

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 August 1992

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

## GEDDES, HON. R.A., DEATH

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

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of the Hon. R.A. Geddes, former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service, and as a mark of respect to his memory the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

It is again my unfortunate duty to have to inform members that a former member of this Parliament has passed on. Richard Alexander Geddes—Dick Geddes to all of his friends—was a member of the Legislative Council from 1965 to 1979. As such, his parliamentary career moves well into the period of the direct memory of many people in this place who served with him.

Mr Geddes was born on 5 November 1921—some would perhaps say that was an appropriate date for a parliamentarian. He was educated at St Peter's College and at King's College. He was a member of the AIF, serving in Borneo with the 2nd/9th Australian Armoured Regiment. After the war, he was a farmer and grazier at Wirrabara, and he was active in his church and in his local community. He was a member of the Stockowners Association from 1963 and he was on the Executive of that body from 1965 to 1979. In addition to his active participation in the affairs of that organisation, he was a member of the Legacy Club, the Adelaide Club and the Naval, Military and Air Force Club. He was active in his sphere as a member of the Legislative Council and as a member of a number of parliamentary committees, the Industries Development Committee being amongst them.

Mr Geddes earned the respect of all honourable members for the way in which he carried out his duties. He was in many ways perhaps a reserved man but at the same time a man who made friends easily. Indeed, that featured in the whole of his parliamentary career. I am sure that I join all members in both Houses in expressing my personal condolences to the surviving members of his family.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I second the motion of condolence to the family of the late Dick Geddes. In fact, yesterday a number of members of both Houses of Parliament attended a memorial service at Parkside for Dick Geddes. I have clear recollections of working very closely with Dick Geddes as a member of the shadow Cabinet in the 1970s. He had the difficult portfolio of Mines and Energy. Dick Geddes put up and was the architect for the development strategy for the mining resources of this

State in the late 1970s which eventually led to the development of Roxby Downs and the Cooper Basin with its liquid plant at Stony Point. Few people appreciate the tremendous effort that Dick Geddes put into developing those projects and the policies surrounding those projects which eventually led to the Liberal Government from 1979 to 1982 adopting those policies under the leadership of Roger Goldsworthy, then Deputy Premier.

Dick Geddes had many facets to his life. He was a very keen farmer. We heard from his family yesterday how he always loved to make sure that the ewes started to lamb on 19 April, which happened to be the birthday of his wife, Pam, and how he had great pleasure in taking her out to the paddocks to see the new lambs on that day.

He was also a man with a great sense of humour, and I can recall that coming through in shadow Cabinet and Party meetings and various functions where he spoke. He was quiet, and that magnified his sense of humour, because he seldom spoke but, when he did, people listened, not only for the wisdom but also for the humour. He distinguished himself in serving his country in the war. He worked very hard for his community and was involved in quite a few different aspects of community life.

Interestingly, for many years he was a member of the Broughton Soil Conservation Board and obviously, therefore, took a real interest in the whole concept of sustainable agriculture. He also participated in many community activities and then finally became a legislator and worked very hard for the Legislative Council, for the community and particularly, as I said, for the mining and energy interests of South Australia. He was an active member of the Anglican church and was a very active supporter of the Willochra diocese. The people of Wirrabara will remember Dick Geddes for many years, because he came from that area.

Dick had one particular poem he first heard when he was 17 years of age, and he quoted it often in giving speeches to public functions and also in speeches to Parliament. I would like to quote just the last verse of that poem in memory of Dick Geddes, because I can think of no better tribute. I have heard Dick use various parts of the poem *If*, by Rudyard Kipling. The verse is as follows:

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,  
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch,  
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,  
If all men count with you, but none too much;  
If you can fill the unforgiving minute  
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,  
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,  
And—which is more—you'll be a man, my son.

To Pam and his family I pass on the condolences of the Liberal Party and other members of the public.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I support the motion of condolence. Certainly, I knew Dick Geddes as a member of the other place but it was in more recent years that I came to know Dick and Pam, when a couple of years ago they moved to Stirling and lived very close to my own home, and we saw them on a regular basis. I have always had a tremendous amount of respect for Dick and the very strong involvement he has had within the community through his lifetime, and I support the comments that have been made by the Acting Premier

and the Leader in regard to that involvement and support. One of the things that I always admired about Dick particularly was his sense of humour, and he always enjoyed a joke. He always enjoyed life to the full and, wherever possible, he ensured that other people enjoyed his presence. I have come to know and respect Pam in more recent years particularly, and I have known his daughter Prue for a long time. I am sure the thoughts of all members of this House are with his family at this time.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would also like to support the condolence motion. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the funeral but on that occasion my thoughts and those of my family went to the Geddes. I knew Dick Geddes back in the days when he was at Ippinichie at Wirrabara. When I was in my late teens and early 20s, our families used to meet on many occasions at Ippinichie for barbecues and functions at Port Pirie. Indeed, Dick used to paddock my horses whenever I was looking for someone who would take them off my hands and put them out to pasture for a few months. As has been said by other members this afternoon, he was a man of great humour, a wonderful host and also a person in the agricultural community up there who was always looked up to and respected. On behalf of my family I would like to record our sincere sympathy at his passing and pass on our best wishes to Pam and his family.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I too join all members of the House in expressing my regret at the death of the Hon. Dick Geddes and extend my condolences to his wife. My association with Dick Geddes goes back to 1973 when we contested the northern district of the Legislative Council. On that occasion Dick Geddes was successful and I was not. As a new member of the Legislative Council, I worked with Dick for many years; it was a pleasure to know the man. Our philosophies were totally different; I was somewhat raw in those days, but Dick Geddes smoothed off a few rough edges with, as the member for Heysen said, a great deal of humour. He was a very funny man with a wonderful outlook on life, and I appreciated that.

It was a pity when Dick Geddes did not gain a sufficiently high place on the Legislative Council ticket and thus was not re-elected to the Legislative Council at a subsequent election. It was a pleasure to have known him. He did represent the northern district in the Legislative Council which, at that time, covered Whyalla. He was well known in Whyalla as a member of Parliament and also as a director of one of the large firms in Whyalla at that time. He was reasonably well known and liked. I add my voice to the motion before the House.

The SPEAKER: I will ensure that the condolences and thoughts of members are passed on to the Geddes family and I ask all members to stand and observe the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.12 to 2.20 p.m.]

## PETITIONS

### INTELLECTUALLY DISABLED PERSONS

A petition signed by 25 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide adequate services to the intellectually disabled was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

### GAWLER TAFE

A petition signed by 211 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to amalgamate the Gawler campus of the Light TAFE College with the Elizabeth College was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

### MAWSON HIGH SCHOOL

A petition signed by 179 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain educational standards at Mawson High School was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

### GAMING MACHINES

A petition signed by 119 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce gaming machines into hotels and clubs in South Australia was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

### STATE BANK

The SPEAKER: Members will probably have seen newspaper reports suggesting that files on members of Parliament have been kept by the State Bank. I was sufficiently concerned to discuss the matter with the President of the Legislative Council. Jointly we wrote to the Ombudsman in the following terms:

Dear Mr Biganovsky,

As Speaker and President we are both concerned with the report in the *Advertiser* of 14 August 1992 dealing with State Bank secret dossiers.

Our main concern would be that apart from the files containing facts, newspaper cuttings, etc., it would appear that an opinion has been formed in these files giving profiles of members of Parliament as to their perceived threat to the State Bank and its policies.

We are most concerned that with files of such a nature being kept by the State Bank, members of Parliament could be subjected to undue influence by the people whom they are dealing with in the bank on behalf of their constituents, and the opinions formed in these files could influence the outcome of the inquiries on behalf of their constituents. We would draw your attention to clause 15 (3) of the Ombudsman Act which enables members of Parliament to act on behalf of members of the public.

We therefore request that you carry out a full investigation to see if these files exist and whether profiles other than those

required for normal banking practice are contained therein and should such files exist, who has access to them?

We would ask you to treat this as a matter of extreme urgency in view of the sensitive nature of the matter under investigation.

To date I have not received a report from the Ombudsman, but that will be presented to members when it is to hand.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hoggood)—  
Drugs Act 1908—Regulations—Advisory Committee Fees.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—  
Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report—Land Division, Eden Hills.  
Marine Environment Protection Act 1990—Regulations—Commencement and Fees.
- By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—  
Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1991-92.  
Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1991-92.
- By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—  
Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Waiver of Fees.

### SEPARATION PACKAGES

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Last week, I gave a commitment to this House and to the member for Bragg that I would investigate his claim that the system of voluntary separation packages was being abused. On Wednesday and Thursday last week I provided details to refute his allegations of abuse within the Department of Agriculture and SACON. Today, I present the information concerning the Department of Education and ETSA, as it has been presented to me. Between 15 June 1992 and 24 July 1992 Drake Personnel provided the Department of Education with a temporary administrative assistant. She had accepted a voluntary separation package of approximately \$15 500 in October last year. Her temporary re-engagement occurred after the sudden departure of an administrative assistant and the subsequent failure to find an immediate replacement through internal notices. Her temporary employment ceased when my own department provided a replacement.

Also in Education, one senior employee who had accepted a VSP has been re-engaged, but as a consultant to an all-Party parliamentary select committee and not to the Public Service. In ETSA, I am advised that one former employee who left with a VSP has been employed by a private firm, which currently provides consultancy services to ETSA on the highly specialised subject of sequential waveform distortion technology.

Last week the member for Bragg implied a scandal concerning VSPs. I have repeatedly asked him for the names of the individuals allegedly abusing their VSPs, and have been repeatedly denied them. Their names are necessary only to ensure they are not re-employed in

contravention of the guidelines. In the reports I have presented to this House, and based on the information given to my office, I have demonstrated the emptiness of the member for Bragg's claim. I am informed that no-one fitting the description provided by the member for Bragg—that is, of having accepted voluntary separation packages of \$100 000 or more—has been permanently rehired by their old department. On the occasions where re-engagement has occurred, it has been temporary, the individuals had accepted very modest VSPs, and when their status was discovered their employment was terminated. This has been the practice of the Public Service agencies long before the matter was raised in this House by the member for Bragg.

This Government has made every effort to ensure that its agencies comply with the guidelines covering the VSP program. Where they have been breached—however minor the circumstances—we have acted. But, to satisfy the member for Bragg, I can inform him that last week the Commissioner for Public Employment wrote again to the Public Service heads reiterating the Government's policy on VSP rehiring and requesting information, where applicable, on possible violations. I make one final request to the member for Bragg: if he is dissatisfied with, or in some way distrusts, my department's investigations, he can solve the problem by giving me the names of those allegedly abusing the system. To use a time-honoured phrase in this place, it is time to put up or shut up.

### CONSULTANCIES

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

*Members interjecting:*

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Last Thursday in this House the member for Fisher alleged the Minister of Tourism concealed from Parliament funding by Tourism SA of consultancy services for the Tandanya supplementary development plan. The honourable member also alleged that the appointment of the consultant represented a conflict of interest since that firm had been involved with other phases of the Tandanya development. It is appropriate that these mischievous allegations be laid to rest.

Briefly, the facts are these: as part of its normal work, Tourism SA has identified a number of key tourism sites in South Australia and provides a wide range of advice to facilitate development at them, including assistance in ensuring zoning is appropriate for tourism development. Tourism SA regards the development of accommodation on the western end of Kangaroo Island as an important part of its development strategy for the State, and has actively participated in facilitating development there since the Tandanya project's inception.

In December 1990, System One Co. Ltd purchased the site and wanted to make substantial improvements to the project's structure plans to take account of environmental concerns raised about the project, which also brought the proposal more into accord with Tourism SA's development strategy. In order for those improvements to take

place, provision for them had to be made in a site specific supplementary development plan. Tourism SA was given the opportunity to comment on the proposed SDP.

Officers of Tourism SA's Planning and Development Division appointed Nelson Dawson and Associates to provide detailed comments on the SDP to reflect the improvements to the project desired by System One. Nelson Dawson, as System One's architects, had extensive knowledge of the site, including the environmental issues under consideration and the proposed amendments to the development concept, together with a sound understanding of Tourism SA's development strategies. Their appointment to assist Tourism SA in suggesting changes to the SDP therefore made good sense, and their comments were incorporated in Tourism SA's submission.

The Tourism SA officers concerned had delegated authority to make such an appointment, and there was absolutely no reason why the Hon. Barbara Wiese, the Minister of Tourism, should have had knowledge of the decision or been required to grant approval of it—and indeed she did not. For members to suggest that there was anything unorthodox about the appointment of the consultant, that it was anything more than the normal conduct of business by Tourism SA, or that the Minister of Tourism sought to conceal it from Parliament, is merely further evidence of their mischievous waste of Parliament's time in the pursuit of political ends.

## QUESTION TIME

### ASER

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Will he confirm that the ASER project cost \$340 million to complete and that the property trust, which owns the ASER project, has accumulated losses since then of more than \$64 million; and what effect will this massive cost blow out, and continuing losses, have on the long-term public funding requirement of SASFIT, which half owns the trust?

I have seen confidential documents which reveal this information. I have also been informed that the hotel within the ASER project cost more than \$160 million—the equivalent of more than \$430 000 a room. This compared with an original estimate of less than \$40 million. In addition, information I have seen reveals that the project has failed completely to meet projected returns. As a result the value of the whole ASER project has been significantly reduced—with Valuer-General's figures putting its worth at less than \$170 million compared with the current equity, loans and losses in the project of just over \$400 million.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No, I will not confirm that. What I will do for the Leader of the Opposition is have the ASER people look at this and see what is fact, what is fiction and what is imagination—and I am sure there will be some of that. However, I understand that SASFIT—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** —is currently before the Economic and Finance Committee, so there is any number of avenues for—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** —members opposite—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The Leader says he has been trying to get it for years. He has not been here for years: he has been here for only five minutes. I have been Minister of Finance for about 2½ years and I have never had a question on this matter, so I do not know who these people are who have been trying to get this information. Nevertheless, if all the avenues available for the Parliament to get this information are not enough, as I said, I will refer the matter to the ASER people and come back with a comprehensive reply in the fullness of time.

## BUILDING INDUSTRY

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Can the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House of any initiatives being taken by the Government in regard to reform in the building and construction industry in this State? The House will be aware that there has been considerable debate and publicity recently about the need to reform industries in order to have long-term improvements in the Australian economy. I am reliably informed by those in the building and construction industry that theirs is one area targeted for reform.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the member for Napier for his question, because some significant steps are being taken nationally and in South Australia to offer reform opportunities for our building and construction industry. I think it is important—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Just accept that you lost and be quiet. The fact is that some major steps are being taken.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** When you have your stirrups, then you can interrupt, but not yet. We have about 500 000 employees in the building and construction industry in this country. Some 60 per cent of the nation's gross fixed capital expenditure comes out of the construction sector. It is important, as the Federal Government, industry and union leaders have said, that we deal with micro reform in this area. In fact, it is important from our point of view to deliver a much better product to our community as a whole. Estimates that we have taken from comparisons with our major competitors in the OECD show that in some places our construction costs are 20 per cent higher. That is very significant not only in respect of our local components but also in terms of exporting our product overseas, and there is great scope for us to do that.

