opposition yesterday. We anticipated that we would have a motion yesterday. I gave notice on Tuesday of the motion that the report on the first term of reference be noted. We indicated after discussion with the Opposition—so there was no attempt to cut it out of a free-ranging debate on this matter—that we would have an extensive debate all day yesterday to hear the various points of view on the matters. We then anticipated—knowing the political tactics of the Opposition—that it was not unlikely that there would be a no-confidence motion today, and that it would then take this no-confidence motion for what it would see as its own self interest in prime media time. Quite frankly, I thought that is what the game plan would be.

Whatever the case, we were very happy to oblige the Opposition in this matter. Instead, it wanted to have the no-confidence motion first, and now we are having the questions today. That really strikes me as a very odd way to do it, especially as in the very extensive debate that we had yesterday all of the points raised so far have been handled by the Government. In relation to the matter of myopia, that comment was certainly handled. There is a lot of hindsight involved in the Opposition as well on matters like this. Members opposite ought to look at their own comments—many of which I read into *Hansard* yesterday—about how they saw things in time gone by in respect of Tim Marcus Clark, the bank, the role of the bank and the relationship of the Government to the bank. We have all learnt some lessons. It is certainly true that the legislation that this Parliament passed in 1983 was not up to the situation faced by a bank that was growing as rapidly as this bank. To that extent, Parliament certainly suffered from myopia, although to a certain extent I guess it suffered from a lack of prescience more than anything.

The other point is whether or not the later events that took place should have been better known by the Government. We have canvassed the extent to which the Reserve Bank did not report adequately to the Government, the extent to which the State Bank did not report adequately to the then Premier and Treasurer and, again, the question is that perhaps other people should have understood better and should have had some kind of telepathy about the situation. However, to the extent that the information should have been known and reasonable concerns about that can be raised, then, yes, the point certainly has been taken that at that time the situation should have been better known. However, that point was canvassed yesterday. To then pick out these sorts of easy sayings from a report in excess of 400 pages and go through each phrase asking whether I agree with it is an odd way to examine the Royal Commissioner's report.

The member for Kavel noted yesterday that we all have yellow stickers in our copies of the report, as did

the Deputy Premier, but we all have our yellow stickers in different places. If the Opposition is going to go through the report and ask whether we agree with every phrase, we will go through it phrase by phrase and give our comments on the other phrases that they very selectively and purposefully leave out.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): Can the Premier report to the House whether he is intending to reduce public sector numbers to the extent forecast for Victoria, particularly in the light of the recent Victorian announcement that the Government plans to slash 6 500 education sector jobs in that State?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Baudin for his question. I can certainly say that the answer is 'No'. I know that my colleague the Minister of Education, Employment and Training was as horrified as I to read in the national press this morning about what is happening in Victoria. It is not sufficient that they break the promises that they made to the electorate before the election; it is not sufficient that in some cases they keep total silence on what they are going to do and then come out with a totally different direction after the election; they even break what they say after the election and go off in an even more draconian direction.

There is a peculiar irony about what has happened in Victoria. Today, when they have announced this very heavy toll—that 6 500 jobs will be slashed from the system before the end of the year, accompanied by plans to close between 40 and 60 primary and secondary schools and with 2 000 direct teaching jobs gone—on the very same day—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I question the relevance of the question and the answer to South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think perhaps the member for Mitcham took the wrong point of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. That is exactly what is happening. It was on the same day that the Victorian Government put in the Victorian papers a soft soap sort of approach to try to get people to believe that what it had been doing was in their best interests when it is very much a poison tablet. I know that a lot more will be said about that attempt at propagandising by the Victorian Government.

The question is relevant, because the point made by the Leader of the Opposition is that he is trying in some flip-flop kind of way to distance himself from the policies in Victoria; yet he says that he is part of a general Liberal philosophy around the country, espoused by John Hewson and others. John Hewson's and John Howard's own words will tie in the Victorian policies to the Federal Opposition and tie those same policies into the Liberal Opposition in this State. We hear talk about not just a reduction in numbers through attrition but about redundancies, and we hear of 2 000 teaching positions going and the addition of more schools to the hit list. This morning, in private members' time, I heard members debating the issue of schools and school closures. The member for Bright, who made various comments on that, must not have read the interstate papers today, or else he performed the most amazing act of brazenness to come into this place and talk like that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe it is against Standing Orders for the Premier to refer to a previous debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. References to previous debates in the same session are out of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, I certainly take your point on that. We will not be doing what Jeff Kennett has been doing in Victoria—that is, to break all the rules of proper, open campaigning with the electorate, to mislead the electorate before an election and then, after the election, to take double bites at these draconian measures. We will not be making the *pro rata* magnitude of cuts that he has been talking about in Victoria. It is up to the Leader of the Opposition in this State to spell out how different he is from Jeff Kennett, not leave us in this policy vacuum in which he has left South Australia at the moment; it is up to him to start coming out with real quantified policies that say what will actually happen, not try to distance himself in a flip-flop way from his Victorian colleague.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will come to order. Every day I have to look at him severely.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): My question is also directed to the Premier. Does the Government accept the fording of the State Bank Royal Commissioner that 'despite these cautions expressed by both Dr Lindner and the Under Treasurer, conveyed by each to the Treasurer, Mr Guerin noted on the minute to the Treasurer that we have to make sure the Remm development happens. It is apparent from Dr Lindner's evidence and from the evidence of Mr Guerin that this was clearly the view of the Treasurer and the Government generally'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hope that the Opposition will quote more properly from the royal commission report. He refers to it as a finding. In fact, what he refers to does not appear as a key fording; it is in the text of the report.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hope we are not trying to second-guess the Royal Commissioner as to what his own findings were. He determined after his text what he was going to make as key findings and as his summary concluding chapter of his first term of reference. It is acknowledged on page 188 that the South Australian Government was also appropriately cautious about the project at that early stage. On page 202 it is stated that 'the bank, as on previous occasions, was seeking to please the Government: the management was bending over backwards to present material in a way that aimed at

a favourable outcome in order to fulfil Government hopes'—that is, the question of what the Government hoped would happen, and the point has already been made that, clearly, all of us, including the *Advertiser* in its editorialising at the time, hoped that this project might be a successful one for South Australia and that it might take place. That was not an unreasonable hope. The question is whether or not in the presentation of that material to the Government that material fully reflected the actual situations that took place.

The information that is contained on page 198 does not mean that the board's conscious decision was to enter into an uncommercial transaction to please the Government, nor does it mean any improper pressure was brought to bear upon the bank by either the then Treasurer or the Government. So, it is not sufficient to try again to draw out a phrase here and a phrase there: what is required is that a holistic view be taken, first examining the key findings and the summary chapter and then a holistic view of all the pages of the text and, of course, waiting for terms of reference 2 and 3.

YEAR 12 EXAMINATIONS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh) Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training assure the House that appropriate steps will be taken to prevent a recurrence of the error in yesterday's matriculation mathematics 1S exam paper which caused so much distress? An accidental use of a minus sign instead of a plus sign in one calculus question created havoc yesterday for hundreds of matriculation maths students across the State. My own son came home from his maths IS examination at Hamilton High School greatly concerned at the impact of this careless error on his prospects and those of others. His concern was not just the complicated adjustments to marking procedures for the particular question but the impact for the rest of the questions in that exam paper undertaken by students. Not only did students lose valuable time trying to solve a question that was beyond their capacity to solve because of this printing error but many had their confidence shattered for subsequent questions on the exam paper. As one student on the front page of today's *Advertiser* describes it:

> I spent a lot of time on it and ended up crossing it out because the answers were contradicting each other. It just put you off for the rest of the exam, because you were always unsure after that question that what you are doing is right.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is a very important and serious matter. I not think that any member of this House would underestimate that, particularly those of us who are parents and who have gone through the examination process with our own children, as the member for Walsh has done. As you, Mr Speaker, would imagine, I have sought urgent discussions with SSABSA, and Dr Garry Willmott, who is the Director of SSABSA, has provided me with the protocols that will ensue from this situation. First, I am making sure—to the extent that one can give any guarantees against human error—that this mistake does not happen again in any examination papers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a very serious question. There are many young children and students in this State whose future hangs on this matter, and interjections will be dealt with very severely.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I share the concerns that members opposite are voicing by way of interjection, and the reason that I am prepared to give a detailed and thorough answer is that, as the new Minister of Education, Employment and Training and following the practices of my predecessor, I want to ensure that this does not happen again, and I have asked for an investigation by the Director of SSABSA to see what went wrong in this case. I just want to put the question into context so that I can answer it, because it raises a couple of important aspects. First, the error occurred in question 12, which was half way through the examination and was worth 18 marks out of 150. Question 12 had 6 parts, 3 of the parts, parts C, E and F, requiring mathematics which were technically not required in the syllabus.

As the honourable member has said, the problem arose because in the example the denominator in the function equation had a minus sign where it should have had a plus sign. I will not go into the implications of that, but I am sure that people understand that that created some extra problems for students. We must decide what we can do about this particular mathematics paper. The SSABSA board offers three mathematics papers of which this is the only single mathematics paper (mathematics 1S).

The chief examiner has had discussions with the Director of SSABSA and markers will be instructed as follows. The first thing that will happen is that the paper will be marked twice: there will be a percentage score on the examination with the whole of question 12 included and a percentage score on the paper with parts *(c)*, *(e)* and *(f)* of question 12 excluded. The best score for each student on this double marking process will be given. This means that some form of a safety net will be provided through the current marking process. Markers will also be instructed to look at the subsequent questions answered by students to see whether any anomalies in their application to the paper appeared. If this is so, the markers will consider the teacher's predicted examination mark in marking these questions.

For those members who are not familiar with the system, SSABSA has standing procedures for re-marking student examination papers based upon predicted examination marks. I will explain that to the House. Predicted examination marks are given to SSABSA by teachers before students sit an examination. Historically, these predicted examination marks correlate very well with the actual examination performance. The predicted examination marks are used in two ways: first, to trigger any re-marking of a student's examination paper if their performance varies significantly from the predicted mark; and, secondly, as a substitute for an examination mark if a student is unable to sit for the examination.

To complete my answer: all students who sat for the mathematics 1S paper yesterday will have the safety net of the predicted examination mark applied to their script. This is standard practice. Students whose performance is below the predicted examination mark will have their scripts re-marked. Because question 12 is in section B of the paper, it will be possible to see clearly any break in

consistency of performance between section A and section B, thus assisting the re-marking process. It is important to note that students can suffer the panic syndrome that everyone of us who has sat for an examination has suffered at some time or another. If that has happened and if that has in a detrimental way affected the student's subsequent performance on these questions, as I have said, two safety net applications will be made to ensure that students are treated as fairly and equitably as possible.

STATE BANK

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government accept the finding of the State Bank Royal Commissioner that 'during September 1989 Treasury's more explicit concern and criticism about the bank was indeed brought to the Treasurer's notice but languished for lack of attention. The political exigencies of the forthcoming election held on 25 November 1989 diverted the attention of the Treasurer and the Government'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again, we are being presented with phrases from the report. I see that we will go through the report phrase by phrase.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is right. I think it might be appropriate for us to go through the other phrases that are judiciously or not judiciously being deliberately left out.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There were a great many. If members read the *Hansard* report of what we said yesterday, they will find how many were referred to with more yet to be quoted from the royal commission report. The matter of what was known has already been canvassed in the evidence given before the commission and the various points of view about that. The then Premier and Treasurer has given evidence about what was known by him from the advice that he was given—and I refer the honourable member to the evidence he gave before the royal commission and also to the submission that the Government made to the royal commission on that matter. In regard to the text of this document as opposed to its key findings or the summary chapter, the Commissioner has clearly given his view on those things but our view has also already been given.