As a result of those figures and estimates, which were prepared in 1990, about 100 senior company executives, union leaders and Government leaders met and prepared an outline for a reform package. That was focused in early December 1991. We then went on to establish a

working group, made up of representatives from both the Federal and State Governments, union and industry leaders, basically to produce a reform package which had the following key aspects which I think it is important to record: the implementation of a more efficient and flexible work practice; the development of specific measures to reduce the incidence of lost time; the implementation of award restructuring; the introduction of new classifications; skill-related career paths and associated training; and improvements in safety standards and working environments.

A comprehensive system was established for consultation with the industry. South Australia has established a Cabinet committee comprising myself and the Ministers of Labour, Industry, Trade and Technology and Employment and Further Education. It is important that we work with the industry in this State to ensure that we can initiate these reforms. SACON has established at local level a memorandum of understanding on restructuring and workplace reform agreements, both within the construction branch and with our building trades and affiliates. We are taking those steps to ensure that micro reform in the building industry is initiated here. We have already cited what we call the workplace which will see these practices being implemented. It will be interesting to see their outcome, because nationally we see major steps being taken in terms of large construction projects. I look forward to being able to report to this House on the progress of this reform, because in my view it is essential to the health and growth of major industry in this country.

#### SASFIT

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** Will the Minister of Finance confirm that SASFIT's total exposure to the ASER project is almost \$300 million, including a \$100 million put option entered into with Westpac Bank?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No, I will not confirm that. Again, what I will do is refer this question to SASFIT for its consideration and I will bring back a reply for the honourable member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Forgive me, but I thought I saw some dealings with SASFIT by the Economics and Finance Committee.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Not at all—well, there we are.

**An honourable member:** Yes, that's true.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** That is true? I would sooner listen to my colleague here. It is true. So, again the questions that the honourable member opposite asks are actually before a committee of the Parliament.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Henley Beach is not necessary in this debate.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Henley Beach for his always welcome assistance. Nevertheless, if any information requires updating, I will certainly do that and I will bring back a reply for the honourable member as soon as practicable.

#### SUPERDROME

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport and also in his capacity as Minister of Housing and Construction. Can the Minister inform the House of the progress of the velodrome being constructed in my electorate? It is a very large and important structure in my electorate and it has sparked much comment and I would appreciate it if the Minister would bring us up to date on how it is progressing.

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the Minister, once again I would remind Ministers of the advantage of a ministerial statement. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Thank you, Sir, and I note your comment. I am delighted to bring the honourable member up to date with regard to the construction of the velodrome. I believe this will be one of the most significant sporting facilities in Australia and certainly it will be a focus for our Australian Institute of Sport program and our cyclists, who were very successful in Barcelona. I believe this will be a focus and a launching pad to help them go on to greater things in Atlanta in 1996. The velodrome has now been named the Superdrome, and the honourable member knows that because he was at the ceremony yesterday when it was announced. The progress of this project must be recorded because, from the point of view of the work that has been done, the architects, Mr Carlo Gnezda and Sue Campbell, are to be congratulated.

Not only will it provide a focus for cycling in South Australia and nationally, which I hope will encourage young people to take it up as a sport, but also it will provide a home for volley ball in South Australia and also wheelchair sports. It will have a regapol interior surface, which will allow for four courts for volley ball and will also allow for wheelchair sports. I am sure the honourable member is delighted to have such a magnificent facility, which I believe will now become a landmark and probably a focus for his electorate, for those who are living in the northern districts in the area of Playford. I am sure he will be able to use that very effectively to support activities in his own community and also to draw people into the electorate to support the activities that his constituents undertake in a social and business sense. So, I want to thank all those involved. I look forward to the track commencing in the next few weeks and to the opening early in 1993.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** What assurances can the Minister of Labour give that local councils who wish to take advantage of any unemployment relief schemes to be announced in tonight's Federal budget will not be deterred from doing so by the high exposure to workers compensation costs for any injured employees? I am informed that councils will not participate in unemployment relief schemes under existing WorkCover laws because of experiences they have had in the past. Arising from claims as far back as 1987, involving injuries incurred in short-term employment projects, there are 158 claims which have

incurred nearly \$1 million. The deficit in the local government compensation scheme fund is \$900 000 and there are five individual claims of over \$100 000 against Salisbury, Woodville, Port Adelaide, Munno Para and Campbelltown, arising from claims made since 1987.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I can give no assurance that people working for councils will not be injured while working for them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Well, the member for Bragg has a few helpers. I was going to say, before I was rudely interrupted by a chorus of know-alls from the other side, that nobody can give assurances about anybody being injured but, from what the member for Bragg has told me, I would think that all those claims would be justified, otherwise they would have been prosecuted for fraud by the council.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The member for Bragg is telling me by his laughter that the people who have been injured, somehow or other, are working a roat.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Members opposite ought to know that every employer has a responsibility to ensure that they have a safe workplace.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Leader will resume his seat.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** If they have a safe workplace—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is way out of order, first by displaying objects in the Chamber, secondly by walking across the Chamber to give it to the Minister while the Minister is on his feet answering a question and, thirdly, by speaking back to the Chair. I advise him to be very careful with his conduct in the Chamber. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Councils have a responsibility as employers to provide a safe workplace. I have been approached by the Local Government Association and advised that they do conduct a very safe workplace and that they have excellent rehabilitation schemes and a workers compensation fund that is currently in surplus. I would be interested to know that it is now in deficit. As I said, every employer has a responsibility to ensure a safe workplace to see that the supervisors conduct and make sure that employees work in a safe manner, so that they do not suffer an injury. They have that responsibility. If councils are to employ people on a part-time basis or as a result of any other scheme, they have a responsibility as employers, as they have a responsibility to any permanent employees. I am of the view that the member for Bragg is asking a mischievous question.

#### BOAT MOORINGS

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister of Marine indicate what financial assistance can be made available

for the construction of a small boat mooring facility in the Port River dock area of Port Adelaide? It has been put to me by local business leaders that a much needed facility of this type would be of enormous benefit both in the short and long term future of Port Adelaide.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** A number of business people in the Port Adelaide area believe that a small boat mooring facility in the Port River adjacent to the lighthouse would allow people who sail their vessels in the Port River to moor those vessels for short periods so that they can visit the historic precincts of the Port such as the lighthouse, the Maritime Museum, the Railway Museum and several floating museums that the Maritime Museum has in the Port River. As a Government, we have made clear to those people that, while we could facilitate the mooring of those vessels and would be happy to do so, we are not in a position to provide the funds for such mooring facilities. However, a pontoon in reasonable condition has become available and could be used for such purposes if these people are prepared to approach the department and purchase that pontoon. If so, we are prepared to make available facilities to moor these vessels. It is an excellent project and one that the business people will have to provide themselves.

#### STATE BANK

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** My question is directed to the Acting Premier. Has there been any contact between the State Bank and the ALP to facilitate the use of information seeking to discredit journalists investigating the performance of the bank and what assurance will he give that the Government had no knowledge of bank dossiers on MPs before their existence was revealed last week?

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BRINDAL:** I take exception to the words used by the member for Albert Park.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the Chair could hear what was said, it could support the honourable member or otherwise. There is too much background noise.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I seek this information following published reports about State Bank dossiers on at least three members of this Parliament and an article this morning revealing that the ALP *Herald* published material which had been held in the State Bank's possession. This material, written in New Zealand, was critical of the investigation methods of an *Advertiser* journalist who has written a number of extensive articles about the State Bank.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** At one point in his question the honourable member mentioned the ALP and at another point he mentioned the Government. I can only answer to the extent that I have any knowledge in relation to the Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I would suggest that, if he wants to know more about any involvement of the ALP, he ring Mr Terry Cameron. I can give him the phone number if need be. I can simply say, as someone who has been Deputy Premier—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:**—since 1985, that I have no knowledge of any of this and, in fact what the *Advertiser* was talking about can be stylised as files, the first I knew about it was when I read that article. All I would say to the honourable member and the House is that you, Sir, have acted, I believe, with the support of all members in asking for an Ombudsman's inquiry. If there is anything there about contacts with any political Parties to the extent it can be ascertained, I am sure that the Ombudsman will report on it. So I would suggest that the honourable member might be just a little patient and all, if there is anything to be revealed, will be revealed.

#### WOODVILLE SPEECH AND HEARING IMPAIRED CENTRE

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Education advise the House when the newly arrived double transportable building at the Woodville Speech and Hearing Impaired Centre will be ready for occupancy, and what renovations, if any, are necessary before the students can occupy this much needed building?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this matter. I have received representations about this issue from a number of members in both Houses. There was some concern in the community that students at the Woodville Speech and Hearing Impaired Centre would have to be relocated for a period while additional accommodation was provided. That has not occurred; it was found not to be necessary, thankfully so, and I want to thank those officers of the department and SACON who have been involved in providing a new facility at that school and in difficult circumstances, and also in the middle of winter, to provide for the refurbishing, stabilising and so on of that building that has been relocated at the Woodville Primary School. I have visited that school and looked at that program, and I must say it is very impressive involving all the students in that school and the broader school community. It provides an important program in our overall provision of services within the Education Department. I understand that, depending upon the weather, the building will be ready for use by students involved in that program in the second week of September. At the moment the building is being refurbished and a verandah is being added.

#### WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** Does the Minister of Health concede that there is a severe car parking problem at the Women's and Children's Hospital which will be further exacerbated with the physical amalgamation of the Queen Victoria Hospital campus? What will it cost to

overcome these problems, and will he guarantee that the money to provide adequate car parking will not be taken from the hospital budget at the expense of clinical services?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In relation to the last part of the honourable member's question, certainly, I can guarantee that. In relation to the earlier part of the question, I will get an update for the honourable member.

#### REGENCY TAFE

**Mr HERON (Peake):** Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House what the Government is doing in exporting its hospitality industry internationally, given the expertise of the Regency College of TAFE?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in our TAFE system. All members of this Parliament, despite some criticisms made of TAFE yesterday on radio, would applaud the Regency College of TAFE for being one of the outstanding jewels in the crown of the national TAFE system. Of course, apart from being a premier hospitality and tourism centre, it also has a very strong engineering and electronics base, but I want to inform the House regarding the area of hospitality. The Regency College of TAFE has been negotiating for some time and has reached agreement with *Le Cordon Bleu*, the world's most famous name in cuisine and hospitality, to be the South-East Asian and Pacific hub of that organisation. Earlier this year I met with Mr Andre Cointreau of the famed Cointreau liqueur family.

**Mr SUCH:** I rise on a point of order. I think we had the *Cordon Bleu* answer last week from the Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As is well known in the House, the Chair has no influence at all in directing any person in this place to answer questions in any particular way. I am not aware whether the question was answered last week; it may even be that it is the same appropriate answer, but it is not within the capacity of the Chair to judge.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order, and repetition may not necessarily be the same answer. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The honourable member is quite mistaken. Perhaps there was too much Cointreau flowing at lunch time. Anyway, Mr Andre Cointreau negotiated with me earlier this year and again in London several months ago—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:**—on the question of an historic association with the Regency Park TAFE. I would have thought that all members opposite—and they can go through last week's *Hansard* in vain—would applaud this association because what it means is that for years young people have gone from Australia, New Zealand and South-East Asia across to Paris or to *Cordon Bleu's* other centres in London or Tokyo to undertake the *Cordon Bleu* courses and get their diplomas and

certificates. Through this association, they will be able to come to Adelaide and Regency Park College of TAFE.

I think that that is outstanding, because people from more than 50 countries go to *Cordon Bleu* each year. As I have said, *Cordon Bleu* has headquarters in Paris, Tokyo and London and now in Adelaide. Hopefully, members opposite will applaud something positive going on, because this is going to be very important for our TAFE system, important nationally and important for students in this State. Indeed, we hope to market this *Cordon Bleu* association throughout South-East Asia and see numbers of overseas students coming to South Australia. This is an example of two great organisations: *Cordon Bleu* and Regency College coming together.

#### EMPLOYMENT

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** My question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Further Education. With the creation of only 84 500 jobs in South Australia in the past 10 years, compared with 355 000 new jobs in Queensland in the same period, can the Minister indicate what strategies the Government will be adopting to create permanent jobs in the private sector?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am delighted to have this question. What the honourable member has done—and there must be some kind of leadership rumblings, because I understand that the Leader has enrolled in a new media and voice production course to improve his standing after a dismal first week—is confirm that there are now 84 500 more jobs than when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Employment and when, in fact, youth unemployment was 66 per cent higher than it is today.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** When the Opposition has finished.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

#### WOOMERA HOSPITAL

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Health advise whether any decision has yet been made at Federal level about the future of the Woomera Hospital? As the Minister would be aware, the board of Port Augusta Hospital has a direct interest in this matter.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** No, I am not aware that there has been, but we are anxious that that decision should be made. My officers have been in discussion with the Commonwealth Minister's officers about this matter and also with the officers of the Department of Defence. As soon as an appropriate decision is made, of course, it will be made available to the honourable member and to the public of South Australia.

#### NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning explain why the National Parks and Wildlife Service and, in particular, the

Resource Protection Branch at Norwood, does not always advertise positions nor carry out interviews before making staff appointments, and does she condone this practice?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I believe the question related specifically to the Resource Protection Branch at Norwood. I will ask the Acting Director-General of the department for a report on the question and provide the answer for the honourable member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** No, I do not know everyone in my four departments.

#### SEWERAGE

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Can the Minister of Water Resources confirm that arrangements have been finalised to divert effluent from the Murray Bridge sewage treatment works away from the river to land-based disposal?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in this matter. In the budget this year we propose to put \$2.1 million towards the final program in terms of diverting point-source discharges from our sewage treatment works into the River Murray. This has taken some time because we have had negotiations with the Army. The actual treated effluent will be diverted to a 50 hectare woodlot on Army land. There is also the potential for using this effluent for irrigation purposes.

This will complete the Government's program with the successful completion earlier this year of the diversion of treated effluent from Mannum onto the land. It is important to note that it is part of the Government's ongoing commitment to ensure that we actually do remove the treated effluent from the River Murray. I am delighted to inform the House that we believe that that will be completed by the end of this year.

#### GOODSPORTS PTY LTD

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Can the Acting Premier assure the Parliament that the decision not to prosecute Goodsports, a partly-owned Government company, for labelling Chinese T-shirts 'Made in Australia' was made without any political intervention? On 13 November 1991, in reply to a question I asked in this House, the Premier undertook to investigate my statements that Goodsports was labelling as 'Made in Australia' Chinese T-shirts distributed through Adelaide's retail outlets for the Grand Prix. My investigations have now revealed that Goodsports, a part Government-owned company, has signed an assurance under section 79 of the Fair Trading Act that it will ensure that in future labelling is correct. I understand that the signing of such an assurance is an alternative to prosecution with penalties to apply only if there is a subsequent breach.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I suppose that, strictly speaking, I cannot give that assurance because I know absolutely nothing about it. All I can do is, first, undertake to get further information for the honourable member and, secondly, indicate that if in fact the



prosecution is a police matter I can give reasonable assurances in that genre of prosecutions, because I think the honourable member would readily concede that the system in this State and country is arranged in such a way that it is very difficult for there to be any political interference in a decision as to whether or not there would be any prosecution. However, as I say, I know nothing about any of this and I undertake to get the information and report back to the House.

### SPORTS FACILITIES

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** I direct my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Does the Government support the development of a regional sports facility at the Noarlunga Centre and, if so, who will be involved in developing the funding and management strategies for the complex?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which obviously provides a good opportunity to address this issue in regard to those residents of the south. In doing so, I think it is fair to record that on 20 July my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning announced the Government's support for a southern regional sports development plan, which involved a report from Gray, the consultant, identifying the needs and available facilities for the development of sport in the south. Again, I have to say that my colleague has worked tirelessly for those people in her constituency and in the south in promoting this facility and encouraging those in the south to work together so that we can see a sports facility developed that will provide adequate facilities not only for those people to use for sport but also to enjoy and participate in as southern residents.

The area that was identified was the parcel of land near the Colonnades, Noarlunga. The report said that we should look at that for developing a regional facility for sports development. In looking at that we have said that we must bring together those parties directly involved, particularly local government, Federal Government and the sports. As a consequence of my colleague's announcement on 20 July, we took steps to initiate the establishment of two working groups that will work with those particular groups. My colleagues, the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Deputy Premier, are very closely involved in the whole development. Those working groups will work with the sports and the local community to identify which organisations would want to go into such a complex and in the process identify what funds are available to put together such a package.

I am delighted that the Government has identified that parcel of land. I think it is a very good and sensible policy to follow. It is also a very valuable piece of land. If the proposals that come back from these two working groups further formalise these arrangements, I think we will see a valuable facility developed there for the people of the south. All those members who serve that area will, I am sure, be very proud of it and will work continuously to see that it succeeds.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** It has nothing to do with the Liberal Party; you hummed and hah'd.

**Mr Oswald:** We got you up to the barrier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphet is out of order. If the member for Morphet interjects, he will be out of order.

### BUS SERVICES

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. How many STA bus services have been cut altogether from the public transport network before 7 p.m. during the week; why was not more effort put into informing STA users on how their transport arrangements might be disrupted; and is this a further attempt to make public transport less attractive to travellers so that the Government can justify even more cuts to the system?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Heysen for his question. During the day there has been little by way of reductions; it is the night and weekend services that have been reduced.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** About a third of night and weekend services have been taken out. During the day very few, if any, have been taken out; but there has been a very extensive upgrading of services during peak periods, particularly in the electorate of the member for Bright. The member for Elizabeth also has had a transit link service introduced and the member for Albert Park, of course, has had a transit link service introduced. I think that even you, Mr Speaker, have had an upgrading in the frequency of trains on the Semaphore line.

We made no secret of these changes. The general principle was announced in January this year, which is some time ago. They have been the subject of debate in the community for a long time. We have notified every householder in Adelaide of these changes. In their letterboxes they have had a publication detailing quite explicitly the changes that have been made. Also, the daily press has carried a number of stories—advertisements have been placed in them by the STA, and the Messenger Press has also been used extensively by the STA to publicise the changes. I am really not sure what more we can do; I just do not know what else there is to do.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It is with a great deal of pleasure that I am able to announce after the very short time—in fact, two days—of the new transit link services that patronage is already up 15 per cent, and we know from our experience with the first transit link service from the Aberfoyle Hub that there is a great deal of potential to carry thousands more passengers very cost effectively if we target the areas that people want.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will come to that in a moment. I know the member for Mitchell has some interest in that area, and I know he is waiting. So, we cannot expand services in the way that we are, picking up thousands of new passengers and at the same time run services that are lightly used or in many cases not used at all. One thing that has pleased me about this debate since

it has arisen is that now at night everybody has a look at empty buses and trains. We still see them—we will see a third less after this week—driving around and burning up taxpayers' money, paid for by farmers in Kimba. In fact, every household in South Australia is paying \$400 a year to subsidise the STA.

I believe that everyone in this House has an obligation on behalf of their constituents to ensure that that money is used wisely—not to have it used driving around empty buses and trains when the people do not require them. So, I am very pleased with the way that the increased patronage is occurring. It was predicted after the introduction of the first transit link service from the Aberfoyle Hub to the city. I know that members here who have the new transit link's services would want me to keep them posted with the figures, with the frequencies and so on and, if I must, I undertake to do that over the next few weeks and months, because I think it is extremely important that everybody sees good Government in action, and that is what the changes to the STA are.

### FOSTERS ROAD

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** Will the Minister of Transport inform the House about what measures have been taken or are planned to eliminate dips in Fosters Road in my electorate of Gilles? Over a period of time Fosters Road has developed undulations and some quite severe dips. These dips cause trucks to make loud noises, much to the annoyance of residents who live along the road.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It is unfortunate that Fosters Road, because of the underlying ground conditions there, certainly has some considerable undulations. That is not peculiar to Fosters Road, of course. People would know that in many areas in the metropolitan area and extensively around the country, unfortunately, that is the nature of the underlying surface. I could name a few other roads around Adelaide that have the same problem; for example, South Road at O'Halloran Hill, Sudholz Road and Grand Junction Road share the problem. The Department of Road Transport does assess these locations, and we do work on these roads, but it has to be on a priority basis.

Members contact me frequently about particular stretches of road in their electorates, and they are quite right to do so. If the Department of Road Transport were to agree to every request, the entire budget would be spent on providing roads, streets and works of that nature throughout South Australia. Obviously, there must be priorities. I point out to the member for Gilles that, while we are aware of the problem on Fosters Road, the traffic flow is not that great compared with that on some other roads. Approximately 6 900 vehicles a day are carried by Fosters Road: that sounds a lot, but that traffic flow can be compared with that on the North East Road, which carries 43 000 vehicles a day. Whilst Fosters Road is used regularly, it is not heavily used compared with other problem areas.

I advise the member for Gilles that we will be doing minor works on that road to alleviate some of the worst problems at a particular spot, the cost of that exercise being in the order of \$3 000. I undertake to all members of the House that the Department of Road Transport will

continue to monitor, to set its priorities and to spend its funds wisely. The electorate of Gilles will get the same attention as all other electorates and, as funds become available, Fosters Road and other roads in the electorate will be given the attention that they obviously require.

### WORKCOVER

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Is it normal practice of the WorkCover Corporation to post out statements for the payment of 1c, followed up by a mailed reminder notice with the warning of a fine if it is not paid; if so, will the Minister instruct that this practice be stopped? In my possession I have just such a reminder notice which was sent to a company in Glenelg; that company has queried the commonsense of spending almost \$20 to process and mail a notice to recoup 1c, particularly since 1c is no longer a recognised unit of currency.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mount Gambier is again out of order.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the member for Murray-Mallee for his question. I too wonder about the practice whereby some corporations send out accounts for such amounts.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I was going to elaborate: as a customer of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, I received a statement every month stating that I owed 4c to Mastercard. This went on for a number of months until I became irritated and paid the 4c; the bank stopped sending statements. I advise the member for Murray-Mallee that the 1c should be paid so that WorkCover will stop sending statements.

I will also obtain a report from the Manager of WorkCover on why this happens; I would imagine it is a computer aberration that occurs from time to time. I know that the member for Murray-Mallee is very experienced in the operation of computers and knows that, when they are programmed properly, they do as they are told: when they are told to bill people for arrears, they do that.

### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education provide details on efforts being made to develop information technology in this State, especially on the availability of education and training in that area?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I can see from members opposite that there is enormous delight about some more good news. I am delighted to inform the house that Regency Park TAFE, together with the three South Australian universities, will be jointly establishing a multi-million dollar advanced engineering centre for information technology and telecommunication in South Australia. This will enable South Australia to compete internationally in this high technology field.

Members opposite who read the national press will know that there were 32 applicants across Australia for Commonwealth Government funding to set up the

advanced engineering centre—that is, 32 applicants for three advanced engineering centres—and South Australia has been successful, along with Melbourne and Sydney, in receiving these Federal grants.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Members opposite are yawning loudly to show their contempt for South Australian universities and the TAFE system. The Federal Government will contribute \$2.1 million as part of the establishment costs and \$500 000 a year for operating costs for at least three years. Local industries will be able to draw on the advanced engineering education and training offered from the centre. I am particularly pleased with the innovative study pathways the new centre will offer students. Students starting at year 12 can obtain a certificate, which will link them into TAFE diploma courses which can in turn take them on to university degrees and doctorates at the highest level. The new centre will focus on short-term research and consultancy projects.

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

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, in the past two sitting days you have twice instructed Ministers on the use of ministerial statements. I believe that the Minister is making a ministerial statement and thus may be guilty of flouting your order.

**The SPEAKER:** The decision is the Chair's, not the honourable member's. However, the honourable member is correct; the Chair has raised that point with Ministers when they have been responding. I did intend, at the end of the response if it went beyond time, to point out that I considered it reasonable to do the same. I would ask the Minister to be as brief as possible.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** A question has been asked of me about something that is very important for this State—for our three universities and our kids' future—and I find it very interesting that members opposite do not like the news. The simple fact is that they will learn that no amount of media and voice training can actually replace substance.

## LITERACY

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** Does the Minister of Education agree with the estimate made by one of his parliamentary colleagues that the literacy problem in South Australian schools is so bad that 25 per cent of our primary school children are at risk of having literacy problems, and there are no resources to deal with them? The House of Representatives Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training, which is looking at strategies for early intervention to ensure the availability of programs for proper literacy and learning for Australian children, met in Adelaide on 21 July this year.

The Federal Labor member for Port Adelaide, Rod Sawford, who would be well known to parliamentary colleagues and who is a former primary school principal in that district, stated, after taking evidence from principals and teachers, that there had been no rebuttal of this 25 per cent estimate of the number of students who

are identified as being at risk. Mr Sawford also said—and pardon the mild expletive:

Everyone has indicated that, with 20 per cent of our children, we have a bloody big problem. Everyone who has come to us has said this. They have been saying it for a long, long time, yet we have failed, particularly in the '80s, to address them.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I cannot confirm or deny the veracity of that figure, because it is not against any measured benchmark, and that is the great difficulty in the field of education when we are trying to determine the literacy needs of our community. During the International Year of Literacy we saw the dimensions of the problems we are dealing with in our community. It is simply not a matter of blaming teachers, schools or school curriculums. Many of the literacy problems in our community come about as a result of migration programs, specific population groups within our community (particularly itinerant population groups) and children who have severe learning difficulties or who are subjected to other environmental factors that militate against their being as literate as our society would like them to be. Also, we live in a society where, indeed, far too many adults also suffer from illiteracy.

This is a very real concern to our country. As I said, it was addressed in its many facets during the International Year of Literacy and there are ongoing programs in place. I welcome the House of Representatives committee's recommendations. The member to whom the member for Mount Gambier refers spoke to me about this matter the other evening at the launch of the Learning Assistance Program, whose aim is to develop literacy programs within our schools whereby parents are much more involved with their children and other children in assisting in learning programs.

It has been a very successful program that has spread throughout our State and right across this country. It is only the development of effective programs that cannot simply be provided overnight—and it is not simply a matter of spending large sums on projects—that will resolve this problem. It is a matter of detailed and specific consideration, often referring to the specific needs of individual students and their families, and all of that is a most complex task. It is simply not a matter of saying that the House of Representatives committee is right or wrong or that its figure is one that should alarm us or otherwise: it is a matter of addressing this problem in a systematic and responsible way, and I can assure the House that that is what is happening in South Australian schools.

## LAND TRANSFERS

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in another place, ask his colleague to consider deleting the short and long form of proof provisions in land transfer and similar documents so as to bring South Australia into line with witnessing procedures in other States? Like yourself, Mr Speaker, I believe that many members of Parliament at one time or another have experienced difficulty or have refused to witness these documents where the persons concerned not known to them personally and where the short and long form of proof could not be used. I am

informed that the short and long form of proof provisions do not apply in other Australian States.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I shall be pleased to have this matter considered by my colleague the Attorney-General in another place and also by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, as both those Ministries should be interested in seeing whether any reform of the law in this regard is possible and, indeed, desirable.

### THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I direct my question to the Minister of Transport: is the Government still committed to building phase 2 of the third arterial road from Darlington to Reynella, including tackling the problem of the Darlington bottleneck; and, if so, when is the work likely to commence?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes, and as soon as funds are made available by the Federal Government. Phase 1 will start and I am expecting to be able to make an announcement on phase 1 fairly soon, with negotiations now well advanced. Phase 2 will obviously take place after that, 2 coming after 1. I can assure the member for Davenport that the third arterial road is still very much on the Government's agenda. It will be built, but road funds are always a problem. Many members opposite would write to me on a daily basis seeking funds for roads in their electorates, and it is a question of priorities. However, the third arterial road does have a high priority for this Government and I expect to be able to make an announcement soon about stage 1.

### COMMUNITY TRANSPORT

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Will the Minister of Transport tell the House what role community transport will play in the State's future transport plans and will he outline the need for such transport?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Mitchell for his question and for his continuing interest in this area. I believe that community transport will probably be the area that gets more attention in the 1990s than any other area of transport because it will become a more vital part of our transport system. Indeed, in many areas it will be a critical part of our transport system.

It is perfectly clear to me as Minister of Transport that the STA does certain things and it does them very well, and it will concentrate on doing them in a cost effective manner. It will not attempt to be all things to all people at taxpayers' expense; it cannot do everything, and this is where community transport comes in.

The definition of community transport is quite wide. Essentially in many cases it involves specialised vehicles being used to transport the disabled, for example. It is much more cost effective and sensible to provide specialised transport such as access cabs in a specialised service than to attempt to modify every bus, train and tram to meet the genuine transport needs of the disabled. The same applies to the transport needs of the elderly. I have had the pleasure of looking at the way councils service the transport needs of elderly residents in a number of metropolitan areas and it is quite remarkable.

Along with the Federal Government, the Government assists councils in supplying vehicles, and councils either organise volunteers to run these vehicles or make other arrangements.

I notice that the Leader is very interested in this topic. He will know about and applaud the Government's action on the southern Fleurieu Peninsula, where we have introduced a transport brokerage to enable the councils to determine just what community transport is available and can be marshalled in those areas. In addition, members representing electorates to the north of the metropolitan area will be aware of the action we are taking in the Barossa Valley, for example. Community transport will fill those gaps that the STA cannot possibly deal with. On another occasion I will give greater detail about some of the community transport operations already occurring throughout the State, not just in the metropolitan area. What some of the non-metropolitan communities are doing is well worth mentioning. Those councils deserve recognition because they are assisting their community.

There is, of course, one further aspect of community transport that is very topical. I refer to the taxi transit service in the south. The service emanates from the Hallett Cove Beach railway station, and I understand that, although the first couple of nights have been quiet, the service has gone well. As it becomes more widely known we expect patronage to pick up considerably. The service means that people can be met by a taxi as they alight from the train and be taken to their front door. It is a great innovation and a cost effective way of meeting people's needs without attempting to do it through the STA. Once again, I thank the honourable member for his question and I will be pleased to answer specific questions on this matter in the future so that all areas of the State that are involved in these types of program can receive the recognition they deserve.