MUSICIANS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety inform the House why musicians' agents in South Australia do not have to be registered, and does the Government see a need for registration? It has been brought to my attention that there are problems in South Australia with fly-by-night agents causing a loss of jobs and wages for musicians. I also believe that South Australia is the only State in the nation where registration is not compulsory.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The licensing or registration of musicians and entertainment agents generally in South Australia is currently under review. However, the status of such agents has always been quite complex, and many of them are managers as well as agents. It is a confusing arrangement in terms of the people for whom they work and who are sometimes the managers themselves. We are looking at how this problem can be overcome. It is my advice that in Victoria recently an attempt was made to legislate to cover this style of operation of agents as well as managers. However, the matter lapsed in that Parliament and my advice is that the Victorian Government does not intend to pursue that legislation further. We are continuing negotiations to try to solve this problem so that the agents themselves can be registered and the musicians can be protected.

STATE BANK

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Does the Premier accept the fording of the State Bank Royal Commissioner that, 'when it suited the Government to intervene, there were limits to the Treasurer's oft-proclaimed policy of keeping its hands off the bank as an independent commercial entity'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I would like to know where members were yesterday during the extensive debate on this matter. I refer the honourable member to the very many references made by a number of members on this side, particularly the member for Ross Smith, in relation to the 1989 interest subsidy to which clearly the member for Morphett is more particularly referring. I do not think there is anything more I can add to the comments that I and other members of the Government made yesterday. I simply refer the honourable member to those statements and suggest that he read and consider them. He will find that he has the answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

LOCUSTS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Primary Industries advise the House whether there has been any change in locust numbers and locust control in this State having particular regard to the northern areas of the State?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I well understand the honourable member's concern because it directly affects her electorate. People are concerned about the locust plague, and properly so. The dimensions of the plague are very significant. I receive weekly briefings, but on the ground there are daily briefings between Department of Primary Industries staff and local farmers. The situation is of great concern and needs to be watched and monitored very closely. South Australia's battle against the plague locust is continuing now effectively on three fronts, with aerial spraying continuing on Eyre Peninsula and in the Flinders Ranges and spraying on the ground in the Riverland.

As members know, some $2 million has been allocated to fight the plague and some 60 departmental staff are involved in fighting the plague in conjunction with the local community. In the Riverland, locusts are being

sprayed on the ground by land-holders at Monash and Overland Corner. In this region, scattered reports are recorded and the situation is being monitored by the Australian Plague Locust Commission and the Department of Primary Industries.

Considerable spraying is taking place by land-holders in the Flinders, tackling sub-target bands of locusts. Currently, in the Flinders Ranges, which is the immediate concern of the honourable member, there is an increasing number of adult locusts mixed with various age hoppers. This means that, with the presence of adult locusts, they have the ability to fly. The adult locusts have access to abundant green feed which means they are able to build up a sufficient amount of body fat for what is termed 'sustained long distance flight'.

Current control operations are now using two spray aircraft aimed at reducing adults as well as hoppers. The concern is with adult locusts being mixed with various age hoppers and, with their ability to fly, northerly winds could easily bring the adults south. A public meeting was called by departmental officers on Tuesday night at Hawker. That brought 38 land-holders and townspeople together to provide an update and explain areas of responsibility for the destruction and suppression of locusts. The meeting did gain full public support for the current program.

In Adelaide there is great relevance because of the number of adult locusts, their ability to feed and fly and, with the presence of northerly winds, it does bring a concerning situation to the metropolitan area as well, because there have been sightings of scattered adults. Had the operation not been as effective as it has been to date in the northern regions of the State, the situation would have been far more significant. It is presently under control but there are some areas of considerable concern.

The SPEAKER: I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that he is able to make a ministerial statement. The member for Victoria.

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Premier. I ask members of the Government to turn to page 389 of the Commissioner's report.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria is out of order. The question must be directed and there must be no explanation or pre-cursor—the question must be directed.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. Does the Premier agree that the State Bank Royal Commissioner explicitly recognises that 'conclusions as to blame, fault or responsibility' can be formed from his report, and does he further agree that South Australians, as exhibited by the polls, overwhelmingly are reaching the conclusion that the Government has to accept responsibility? Will he now tender the resignation of his Government?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This matter was debated extensively yesterday, and I wonder what the Opposition thought yesterday's debate was all about. It changed what originally was a proposed motion—originally we were just going to note that the report be tabled, but then it changed it to a no-confidence motion, and that motion went to a vote. I recall the vote and I recall that at about midnight when the vote was taken there were 23 Ayes and 23 Noes and you, Mr Speaker, gave your casting vote in favour of the Noes. The decision has been made. The fact that the Opposition cannot wait to get to an election, the fact that it is in this eager hunger, especially the present Leader, who is so uncertain of his position because he knows that if he does not get in—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Especially after yesterday.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Especially after yesterday. He knows that, if he does not get in quickly, members opposite will be history as other people shuffle themselves into their seats. We can understand that and we can understand that they are not prepared to wait for the reports on terms of reference 2 and 3 and the Auditor-General's report, because they do not want that to be taken into account. I am starting to feel from them a real fear about what might be in those reports, because I am starting to feel from them that they are starting to realise that this does not have enough in it for their political purposes and that the further reports will really allocate the responsibility over a much wider field as the Commissioner himself says and as quoted by the member for Victoria.

The member for Victoria does not want us to adhere to the procedures of this Parliament, where a vote has been taken after an extensive debate—a much more extensive debate than is normally the case for a no-confidence motion. We were quite happy to oblige that much more extensive debate. What he would rather have us do is believe the results of some telephone polling of a television station where people probably had their automatic redials on all evening creating votes. Of course, those figures do not even match up with the *Advertiser's* phone poll on this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Kavel had a particular attack of sourness last night. I suggest that he wants to bide his time because he knows that, when the present leadership team over there falls flat, as it is in the process of doing, he will have yet another chance at the leadership of the Party. The member for Victoria should pay more attention to what happened in this Parliament yesterday, because that gave him the result to which he should listen.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of State Services outline to the House details of how State Government agencies have responded to requests for information under the Freedom of Information Act? The Freedom of Information Act gives the public the right to access Government documents and ensures that Government agencies make available more information about their policies and operations. A constituent who had reason to request information told me that she was pleasantly surprised by a full and prompt

response and wondered whether this was typical or whether she had just been lucky.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am certainly delighted to report that, of all the processed applications in South Australia for material under the Freedom of Information Act, 82 per cent resulted in full disclosure. That is higher than any rate achieved interstate during initial phases of freedom of information legislation. Of course, members will realise from reading today's Melbourne *Age* that the new Government in Victoria has decided basically to abolish freedom of information and prevent the press and members of parliament from having access to files.

However, the 82 per cent of requests granted in full compares to 73 per cent in New South Wales, 62 per cent for the Commonwealth and 53 per cent for Victoria—that is, until this latest legislation which restricts FOI access. In the majority of cases agencies dealt with requests in well under the statutory prescribed period of 45 days. In 75 per cent of cases, or in relation to 823 applications, the issues were dealt with in 30 days or less. For an identical time period, New South Wales agencies achieved a 60 per cent rate.

Applicants who do not agree with agency decisions under the FOI Act are given three opportunities for review or appeal: an internal review; an external review by the Ombudsman or the Police Complaints Authority; and by appeal to the District Court. The record shows that 27 cases, or 2 per cent of applications, were challenged and put to internal review. Of these, nine decisions were varied in favour of the applicant, demonstrating that this process is able to provide an objective second look. In addition, seven cases went to external review and, up to the end of June, no cases have yet been taken before the courts.

I am encouraged by the evident commitment by Government agencies to provide the maximum amount of information possible in the interests of open Government. Members on both sides of the House can make a real contribution to freedom of information. At about the time that I made my speech about the State Bank I understand that the member for Coles, according to members opposite, wrote to Tim Marcus Clark telling him that she would value his opinions and advice on issues affecting the South Australian economy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask you to rule on relevance.

The SPEAKER: This was a question on freedom of information. However, to bring out a specific letter in the answer to a question is incorrect. It was a question about freedom of information. The Minister can use it as an example, but should not quote it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Certainly, the decision in Victoria is a blow to open government and testimony to the hypocrisy of the politicians there when they moved from Opposition into Government. Members of the Liberal Party in that State talked about their support for freedom of information, but of course they changed their mind as soon as they got into Government. I hope the member for Coles—for whom my great affection is well known—will release that letter, if she sent one, and table it in this House to show whether or not she told Tim Marcus Clark that she valued his opinions, advice and also his insight and perspective. I am sure that if what members opposite have been saying over the years is dinkum and what I remember back in February and March of 1989 is accurate, then let us see her table that letter in this parliament to see whether she is a woman of honour or a hypocrite.

SPEAKER'S POSITION

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is to you, Mr Speaker. Do you support the Government's rejection of the findings of the State Bank Royal Commissioner implicit in the answers to the House given by the Premier this afternoon?

The SPEAKER: I can understand what is going on. There is obviously a plot, as far as I am concerned—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!—between some members of this parliament and, I think, the media to place the Chair—that is what you are doing—in a position that I believe will dishonour the Chair. The member for Coles has been here longer than I and she knows I have no responsibility to answer that question. I am responsible from this Chair only for the operations and functions of this House. I have clearly explained this on half a dozen occasions. I have no responsibility to answer any questions apart from those relating to the running of the House. If members have a question about that, for which I am responsible, I will answer it. Anything else is my business.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 96 which provides:

> 2 questions may be put to other members—

that is, members other than Ministers—

> but only if such questions relate to any Bill, motion or other public business for which those members, in the opinion of the Speaker, are responsible to the House.

I would have thought that yesterday's motion came into that category.

The SPEAKER: I am the Speaker and, in my opinion, I do not have to answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SPORTS INSTITUTE

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House which sports at the South Australian Sports Institute have achieved outstanding results in this the 10th year of the South Australian Sports Institute?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am very pleased to respond to the honourable member's question. Many sports within South Australia associated with the South Australian Sports Institute have achieved outstanding results and success during 1992. The Inaugural South Australian Sports Awards, held last Saturday evening, were conceived specifically to acknowledge and commend the achievements of sports and individual athletes from the South Australian Sports Institute and the

newly-formed Sports Development Section of the Department of Recreation and Sport. At the end of the awards evening, it was evident that two sports in particular had achieved outstanding success during this year.

The sport of rowing won three of the categories, while two of our cyclists, Ms Symeko Johinke and Mr Stuart O'Grady, won the outstanding junior female athlete and outstanding junior male athlete respectively. The three awards that the sport of rowing won were the Outstanding SASI Coach, Simon Gillet; the Outstanding SASI Team, Victoria Toogood and Alison Davis; and rowing also won the SASI best sports program. Victoria Toogood and Alison Davis, coached by Simon Gillet, won a gold medal in the junior coxless pair at the World Championships in Montreal earlier this year. These last three awards culminate the end of an extremely successful 1992 for South Australian and, indeed, Australian rowers. Australian rowers are ranked second in the world, having won collectively four gold and three silver medals at the 1992 Barcelona Olympics and the world lightweight titles in Montreal this year. South Australian Sports Institute rowing crews won 25 per cent of those Australian medals.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Newland has a point of order.