---

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances. The honourable member for Playford.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** This morning I was awoken very early with the news that Jim Toohey had passed away during the night. Jim Toohey was a man slight in build and at a good age, but he cast a giant shadow over the Labor Party and the affairs of State for many decades. His passing is to be noted with great regret. He was 83 years of age. He is survived by his wife Margaret, and he has other close relatives, although no children. Jim Toohey was a Senator for South Australia from 1953 until a heart attack in 1971 forced him to resign from the Senate. He served for 18 years as a representative from South Australia in the Australian Senate. In fact, that heart attack robbed him of participating in the Whitlam years of which he was one of the architects or engineers who built the conditions upon which Whitlam came to power in 1972.

Before his service as a Senator, Jim Toohey had been State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party and before

that a VBU trade union official. Jim's contribution to the Labor movement officially spanned four decades; unofficially it spanned more than six. The reality is that there is no member on this side of the House who has not been deeply influenced by Jim Toohey, has not been spoken to, counselled and, in many instances, given very valuable guidance by a man who was always calm, who always looked at a moderate perspective and who had a wealth of experience—more than all of us here.

Jim Toohey went through the very difficult 1950s, first, as State Secretary in South Australia and then as a Senator. He left his stamp on more places than just Adelaide. For a time he was appointed by the national executive, because of his well recognised skills, as temporary secretary of the New South Wales branch. Most of the books of that period record his performance well. It is interesting, when one goes through the history there, to find that this man was recognised for his ability to get warring factions together and to find a common path on which all could agree. He used those skills in New South Wales.

It is interesting that in New South Wales and in South Australia the Labor Party did not have the destructive split which took such a terrible toll of the Labor Party in the 1950s, ensuring in some States that it did not see Government for almost three decades after that, and federally it gave the Labor Party such a problem that it did not see Government until 1972. The reality is that the Jim Tooheys of this world set the pace for the necessary reforms that gave the Labor Party Government federally in 1972.

Jim Toohey had a well-known sense of humour. Nine months before he ran for the position of State Secretary he nominated to be a State organiser. He received one vote. He often told the story that if he had not voted for himself he would not even have got that. Nine months later, of course, he was State Secretary, and a well revered one. He has told many members in this House how in 1952 there was a problem with the Senate ticket. As State Secretary he could well have arguably gone for the first or second position on that ticket, but he gladly took the third position. Three out of five and he won that third position. Jim, your mates will miss you.

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

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** I may say how pleased I am to see the Minister of Health in the Chamber, because I am about to give him a report on the car parking situation at the Women's and Children's Hospital, to indicate to the Minister that I do not need the report which he said earlier he would supply. Unfortunately, the Minister appears not to know what is going on with this major capital expenditure. As we know, the amalgamation of the Children's and Queen Victoria Hospitals is an expenditure item of about \$54 million. Here we have clear evidence that there will be an overrun of that budget and the Minister does not know, is getting incorrect information or does not care. So, I would like to give the Minister some facts.

On 6 May, in response to a Question on Notice asked by the present member for Hanson, the Minister said:

The usual occupancy rate of the Kermode Street parking station is 70 per cent to 80 per cent during normal working

hours and 40 per cent to 50 per cent outside normal working hours.

In other words, steady as she goes; there is no need to be perturbed; lots of car parks are available. On 12 May in a letter to the Friends of the Queen Victoria Hospital, the Minister further said in relation to car parking:

... there has been no indication that there will be a problem when physical amalgamation occurs.

I am not so sure of that because, in response to a number of concerns that have been raised with me, I wrote to the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children at that time, in response to having been sent a copy of a staff concern and staff circular in relation to the matter. The centre responded with a number of interesting things, particularly given the response of the Minister on 20 May that (and I repeat):

... there are no plans to build another car park, as there has been no indication that there will be a problem when physical amalgamation occurs.

In the letter to me from the Deputy CEO at the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children, as it was then called, I am told (amongst other things):

... the car park is now full in the early afternoon.

I am further told:

We are currently pursuing various options, including building extensions to the existing Kermode Street facility.

That is in direct contravention to what the Minister has told both Parliament and the Friends of the Queen Victoria Hospital. I find that distressing, because this is a major budget item and the Minister ought to know what is going on. I find it distressing also because there are issues of staff safety involved in proper parking. The issue of staff safety at public hospitals, particularly where shift workers are involved, is of prime concern to me, even if it is not to the Minister, and I am very concerned when nurses and other staff doing shift work are expected, because of a lack of car parking spaces, to walk large distances through dark and often unsavoury places. The Deputy CEO knows what is going on there, because he states:

Because the car park is now full in the early afternoon when the afternoon shift commences, other strategies to enable nursing staff to have access to the medical centre car park are being considered as a matter of urgency.

Why did the Minister not tell us that in Question on Notice 422? Why did the Minister not tell the Friends of the Queen Victoria Hospital the facts? I do not know, and I am disappointed that he did not elaborate. I would further like to indicate that the Deputy CEO states about nurses who go out during their lunch hour and get injured:

... the ongoing management of an injury which strictly speaking could not be classified as work related would be the hospital's responsibility.

Maybe the Minister of Labour should speak to the Women's and Children's Hospital about some potential changes to the WorkCover Act. The basic issues are that the car parking will be an extra cost and we were not told, and that the Minister either does not know what is going on or is getting lousy and/or incorrect advice.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** The passing of Jim Toohey will be a sad loss for the Labor Party in South Australia. Jim Toohey was a constituent of mine and, I believe, a very close friend. In the years that I knew Jim

Toohey, he was a very kind and gentle man as well as a very straight man and a man who, if you sought advice from him, gave it to you straight from the hip. He was a man prepared to offer advice, was the master of conciliation and within the Labor Party was a man well respected across all factions. He was small in size, but he was a giant amongst his ALP friends. Jim Toohey was born on 11 July 1909. He was educated at the Cowandilla State School and employed as a motor body builder at West Beach. He was organiser and assistant secretary of the Vehicle Builders Union and General Secretary of the South Australian branch of the ALP from 1945-1947 and President from 1954 to 1955. He was a member of the Federal Executive from 1948 to 1959 and was senior Vice-President. He was also a member of the West Torrens council from 1947 to 1949. He also served on the Lotteries Commission.

As has been indicated, he spent some 18 years in the Senate. Jim Toohey was the son of a builder's labourer and was, along with his father, interested in the union movement and politics. He was well-known to all of us not as Jim Toohey but as 'Toohey'. In the years that I knew him he commanded respect wherever he went. My first impressions of Jim Toohey were formed at ALP conventions where, on one occasion, there was almost blood on the floor as factional fighting was out in the open. During the heat of the debate he came up with an amendment and defused the situation and consensus was reached. That is the type of man that he was.

As a constituent of mine it was not unusual for Jim Toohey to give me a ring some time on a Saturday afternoon and say, 'How are you mate, what do you know?' and have a bit of a chat. It is well-known that I have a certain volatility about me sometimes, but he was a man that I could go to when I was troubled on issues and I always got a kind but straight response from Toohey. Not only will his loss be severe within Labor Party circles but also within the Woodbridge Retirement Village where he was well respected. He was a man that many people in that village came to for advice—a man who loved his wife dearly and looked after her. It was a pleasure to behold the way he looked after her.

Jim Toohey within the local branch forums of the Labor Party would sit in a meeting and say little. However, when he did he commanded respect and was listened to, and I can remember only one occasion on which Jim Toohey was knocked off on a proposition. One of the issues he often laughed about was years ago when he came to the dining room of this place and was denied entry because he was not wearing a coat. He borrowed a coat from a chap who was about six foot five, wore it into the dining room, and was admitted. The loss of Jim Toohey is very sad indeed.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** This afternoon during Question Time the Minister of Recreation and Sport made an amazing outburst. I thought that it was quite incredible. Again we heard of Labor Party plans to build a southern region sports complex. I ask members to cast back their memory a few years to when the Labor Party was adamant that there was no way in the wide world that it would support a sports complex in the southern region. I, on behalf of the Liberal Party, started to make plans along that line and was accused by the Minister of

Recreation and Sport of wanting to create a Taj Mahal in the southern region.

My mind goes back to the Crome report—a committee made up of local government, the southern region of councils, representatives from the Department of Recreation and Sport and community organisations representing various sportings groups in the district. The Department of Environment and Planning was probably represented on it, along with others, but the point is that it was a very composite committee of expertise that sat down and, over a lengthy period, came up with a recommendation that the area needed and warranted a sporting complex of some sort. That report never saw the light of day. To this day the Minister has never released it. There are plenty of copies around the district. I have a copy, as do many people in local government, but to this day the Minister has never released it because at the time it showed clearly that a need existed in the southern region for some sort of sporting facility.

The Minister and the Government were overtaken by a series of events. Notwithstanding the fact that the Liberal Party made a positive commitment to designate land down there for a facility, some local government councillors got together and formed a committee to agitate for a sporting complex. A football match was put on by the SANFL at the Bice Oval. That was a resounding success. Over 9 000 fans turned out and it was the signal to the Minister of Recreation and Sport to go into a complete panic. On the Monday following that highly successful game the Minister's staff informed Football Park that they wanted to talk, and indeed talk they did. From then on we have seen the Government doing a backflip.

**Mr Lewis:** Talk its head off.

**Mr OSWALD:** It certainly did. It did a backflip, and now it is hell bent on trying to become associated with the aspirations of the local community, which have been identified for years now. The Government has now promised to set aside the land. It was a Liberal Party initiative that we put forward over a year ago. The Labor Party has now recognised its electoral vulnerability and that it must do something for the people who live south of Darlington. The area south of Darlington has been starved of sporting facilities for years. We have seen an emphasis in the northern plains on major sporting facilities, yet it has been predicted that, by the year 2025, almost a third of metropolitan Adelaide will be living south of Darlington. A large number of young families with children growing up to become future sports men and women of Adelaide will live there, yet the Government has turned a blind eye to them.

Suddenly it has done a backflip, as did the Minister for Environment and Planning over the Hackney tram barn. She has backed off because of electoral pressure. So the Minister of Recreation and Sport has done a backflip and is on the bandwagon trying to claim credit for responding to the needs of the southern region. It is the Liberal Party that should take the credit for this. It was the Liberal Party that put this issue out into the public arena 12 months before Labor did. We picked up the recommendations of the Crome report that this Government is continuing to hide. It is the Liberal Party that deserves the credit for it, and we will certainly see that we get it.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Acting Premier):** It is a measure of the grief felt by me and my colleagues on this side of the House at Jim Toohey's passing that all three of our contributions in this debate should be devoted to his memory. Jim Toohey was 83 years of age, and it is somewhat ironic that he retired from the Senate prematurely because of health problems yet managed to live to quite a considerable age. Jim Toohey will be remembered as the architect of the modern Labor Party in South Australia, yet it is typical of the man that, when he was interviewed about these matters for the Labor forum in 1980, he attempted to give the credit to someone else. I will quote from that article:

Q. Towards the end of the 30s, the South Australian branch had regained unity and later on became quite famous for its lack of factionalism. The particular method for maintaining this unity has often been called the 'consensus approach' and even 'Tooheyism'. How did this approach come about?

A. It really ought to be called 'Cameronism' because Clyde Cameron was the architect of the 'consensus approach'. It could be said that together we put it into operation, but he was the architect.

Of course, there are a number of people who were responsible for the building of the modern Labor Party, and Clyde Cameron cannot be ignored; nor can a young lawyer of the time by the name of Donald Allan Dunstan be ignored, or people like Geoff Virgo and many others. Nonetheless, I think most of us who have any knowledge of what happened in those days would want to give the prime credit for that approach to Jim Toohey himself.

There is another sense in which the word 'Tooheyism' was used within the Labor Party. I think it was Mick Young who on one occasion at another of those conventions was heard to say, 'This convention seems to have been infected with an outbreak of rampant Tooheyism.' When asked what he meant by that, he meant that there had actually been an outbreak of commonsense in the convention because that was so much characteristic of Jim Toohey.

Jim Toohey was a great South Australian, a great Australian and a great human being. He was one who was prepared to proffer advice when asked but not someone who sought to continue to operate as some sort of armchair critic. He had enormous experience of the labour movement, both the political and industrial wings and, in the 1940s, both he and Clyde Cameron were extremely well positioned to be able to ensure that the rearrangement of affairs within the Labor Party at that time should be carried out, because between them they represented the two largest affiliates of the Party—the Australian Workers Union and the Vehicle Builders Union, as it was then called.

Jim Toohey saw the emergence of the Australian Labor Party from what was essentially a trade union party to the broad-based political Party which it has become in recent days. Also, if one considers the electoral successes of the Australian Labor Party from the mid 1960s in this State, one has to say that that built very much on the basis which Jim and his colleagues put together in those days. Other members have mentioned Jim Toohey's quiet humour, and his close relative, Glen Broomhill, is well known to us all. If those who did not know Jim well want any sort of hint as to the flavour of his gentle humour, one need only remember Glen's contributions in this place, both his speeches and interjections from time to time.

Of how many people could it be said that they pass on with not an enemy in the world, having been involved in public life for as long as was Jim? That could be said of very few of us, I would suggest, yet it certainly could be said of Jim Toohey. I believe that his funeral will be on Friday. I would be surprised—indeed, I would be very disappointed—were it not the best attended funeral of any ex-parliamentarian in this country for many a long day.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I will spend these few minutes on the problem of autism as it affects parents not only in my electorate but throughout South Australia.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Hear, hear!

**Mr BRINDAL:** Autism, as the Minister has just acknowledged, is a very serious problem, one with which it is very difficult to grapple because the characteristics of the people who are autistic are such as to require great degrees of help. We have seen this Government's commitment to keeping people in the home and giving them a quality lifestyle. It is about that which I wish to speak briefly today. One of my constituents has three children, two being sons aged 10 and six who are both autistic. Before the eldest son was six years old, he was part of an early intervention program and had up to 16 hours per week of personal help. By the time the youngest son came to be involved in the program, he received only six hours help per week. In anyone's terms, that is an overall reduction in help to individual autistic children of 10 hours per week.

Members opposite may ask, 'So what?' but it is considered by people who understand these things far better than I that, in dealing with autistic children, the early years are the most important years, so the more hours that can be supplied in those early years, the better it is for the long-term development of the person concerned. Any reduction in hours, especially in those early years, is critical.

The next matter of concern regarding autism is the closure of the autistic school. Because the Minister has written to me on this subject, I know that the closure of the school was partially triggered by a withdrawal of Commonwealth funds and that the Education Department is doing the best it can within a limited budget to cope with the problem, but I wonder whether that is quite good enough. We cannot sheet home all the blame to the Government, but it seems to be a continual trick of government—

**Mr Atkinson:** We cannot?

**Mr BRINDAL:** No—at whatever sphere to initiate programs, to provide seeding money and then to withdraw from them at a rate of knots when they lose their glamour or appeal and say to the level of government to which it was supplying the funds, 'You've got the baby. You bring it up.' For that reason, I think the Commonwealth has more than a degree of blame to answer, but the State Government is not entirely guiltless in this area because local government often accuses it of the same sort of thing. The school has closed, and that is distressing parents of autistic children because, whilst the Education Department has set up a consultancy service in the north and the south, it is not capable of providing the same level of service as was previously provided.

Some children are happily involved in Ashford School, but the autistic school was seen as a first measure

between that early intervention program and eventual assimilation into Ashford School. Indeed, those parents complained to me, and vigorously, about the much touted negotiated curriculum of the Education Department. It is worth putting on the record that one of the parents believed that the whole process was a sham. Basically, the Principal does not believe he will get the support necessary for the child, so he has spent the past nine months trying to argue the child out of enrolling in his school but at the same time not providing support or suggestions regarding any other school.

He does not believe he will get the assistance necessary from the Government. He knows that none of his colleagues will, so he is not prepared to front them and ask what he will not do. As a result, those parents are left in limbo. They are doing exactly what the Government wants. They are keeping children in a quality environment in their own homes—exactly what the Government wants—but they are not getting the level of support that is needed. I know that the levels of Government support are not unlimited.

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

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for the completion of the Address in Reply and the following Bills:

Supply (No. 2),  
Racing (Dividend Adjustment) Amendment, and  
Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment  
be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 20 August.

Motion carried.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 13 August. Page 167.)

**Mr HERON (Peake):** I rise to support the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's speech. I must say that for three days I have been listening to rubbish from the Opposition. Well, I am going to talk about rubbish, too, but a different kind of rubbish. Australians today are among the world's biggest producers of waste. Waste going to land fills throughout Australia amounts to about 14 million tonnes per year and about 35 per cent of that waste is produced by householders. In metropolitan Adelaide 1.3 million tonnes goes into land fills each year. This is equivalent to 1.2 tonnes per person, and 40 per cent of Adelaide's land fill comes from domestic waste.

We can get rid of our rubbish in three ways: first, we can put it into a dump; secondly, we can burn it; and, thirdly, we can recycle it. We must realise that some commodities, because of environmental problems as well as for health and safety reasons, can be disposed of only in certain ways, so it is pleasing to hear that Canberra, under the National Waste Minimisation and Recycling

Strategy wants to reduce waste going into land fills by 50 per cent by the turn of the century—that is just eight years away. I hope that that goal can be reached.

I said previously that Australia is one of the largest producers of rubbish per capita in the world, and our capital city land fill spaces will have reached their capacity to accept rubbish by the year 2005. Recycling can divert up to 25 per cent of household rubbish from land fill, and composting can divert another 50 per cent of household waste requiring disposal. Australians today are environmentally conscious and waste is a form of pollution. No-one wants a land fill near their home, but that 14 million tonnes of waste that Australia produces each year has to be controlled.

What is needed is an education program to encourage all Australians to avoid waste—and it is not only household waste that is a problem. There is the discharge of waste water to sewers: more than 200 000 tonnes of liquid and solid industrial waste is taken to special land fills and treatment facilities throughout Australia. Areas that should be looked at are waste avoidance, waste reduction, waste re-use, waste recycling or reclamation, waste treatment and waste disposal.

As to recycling, there is a need for a kerbside recycling system to recover from households materials for recycling. There is a need for industry to implement recycling programs and for such programs to be introduced in schools, offices and even here in this Parliament. Commodities that can be recycled include plastic containers, glass, aluminium and steel cans, liquid paper board containers, newsprint, paper packaging and many products. Many waste materials find their way into our beaches, waterways, parks and roadsides.

Sydneysiders alone dump enough glass each year to produce 200 million soft drink bottles and enough ferrous metals to build another harbor bridge. Recycling is only part of the story, but it is important in the fight against pollution and the degradation of our environment. Recycling reduces the amount of garbage, and garbage is a major environmental problem. Garbage dumped into oceans or rivers will pollute the water. If garbage is burnt, it can pollute the air and if it is buried in land fills it is not safe because, as the garbage degrades, much of it produces harmful chemicals that can seep into our soil and end up in our drinking water.

Recycling also preserves open space and, if garbage is not recycled, it will finish up in a land fill. If fewer land fills were needed, more open space could be protected. It is good to see that the Federal Government is setting targets to reduce land fills throughout Australia, and it is good to see in South Australia the Government, through publications by the Department of Environment and Planning, stating the following:

South Australia has led the national push to establish a network of kerbside collection systems and regional sorting facilities which will return recyclable material to industry . . . South Australia has also led the way in establishing national recycling schemes to collect and recycle used motor oil and motor vehicle tyres. By agreement with Australian Newsprint Mills, at least 15 000 tonnes of used newsprint from South Australia will be collected and recycled each year . . .

The introduction of a levy on disposal of solid waste has provided an expanded recycling fund which has given encouragement and financial assistance to a number of South Australian enterprises set up to process recyclable materials. The introduction of a Government purchasing policy has enabled the South Australian Government to take a lead in the purchase of



recycled products and materials, thereby providing opportunities for the local recycling industry and encouraging South Australians to dispose of recyclable commodities in an environmentally responsible way.

The full effect of many of these measures is still to be felt but it is clear that the quality of the South Australian environment will be enhanced immeasurably by some of the measures taken during the past two years. It is equally clear that a new set of ground rules has been established which will enable South Australians in the next century to continue to enjoy a clean and pleasant environment.

Not only have we begun to remedy some of the mistakes of past generations but we have established a new attitude to the exploitation of South Australia's natural resources which will ensure sustainable use of our air, water and soil and the continued good health of our natural systems for generations to come.

It was also pleasing to read an *Advertiser* article on 14 July headed 'Plan to use South Australian waste for energy', and that article, importantly, goes on to state:

A plan to revolutionise waste management in Adelaide will be launched by a consortium of 16 private and public companies meeting in the city today. The plan aims to turn Adelaide's entire domestic and industrial waste into a source of raw material and energy for use by industry and in residential areas. Central to the scheme is an integrated use of existing facilities whereby waste from one industry can be used as raw material for a nearby one. The scheme also would lead to new facilities, such as a waste-to-energy, low-temperature incinerator to burn non-recyclable material. This would generate electricity and the ash from the chimney would be mixed with concrete to make bricks.

The consortium, entitled MFP Services Company, includes some of the biggest companies in the State as well as Federal, State and local government bodies. It also has backing from Japanese and French companies. The company has been jointly developed by KPMG Peat Marwick and MFP Australia. Other members in the syndicate are Adelaide Brighton Cement, Penrice Soda Products, James Hardie subsidiary T. O'Connor and Sons Pty Ltd, Cleanaway, Australian Water Services . . . Japanese engineering firm Chiyoda Corporation, Port Adelaide and Enfield councils, CSIRO, ETSA, SAGASCO, and the E&WS Department.

Initially, the scheme would concentrate on energy generation and feedstock for industries near the site of the proposed multifunction polis at Gillman and residential areas nearby, such as Port Adelaide. But the consortium intends to use and market the scheme as a blueprint for future waste management. Waste that will be treated will include Adelaide stormwater and sewage from the Bolivar and Port Adelaide sewage treatment works.

Products arising from the treatment include:

- Electricity for use by industry, residential developments and to sell to the national power grid scheme;

- Treated effluent and stormwater for irrigation and industrial use;

- Fired ceramics, bricks, pavers, tiles;

- Soil conditioner for agricultural use;

- Pellets for use as fuel in industry;

- Industrial gases, such as methane, for use in power generation, extracted from the Wingfield and Garden Island rubbish dumps.

So, we see industry playing its part in assisting with this enormous problem. Local councils should also be congratulated for their kerbside recycling programs. Schools are also doing their bit and the Government is encouraging recycling initiatives in the community in general as well.

However, not all forms of recycling are worthwhile. In some cases the amount of energy required to collect, transport and process materials for recycling is greater than the need to make a new product. A successful recycling scheme must combine effective collection and sorting of materials, the technology to convert them into a useful product and, most importantly, a demand for the

end product. The cost and benefits of recycling vary from one material to another. For instance, while there is a limited demand for recycled newspaper at the moment, although it is easy to collect, not enough metal can be collected to meet demand. Demand for other materials such as plastic and textiles is still increasing. So, it is no good having a problem with collecting recyclables if there is no market for the end product. If we collect excess paper, plastic, glass and aluminium cans—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is accepted that members should not read speeches in this House. Further, the honourable member is reading a speech that is not his own work; it has come from the Minister's office.

The SPEAKER: The Chair cannot adjudicate on where the speech came from and who wrote it. However, it is the practice in Westminster Parliaments that speeches are not read. If the honourable member is reading his speech I ask him to desist. Perhaps he can refer to his notes.

Mr HERON: Yes, they are copious notes and they are not from the Minister or the department; as I said, they are my own copious notes. During the recess I visited the cities of Athens, Paris and London. While in those cities I spoke to councils, industry and Government about waste management programs, in particular. I learnt that cities such as Athens, Paris and London, compared with Adelaide, all have different ways of removing and dumping rubbish.

Primarily, because of city design and different types of waterways, in London some rubbish is burned in high temperature incinerators. In fact, about 10 per cent of waste in the United Kingdom is incinerated. Incineration can reduce the volume of waste by up to 90 per cent, and its weight can be reduced by approximately two-thirds. There are some hazardous waste materials for which high temperature incineration is the only safe method of disposal. However, great care must also be taken at incineration plants to safeguard against harmful emissions to our atmosphere.

One method employed to achieve safe disposal is the scrubbing of waste gases with water to remove the acid, dust and grit before it comes out of the chimney. High temperature incinerators are also used for generating electricity in those countries. However, the cost of building, operating and maintaining incinerators to the necessary vigorous demands required by legislative controls, especially in the United Kingdom, is very high. Only very large plants or establishments are cost effective and they must operate constantly, 365 days a year. Landfills are still the main method of disposal in England, because they are cost effective.

Paris is using high temperature incinerators as well as landfills, and Athens uses landfills in the main. Landfills are always a problem, especially in relation to location. No-one wants a rubbish dump in their neighbourhood and, of course, no members of Parliament want a rubbish dump in their electorate. Within about a kilometre of most land fill sites, one sees dust and birds hovering, and getting closer to the site one sees papers along the road and, of course, there is the smell.

In Paris, I visited a rubbish dump and it was not until I was inside the perimeter of the dump that I realised where I was. There were no birds, dust, papers or smell.

In that situation, the Government, council or waste management company enters into a lease agreement with a farmer who has land that is not being used. The lease can be for up to 10 or 20 years, depending on the size of the site. The agreement is that the land will be restored to its original condition. The farmer is happy because he is receiving payment over that period and he gets his land back for future use.

Large holes or pits are dug—sometimes larger than two football grounds. Plastic sheeting is laid at the bottom of the pit. On top of the plastic is a layer of sand and a light layer of metal. At the same time, pipes are laid for removal of the gases that the rubbish will create. Rubbish is then emptied into the pits in the normal way from trucks, and it is then levelled by a bulldozer. After a certain tonnage of waste has been put in the pit it is levelled and further sand and gravel are spread across. More pipes are then put in to rid the site of gases. At the end of each working day the rubbish is covered by either sand or metal. So, at 5 p.m. one would not know the rubbish dump was there; there are no birds, smells or papers blowing about.

When the pits are eventually full they are covered with two metres of soil and the farmer gets back the use of his land. The gases which extracted from the site for years afterwards, are transformed into electricity, which goes back into the main Paris grid. Completed landfills in France are also turned into parks, gardens, golf courses and sporting fields. Landfills do not have to be smelly, nasty things that no-one wants to know about. Too many people throughout the world today think only about putting the bin out for the rubbish to be removed. They do not want to know where it goes or what damage it can cause.

I emphasise again that a vigorous education program is needed so that our air, land and water are pollution free. In some areas where recycling takes place I came across a company which was receiving plastic bottles for recycling. The problem was that it ran out of a market because the different colours and ingredients of the plastic were not compatible with a good product. We are all aware that France brags about its wines. However, it realised that the stakes for the vineyards could be made from a melted down plastic recycling program. Innovative ideas can be sought by industry for products which can be used in other areas. For example, the colour and the shape of vineyard stakes were not all-important.

The Department of Environment and Planning in South Australia is on the right track with regard to waste problems in this State. The Federal Government has set its goals for the end of the century. We know that there is still a long way to go, but with a good education program and with the general public, industry, waste management companies, councils and Government working together we can make our State much healthier and safer for generations to come. I support the motion.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I support the motion. I am very pleased to commend Her Excellency the Governor on the dignified and competent fashion in which she performs her daily duties. She is an adornment to the position. I am sure that all members extend to her their good wishes for the future.

It is with sadness that I reflect upon the deaths of parliamentary colleagues, with some of whom I was reasonably well acquainted; others of whom I knew very little. They include Joyce Steele, with whom at one stage I shared the distinction, together with the Deputy Premier, of having been Minister of Education in South Australia, Bert Shard, Bert Teusner and recently Dick Geddes. To each of their families I join other members in expressing condolences on these sad deaths.

Former colleagues have also resigned from the House, namely, Ted Chapman and Roger Goldsworthy. Each of them contributed substantially towards the well-being of South Australia, especially during the time when they were in office as Ministers of State. Roger Goldsworthy, in particular, presided over a period of rapidly burgeoning exploration and discovery in South Australia, culminating in the subsequent development of the massive Roxby Downs venture, which is now contributing very substantially towards the royalties income of South Australia. Indeed, without those royalties the State would be in a much worse position, despite having been described by the present Premier as a mirage in the desert—one of those clichéd expressions which I am sure the Premier would prefer not to have made.

I support the member for Napier more in the principle of the address than in complimenting him on its content, which added nothing to the wit or wisdom of this House. Enough said.

It worries me that intelligent members on the Government benches seem to treat quite a few of the speeches somewhat lightly and it worries me very much that the Governor's address contained virtually nothing by way of progress for the next 12 months but was essentially a legislative program. We are all hoping that in the budget, which will be handed down in the near future, there will be something of greater substance than legislation which tends to curtail rather than to free the lives of individuals in any society.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** In democracies, as the member who is attempting to interject will realise, you are all free to do as you are told. That is really the strength of a democracy.

The matter which troubles me the greatest in Mount Gambier, which is a problem due in no small part to State and Federal Government activities or inactivities, is unemployment. It has to be the single greatest issue in politics today in Australia, if not across the world, whether in Western or developing countries. However, in Australia it is far less forgivable than in third world countries and, indeed, in those Western democracies which are currently in a state of flux where communism has disintegrated and the situation is almost revolutionary once again.

In Australia unemployment has been largely brought about by the single-minded policies of having high interest rates and believing that that one economic policy could resolve all the problems in this wonderful country of ours, which should be among the most affluent nations of the world. Indeed, it used to be in the top two or three, but now it is down in the company of Mexico, Argentina and other countries in an extremely poor economic situation. That is unforgivable. The policies of socialist Governments in Australia have contributed massively

towards our present situation. We should be leading the world into prosperity.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** It is always the case when interjections or excuses offer somebody else's plight as being the real reason. I notice that Malcolm Fraser is still being blamed by Paul Keating and the Federal Government for the problems of the world. Here the Tonkin Government is still being blamed, although he was in office for only three out of 23 years, and that was a decade ago. However, memories die hard. If you are going to blame someone, don't blame yourselves, boys! You will be over here soon enough without doing that. Do not give us any assistance. We will make our own way.

Unemployment has been reported as being very high in country South Australia, and in South Australia generally the situation has been exacerbated over the past two years. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics official survey data, in June 1992 we had 90 900 South Australians unemployed—12.5 per cent unemployment. That compares with 47 500 in December 1989. Unemployment has almost doubled in that brief period. In December 1989, 650 900 South Australians were employed, and that represented 7.8 per cent of the Australian labour force. We generally estimate that South Australia has about a 10 per cent share of almost everything that goes on in Australia, but from the point of view of employment we were down to 7.8 per cent in 1989. That situation, too, has gone from bad to worse, because in June 1992 we had 637 800 employed.