Mrs KOTZ: Mr Speaker, I believe this is the fourth Minister in a row who has chosen to make a statement in Question Time rather than a ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: The decision on whether it is an answer or a statement is for the Chair. I do not believe it is a statement, although I point out to Ministers once again that they have access to ministerial statements whereas other members do not. I ask the Minister to keep it as short as he can.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I just want to inform the House briefly of these outstanding achievements by South Australian athletes, as requested by my colleague. The South Australian Sports Institute crews won every junior women's race at the national championships in Victoria earlier this year. The South Australian Sports Institute provided 100 per cent of the Australian women's junior team. The SA Sports Institute provided 83 per cent of the Australian women's under-23 team and 62 per cent of the entire women's Australian team. There are 70 athletes in the Sports Institute's rowing squad, 20 of whom are junior athletes brought into rowing through rowing's very successful talent identification program.

SPEAKER'S POSITION

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is also directed to you, Mr Speaker. What are the circumstances in which you would withdraw your support by voting against the Government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There are two reasons why I will not answer this question. First, it has been asked before and, secondly—watch my lips—I am not responsible to this House for any function except the operations of the House. This is not a part of the operation of the House. It is a personal choice of mine as a member, not as Speaker. I am sure the member for Adelaide wants to raise a point of order.

Dr ARMITAGE: Yes, Mr Speaker. In Erskine May (page 285), under the heading, 'Questions to the Speaker,' it is stated:

> A question can be addressed to him on a matter which urgently concerns the proceedings of the House for which he is responsible.

I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that a vote against the Government is a proceeding of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I need say no more: you have answered your own question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MONTAGUE AND BRIDGE ROADS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training have discussions with her colleague the Minister of Transport Development about what measures need to be put in place so that school children can safely cross Montague and Bridge Roads in my electorate? Students who reside in the Pooraka estate area, and soon those who will be moving into the new Montague farm, currently must cross Montague Road to attend Pooraka Primary School or Bridge Road to North Ingle Primary School. Both roads are exceedingly busy and dangerous, and the present bus arrangements should be supplemented with properly designed crossings.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I certainly would be very happy to take up the matter with my colleague in another place, the Minister of Transport Development, to see whether we can look at achieving a solution for the problems the honourable member has outlined to the House.

SPEAKER'S POSITION

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Why have you concluded, in the statement you made to the House last night, that the State Bank royal commission report does not make out a case against the Government when you have not properly analysed the report?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order. I could stand here and explain it forever. The question is not acceptable.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you made a statement to the House last night: I understood you were responsible for that statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. Let me explain to him very clearly how he can take objection with the Chair: he can write out a motion of dissent and bring it forward, and we can debate it, otherwise the Chair will not accept the question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: At this stage, Mr Speaker, I am simply taking a point of order, pointing out that, under Standing Order 96.2, I believe that the question I

am putting to you is a legitimate question, and I simply ask—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. There are forms of this House whereby he can do that. It is not the operation of the House: it was a statement made in a decision of the Chair at the time. I have ruled it out of order three times, and I will rule four times that it is out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, will you allow me at least to conclude my question and explanation to you?

The SPEAKER: No; the Leader will resume his seat.

FISHERIES LIMITS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Primary Industries advise the House why the white paper 'Management plan for the marine scalefish fisheries of South Australia' and his Director of Fisheries, Mr Lewis, say that boat limits on taking fish will in general be three times the individual bag limit on that species of fish when, in the fine print of the white paper, most popular species will have a boat limit fewer than three times the bag limit? How will recreational fishermen be able to remember and obey boat limits that vary as a multiple of the bag limit for each species of fish?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I appreciate the honourable member's question and his concern for the recreational fishing industry. I do want to say from the outset that the recreational fishing industry is a most important one to South Australia. It contributes to tourism, apart from giving pleasure to something like 300 000 fishermen in South Australia. So, it is a very important part of our economy. At the same time, the resource needs to be protected but, because there are so many people with access to recreational fishing, it obviously has an impact on our fishing resources, and that is actually occurring.

As Minister of Primary Industries I am responsible for ensuring that our fishing resource is not depleted and is there for the recreational and commercial fishing industries. I do not have direct control over the recreational fishing industry as I do over the commercial fishing industry. Consequently, the controls needed to protect the depletion of our fishing resource must be somewhat indirect. Those indirect controls consequently find their way through boat, bag and trip limits. I do not think the recreational fishing industry will have any difficulty in coming to grips with these restrictions.

Regarding the commercial fishing industry over which I have direct control, a licence amalgamation scheme is to be instituted and the industry itself will be involved in integrated self-management and will make the decisions on the best way to restrict catches to protect that resource. With regard to the recreational fishing industry, which is important, I believe these measures will protect that industry and preserve this aspect of tourism for South Australia.

As fishers are made aware of the bag, boat and trip limits that will apply, this will ultimately become an administrative task of the Fisheries Division of the Department of Primary Industries. I expect that a publicity campaign supported with perhaps an updated recreational fishing guide booklet and facts sheets would be made available to the fishing community, but quite obviously because of their own expertise it will not take them long to appreciate the way in which the limitations will apply in practice.

STATE BANK

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government accept the finding of the State Bank Royal Commissioner that 'in his letter to the bank of 24 November 1989, Mr Prowse, in dealing with a range of issues, proposed for no apparent reason that $2 million of the bank's indebtedness to SAFA be forgone. Mr Simmons' letter in reply of 14 December 1989 is equally oblique. Mr Prowse's minutes to the Treasurer of 11 and 19 January 1990 are of parallel obscurity. The Government claimed credit for holding down interest rates. The manner in which the compensation to the bank was agreed and paid can only be described as surreptitious. The manner in which the payment was made was such as to minimise the risk of public disclosure of the arrangement'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This is a very repetitious and tedious tactic of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Members opposite had a day of answers and an extensive contribution from the Government side yesterday. The Commissioner has reported on the first term of reference and on his views of the evidence put before him. Those findings have been tabled in this House. The ministerial statement that I delivered on Tuesday indicated the Government's reaction to those findings. In addition, there was extensive debate yesterday during which I spoke for nearly 50 minutes and to which a number of members on this side, including the member for Ross Smith, contributed. With particular reference to the matters now being raised again by the member for Bright, I wonder where he was last night. Why did he not listen to the points that were made then?

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is right, perhaps he was on the telephone.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister will resume his seat. The Chair asks the member for Bright whether he accepts the Standing Orders.

Mr MATTHEW: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Orders prevent interjections. Remember that. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I note that one of the stations which ran one of the television polls had a 0055 number. There are some members who know very well how to use such numbers. I suspect that may be one reason why the honourable member was not available to listen to the comments being made in the Chamber on the matters referred to in his question. I therefore refer him to *Hansard.*

MONTAGUE AND SULLIVAN ROADS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport

Development. What developments are planned for solving the various problems surrounding the Montague-Sullivan Roads intersection at Ingle Farm? Although there is a set of turning signals 50 metres to the east of Montague Road, traffic and pedestrian movement off Sullivan Road onto Montague Road at peak hour is not only slow but very dangerous. Local residents would appreciate the department's having a close look at these problems.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Certainly I pay tribute to the member for Playford's crusade for road safety in the northern suburbs. I am very aware, because of the nature of my electorate, of this problem with Montague Road. This matter follows on from the controversies over the years with respect to Beafield and Ceafield Roads and their junctions with Main North and Bridge Roads. I will be delighted to raise the issue with my colleague the Minister of Transport Development and obtain for the honourable member an urgent report for his constituents.

STATE BANK

Mrs KOTZ (Newland) My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government accept the finding of the State Bank Royal Commissioner that, 'It is a measure of the Government's low key role, if not its indifference to the mariner in which the bank conducted its affairs, that it claimed to justify its attitude and policy by its reliance on the surveillance of the State Bank by the Reserve Bank without having any idea of, and without seeking to ascertain, the outcome of that surveillance'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again, Mr Speaker, I refer the honourable member to my ministerial statement on Tuesday, my extensive contribution yesterday in this place, and the contributions of the Deputy Premier and other members on this side which answer the question in an extensive way.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I noted this afternoon during Question Time that the Government, through the Premier, rejected at least six major recommendations of the Royal Commissioner. These were put quite specifically—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—to the Premier, time after time, as to whether or not he would accept the various recommendations—the major recommendations—of the Royal Commissioner. We have a Government that has commissioned the royal commission, has set the terms of reference and appointed the Royal Commissioner, but now it will not accept the umpire's decision.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Both sides of the House will come to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That is a very serious state of affairs—to have a royal commission report brought down which is highly critical of the Government but now to have the Government not accept the umpire's decision. It was for that reason that the Opposition this afternoon also asked whether you, Sir, with a casting vote in this House on many occasions, also accepted the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner. If we have a Government in this State that has set up a royal commission and then does not accept its findings, it is extremely important to know whether or not the majority of this House accepts the commission's recommendations.

Mr Speaker, I have obtained a transcript of what you said to this House last night—I asked you for a copy and you gave it to me, as you realise—and I have read that carefully. In your statement last night you indicated, among other things:

> I have listened to the debate from both sides of the House and have read the findings of the report.

Then you concluded your remarks by saying:

> However, I do not accept that a case has been made out—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. The member for Walsh.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Regardless of whether or not this is a grievance debate, is it in order for an honourable member to be quoting from debates within the same session?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I did rule on that point earlier today—that members cannot refer to debates in the same session.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport will resume his seat. I will deal with one point of order at a time. I did rule earlier today that members cannot refer to a debate in the same session and, to be consistent, I will have to rule the remarks out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Sir, I took the previous point of order and you ruled. I now take the point of order that your statement was not part of the debate. Your statement was made after the vote and it was not part of the debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Let us clarify that. We had this debate earlier with the member for Adelaide who for some time would not accept that any utterance in this House is a debate. If we look at *Hansard,* for instance, members will see that it says 'Parliamentary Debates *(Hansard)*'. Every word uttered here and recorded in *Hansard* is considered debate under all our Standing Orders and Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice. Anything recorded in *Hansard* is regarded as debate and, if anything I said is recorded in *Hansard,* it is debate.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, I will proceed. I have a transcript of a television interview that you undertook yesterday, and I would like to read it to the House. The transcript is as follows:

> Q: Have you actually read the report?

Speaker: No.

Q: You haven't read it?

Speaker: No.

Q: For someone in your position of responsibility, don't you think you should have read it by now?

Speaker: No, I'm letting all you experts tell me what's in it.

Q: So you won't be changing your mind at all then on any of this?

Speaker: From any information I have at the moment, no.

Q: Maybe after you have read the report it might change?

Speaker: I doubt that. I think I have a fair idea of what's in the report. It is not the report that will make the difference, is it?

Later in the evening we had a clear statement which I have already read to the House this afternoon that the report had been read. It is pertinent to wonder how many pages of the report you read, Mr Speaker, before you made your statement to the House last night and cast your vote on the no-confidence motion—

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): On the Channel 10 news last night I was surprised to see among the interviews and commentary on the royal commission report a comment from someone described as 'a prominent businessman and Deputy President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Mr Rob Gerard'. Mr Gerard apparently said that the moral thing to do in the light of this report was to call an election. He said, 'What we have really got to do is get around and do something about it by probably letting the people say who they want to govern the State. Well, we have had snap elections before for less things than this.'

That statement surprised me considerably, and on three counts. I would like to comment on it and on Mr Gerard's status in making such a statement and such a call. I would like to refer to him not only in his categories as a prominent businessman, as described, and as the Deputy Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry but also in his role as an active and public member of the Liberal Party. First, let me deal with his role as a prominent businessman to see whether there is morality involved in the position that he is expressing. As the Leader of the Opposition so enthusiastically interjected at some point today, the company of which Mr Gerard is Managing Director is in fact the fourth largest employer in this State. It is a very successful company and it has received, over the course of its development, a considerable amount of Government assistance appropriately through the Industries Development Committee of this Parliament on a bipartisan basis. I am sure that Mr Gerard is grateful for that.

It is public knowledge that over the past couple of years Gerard Industries has been considerably exposed financially and there has been concern about its viability. Indeed, members may recall that Citibank, which had a number of exposures around Australia, made clear at one point that it had a significant exposure to Gerard Industries, and this was in the order of millions of dollars. In fact, that bank was seeking to put that major South Australian company into receivership. The story so far is fine, as it stands, but at that time—I am now talking about August 1991—I received a call from Mr Robert Gerard, who believes the moral response to the royal commission is to have an election. I received a call as Premier from Mr Robert Gerard—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The House is again out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —during which he requested me to ring the Managing Director of the State Bank and intervene to ensure that the State Bank took over the debt or in some way assisted him to get his company through its difficulties. The State Bank, of course, as well, was very significantly exposed to Gerard Industries at that time and was reluctant to intervene. I told Mr Gerard that I did not feel it was appropriate for me to do so, because that would be interference in the commercial affairs of the bank—the very thing that was dealt with. I said incidentally in passing to Mr Gerard that it was the activities of his colleagues in the Liberal Party that probably had made that much more difficult than it might have been in the ordinary course of business.

I did not leave it at that, I hasten to add. In fact, I contacted Citibank, a bank over which I had no jurisdiction whatsoever. I asked the Director in Melbourne whether the bank would put a pause on the moves it was taking to put the company into receivership. I arranged for a very experienced officer in a Government department to act as a mediator to convene a meeting with the State Bank and Citibank, and in that time to attempt to come up with a solution. In fact, I am pleased to report that, as I understand it, appropriate arrangements were put in place. I find it extraordinary that someone who is both a Vice President of the Liberal Party—and, incidentally, the candidate of the member for Kavel for President, and who failed in his bid to gain that office—and has the responsible job of deputy chairman of the chamber, should in fact make those public statements when he knows what he felt about the morality of the situation in the approach he made to me. I would not have put this on the public record in any circumstances but for what I believe is quite inappropriate behaviour.

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

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): We have seen the ultimate in hypocrisy here this afternoon. How often when issues have been raised on this side of the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: I refer to the issue of a Kangaroo Island farmer that was raised in this House in the past week or fortnight. Members of the Labor Party raised with us and publicly in this Chamber how it was wrong to bring the personal circumstances of anyone before the this Chamber for base political reasons. The member for Ross Smith did not like what Mr Gerard said about this Government on television last night, so he has decided to get up in this Chamber and have a full square go at him—someone who cannot reply to the honourable member's remarks in this Chamber. It was interesting to note that this was a well-prepared text; it was not off-the-cuff. We understand the Premier had a prepared text to dump on Rob Gerard today. The Premier withdrew from doing that today on the basis that there

might be a bit of political fall-out in the business community in town. What did he do? He passed it over to the member for Ross Smith, who has had so much political fall-out in the past 24 hours that no more can hurt him in this Chamber. The simple fact is that the Dorothy Dix question about Mr Gerard's being Vice President of the Liberal Party was wrong to start with.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: He is not! Mr Rob Gerard is a businessman in this community who has done well by the South Australian community. At least the member for Ross Smith was prepared to acknowledge that he is a large employer in South Australia, expanding out to not only national markets but also international markets.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders provide for only one speaker at a time, and at the moment that is the member for Kavel.

Mr OLSEN: Clipsal—a family company built up through hard work, endeavour and effort—is about the fourth or fifth largest employer in South Australia, and that is something about which this State ought to be proud. We should be proud of what Clipsal Industries has established and done in this State. Mr Rob Gerard, as the most senior managing director within that company, deserves credit for what he was able to achieve as an individual in spearheading that company and its employment to decentralise throughout South Australia. The company has, as the former Premier well knows, a facility at Murray Bridge, a facility—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Yes, I did open it and I was very pleased to open it, because at least I was there supporting regional development in South Australia, which is more than your Government did in the 10 years it was there.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Sir, once again I draw your attention to the relevant Standing Order, which provides that all members must be referred to by the seats they represent or the—

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier has made his point of order and I uphold it. I know the member for Kavel has some trouble grasping it, but they are the Standing Orders of this House.

Mr OLSEN: Not only has Clipsal Industries under the guidance of Mr Rob Gerard expanded, decentralised and established regional factories in South Australia to put much needed employment in those areas it has also embarked upon the international market as a major export earner for this State. The Arthur D. Little report and this Government talk about export markets. But, here is a person who in an industry sense has gone out and met that export market potential. What do you do to the person who has achieved this? You come into this House for base political reasons and dump on him!

Not only that, what has he done in the sporting area? Have a look at the Clipsal Power House and the North Adelaide Football Club, and the list goes on. I bet Mr Gerard has put more into the North Adelaide Football Club than has the number one ticket holder, the member for Ross Smith. The point is that he has been a benefactor to sporting interests and many groups in this community. He has not been selfish; he has been prepared to support sporting industries, export industries and employment in South Australia. We should be lauding the man, not denigrating him in this Chamber.

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): That was an interesting response regarding someone who chose to enter the political fray. Earlier today the member for Coles gave notice of a motion that she intends to move regarding the accreditation of media personnel, the important interface between this Parliament and the public. In theory, the media are conveyors of information, educators, and the main means by which people learn about civic matters and politics, because very few have had the opportunity to study politics.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you have ruled twice today that it is not proper to debate a matter that is currently before the House. I believe that in his grievance contribution the member for Walsh is clearly pre-empting a debate of which notice has been given.

The SPEAKER: Only notice has been given; the matter is not before the House. Does the member for Hayward have some problem with that? If so, I would like him to bring it to the Chair. Does the member for Hayward have some problem with it?

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I would not disagree with your ruling but, if notice is given, how is it not before the House?

The SPEAKER: The member for Hayward is well known as an expert on Erskine May, and I would ask him to look through it. It is a pre-condition of the House and a standard that has been built up over the years. If the member for Hayward does not like it, I suggest that he should get Erskine May and Standing Orders changed. The member for Walsh.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: It is most unfortunate that that point of order was taken, Mr Speaker, because I was going to lead on to a defence of you and the integrity of the Chair. The media provide the only way in which most people can become aware of the principles upon which our public institutions and our body politic are based, how our public institutions are supposed to work, what is happening and what it signifies. We expect them to be accurate, unbiased and knowledgeable, and we expect them to get their facts right. Yet, I noticed on ABC television not long ago that the *7.30 Report* had to retract an allegation that it made that the Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee had refused to appear on the program. They apparently made no attempt to be accurate about their allegation.

Again last night I noticed reckless allegations about a member of this House, allegations which also reflected on you, Sir, and the office that you hold. Miss McClusky, on the *7.30 Report* last night, said:

> In the face of the significant position Mr Peterson now finds himself in, we have asked him to join us on this program on numerous occasions, and on every occasion Mr Peterson has been unable, too busy or simply unwilling to speak with us and our audience.

I believe that that program has acted rashly with respect to those allegations and also in the reflections that were made on the Chair. I also believe they are quite erroneous, and I am sure that you, Sir, can confirm that

regarding the allegations made concerning your inability to appear. In any case, I believe that the conceited media personnel of this low-rating program have no right to demand anyone's appearance as if by some form of divine right. I believe that their action in that respect is wrong, apart from the disrespect that they have shown towards the Parliament and the Chair. I find the program irritating, not just because of its occasional political bias but because of the inane comments made after each segment by the current compere and her insistence on debating with guests instead of interviewing them. Above all, it is the disrespect shown to the Chair on this occasion that I find intolerable.

I also object to the attitude taken by the *Advertiser,* which is no better, using terms such as 'erratic' and 'duplicity' to refer to you, Sir, in your current position. I believe that the reference to 'duplicity' is probably actionable. The *Advertiser* also said:

> Mr Peterson is capable of rationalising almost any political stance, however contorted or contemptible, if it suits his own ends.

I would say that the *Advertiser* is guilty of continually rationalising positions to justify whatever its policy for the day is in order to attack the Government. Its support for the coalition was on for one moment, then off, then on again. The Remm project, which was the greatest thing since sliced bread, is suddenly looked at from a different angle. But who can forget what it did with its for and against position with regard to poker machines. It is regularly inconsistent. I understand that it used to have a committee that would reconcile its current editorial policy with old policies.

However, above all, I would like to know what idiot wrote this:

> It is one of the anomalies of the Westminster system of government that the Party which has the confidence of the Lower House, sometimes called the people's House, cannot be forced to an early election.

That is not an anomaly; it is the very basis of the Westminster system. Basic civics lessons would point out to the Editor of the *Advertiser* that the public elect a Parliament, not a Government, and a Government is then formed within the membership of that Parliament and it serves for a full term as long as it has the full confidence of this House. I am astounded.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Mr Speaker, I have seen some despicable behaviour before in this Chamber, but none so despicable as I saw from the former Premier in the course of his grievance debate today. What took place in that instance was the Government's covering up of the illegal activity of the secretary of the State branch of the ALP. In this instance, there is no question about the legality or otherwise of anything that Mr Rob Gerard has ever done in this State. He has been prepared to go on the public record rather than resort to gossip and innuendo, and definitely not on public money. Whatever exposure the public has had to any of the business interests of Mr Rob Gerard has always been secured by assets offered as an offset.

The important point to be made in this instance is that the former Premier chose to break the rules of conduct of proceedings of the former Industrial Development Committee and expose to public gaze information about an applicant to that committee. That information was given in confidence and that confidence has now been breached. As a lawyer he should have known that what he did was wrong and as a former Premier he should have known that what he did was wrong; but, given the record of the man and the way in which he conducted himself in relation to the affairs of the State Bank, it is small wonder that he chose to do as he did. Mr Rob Gerard spoke on behalf not of himself but of other manufacturing and employing interests in South Australia that go to make up the fabric of this State's economy. Is it any wonder that we suffer a lack of confidence of capital in this State's economy when we have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: —members of the Government who are prepared to white ant the kind of endeavours that are being made to shore up the flagging State's economy and investment that provides the jobs and gives the State the chance to go ahead. That is what the Premier is prepared to do.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

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

Mr LEWIS: And I believe that the member for Walsh is prepared to stoop to the same level, judging by the interjections he has made, as well as the member for Playford and the member for—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I believe that the member opposite was reflecting on me as a member when he referred to members stooping to various levels, and I ask you, Mr Speaker, to ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The member for Walsh has requested that the member for Murray-Mallee withdraw.