Although the figure has gone down, its share of employment in Australia has diminished to less than 7.4 per cent. So, really, the significance of the comments that are repeatedly made across the floor of this Chamber and in public by the Minister of Employment and Further Education are quite meaningless unless one equates his claimed success to the obvious failures that are registered by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. It is no good saying that we have far more jobs available when our unemployment rate has also increased by an even greater amount. The figures speak for themselves: more than 12.5 per cent of South Australians are unemployed—that is one South Australian in eight.

Another point we seem to be losing sight of is that great emphasis is placed on the needs of the young, and no-one disputes that, but for every one youngster who is unemployed there are seven adults; it is seven to one, and many of those adults who are unemployed would normally be the breadwinners for the young people in the family who are also unemployed. We have an even more difficult situation where the fathers, mothers and children are unemployed, but we never hear anything of this from the Minister, who stands up and repeatedly claims victory when the people of South Australia have a far different opinion.

Today, to emphasise that difficulty further, I would refer specifically to the unemployment problems in rural South Australia. If the Government does not do something about sharing out the resources of South Australia among all South Australians, there will be a continuing and quickening trek of people young and old from country South Australia into Adelaide, and such movements will further compound the difficulties of

transport, provision of essential services and housing and land subdivisions and all those issues that are pertinent to the development of the great metropolises of the world—overcrowded conurbations—when the expenditure of a reasonable amount of funding in country South Australia could keep people away from the metropolis and help the rural parts of South Australia to continue developing.

My own electorate of Mount Gambier, which incorporates the city, of course, in the South-East, is one of the largest contributors to the wealth of this State. I would ask that, when it is framing its budget and listening to the pronouncements of the Prime Minister later this evening, and when substantial funding is promised for housing, railways, hospitals, technical and further education redevelopment and for the request in the recently released Carmichael report, which recommends possible integration of upper secondary, technical and further education and university training within single institutions, the Government will bear in mind that there is a rural South Australia, the people of which should expect quite rightly to share in those Federal Government hand-outs.

A fair share should be made available to rural South Australia, and I simply put in a plea for those funds. I do so in the knowledge that Mount Gambier, for example, has had little or no South Australian Housing Trust housing built in the past two to three years whereas, in previous decades, it could always anticipate a share of housing funds year by year.

The Wolseley to Mount Gambier railway line should be standardised, even if the Government in its wisdom has decided not to accept Arbitrator Newton's recommendation that the passenger rail service be reinstated because, if the line is not standardised, the freight service would also have to be discontinued, or very expensive transfer equipment would have to be provided for loading both in Mount Gambier and at Bordertown/Wolseley for transshipment from one line to the other in very much the same way as used to occur at Albury/Wodonga and other centres under the old non-standardised national railway system. That is the very system that the Federal funds are designed to overcome, to do away with completely and to standardise from one end of Australia to another. If the Government decides not to standardise any of the lines away from the Melbourne, Adelaide, Port Augusta, Perth line, it will virtually have excised the country arms of South Australia's railway network completely from the main lines and they will fold up and simply die. South Australia would then be the only State in Australia that did not have a country railway network.

So, I ask the Federal Government and the State Government to have another look at that. Even a Federal Labor Senator has openly stated that he believes the Wolseley to Mount Gambier line should be standardised and in that he has joined in the plea that I have been making for the past 17 years as a member of Parliament for the Mount Gambier to Adelaide railway line to be brought up to first class condition. It is nice to have some support, even if it is from a most unlikely quarter, and I thank Senator Schacht for that; even if his colleagues did walk out on him at the meeting he attended with the unions a few nights ago, he is not entirely wrong.

With regard to the hospital funding, which I think may be forthcoming in the Federal budget this evening, the Mount Gambier Hospital has been promised redevelopment for about 15 of the past 17 years, dating back to when a Labor Minister of Health promised to bring the Mount Gambier Hospital up to teaching standard and to refurbish it quite extensively. We have had a succession of reports into the need for the redevelopment of that hospital which is 1930s design and late 1950s construction and which is now desperately in need of total refurbishment or relocation and rebuilding on a green field site. That is the current preferred option, because the Government has already acquired the land. In either case, the cost would be about \$20 million to \$25 million, depending upon the size of the newly constructed hospital, and opinion is commonly held that it would be preferable to have a green field site, simply because year by year the operating costs would be far cheaper and therefore in the long run considerable funds would be saved if we had a single storey hospital purpose built on a new site.

It does concern me that at the recent Labor Party convention in Adelaide a motion was passed (it was put, I believe, by the Mount Gambier branch of the Labor Party) calling for the Government not to privatise Mount Gambier Hospital or indeed any country or other hospitals in South Australia under any circumstances. That would seem to be, first, extremely negative. It simply looks at the worst aspects of possible privatisation and, despite the fact that we have been looking for the redevelopment of the hospital and a first class hospital for a decade and a half, nowhere in that motion was it suggested that the Government should get on with it and do it; that it should move ahead, whatever the choice. Simply, a negative attitude was taken.

To my way of thinking, that indicated that the Mount Gambier branch of the ALP is blindly following the left wing unions. It is not interested in the future well-being of the people of South Australia but only in the doctrinaire attitudes and policies of trade unions in South Australia. Secondly, it was a premature motion because the report on possible privatisation or operation of a hospital by regional local government in the South-East, or indeed any other option, has not been made public and therefore we are not aware of the advantages or disadvantages as indicated in the report. The Mount Gambier City Council, the Mount Gambier Hospital Board and the Government itself are investigating a range of alternatives. The Mount Gambier Hospital Board, the hospital executive, the Health Commission of South Australia and the State Minister have conferred over the past several months and would appear to be sympathetic to local needs and to the possibility of other than a publicly built hospital being provided, that is, a Government built hospital being built. They have open intelligent minds, yet the motion passed at the ALP conference tried to close off the option completely.

I for one took it to be an insult to the work of the Chairman of the Mount Gambier Hospital Board, Mark Lampshire, who is doing an excellent job. It was also an insult to the Minister who tried to move a softening amendment on the evening but was roundly defeated, and an insult to the people of Mount Gambier in that the motion was purely negative and did nothing to ensure

that the hospital construction or refurbishment would go ahead with some pace. It was a completely negative motion. I hope that those people reconsider their motion and look at its full implications and, when they do, that they realise they are men of the past in moving and having passed such a motion. I hope that they will have an open mind—although I say that more in hope than in anticipation—when the report is handed down in the not too distant future.

I have other very pressing issues to mention, but such are the times that none of us has time to do more than simply signal problems within our electorates. While I am discussing the problems in Mount Gambier and the problems of unemployment, which I have already passed over, I ask members of this place to realise that, for the first time since the Federal Government's assets test was promulgated, I again have grown people weeping openly in my office. I do not know how many other members of Parliament are experiencing the same thing.

When the assets test was being pushed by the Federal Government I had pensioners worried about the implications for them that their assets would be taken into consideration and their pensions severely reduced, particularly in the country. We now have grown men, who have been out of circulation for months, if not for more than a year, appearing in my office and bursting into tears when they tell me they have been looking for work religiously and, week after week, have been unable to find it. They must keep reporting to Social Security and the Commonwealth Employment Service Office in Mount Gambier and keep handing in their signed statement showing precisely to whom they have applied for employment.

There are some 3 000 people in the South-East currently unemployed and desperately looking for work, all in a fairly confined industrial, commercial and business area, and they feel the absolute futility of having to report week by week. They feel the despair and the indignity as they fail to get work each time that they apply. There is an element of prejudice on both sides with employers tired of seeing the same faces and job seekers in despair of ever being offered employment. One can hardly blame them for shedding a tear when the injustice of the situation gets to them. They have been trying to maintain their pride, many for six or 12 months or more and at last it is getting to them. I feel extremely sorry for these people for whom the Governor's address really holds very little promise. It offers no hope and no maintenance of dignity, because the Government is absolutely bereft of ideas.

For the past decade all members would acknowledge that the major projects in South Australia were those initiated by the Tonkin Government. The present Labor Government of its own initiative has achieved very little. It did not have ideas a decade ago and it does not have ideas now. However, there is an element of almost smug satisfaction or derision by speakers on the Government benches when they say that we are no worse off than we were a decade ago, as if we are not entitled or supposed to make progress in 10 years. They look back to see who they can blame a decade ago. Even in making that claim they are entering into a specious argument. They claim that the present unemployment situation was as bad, if not worse, in 1982.

If Government members care to look at the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for 1982-83, they will find that, in my electorate of Mount Gambier, unemployment was around 1 400 or 1 500 people in 1982 and was around 3 000 in December 1983; in other words, the very Government that claimed that it would resolve all the problems that were being experienced at the time actually saw unemployment deepen after only 12 months in office. Ten years later it has made no improvement at all. Rather than embark on several other topics very relevant to my electorate, I will reserve my remarks for debate on the Supply Bill and subsequent grievance debate. I support the motion.

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** I have pleasure in supporting the motion. As a number of members prior to me have done, I thank the Governor for the imperturbability and equanimity that she brings to her position. I congratulate her on having, in a short period, made the position completely her own. It is gratifying to see, on the many occasions when I attend functions at which she is present, the affection with which she is regarded by South Australians. That affection is totally justified. The Governor has indeed made her mark on Government House in more ways than one.

I was lucky enough to be a participant in a walk along North Terrace which, as one of the major cultural boulevards in Australia, I am very proud to represent as the member for Adelaide. One of the highlights of that trip along North Terrace, sponsored by the History Trust, was going into the grounds of Government House and being shown a truly magnificent sundial that the Governor has presented to Government House. It was a delightful example of the way that traditions build up in South Australia and an example indeed of the ever-changing but constant continuum of the traditions of Government in South Australia. The Governor's speech details the Government's program, and I have to say what a sorry litany it is given the devastated state of South Australia at present.

One of the first initiatives, so-called, announced in the Government's program is the replacement of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology with an Economic Development Board. Given that the purview of the Economic Development Board will be the responsibility for the development of the State's international business linkages, the marketing of the State interstate and overseas to attract new investment, the assessment of future advanced infrastructure needs, and the development and management of major economic development projects and programs, I would ask: what has the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology been doing? Surely it has had responsibility for the development of the State's international business linkages. Surely it has been marketing the State interstate and overseas to attract new investment. Surely the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology has been assessing future advanced infrastructure needs and the development and management of major economic development projects and programs.

It is my view that the replacement of the department with the Economic Development Board is nothing more than an admission of failure by the Minister. I think it is a measure of the Minister's performance that the

replacement of his area of responsibility is one of the first initiatives to supposedly get South Australia out of its devastation. This fate of having the departmental rug pulled from beneath his feet, ignominious as it is, falls to the very man who, the corridor dogs bark, is soon to be given the poisoned chalice within the Labor Party of the premiership—the leadership of a Party which has taken a once proud South Australia into poverty. My only statement in relation to having his department removed from around him is, 'Well done, Minister!'

Another element of the Government's program is a determination to 'boost economic performance'. That is not one minute before time, may I say, and I say that advisedly, because one of the initiatives that will supposedly bring us wonderful advances and economic benefit is a change for South Australia to Eastern Standard Time. Whether or not one is in favour of such a move—and I believe that both sides of that argument will be heard—the much vaunted Little report indicated that the move to Eastern Standard Time is of little consequence. So, I would say, let the people of South Australia not be fooled that all our woes will be resolved when we have abolished the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and moved to Eastern Standard Time.

Further, according to the program, the Government is 'committed to continued reform of the WorkCover system'. I am delighted to hear this because, as the member for the electorate which includes the central business district, I receive frequent calls from people who tell me that WorkCover is an impossible impost on their business. I cite the example of a small store in my electorate in which one of the employees unfortunately received a minor cut on the finger. The employee's response was, 'It is nothing; it is no problem. I will not bother.' However, in an effort to be as good an employer as possible, the employer said, 'No, I think you ought to go to the doctor.' The employee went to the doctor, who looked at the finger and said, 'It is not too bad; let us put a steri-strip on it, and it should be okay.' A steri-strip is a little bandaid. Given that this was a WorkCover claim, what then happened to the employer in this instance is a classic example of why WorkCover fails. Because there had been a claim on WorkCover for the treatment, the employer lost his bonuses and incurred penalties. It cost many hundreds of dollars—towards \$1 000—basically for one bandaid. This bandaid, apart from being a worthy entrant in the *Guinness Book of Records* with respect to its expense, has also resulted in the employer feeling enormous anger and resentment in relation to not only the system but also, unfortunately, his employee. That is exactly what is wrong with the WorkCover system. So, I am delighted that the Government is committed, supposedly, to continued reform.

Further, I have been told of a worker who had a WorkCover bill of several thousands of dollars generated around his injury. Great, we may say. However, when one analyses the Bill, one sees that most of that money went to pay for people discussing the patient over the phone. There was very little client or patient contact, but a variety of people did very well out of the system. I put to the Government, which is, as I said, allegedly committed to continued reform of the WorkCover system, 'Who benefits from a system whereby thousands of

dollars can be racked up by way of phone calls but the client or patient is seen on an infrequent basis?' I put to the Government that everyone benefits except the worker.

If the Government wants to stop this major cost factor in terms of WorkCover, I will give it some free advice, which is given on the basis of what is sauce for the goose is very good sauce for the gander. When I was in general practice, one of the banes of my existence was the person who rang up on a regular basis for so-called telephone consultations. I was always happy to speak with such people. However, a number of people did it on a frequent basis, one of the reasons being that the Medicare system does not allow the doctor to charge for a telephone consultation and claim against Medicare. Doctors can still charge the patient directly but they cannot charge the system. I put to the Government that this would be a wonderful manoeuvre for the WorkCover system. Let the people making the telephone calls charge not WorkCover but the clients or the patients directly. I put to the Government that there would be an immediate reduction in both the number of telephone consultations and the charge for those consultations.

Earlier today I quoted a letter from the Chief Executive Officer of the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children. I am sure that the CEO would delight in giving advice to the Minister if the Minister is really committed to making changes. In relation to parking problems at the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children, now called the Women's and Children's Hospital, he indicated that, if people went out during their work hours and were injured, the injury would have to be paid for by the hospital even though, as he put it, strictly speaking it was not a work injury.

One of the most important and often heard complaints about WorkCover involves the injuries sustained as people get on the bus or fall over in the street on their way to work. If the Minister and the Government are serious about making some changes to assist in respect of this scheme which is flawed fatally in a financial sense and from the point of view of giving injured workers the best possible results for the money spent, there are some ready changes that can be made. I make those points because I believe that one can provide a better service by targeting more money towards the worker who is genuinely injured at work rather than by making the scheme a bonanza for those who provide services to the injured workers. However, I must confess to a degree of scepticism, because previously the Minister has defended the system resolutely, ideologically and unthinkingly.

The Governor's speech also indicates that part of the Government's program is to reduce red tape. That is one aspect that members on this side will believe only when we see it. Perhaps this will be the one-stop shop—who knows?