Mr LEWIS: I have no idea what the member for Walsh is talking about. I simply drew attention to the fact that he was supporting the remarks that were made by the Premier which were very damaging to Mr Rob Gerard in that they were a breach of confidence to the Government and a committee of this Parliament, against the rules of that committee. I have no intention whatever of withdrawing anything I said about the member for Walsh's support for that. However, it was not my purpose in this debate to have to put on the record what I regard as the outrage I feel on behalf of members on this side and members of the general public out there who are trying to do their best to keep this State together.

I rose to defend a man whom I represent in this place—a constituent and his wife—who has been suspended from the Department of Correctional Services and put on long service leave without any lump sum payment being made to him for his long service leave in order to prevent him from pursuing a case against Correctional Services and its officers and administration. He was framed and found guilty of a crime that he did not commit, in his opinion and in the opinion of his wife and his workmates, who know the man and who know his background and integrity. Now, he is prevented from clearing his own name by the strategy that is being

adopted. On the one hand, he was put on leave without pay and then, a few days later, he was returned from his leave without pay and put on long service without his ever having applied for long service leave. Now that he seeks to get his long service leave pay, they refuse to pay him, because they know that he wants to use the money to clear his name through the courts—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS:—in due process, and that is crook.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee knows that he must come to order when his time expires. I remind him not to talk over the Chair.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): This morning in the newspapers that were available in this city, we received a multicoloured, very expensive publication put out by the Victorian Department of Business and Employment—which, of course, is an arm of the Victorian Government—dated November 1992 and entitled, 'You want to know about Victoria's new employment agreements? Read this.' In this document there is a glowing report of the new legislation that has just been carried in Victoria by the Kennett Government. When members have an opportunity to peruse the legislation, they will see that it is a detrimental piece of legislation. It means that working men and women will be forced out of awards that protect wages and conditions. Holiday leave loading has been abolished for workers in the State of Victoria. Working hours and penalty rates are up for grabs. No longer is industrial action a right: in most cases, it is illegal and outlawed. Workers can now be fined for withdrawing their labour.

A fundamental right of working men has gone. Gone is the umpire, the conciliator. Rather than productivity and efficiency, this legislation is aimed at weakening employees and giving employers a free hand. Many good employers will do their best to ignore this legislation, and unscrupulous employers will have a field day. This legislation makes the law of the jungle apply. The extraordinary concept of individual bargaining without the protection of awards or the umbrella on an enterprise agreement will weaken the position of the most vulnerable groups in the work force—those least able to bargain, that is, unskilled, low skilled, casual and ethnic workers, young people, the disabled and women, in particular. For anyone not covered by an award at present, there is no minimum wage. Youth and the unemployed will be the first victims. Incredibly, an employment contract would enable employers to fine employees if the employer believes that the employee is late, rude or disobedient. What an extraordinary situation!

Working hours are not guaranteed; employment agreements could specify that ordinary hours of work are 50 or more. Penalty rates, overtime, meal breaks, redundancy pay and bereavement leave are not guaranteed under this legislation. The basic right to pursue an unfair dismissal claim is severely restricted; it is now a privilege for which the employee must pay. Only workers covered by State awards now have the right to apply. The employee must have been employed for six months and is required to establish a *prima facie* case to the satisfaction the Chief Commissioner/Administrative Officer. The employee must have tried to resolve this dispute. The employee is required to pay a $50 filing fee when lodging the application. The fee is not recoverable, even if the claim is successful.

If the employee succeeds in showing that the dismissal was harsh, unjust or unreasonable, the commission may order the re-employment but not the reinstatement of the employee. The commission may also order the employer to pay the employee an amount not exceeding the pay the employee would have received, less any moneys received through social security. Industrial action has been effectively outlawed under this legislation. In most instances, to strike is illegal.

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

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1581.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Before the luncheon adjournment, I had moved an amendment to the motion. I made the point that there was a need to balance the reasonable needs of the residents in the proximity of the airport with the economic development of this State. Much has been said about the importance of an airport to this State's economy, but it is worth noting that a recent study by Coopers and Lybrand has established that one additional weekly Boeing 747 service to Adelaide can create 50 permanent jobs in the region. This is equivalent to about $2 million in income—a significant sum. The Party to which the member for Hanson belongs, by its public statements, supports the view that access to international tourism and to export markets that the airport provides is vital to our economic recovery and future development. It will be interesting to hear what other members of his Party have to say on this matter.

Before the luncheon adjournment, I also indicated that this was a rather curious way in which to address this issue, as it refers to what the then member for Morphett, now the Minister of Primary Industries, said in this place 14½ years ago. There have been four modifications to the curfew in that time. The first, in 1979, pre-dates the Federal Airport Corporation's (FAC) consultative process; indeed, it pre-dates the FAC itself. There has been no change at all to the flying time curfew which was and is between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. The modifications to which I refer concern who and what are allowed to operate within the curfew. First, in 1979, there was dispensation for low noise turbojet aircraft to operate during curfew subject to application and specific approval. 'Low noise' refers to the aircraft's noise certification and requires an EPN level of 95 decibels or less.

This allowed small business jets and night couriers such as Lears and Westwinds to operate overnight. In May 1990, Ansett and TNT, which were using BAe146 aircraft, had approval for inclusion of this aircraft as low noise. This need not have been discussed as a curfew change and approval could have been automatic under the

1979 change; however, because the BAe146 is a big aircraft and because by then the FAC consultative committee was in place, it was made subject to the full consultative process and approval was subject to conditions which included a limit of five flights per week and the termination of the Argosy flights that they replaced.

The next modification was in July 1990, again for the BAe146 aircraft operated by National Jet in the Santos contract which was given approval under similar conditions to operate four night freight flights per week. Finally, in March 1992, approval was given for diverted international passenger flights to depart during curfew. I think it is worth noting the circumstances behind this decision. It followed an incident when a British Airways flight destined for Melbourne and Auckland was diverted to Adelaide during curfew because of fog in Melbourne. The fog lifted and British Airways wished to refuel and proceed to Melbourne, but were prevented from departing Adelaide because of the curfew.

Most of the passengers were in transit in Australia on their way to New Zealand and did not have Australian visas. They were lined up all night so that immigration officials could issue them with visas to stay overnight in Adelaide. The outrage at that was sufficient for a general dispensation to be given to aircraft in similar circumstances.

The position of this Government concerning Adelaide Airport is one which tempers the needs of thousands of South Australians and visitors with a very real concern for the social costs of its unrestrained growth. That concern obviously prompted the motion carried in 1978, which the member for Hanson wishes to reaffirm. As I have just said, that motion in 1978 was moved during an era of very noisy turbojet and low bypass turbofan powered aircraft, very few of which still operate to Adelaide and none during the curfew. Since then, engine technology has advanced so much that some of the new aircraft are only half as noisy as their predecessors. Some, such as the BAe146s that I have mentioned, are so quiet that they inflict virtually no significant noise outside the airport's perimeter. They are very much quieter than the Argosy propeller aircraft which they replaced and which were not subject to the curfew.

That brings me to the whole gist of this issue—commonsense. It makes no sense whatsoever to insist on the inflexible imposition of a curfew if it can be modified without causing increased hardship to residents surrounding the airport. I believe that the three modifications to the curfew which have occurred since 1979 and which I have just outlined together with the one proposed by Qantas for next March are evidence that it can. All have been accompanied by a consultative process conducted by the Federal Airports Corporation and achieved in a spirit of cooperation with the support of residents expressed through their local councils.

Similarly, a strong case can be made for considering lengthening the airport's main runway to allow a greater range of non-stop services if it can be achieved without significant disruption to residents. In fact, like previous curfew modifications and Qantas' proposals, it may result in a lessening of the noise nuisance to residents choosing to live in proximity to the airport. A longer runway, by allowing all but heavily laden aircraft to commence their take-off part-way along the runway to the south-west, would lessen the noise to the north-east where residents are closest to the runway.

I suggest that this is a far more practical alternative to the multi-billion dollar proposal of moving international operations to Edinburgh, as the member for Hanson has suggested. While I understand his desire to shift his constituency problems elsewhere, I do not think the honourable member can sustain the argument that it would be in the interests of the State. Leaving aside for a moment the monumental costs involved—and the honourable member stated correctly that Edinburgh would need to be extensively upgraded—I think we need to consider what a regressive step it would be to separate domestic and international operations, particularly at the very time when the Commonwealth has dismantled the regulatory barriers between them. Of course, the merger of Australian Airlines with Qantas is the obvious manifestation of that Commonwealth policy. We should be taking advantage of that and not imposing unofficial barriers of our own. Besides, we also must recognise that Adelaide Airport's proximity to the city is an asset that we should not consider relinquishing lightly.

Back in 1989, Flinders University estimated that moving the airport to Two Wells—as the proposal then was—would cost $800 million to $1.3 billion in increased time and travel alone. No-one has costed the proposal of upgrading Edinburgh, as suggested by the member for Hanson, but most of the costs that Flinders University calculated for the Two Wells proposal would have to be added to the runway terminal and ground transport infrastructure costs which the honourable member so blithely suggests are reasonable to move the problem from his backyard to someone else's.

Qantas, which has received approval to land four flights per week at 5.5 a.m. during the winter schedule period, will be required to approach the airport from the seaward side. This will result in virtually no inconvenience to residents whereas many of its present 6.5 a.m. landings, which are outside the curfew period, approach the airport over the city. It should also be noted that Qantas proposes to use only Boeing 767 aircraft, which are the quietest in its fleet. The B767/300 in particular is virtually indistinguishable in terms of the noise annoyance it inflicts from the BAel46s already approved to land during curfew.

Qantas proposes to land only from the south-west and to avoid the noise-generating reverse thrust unless operationally required. If wind conditions preclude an over water landing, the flight will not land and will divert to Melbourne. However, Qantas predicts that diversions will be extremely rare. Overall, particularly in West Torrens and suburbs north of the airport, residents would be subject to far less noise as at present many of the 6 a.m. landings are made from the other direction over the city.

The member for Hanson rather missed the point when he talked about grumbling and anxious people needing to get home. The State Government has supported Qantas' proposal because it is necessary to the State's efforts to compete overseas for tourists, to increase its air freight capacity and to improve access by South Australian businesses to international markets. Without some sort of curfew modification, we may lose more than half our

tourist trade by losing Eastern State connections. Inbound tourists want quick access to their destination. They do not want to spend an extra hour stretching their legs in Singapore while watching other flights take off to competing Australian destinations, however salubrious their surroundings may be. Even more importantly, the early arrivals are essential to allow the next sectors to Sydney to depart in sufficient time to connect with a large number of onward flights.

Without approval for early arrivals, we would lose about 60 per cent of those connections to cities such as Seoul, Taipei, Manila, Hong Kong, Kuala Lumpur and Honolulu. Needless to say, for Adelaide to be marketable as a destination for international tourists we must be able to get them home again. That is not to mention the asset such access and export capacity represents to South Australian business.

The Federal Government through the Air Navigation (Aircraft Noise) Act 1991 has legislated an orderly withdrawal of other than Chapter 3 aircraft. This means that the noisy first and second generation jets such as the Boeing 727s, the 747-100s and 200s, the Fokker F28s and DC9s, etc., which already may not be imported to Australia, will be excluded by March 2002 or sooner depending on their age. The remaining aircraft such as Boeing 737-300s and 400s, Boeing 747-300s and 400s, Boeing 767s and the airbus A300s and A320s are much quieter.

So, this Government is not prepared to freeze the airport in a time warp. We are prepared to encourage change, provided that to do so is in the interests of the State as a whole and, at the same time, does not disadvantage any particular group of citizens. As Mr Spock of Star Trek said, 'The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few.'

In the remaining time available to me, I will quote from a letter that Senator Cook, as the Minister for Shipping and Aviation Support, wrote to the Chairman of the Adelaide Airport Consultative Committee. He said:

I note that both the West Torrens and Glenelg councils support the proposal to allow Qantas B767s to land at Adelaide during the curfew, subject to a number of conditions. Also, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) has assessed that the proposed landings will result in only a slight increase in noise exposure.

I am therefore satisfied that the curfew amendments proposed by the Airport Consultative Committee will not have a significant impact on the environment, and am prepared to make revisions to the curfew arrangements, subject to the following conditions:

- use of Boeing 767-200 ad 300 series aircraft only;
- landing approaches to be made from the south-west over the sea, with the aircraft to be diverted to an alternative airport if weather conditions prevent such a landing;
- use of idle reverse thrust to slow the aircraft on landing;
- a maximum of four landings per week on four separate days at no earlier than 0505 CST—

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

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMUNITY SERVICE AGENCIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House calls on the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services to advise the Parliament about specific representation he is making to his Federal colleagues to have overturned a proposal to change from quarterly to monthly funding for non-government community service agencies in view of grave concerns held by these agencies that services will be dramatically affected by these changes.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1125.)

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I rise to support the motion of the member for Heysen. I do not know whether the correct protocol is in anticipation of the support of the House to in fact comply with the motion and proceed with an explanation, or to wait until after it has been adopted.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It doesn't matter, as long as you support it.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Indeed. I will take the first course and, in my explanation, provide the House with some further information on this matter. The House would be aware that, since the introduction of the SAAP program in 1985, payments from the Commonwealth have been paid quarterly in advance. Payments are transferred from the State to funded community organisations on the same basis. Recently, as the member for Heysen pointed out, the Commonwealth Department of Finance directed that all Commonwealth program departments change the basis of this payment from quarterly in advance to monthly in advance. This decision had a very negative impact, not only on the budget of the State but also particularly and significantly on the budget of the many community organisations that rely on Commonwealth and State funding of some $13.5 million per year for their very worthwhile activities in the community. Of that total, some 60 per cent is Commonwealth funding, and the balance comes from the State.

The impact of these changes, as I have said, would be quite negative on these organisations and on the State's own budget. It would result in increased administrative costs to the State and to these organisations at a time when all levels of government are pursuing structural efficiencies. Three times as much administrative work would be imposed in the payment process. It would result in increased costs to community organisations, again from increased administrative costs, but also from a loss of interest income. Those organisations have, over time, built the income from interest on deposited Commonwealth and State funding in their bank accounts into their budgets, and that is not extra money to them but part of the process each year when they submit their budget to the Commonwealth.

As the member for Heysen foreshadowed, these concerns have been pursued quite vigorously with the Commonwealth Government. On behalf of the State and those community organisations, and as Minister, I have raised my own strong objections in writing to the Hon. Peter Staples, the responsible Commonwealth Minister. My department, which administers the SAAP program, has expressed my concern directly with Commonwealth

departmental officials, and we have joined most other States in opposing the change at the most recent meeting of the Committee of Australian Social Welfare Administrators. The State Treasury, the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Inter-Government Relations Unit have also been involved in negotiating this issue and in conveying the concern of the State in this matter. I believe that Federal members of Parliament from both political Parties have also expressed their concern directly with the Commonwealth.

Apart from any other matter, the proposal is in breach of the Commonwealth-State SAAP agreement because, under the terms of that agreement, such changes as the Commonwealth has made are subject to agreement between Commonwealth and State Ministers. As a result of all this, I have recently been the recipient of a letter from the Hon. Peter Staples. The letter, dated 10 November 1992, addressed to me as Minister, states in part:

In accordance with payment arrangements established under the current SAAP agreement, Commonwealth payments will continue on a quarterly in advance basis for the remainder of the agreement, i.e., to 30 June 1994.

The rest of the letter is not particularly relevant in this context, but it does suggest that the Commonwealth has now indicated it will revert to the original agreed basis for the payment of funds. I do understand, unfortunately, that the Commonwealth wishes to continue to examine this question, and as part of the renegotiation of the agreement in 1994, the Commonwealth has foreshadowed that it will continue to examine this aspect of the matter and negotiate it as part of the overall discussions. Whilst any change would be resisted, or at least compensation sought for it, the fact is that, as part of the negotiations, at least the State and community organisations have the opportunity to seek to have these changes incorporated in the overall grant structure.

So, it is quite a different proposition for the Commonwealth to suggest, quite properly, that it wants to review those negotiations as part of the funding program in the long term as distinct from the recent unheralded change which took community organisations and the State unawares. The Commonwealth can expect significant resistance from the State in this area. If it is negotiated as part of the overall agreement, at least we understand the basis on which it is done and a much more satisfactory basis for discussion is made available.

So, Mr Speaker, this has been an unfortunate saga in the SAAP program. I believe it has now been set right by the Commonwealth's acknowledging the force of the arguments by the community organisations and the State. I am very pleased that the Commonwealth has seen fit to reverse that decision. The ongoing negotiations provide a means of redressing any questions the Commonwealth wants to look at in the long term. On that basis, I am quite prepared to support the motion of the member for Heysen as a means of discussing this matter in the House.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I am delighted that the Minister has agreed to this motion. It is of major concern to the non-government agencies in particular. I am sure that the Minister has received the same representation that I have from SACOSS and other organisations, and I am delighted he has made the representation that he has. I hope he is successful in that representation. From what the Minister says, he believes that that will be the case. It is not my intention to take up the time of the House other than to thank the Minister and, I hope, other members of the House for their support for this motion.

Motion carried.

GAMING MACHINES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis**:**

That this House urges the Government to establish regulations which require licensees of premises in which poker machines and other electronic gaming machines are installed for public use, to ensure that the people who play them are not at risk of losing their family's housekeeping money or becoming bankrupt, and which require the licensee, if that happens, to—

(a) refund sufficient money on the player's loss to prevent his/her family becoming dependent on taxpayers through the welfare system; and

(b) pay an equal sum as a fine into a fund used to research the adverse consequences of gambling and assist in ameliorating its effects in the community.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 688.)

The Hon. E.C. EASTICK (Light): At the outset I give the member for Murray-Mallee full marks for his initiative in drawing the attention of the House to vital issues directly associated with gambling. Having said that, I must quickly say that I am unable to support the motion as it is before the House, other than to use it as a means to discuss the issues at hand. I would find it difficult to support it on the basis that it would not take long before a group of people would make sure that they were getting a hand-out on every occasion that they went into a gambling establishment. That would do nothing to assist them with any untoward attitude that they developed towards gambling. If this were projected on, as I heard it suggested on one occasion, to similar circumstances associated with going to licensed premises, where the person was not allowed to go home broke and was given back funds to make sure that he was able to take them to his family, there would be a number of people who would very much imbibe rather heavily in the drink in the expectation that some of the money they spent would be returned.

I do not raise that in any facetious way at all, but it is the type of activity that I suspect would come into the *modus operandi* of a number of people who are always on the lookout to obtain a benefit to their advantage, albeit that it might not be to the benefit of the community at large. However, my colleague has drawn attention to this matter by drawing up an indictment of the Government relative to approaches to gambling and the social consequences of gambling.

When the Casino was first established there was a clear indication that its activities would be adequately monitored by the member of the Ministry who had responsibility for family welfare or family funding in circumstances where there was an over-indulgence so that the community would know, at least, what action might be taken to prevent an ongoing demand upon the public

purse. We also had the situation that out of a lack of funds within a home there was adequate history to indicate that violence was not an uncommon aftermath of that type of activity and, whether it be to the spouse or the children, there can be and often have been major difficulties.

Most members would have had through their offices cases directly associated with the Casino where someone became addicted and serious consequences have fallen on their family when that has been followed through. I take what my colleague has drawn to the attention of the House as matters that need deeper investigation by the House, perhaps on a later occasion, with particular attention being given to the subject matter of the motion by those Ministers who have an impact on their activities as a result of the difficulties that the motion portrays.

Gambling, *per se,* can be an addiction and it becomes a matter of whether the Government should sponsor anti-gambling organisations or whether there should be an education process at an early stage of schooling to draw to young people's attention the difficulties that they can run into when we have open access to gambling without any thought being given to the consequences. I believe that any and all of those matters are a worthy outcome of deeper consideration of this matter. I hope that other members, like me, who feel inclined to draw credit to the member for Murray-Mallee for the initiative he has shown in bringing this matter before the House but who cannot support the motion will entice him to look at other ways whereby he may come back to the House with alternate statements on another occasion or perhaps have his efforts augmented by feedback that he may be able to obtain from the likes of the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, the Minister of Recreation and Sport and, indeed, the Attorney-General in some circumstances because of the known consequences of a number of corporate failures associated directly with embezzlement or overspending by people who become addicted to gambling.

Each and any of those matters is worthy of further consideration at a later date. As a result of this motion being put before the House, and having listened to the honourable member's statements relative to it, and having listened to statements by other members who have and who will be addressing themselves to the subject, I believe it has been a worthwhile exercise to stir the mind to look at ways and means whereby a satisfactory motion and/or Bill can be brought to the House to give due regard to the theme that the member for Murray-Mallee has addressed.

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE BANK

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That this House views with concern—

(a) the actions of the State Bank in the management of its non-performing loans;

(b) the composition of the GAMD Board; and

(c) the potential for further significant losses to be sustained by the GAMD;

and therefore calls on the Treasurer to—

(i) reconsider the composition of the GAMD Board to ensure that it contains people with proven track records in banking and management of businesses in receivership; and

(ii) provide quarterly financial statements, audited by the Auditor-General, to the Parliament on the operations of the GAMD

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1135.)

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): This is an important motion, as it deals with the Group Asset Management Division of the State Bank of South Australia. It is a motion which the Opposition and, in particular, the member for Mitcham has not put forward lightly or without due consideration. However, that is not the way in which this important motion is being treated by the Government. When members get to their feet and are dealt the sort of spurious comment that incessantly flows from the member for Napier one is left to wonder what this Chamber is being turned into.

As I said, the debate touches on the Group Asset Management Division of the bank. That is most significant to the House not only today in the light of the Royal Commissioner's first report on the bank but also for the future prudential management of the assets of this State. It is worth repeating to this House that the motion is carefully worded, as follows:

That this House views with concern—

(a) the actions of the State Bank in the management of its non-performing loans;

(b) the composition of the GAMD Board; and

(c) the potential for further significant losses to be sustained by the GAMD;

and therefore calls on the Treasurer to—

(i) reconsider the composition of the GAMD Board to ensure that it contains people with proven track records in banking and management of businesses in receivership; and

(ii) provide quarterly financial statements, audited by the Auditor-General to the Parliament on the operations of GAMD.