In his Address in Reply contribution the member for Hayward referred to Shakespeare's four tragedies. I wish to address the tragedy of a once proud South Australia. Recently, two examples of where we as a population in South Australia have been forced to go have been brought to my attention—and they are an indictment of this Government. One father indicated to me that he was very pleased that his 13-year-old son had been lucky enough to be selected to go on a cricketing trip that involved overseas travel. He was pleased and proud as a

father, but he said that he was also pleased because it gave his son an opportunity to look at the lifestyles in other countries and States and because it would enable him to encourage his son to look elsewhere, given that South Australia was a failure as a place to live now and, because of the debts we have incurred, it will be a failure in the future. What an indictment that parents are actually suggesting to their children that they should be delighted to move elsewhere rather than to be proud to live in South Australia!

Another vestige of the tragedy for South Australia is in the medical sphere. I refer to a trainee in a speciality who had been shepherded through a training program, including overseas programs, by the specialist in this field in South Australia. His whole career had been geared towards his returning and being a leader in the field, for the benefit of all South Australians. However, when he decided that his training had been completed and he wanted to return, there were no jobs for him in the public hospital system. This trainee, who has been nurtured by our system for nearly a decade, is now practising in another State. Well done Minister of Health and Mr Premier and Treasurer that such a situation has been allowed to obtain!

We have a palpable loss of confidence by the community in South Australia, and one reason for that lack of confidence is the absolute disaster in relation to employment and unemployment. Most members have mentioned that the unemployment rate is 12.5 per cent—and that is a record—and we all know that the youth unemployment rate is 42 per cent, but Government members sprout routinely that the panacea will be this much vaunted and supposed recovery that we are now seeing. It is a very slow recovery, and my business associates tell me that they are not seeing anything that would indicate to them that a recovery is on the way. More importantly, while we address the tragedy of South Australia, those employers tell me that they have learned much from the recession or the depression—whichever one wants to call it. Those employers—many of them major employers—have indicated to me that they have down-sized (in the dreadful vernacular of today's language) their work force.

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** In other words, they have sacked people.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** They have been forced to sack people because of high interest rates or whatever and they have down-sized their work force. In having reduced numbers from, say, 600 to 400 employees, they have learned that, when they have two-thirds of the number of employees, they thus have two-thirds of the workers compensation problems, the union disputes, the superannuation problems, the payroll tax, the State charges and the 17.5 per cent leave loading—all of which are directly attributable to the State Government. These employers are saying to me, 'We have learned that we are happier people when we have only two-thirds of the problems rather than three-thirds, and we will never go back to employing 600 people.'

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** That is horrifying.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** As the member for Coles says, it is horrifying; it is a terrible picture to contemplate. The long-term effect in South Australia of this recession which has been caused by the Labor Party and which has

been worsened by payroll tax, WorkCover and so on has not yet sunk into the Government's realisation. However, I can tell the Government now, because my business contacts are the ones who will be writing the employment cheques, that employees will never go back to the previous employment levels, the reason being that they get absolutely no encouragement from the Government to do so. The effects of all this are starkly analysed in the 2020 Vision document, of which the Government is clearly proud. At page 12 the situation in 1962 is contrasted to that in 1992. The dot points listed for 1992 are as follows:

- Low population growth.
- Slow economic growth.
- High unemployment.
- Steadily declining real incomes.

Well done to the Government! Still at page 12, the reasons for this are as follows:

National economic and population growth is tending to gravitate to south-eastern Queensland.

The reason for that is that the history of government over the past 20 years in Queensland has been to encourage business. What does this Government do? It keeps up charges and taxes so that business will not employ people. The document 2020 Vision goes on to state (and this is a matter of great import):

The levels of public sector debt are likely to severely constrain public policy for the foreseeable future (10-15 years). That is an admission of what the Liberal Party has been saying: the public sector debt will constrain us in everything we are trying to do to get this State back on track. When the Bannon Labor Government came to office, the net State debt was \$2.6 billion. By the 1989 election that debt had risen to \$4.4 billion. By 30 June 1991 it had topped \$6.6 billion and at this stage it is likely that it exceeds \$7 billion. For every \$1 of tax collected by this Government 47 cents goes to pay interest bills on our borrowings. Every day South Australians pay \$600 000 in interest on our borrowings. A home could be built every six hours, or four homes could be built each day, for the amount we are paying in interest. As Professor Julius Sumner-Miller might say, 'Why is it so?' In my view it is so because of the paralysis, lethargy and fear of this Government. It is a paralysis of thought; the Government is completely lethargic in taking no action; and it is afraid of losing Government in a landslide.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Dr ARMITAGE:** On 3 October Victoria will clearly show the way. It will show that the longer this Government stays in office the more its inadequacies will be highlighted and the more likely it will be that the electors of South Australia will follow the lead of the Victorian electors.

I will very briefly turn to the area of health. I wish to refer to two hospitals: the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwen Hospital. I do not choose these hospitals at random; I choose them specifically because they are the hospitals used by the constituents in the seats of Semaphore, Elizabeth and Napier. Of course, those of us who are political practitioners would know that the members for Semaphore and Elizabeth and the member elect for the seat of Napier—

**Mr Atkinson:** He's not the member elect; he hasn't been voted in.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** I am indicating that he is the member elect for Napier. Those three members prop up this tired, lethargic, fearful and paralysed Government. First, let us look at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. This hospital services the needs of the constituents or potential constituents of two Independent members. A front page article of the Gawler, Salisbury and Elizabeth Messenger Press newspaper last week states:

The number of people waiting more than 12 months for elective surgery at Lyell McEwin Health Service has jumped 305 per cent in the past year—the biggest increase for any major South Australian hospital.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you will be interested to know that 577 people are waiting for ear, nose and throat surgery at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, 233 of whom have been waiting more than 12 months. They are your constituents, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Chief Executive Officer said that the health service of the Lyell McEwin Hospital received 50 calls a day from people wanting to know when they would have their operation. One of the solutions supposedly proposed for your constituents, Mr Deputy Speaker, is the sharing of facilities between Lyell McEwin Hospital and Modbury Hospital. What a wonderful bureaucratic solution. Tell that to someone in Elizabeth who has no public transport; tell those people that they have to catch numerous buses or ride a bike between Elizabeth and Modbury because that is where their spouse has been admitted for two or three weeks. Why does not the Government do something about these people who have no other way of being treated, and who have no public transport? That is the Government that the Independent members of Parliament are supporting.

If members look at the human face of what is going on at Lyell McEwin Hospital, they will understand what I am saying. I have been contacted by a Mrs Vogelsang, of Elizabeth Grove, who said that her 10-year-old daughter has been on a waiting list for a tonsillectomy at Lyell McEwin Hospital for two and a half years. She went on the waiting list in May 1990 and I am delighted to say that because of pressure brought to bear she has been booked in at last—wonder of wonders—for an operation on 25 August this year.

When this person's daughter was booked in and she contacted the Chief Executive Officer, she was told not to hold her breath because the children's ward was full. This is the human face of what the Government is doing. This 10-year-old who has been on the waiting list for a tonsillectomy for two and a half years because of chronic tonsillitis has missed 50 days of schooling this year. The Education Department has written letters asking why she has missed those days of schooling. It is because the Government cannot supply enough money to provide operative treatment. The operation would take perhaps 45 minutes and the recovery would be a week at the maximum, yet the Government cannot afford to do it. It is putting the future of our children and, Mr Deputy Speaker, the children of your constituents, on the line.

This girl cannot attend school. What is the future for a 10-year-old girl, presumably in year 5, who misses 50 days schooling between February and August? That is the human face of what is going on and what is being propped up by the activities of this Government.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is situated close to the member for Semaphore's electorate. The hospital recently indicated that it will close 50 beds, that there will be

extended shutdowns over the Christmas, New Year and Easter period of 1993, that there will be a 25 per cent reduction in outpatient services and further reductions in staff numbers. That is what this Government does to people all around South Australia and it personalises the examples within the electorates of the Independent Labor members.

The people of South Australia believe that this Government has had its chips; it is past it. South Australians want better treatment from a Government so that the major problems of employment and lack of confidence can be answered. The Liberal Party has the answers and I am very disappointed that the Government's program glosses over many of the major problems facing South Australia. We are in too dire straits not to be concerned.

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** I also support the Address in Reply and I congratulate Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell on the exemplary manner in which she carries out her duties on behalf of the people of South Australia. Her Excellency's speech outlined a number of undertakings by this Government that both reflect our policies and address the problems facing this State. These undertakings refer to both the short-term and long-term strategies.

The Governor's address refers to proposals regarding economic development, the MFP, employment, education and training, planning review, agriculture, small business, international competitiveness and trade, WorkCover and industrial relations. The content of the speech has been consistently attacked by every speaker from the Opposition benches. Not one member opposite—apart from the Leader, who made a very average attempt to outline Liberal policy—put up one positive measure from the Liberal Party. They simply knocked and whinged without putting forward one aspect of their policies.

I recall the member for Hayward's attempt to give everyone a matriculation English lesson. It was either that or he was simply trying to show off his knowledge of Shakespeare. There are times like that when I prefer to quote a more contemporary poet, Bob Dylan, who, in 'Positively Fourth Street', said:

Yes, I wish that for just one time you could stand inside my shoes; you'd know what a drag it is to see you.

I can only conclude that, where a political Party has a forum to present its policies and does not, it is either embarrassed by them or it knows that its policies are so unpopular that, if it divulges them too early, it would never be elected. History proves me correct, because when the Opposition finally got into office between 1979 and 1982, its policies were so hapless and irrelevant that the people of South Australia threw it out of office after only three years.

Let us take one of the Opposition's policies—the all-encompassing great white hope of the Liberal Party, the GST, industrial relations and the economic paper known as 'Fightback'. It is probably understandable that the people on this side of politics would oppose 'Fightback', but, when one gets some pretty big players from the Liberal Party's own support base opposing it, one knows that something is rotten in the State of Denmark. Take, for example, National Mutual and AMP, which have squarely attacked the superannuation component. It is not

a mild attack. Those organisation have gone to the extent of publishing their opposition in quite extensive and expensive documents. Further, the Chief Executive of Ford Australia, the Chief Executive of the big Australian—BHP, this country's single biggest employer—have both roundly, expertly and openly criticised the industrial relations section of 'Fightback', not just for what the Liberal Party's policy contains but for what it does not contain—the wiping out of the trade union movement; the genocide of trade unions in this country.

The GST is gradually being recognised in the broader community for what it is. By way of example, in New Zealand, which has a population of approximately 3.5 million, after only one year of GST, retail sales dropped by \$1 billion. Further, the Liberal Party, as part of its GST policy, intends to empower the police, as they do in Italy, to stand out at the front of shops and businesses to check people's sales dockets and receipts to see whether they have paid the tax. That will go down like a lead balloon in this community.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr McKEE:** That is correct. Finally, on this point about 'Fightback', I was appalled to hear that the only response by the Liberals to the young unemployed in this country was to offer to pay them a lousy \$3 per hour. If you want successfully to insult and denigrate our young people, then throw them the bone of \$3 per hour for their labour.

Let us be positive. This Government has recognised the importance of educating our young people. Her Excellency referred in her speech to the expanded role of the Senior Secondary Assessment Board with the introduction at year 11 of stage 1 of the new South Australian Certificate of Education. We will continue to play a key role in the curriculum development for Australian schools. We are attempting to give the opportunity to our young people to have the best possible chance in life by having a meaningful career, not working for \$3 per hour with nowhere to go.

Further, in the area of training our young people for a meaningful future, this Government has led the way in getting the Commonwealth Government to establish a national TAFE training system in consultation with industry while still leaving control at State level.

The Leader of the Opposition has chosen to attack and denigrate the standard of computer education in our schools. Just why he should want to launch such an attack is difficult to understand. It is just another example of the Leader's inability to bring any forward-thinking into his speeches in this House. All he ever does is repeat the same old worn out cliches, the same old worn out political rhetoric for which his side of politics is famous. Where is his vision for the future?

The Leader of the Opposition in his speech said that from year 10 people in Germany are 'trained to take on computer skills that are needed within companies . . . and our system fails completely to match those international standards'. I can tell the House that the Leader of the Opposition's attempt to put down the excellent work of our schools in this area of computer studies simply will not wash. I do not have to look any further than the local high school in my electorate to demonstrate how mischievous and misleading are the statements of the



Leader of the Opposition. Let me put the record straight and at the same time congratulate the Education Department and the administrators and teachers in our schools on their forward thinking in implementing computer studies in our schools.

At Windsor Gardens High School in my electorate of Gilles computers are used by all students from year 8 onwards and across the curriculum. The schools information system and information technology faculty has two computer rooms running up to 50 computers for student use. The computers are networked. Indeed, it is one of the biggest network sites licensed in this State.

In years 8 and 9 all students have between 25 and 40 lessons per year where computers are used across the curriculum as part of the teaching program. In year 10 specific computer courses are offered consisting of 20 weeks of five lessons a week. In year 11 six full-time courses of semester length are offered and students take up one or two of them. At year 12 level eight or nine courses are available requiring full-time contact with computers.

Windsor Gardens High School is running industry standard software. I stress this point because the Leader of the Opposition seems to be misinformed when he alleges that our students, unlike those in Germany, are not being exposed to software run by industry. Windsor Gardens High School has computed-aided design software which is an industry standard package. They are running Windows which is industry standard. Under Windows they run applications like Pagemaker 4, Aldus Pagemaker, Word for Windows, Correll Draw and Quick Draw, all of which are industry standard packages. Students today are working with the same software as that used by industry.

So much for the Leader of the Opposition's attempt to put down our schools with misinformation in the hope of scoring a few cheap political shots. There is no doubt that students in high schools like Windsor Gardens have every opportunity not only to become computer literate, but to work with programs that will enable them to go out into the workplace with an understanding and knowledge of the tools used by industry today. I congratulate the school, its staff and the Education Minister on their forward-looking policies.

Her Excellency made reference to the establishment of an Economic Development Board which will be responsible for the development of the State's international business linkages, marketing South Australia interstate and overseas. This is another step forward in recognising the need to have closer ties with Asia. The Leader of the Opposition said that South Australia should be working towards closer links with Asia and that it would be a priority for a future Liberal Government.

This Government has already created those links and is continually working to maintain those contacts. For the record, as far back as 1983, the Premier led investment missions to Japan, Hong Kong and Singapore. In 1985 the Premier led investment seminars to Singapore and the United Kingdom. In 1986 he visited Shandong Province in China to sign an agreement to establish friendly relationships and to hold discussions on bilateral relations with Chinese leaders to Beijing and Jinan. In 1987 he led another investment seminar to Japan and again in that

year to China to open the Simpson washing machine factory in Tianjin.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold) has also been working tirelessly to establish business and trade connections with Asia. Since the early 1980s the Minister has travelled extensively to Singapore and Hong Kong, in 1987-88 to Thailand and Korea, and more recently, in 1992, he conducted a trade mission to Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam, and Indonesia. I had the pleasure to be a member of the Vietnam mission. If we want to go back even further, it was a Labor Government, under Prime Minister Whitlam, that first recognised China. So, while the Liberal Opposition is talking about what it is going to do, this Government has already done it.