I would think that there is not a member in this House who would not support this motion. If we read—as the former Premier and the Premier remind us constantly that we should—the totality of the report on the first term of reference of the royal commission into the State Bank, we see the absolute need for the Parliament to support this motion. The elements that are basic to this motion are the very elements that were picked up in a report that we canvassed at some length yesterday. To that extent they cannot be lightly brushed off and easily disregarded. It is therefore with very much dismay that I note that the last person who spoke for the Government on this matter, when it was debated in this House on 28 October, was none other than the member for Ross Smith. In his contribution to the debate he stood in this place and chose to berate the member for Mitcham.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that he cannot refer to debate in this session of Parliament.

Mr BRINDAL: Excuse me, Sir. I can surely refer to debate on the same motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Provided it is on the same motion.

Mr BRINDAL: It is. This is a reference to the member for Ross Smith speaking to this motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Very well.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith, in speaking to this motion, said:

> And I now turn to the second aspect of the honourable member's argument, that persons who constitute the board of the Group Asset Management Division are insufficiently qualified and need greater expertise.

He then went on to say:

> I think that that is a bit rough.

I would like to record for the House quite clearly and quite categorically the surprise with which I view that statement. I do not think that the member for Ross Smith should be standing in this place and saying those sorts of things about the member for Mitcham. I have not heard the member for Mitcham get up and criticise serious matters of this nature unless he backed it with argument. I do not think the member for Ross Smith should do so, either. I do not think the honourable member is in the best position to make an assessment of this matter. He may once have been, but time has passed him by. He is not now Premier of South Australia, he is certainly not now Treasurer of South Australia and there are those in the community who have an opinion that he should no longer be Treasurer of this State.

So, whatever actions he took as Treasurer are now open to rightful scrutiny by this Parliament. I think he is the last person to come in here and tell us how good he was and what fine contributions he made when that is open to doubt. I really have little more to say other than to commend the motion to the House and to deplore the contribution made by the member for Ross Smith on this matter and to suggest that in future he should confine himself to areas on which he has greater expertise.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I have never seen anyone come into this House in that fashion and take part in a debate that is supposed to be so important, that actually impinges on not only the Royal Commissioner's first report but also on the very important reports that will follow covering references two and three and the Auditor-General's report. This debate in fact pre-empts those reports. The honourable member speaks on behalf of the Opposition and tells us three or four times how important this is. Yet, when we look at what has been said, it is nothing. It is hollow and shallow. Obviously, the member for Hayward has been told to come in, because he took the adjournment, and speak on behalf of the Opposition. No wonder they call him 'Ankles'.

This motion is in direct contradiction to what this House agreed to in relation to the affairs of the State Bank. Sir, I am well aware of the your ruling that I must not refer to a debate that took place in this House this week, in fact, yesterday—a tedious 10 hours of debate during which we heard nothing but personalised attacks by members opposite, including all members who are in the House who actually took part in the debate. I do not think 'Ankles' had anything to do with it; I am not quite sure.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, I thought it was customary in this Chamber to address people by the seat they occupy or the office they hold in this Chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and I ask the member for Napier to refer to the honourable member by his title.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Albert Park just reminded me that the member for Hayward has taken great delight in calling him 'Hollywood' in the past and he has not taken offence at that. The term 'Ankles' is a term of endearment. I would have thought that the member for Hayward would be quite appreciative of that. It just shows you: you stretch the hand of friendship across the Chamber and you get it bitten. I object to it. The whole point of this motion in effect pre-empts the reports that Commissioner Jacobs and the Auditor-General will bring down sometime next year. The motion does talk about the actions of the State Bank in the management of its non-performing loans. In fact, that was one of the terms of reference. It does not talk about the composition of the GAMD board, but that was as a result of the problems that the Opposition claims it highlighted in the House. In fact, members opposite took the Government to task because we failed to respond, in their words. We did respond: we set up a royal commission.

The motion then goes on to talk about all the things that Commissioner Jacobs, after having heard all the evidence, is busily writing his second report on. Also, we are well aware that, because of other questions that have come from the other side of the Chamber, our Auditor-General has requested an extension of time so he can further consider all those points. What are the member for Mitcham and the member for Hayward trying to achieve? The member for Hayward says that this is a very important motion because it has been moved by the member for Mitcham.

In all the time that the member for Mitcham has been here, I have never known him to move any motion that, even in anyone's wildest imagination, could be considered as important. In fact, Sir, you may recall that when he was introducing the motion he referred to one of his tutors when he was at university taking economics. It is a good job that you, Mr Speaker, were in the Chair, because I went into hysterical laughter when I heard that the member for Mitcham had taken a course in economics.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the member for Napier is not reflecting on the Chair in any way.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, Sir; I am just trying to fill you in that, when the member for Mitcham informed the House he had taken a degree in economics and was quoting Professor Hancock, I suddenly collapsed with hysterical laughter and you, quite rightly, pulled me up. That is the point that I am making. This motion should be rejected out of hand, because the people who are going to deal with it—the Commissioner, based on all the evidence that has come before the royal commission, and the Auditor-General, again based on all the information that he has sought from and been given by the State Bank—will make their reports, and this House will then be in a better position to analyse the ramifications of those reports. My advice to the member for Mitcham is not to jump the gun for a quick headline.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You would know.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Heysen refers to me as jumping the gun for a quick

headline. We shall be dealing with another motion following this one in connection with which the member for Heysen, in order to grab a quick headline, put something in his local paper and got his fingers bitten.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. The member for Hayward has a point of order.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, the member for Napier is speaking to motion No. 4 and he has now deviated to motion No. 5, as he said. Surely he cannot debate both motions at once.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The member for Napier will debate the motion before the House.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I think that I have said sufficient to convince all decent thinking members to reject this stupid motion for what it is worth. It is not worth having any more time spent on it. There are other motions on the Notice Paper that need to be debated and voted upon. It is typical of the Opposition, knowing that the motion is no good and not worth a cracker, to give it to the member for Hayward to stand up and make a fool of himself.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): If ever I have heard an inane contribution, I have just heard one. I think it came from the member for Napier, but I am not sure; there was a noise from the other side of the Chamber. Not many of the words were comprehensible, but those that were seemed unrelated to the topic before us. It is a tragedy that members do not take the trouble to do any research into the subject matter if they intend to say something about it—to make a noise. The member for Napier should know that by now. Regrettably, he has overlooked some significant aspects of the proposition in the course of whatever he was sounding off about.

The one thing that I would put before the House as having been overlooked by the member for Napier is the fact that exposure of the State Bank to risk in economies outside the regional economy of South Australia is still more than 50 per cent. Indeed, it is more than 60 per cent. That is not the reason why the taxpayers of South Australia were asked to give and were compelled to provide the guarantee, and it is not the reason why this place established the State Bank in the first place. It certainly ought to be a salutary instruction to the people involved to get out of those markets, to get back home where they belong, and to reduce the risk of loss, further exacerbating the contribution that will have to be made by State taxpayers in any context where it is outside their immediate concern, domain or welfare. Any other course of action is crazy.

The motion quite properly calls on the Treasurer to reconsider the composition of the group of people who are charged with the responsibility of looking into that aspect, to reconsider the composition of the GAMD Board to ensure that it contains people with proven track records in banking and management of businesses in receivership and to provide us with quarterly financial statements, audited by the Auditor-General, so that we will know what is going on and be able to decide whether that is truly supporting and in the interests of South Australia.

Quarterly reports such as we were accustomed to getting from day one of the bank were suspended by the bank for over six months. It took some prompting from me to get those reports reinstated, as I understand it, because no additional information by way of explanation was given to me as to why they suddenly recommenced. The motion moved by the member for Mitcham deserves the support of everyone in this Chamber. There is no politics in it at all. It simply seeks to ensure that we as a Parliament and as part of the Parliament should understand what the hell is going on in the State Bank.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I oppose this motion and I wish to address each part of it in turn. The first part of the motion states that we should view with concern the actions of the State Bank in the management of its non-performing loans. The member for Mitcham gave various examples that he claimed supported that view. The fact is that the Government Asset Management Division of the bank is involved in the difficult and complex task of managing a large portfolio of non-performing loans with the objective of maximising the amount recovered against those loans. That is the duty of the GAMD; that is what it is supposed to do. Yet apparently the member for Mitcham believes that is improper. In fact, there has been an element of schizophrenia on the part of the Opposition over this aspect of State Bank activities.

On the one hand, they claim that the bank is too tough with some clients. Apparently, this dreadful bank has been too tough in trying to get its money and protect the investment of the people of this State. On the other hand, we hear other examples where the bank has been too lenient; it is giving it away; it is a fire sale; these assets are going too cheaply. I suggest that members opposite cannot have it both ways. The GAMD has a particularly difficult task to carry out and it should be left to get on with that task.

It is scarcely surprising that the member for Mitcham should be getting representations from clients, whose objective is to reduce the amount that the bank or the GAMD can recover. It is obviously in their interests that the bank should get as little as possible and that they should get as much as possible. Therefore, it is scarcely surprising that they should be approaching members, such as the member for Mitcham, to put pressure on the bank to alter its decisions to pursue the proper recovery of moneys that it is owed. As I said, members opposite cannot really have it both ways.

The other aspect that we should note is that all members of Parliament get representations from time to time from constituents. I think every member would know that there are always two sides to every story. To use a few anecdotal stories that have not been checked as the basis for putting a motion before the House and drawing some conclusions against the GAMD is entirely improper. The second part of the motion criticises the composition of the GAMD Board. That was a rather cowardly attack by the member for Mitcham, and I do not think that he would dare repeat his comments about the individuals concerned outside this House.

In fact, there are three members of the board with a broad range of experience. First, Mr Robert Ruse, the Chairman, as most members would know, has significant

financial expertise given his background as a long-standing executive in the Public Service. He is well acquainted with the needs of Government and this Parliament in relation to the operations of the Group Asset Management Division.

Mr Robert Martin is the Treasurer's representative under the indemnity, and he has been located in the Group Asset Management Division since 1991. Mr Martin's appointment allows him to continue this role and to continue to apply his considerable knowledge of the GAMD assets and of the personnel and procedures employed by the bank in the Group Asset Management Division. The member for Mitcham, in his contribution, asked the question, 'What is the Crown Solicitor's office doing in there?' The answer is that Mr Martin is a solicitor of longstanding who conducted a private legal practice for a number of years, specialising in the recovery of debts and in bankruptcy and liquidation law. In the private sector, Mr Martin has also been responsible for restructuring a group of companies. In other words, Mr Martin has exactly the qualifications and experience required of the task. That is why he is there.

Another member of the board is Mr Jim Glidden, who is at present a member of the State Bank Board; he brings an extensive business background to the GAMD Board. His appointment also ensures continuity, as he was Chairman of the bank's GAMD committee, which was charged with overseeing the operations of the division prior to the splitting up of the elements of the bank. Thus the appointment of these people to the board is entirely appropriate, and the comments of the member for Mitcham are right out of line. The size of the GAMD Board can be enlarged under the amended indemnity, if that is required.

The third part of the motion refers to the potential for further significant losses to be sustained by the GAMD. In the light of the State Bank royal commission, we have every right, indeed a duty, to closely scrutinise the bank's activities. But if the member for Mitcham is going to make these sorts of allegations, one would like to think that he will provide at least a shred of evidence for it. I have been in this House on a number of occasions when the Treasurer has offered a briefing on these activities to all members opposite, if that is what they want, so they cannot claim that they do not have access to the detailed information if they require it. In spite of their having that offer, they are prepared to make these objections without putting up one shred of evidence.

We ought to recognise that the cost of holding the non-performing loan portfolio in the GAMD is significant but, of course, it will reduce as the loans are worked out and assets are disposed of. As I have pointed out in this House on a number of occasions, the actual amount that will be recovered by the Group Asset Management Division will be determined only as the loans are worked out and the assets are sold over a period of time. It must "be acknowledged that the GAMD will be susceptible to economic and market forces and other influences during this period, in particular the state of the property market. That is an obvious point. None of us can tell exactly what that market will do.

The fourth point in the motion is that the Group Asset Management Division should provide audited quarterly financial statements to the Parliament. It has already been made clear by the Treasurer that the GAMD will produce audited financial statements, which will report the results of GAMD to the Parliament. The Government intends that the Auditor-General will be able to audit GAMD and, to that extent, I do agree with the member for Mitcham that there should be perusal by the Auditor-General. But a quarterly perusal will not really help this Parliament, the people of South Australia or anyone else to deal with the problem.

In summary, I do not believe that there are grounds—and certainly the member for Mitcham has not produced any grounds—on which we should support this motion. What we need is for the Group Asset Management Division to get on with the very important task for the people of South Australia of minimising the losses from the impaired loans within its portfolio. It has people who can do that. They should be allowed to get on with the job, and we should reject this motion.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House calls on the Minister of Transport Development to advise the Parliament what immediate action the Government is going to take to alleviate the significant problems on the Mount Barker Road between Cross Road and the commencement of the South-Eastern Freeway due to hazardous driving conditions as a result of fuel spillages and considerable delays as a result of accidents and breakdowns involving heavy vehicles—

which Mr Holloway had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after 'House' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'notes those actions already undertaken by the Government and those currently in train to alleviate hazardous driving conditions on the Mount Barker Road between Cross Road and the commencement of the South-Eastern Freeway'.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1138.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I have heard the arguments of the member for Mitchell and read carefully the intention of his amendment. What he fails to grasp is that we need to know what the Government will do now with respect to Mount Barker Road to alleviate those continuing and significant problems, which were not addressed in the course of his remarks, arising from the hazardous consequence of fuel spillages, accidents and breakdowns which involve heavy vehicles and the way they congest the Mount Barker Road. That is the gist of what the member for Heysen has said in this debate.

We are not talking about how good it was when they changed it from a bullock track to an unsealed surface suitable for tired vehicles that were driven by motors rather than drawn by animals; we are not talking about what was done last year or the year before that; we want to know what will be done now, because it is a mess, it is dangerous, people are dying, property is being wrecked and people are being injured. It is not possible to get to the point where the disaster is occurring. We must fix it and fix it now, and we want to know what the Minister is

going to do about it. Mr Speaker, if you speak to anyone who has to use that road, you will come to the same conclusion as we arrived at: it is irresponsible to water down that proposition. The Government must act and act now. All that the Government has done is to spend money to get itself re-elected. Window dressing! Not good enough!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I oppose the amendment, and I support the original motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, D.M. Ferguson, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S.Heron, P. Holloway (teller), I .J. Hopgood, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (19)—H. Allison, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—M.K. Mayes, C.F. Hutchison, F.T. Blevins, R.J. Gregory. Noes—P.D. Blacker, D.C. Kotz, P.B. Arnold, M.H. Armitage.

The SPEAKER: There being 19 Ayes and 19 Noes, I cast my vote in the affirmative.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION (SUPERANNUATION GUARANTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974. 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 Parliamentary Superannuation scheme so that all members of the scheme, that is the members of this Parliament, receive an employer financed benefit which satisfies the requirements of the Commonwealth's Superannuation Guarantee Charge legislation.

Under the existing scheme, a member of the Parliament who loses his or her seat at an election and has not been a member of the Parliament for at least six years, simply receives a refund of his or her contributions paid into the scheme, plus interest on those contributions. There is no employer financed benefit payable to the former member as required under the Commonwealth's SGC legislation. This Bill seeks to remedy that situation.

The proposed amendment to the scheme will provide the former member with a lump sum equal to twice the amount of the member's contributions paid to the scheme, plus interest.

However, on ceasing service the former member will have the option of immediately receiving one half of the benefit, in other words an amount equal to a refund of his or her own contributions plus interest.

In all cases the Government financed portion of the proposed benefit, that is one half the benefit determined at the date of the member's cessation of service, will be compulsorily preserved until claimed after the age of 55 years, or earlier invalidity or death.

The Bill also makes some minor amendments to the extent of repealing some redundant provisions and making a minor technical modification to an existing provision.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Bill. The essential provision of the Bill is the substitution of section 22 which ensures that a former member receives an employer funded superannuation payment that exceeds the superannuation guarantee charge required by Commonwealth legislation. The Commonwealth legislation operates from 1 July 1992 and new section 22 should operate from this date as well. There is no reason why the other provisions of the Bill should not also operate from this date.

Clause 3 removes some outdated provisions from section 17 of the principal Act.

Clause 4 amends section 20 (2) of the principal Act to make it clear that subsection (2) operates subject to section 36 (3).

Clause 5 replaces section 22. Half of the benefit under this section must be preserved until the former member reaches 55 years unless the whole amount is rolled over to another fund or scheme. The preserved amount accrues interest until it is paid (see subclause (9)).

Clause 6 removes an outdated provision from section 24 of the principal Act.

Clause 7 amends the definition of 'the bond rate' in section 31a and renames it "the 10 year bond rate". The amendment overcomes a potential problem that would arise with the existing definition if an interest rate needed to be applied in respect of a financial year occurring before the South Australian Government Financing Authority was established.

Clause 8 makes consequential changes to section 36. New subclauses (1) and (la) provide for the reversal of a former member's position if he or she becomes a member again. Paragraph *(b)* of this clause makes a minor tidying up amendment to subsection (2).

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

MINING (PRECIOUS STONES FIELD BALLOTS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act 1971. 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 Mining Act 1992 is the principal act governing prospecting and mining on the opal fields in South Australia.

The Mining (Precious Stones Field Ballots) Amendment Bill has the specific purpose of amending the Mining Act to allow for ballots of certain portions of Crown Land un-reserved from the Mining Act.

Members are aware that the Mintabie Opal Field is part of Aboriginal land but a special set of circumstances apply there. Several attempts have been made to extend the size of the Mintabie Opal Field along the outcrop of the Mintabie sandstone. While many of the local Aborigines favour the continued prosperity of the Mintabie field, the procedures to extend the size of the field have not been successfully completed under the Pitjantjatjara Lands Rights Act 1981.

As a result, the Mintabie miners have looked inward within the opal field at areas reserved from the Mining Act for purposes of public infrastructure.

In August 1986 a strip on either side of the wide airstrip was released for pegging. The area proved highly prospective.

The Mintabie Miners Progress Association has corresponded with the Civil Aviation Authority and the Royal Flying Doctor Service and have agreed that a further strip on each side of the airstrip could be released for pegging while still meeting CAA guidelines for the operation of the Royal Flying Doctor Service King Air aircraft.

The shortage of prospective land within the proclaimed Mintabie Opal Field suggests that there will be intense interest in the unreserved land, and that care be taken to release the land in an orderly manner to prevent a pegging rush similar to a Wild West cinema-scope production.

Consultation has taken place with the four Opal Mining Associations and all the associations support the option of having a ballot system in this and future un-reserving of land.

In the interest of the orderly release of the land, I recommend to the House the Mining (Precious Stones Field Ballots) Amendment Bill.

Clause 1: is formal.

Clause 2: provides for the enactment of a new section relating to the use of ballots in certain cases where land is to become a precious stones field. The provision will empower the Minister to conduct a ballot where he or she considers that it is appropriate to do so in order to facilitate the orderly prospecting and pegging of claims on the relevant land. A holder of a precious stones prospecting permit will be entitled to register for the ballot. A person who is successful in the ballot will be entitled to peg out the block awarded through the ballot until 5 p.m. on the day following the day of the ballot. No pegging will be allowed during the period leading up to the ballot, and no other pegging will be allowed for 14 days following the ballot. The Minister will be able to fix a fee for participation in the ballot, which will be refundable to unsuccessful participants. The right to peg out a block through participation in the ballot will be non-transferable. Significant penalties will apply if a person pegs out a claim in contravention of the section.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (PUBLICATION OF REPORTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): 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 Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 came into operation in November 1991 and following that members were appointed by the respective Houses to membership of the four committees.

Throughout 1992 the committees have been extremely busy in establishing operational procedures and in undertaking investigations. There is no doubt that the committees established under the Act have developed an identity and a profile that is much greater than the committees they replaced. This is certainly what was envisaged by the Act; it has enabled backbench members and the Parliament itself to become actively involved in the discussion of important contemporary issues. It has also led to a greater involvement of the public in parliamentary activities and a more serious reporting of committee work by the media.

While all four committees have been equally busy, the Economic and Finance Committee is the one which had attracted most interest—some might say notoriety. In the main this has come about because of the issues which it has addressed—issues like the financial activities of statutory authorities, consulting services to government and so on.

Because they are very much issues of the day the question has arisen about the speed with which completed and interim reports can be tabled in House of Assembly and thereby be available for wider discussion.

This bill will overcome an impediment that would otherwise arise if a committee completed a report just after the Parliament had risen for the Christmas New Year break or the winter recess.

The Bill provides for the Committee to present a report to the relevant Presiding Officer and for the Presiding Officer to authorise publication. This will ensure that in nearly all circumstances there need be no delay between the conclusion of an examination and the reporting and publication of this examination to the wider public arena.

The committees are committees of the Parliament and must by necessity report to it so that Parliament can examine and debate the committees' work. Given the timetable committees are working on, that will occur in most situations. However for those occasions where there is a mismatch of timetables, this mechanism will allow the Presiding Officer to consult with a committee where work has been completed and will allow the Presiding Officer to authorise publication.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1—Short title. This clause is formal

Clause 2—Amendment of s. 17—Reports on matters referred. Section 17 of the principal Act currently provides for each committee to report on a matter to its appointing House or Houses. The clause adds to this section a new provision providing that if more than 14 days elapse from the day on which a report of a committee (whether a final report or interim

report) is adopted by the committee until the next sitting day of the committee's appointing House or Houses, the committee may present the report to the Presiding Officer or officers of the committee's appointing House or Houses and the Presiding Officer or officers may, after consultation with the committee, authorise the publication of the report prior to its presentation to the committee's appointing House or Houses. The clause also adds a further new provision designed to make it clear that any such report or other document published by or on behalf of a committee will be taken to be a report or paper of Parliament published under the authority of the committee's appointing House or Houses. This provision is intended to operate in conjunction with section 12 of the Wrongs Act 1936 which provides for a stay of civil or criminal proceedings or a defence to civil or criminal proceedings in respect of the publication of any report or paper or an extract from any report or paper that either House of Parliament has authorised to be published.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Thursday 26 November 1992.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 24 November at 2 p.m.