Parts of Asia are growing at a rapid pace. Already our trade with Indonesia and Malaysia is increasing, while BHP, Santos and Telecom have a presence in Vietnam. Other countries around the world are also vying for the Asian trade, including Asian nations themselves. For example, I understand that Taiwan has established over 2 000 manufacturing operations in 14 coastal cities of southern China. I believe that Australia can have a strong future as part of the Asian region, but we must strengthen those ties on a constant basis.

South Australia can be involved in selling our technological expertise in everything from clean air, clean water and traffic systems to waste management. We have a wonderful opportunity on our doorstep and it is a pity that members opposite cannot see the connection between our vision for TAFE, higher education and the multifunction polis in providing not only a future for our children but also a future for South Australian business in the rapidly expanding Asian regions.

The multifunction polis can be this State's vehicle for the future sales of technological products and services to Asia and world markets. Already, an investment consortium, consisting of Adelaide Brighton Cement, Penrice Soda Products, Chiyode Corporation of Japan, T. O'Connor & Sons, Australian Water Services (a joint venture between Britain and France), KPMG Peat Marwick, Cleanaway, SAGASCO, local government and State Government departments, has been formed to examine the feasibility of commercial opportunities for the development and application of our technology. I am getting heartily sick of the continual knocking of the multifunction polis project by either members of the Opposition or misguided community groups who refuse to want to come to grips with the twenty-first century. Well, there are some cases where we just have to drag the nervous nellys kicking and screaming into the twenty-first century.

There was not a lot with which I could agree amongst the Opposition contributions to this debate, mainly because they were negative and knocking, but I did agree with the remarks of the member for Chaffey in relation to the wine industry in this State. The recent Commonwealth Games bid, whilst unsuccessful, was recognised as the best submission, and we were unsuccessful because of the political view that the next Commonwealth Games should be held in an Asian country. The point I wish to raise is that the Commonwealth Games bid unit that was formed to mount our bid has gained valuable experience and

expertise in dealing and lobbying at an international level, and it would be a shame if the unit were to be disbanded entirely.

Already, through the initiative of a ministerial statement, the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. Kym Mayes) has announced that elements of the Games bid unit would apply that expertise to attract world sporting events to South Australia. However, I believe there are many other applications for this unit, hence my support for the remarks made by the member for Chaffey in relation to the wine industry. I believe that the expertise gained by our Commonwealth Games bid should be used to have Adelaide host an international wine show. This would have a two-fold effect: not only would it have a positive effect on our tourism industry both within Adelaide and the wine growing areas from Clare to the South-East, but it would also be the greatest showcase for our wine at an international level. Gone are the days when our friends the poms would say, 'We are just going down to the off-licence to get a bit of cheap Aussie plonk.'

Australian winemakers are being sought in the great wineries of Europe and America. The wine producers of this State have come of age, and I believe their products are as good as any produced anywhere in the world. They should be showcased, and I believe the best way to do that is to stage an international wine event in this city, and I believe that elements of the Commonwealth Games bid unit have the talent and expertise to organise it. Even the most disinterested observer of the Address in Reply debate could not help noticing the stark contrast between the positive input based upon policy and directions from this side of the House and the continual negativism, knocking and total lack of policy from the Opposition benches. I support the Address in Reply.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the motion for the noting of the Address in Reply, and I take this opportunity to congratulate Her Excellency on the manner in which she presented her address to the House when in so doing she outlined the Government's program for the coming year. I note with some sadness the passing of two former members of Parliament, both of whom I have met but with neither of whom I have had close dealings, but I certainly had a great deal of respect for them both as I knew them and was able to speak with them from time to time. I also note the passing of other members of Parliament who have been referred to recently in this House.

I do not know that we have ever been at such a serious stage in the development of any State at any time. I do not know that the people of South Australia fully understand the gravity of our present situation. We are certainly in a very parlous state, and we are certainly moving into a situation of hard economic times and very difficult times for each and every citizen of the State. I looked at the address by Her Excellency to see what we could gauge from that, in terms of direction, how we are to get out of this economic mess and where we go from here. I regret to say that I was saddened that there was not enough direction; there was not enough get up and go; there was not enough incentive there for people to get out and create employment opportunities; and there was

just not that push that is so necessary to address the very hard economic circumstances that we are in.

I think it has already been acknowledged that the State has to pay off some \$3.4 billion or \$3.5 billion to the State Bank, and that is not the end of it. We know that potentially it is more, and that potentially it is as much as \$6.5 billion. Not many people can understand the gravity of that situation; not too many people can work out the figures associated with that. Allow me to use a scenario which I have used before but which is necessary to use to get people to understand the seriousness of the situation. If that \$6.5 billion (the figure to which I have just referred) is divided by the total number of rural enterprises in South Australia (that is, every hobby farm, small farm, wheat farm station and rural enterprise in South Australia), we get a figure of \$451 000 each so, effectively, that potential loss of \$6.5 billion (the figure referred to in this House) has effectively mortgaged every square inch of country South Australia in one fell swoop, and it has all happened over the past two or three years. That is the seriousness of our position.

On top of that, we can add up all the other financial disasters that have taken place, so now we as a Parliament and the Government of the day and Governments of the future probably for generations to come will have to claw their way back from the financial disaster that has occurred over the past three years, and it will probably take three decades to win back the stability that we once enjoyed. We can look at our figures and ask, 'What has brought all this about?'

I know people philosophise and look back at the Playford era and say, 'There were good aspects about that,' and I agree that there were some very good aspects about it. It was a Government of the day that was there for development and Sir Thomas Playford and his Ministers at that stage encouraged development as much as they possibly could. They effectively built the Iron Triangle area; they built Whyalla and in many cases it could be argued that by building an industrial centre in the Iron Triangle, together with the associated industries in the metropolitan area, they worked themselves out of Government. That is what they did, but on the other side of the political fence was the welfare, social security type of feeling. Wealth had been generated in the State and some political philosophies held that all people should share in that wealth.

So, we have gone the full circle from a development approach where the State built up and developed industries and work opportunities to the other extreme of the 'give me' or 'hand out' mentality, which is the wrong way to go. It has become too costly and we have had too many financial blunders that we can no longer afford to pay. There are not enough taxpayers left in the State to pay the tax receivers. This is happening on a national basis as well as at a State level. That restructuring has to be brought back from a welfare mentality to a balance of development and welfare and recognition of those genuinely in need to give them the proper support and services that they require while, at the same time, creating employment opportunities. Until we get that renewed environment, enthusiasm and encouragement to create job opportunities, we will not get anywhere.

Unfortunately, the document presented to us on the opening day of Parliament does not go far enough down

the track to encourage that. There were some good points in it, and I note that paragraph 10 of Her Excellency's speech refers to the Government's commitment to reduce red tape through the review of small business licensing. That issue itself is something that I have pursued for a long time. We should have one small business licence with the appropriate endorsements so that, if a small business person goes to the small business authority, they pay the appropriate fee and receive one licence—maybe a 10 page book—with the appropriate Government requirements ticked off. That single document should contain all appropriate requirements for that person to undertake their business.

The precedent has been set in the fishing industry. Through the Minister the Government has an 'A' class fishing licence with all the appropriate endorsements. That person gets an 'A' class licence, ticks off the appropriate endorsements, works out the appropriate fee and that is it. The insurance industry does the same with its business plans, farm packs and so on. The appropriate insurance requirements are ticked off and the fee is paid at the end—it is a single package. There is no reason in the world why we cannot have a single small business licence and use it as a means of alleviating the burden of red tape on some of our small businesses.

If we could do that, there is a fair chance that almost every small business could employ another person. If every small business could employ an extra person, we would solve our unemployment problem. If every small business could be encouraged to employ one additional person, the problem would be solved. It is an oversimplistic view, but a very real one. It is a matter of job opportunities and an environment in which people can employ. Such opportunities and the environment to employ embraces a whole range of problems, not the least of which are WorkCover and other associated costs imposed upon the employer related to the creation of employment. Frankly, we are in a situation where the hassles of being able to meet all Government requirements, State and Federal, make employers reach a point of throwing up their arms and saying, 'I cannot be bothered'. As long as that attitude remains and as long as people out there say that they cannot be bothered with the hassle of trying to create extra jobs, the present position will continue.

We have to renew that enthusiasm and the environment in which people will be encouraged to employ and pick up those issues. I am not necessarily opposed to the basic principle of WorkCover, superannuation or occupational health and safety, but the costs associated with them retard business opportunities. In many cases an average employee has to earn for his or her employer their wages plus 30 per cent or 40 per cent; in some high risk industries it can be plus 100 per cent, and in the mining industry it can be as high as plus 230 per cent.

I cite the example of an employee on \$500 per week—it would be more in the mining industry—plus 230 per cent. The employee must return something like \$1 800 or thereabouts before the employer can break even and, unless he does that, there is no incentive for the employer to create that job. That applies in everything, so we must be able to assess the work-related package in the cost of employment because it is not simply a case of wages—it is wages plus all of the add-

on costs. On top of that there are other things such as equipment, vehicles and whatever else is necessary. It is the individual costs related to employment that make it difficult for anyone to take on those jobs.

Her Excellency mentioned a number of other aspects that need to be referred to, including the rural sector. It can be reported that reasonable opportunities face us in this coming harvest. For many years I have stood in this House and said that in my electorate we have had terrible years, but on this occasion the bulk of my electorate is facing an average or above average return. The northern part of my electorate is more uncertain and, as we go further to the north-west between Streaky Bay and Ceduna, some areas are quite devastated, and in many areas they will be lucky to get back their seed. In a few areas there will be almost no return from cereal crops at all. In those pockets individual farmers are facing dire circumstances, but in the bulk of my electorate on the southern part of the peninsula the crop prospects look good and the feed prospects on the peninsula also look reasonably good.

All we can hope for is an improvement in commodity prices. The wool price is not the best at the moment. It has been low and slipped a little last week. Unless it improves, wool growers will be facing a very difficult time for the next two to three years. However, it is known that the wool production will under-supply consumption for this year by approximately 20 per cent. Each time that occurs, there is a gradual whittling down of the stockpile, and we all know that the sooner that stockpile goes, the better, because we can settle down to a reasonable marketing procedure.

Grain prices are a little more uncertain. They seem to be fluctuating widely, but it is fair to say that the prices predicted now are better than those predicted at this time last year, even though from August-September until harvest time last year there was a massive escalation in price, which was an absolute saviour to many of the farmers at that time. So, they are the aspects which, hopefully, will provide some stability in the future.

Before I leave agricultural issues, I wish to stress again the importance of the rural sector in not only the revival but some would say the survival of this State. No other industry has the ability to recover as quickly as the rural industry. The manufacturing industry cannot recover and create a cash flow for the State anywhere near the degree to which the rural industry can recover. Similarly, if we were to set about a new industry, irrespective of what that new industry might be, the lead time down the track before that became a net wealth generator would be a long way away, so we are talking about many years. The MFP was referred to today. Whilst the concept might have some value, it will be many years down the track before it becomes a net wealth generator for the State. So, whilst it is good to have those long-term visions in the back of our mind, they are not the answer to the immediate problems besetting us at this time.

One of the dilemmas that has occurred in the rural sector—and not many people really come to grips with it—is the machinery run down, which involves so many farmers. We know that 10 years ago on average about 13 000 new headers were being sold in Australia. I doubt that the figure in the past few years has even topped 3 000. Farm machinery is ageing; in other words, farmers

have been patching up the old equipment to keep it going, but the time is rapidly coming when the old equipment will not be able to keep going and farmers will not have the ability to replace it with new machinery, first because no manufacturers will be left in Australia and, secondly, because the price is way out of all proportion compared with the work that that machinery undertakes on the average size farm.

These days people can pay up to \$250 000 for a large, self-propelled header. The amount of money involved in the machinery can be as much as the farm is worth. A tractor and tillage equipment to plant a crop with a large header could cost the same sort of money, so it is not unreasonable on a large grain farming property that there would be \$500 000 worth of equipment in the machinery shed, including the large tractor, header, seeding equipment—and \$40 000 for an air seeder is a fairly common figure. So the crunch is coming. Farmers can no longer afford that sort of equipment. The farming operations must be restructured. Do we go from the individual farmer with his individually owned equipment into a sharing or contract arrangement? South Australia does not lend itself to that.

We do not have a long harvest period. It is not as though contractors could start in the north-west and move to the south-east over a six month harvest period. That opportunity is not afforded to us: our harvest period for cereals is about six weeks, so all the grain in the State has to be taken off in that period. Therefore, it is not practical to go to the contractor system. Whether we ensure that manufacturers produce a machine that is more applicable to our rural properties is another question. It does not take too much to work out that, unless the equipment is available and at a price commensurate with the returns of the producer, dramatic and radical changes will have to take place in the rural sector.

There are many other aspects that flow from that, including lost job opportunities. Where do they go? All those returns, or lack of returns, need to be balanced. Interest rates must continue to decrease. That factor has been of considerable advantage to many people in recent times, but now comes the dilemma whether the Australian dollar will be able to be kept low. If it comes down, will interest rates go up commensurately? Farmers face all those variables at all times.

The effect of the rural recession has been felt in many other intangible ways. The average age of farmers is a matter of great concern. The required numbers of younger people are not moving onto farms, with new farming technologies. The average age of farmers is about 57 or 58 years thus there will be a crunch point when we do not have the younger generation. We desperately need a young farmer establishment scheme or a first farmer establishment scheme or something like that to encourage the younger generation to remain on the land, otherwise they will move off to Roxby Downs or to the metropolitan area, compounding the problems there, taking with them the expertise of their family. The appropriate expertise will not remain on the farms with the young land managers.

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

## STATE BANK

**The SPEAKER:** I lay on the table the response from the Ombudsman on the matter of personal files held on members of Parliament by the State Bank, together with a letter from Ian Kowalick, an employee of the bank.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption resumed.

**Mr BLACKER:** Prior to the dinner adjournment, I was talking about some of the long-lasting effects of the rural recession and the impact they will have not only on machinery agents and manufacturers but more particularly on the ability of farmers to replace their ageing machinery. Of course, the problem is more serious than that—it is only part of the story—because the loss of manufacturing and service industry jobs and the loss of cash flow within the rural communities have serious impacts on sporting teams, health, education and just about every other aspect of rural community life.

Health services in country areas are no better now than they were 30 years ago in terms of accessibility and, unfortunately, the more stringent requirements in relation to access to the Patients Assistance Travel Scheme (PATS) have meant that many people are becoming more and more isolated. But, it is not all like that: it is not as though everyone has given up the ghost. People in the rural community are starting to fight back, and the challenge for those rural communities is such that they are knocking down to fight back and demonstrate that they will not take this depression lightly. It is worth noting that only one person in five now lives in rural Australia; only one in three lives outside the metropolitan area; more than 85 per cent live within 80 kilometres of the sea; and more than 60 per cent are concentrated in the six State capitals.

While these blunt statistics demonstrate the electoral vulnerability of rural Australia, they also hide a malicious population exodus which threatens the current infrastructure of a growing number of towns and cities in the bush. If these trends are allowed to continue, it will not only be Australian soils and pastures that erode and decay—rural towns will also become barren and abandoned wastelands.

I wish to make particular reference to a couple of groups that have been established in my electorate. I will refer to one now and the other later. One group has been established at Tumby Bay. The community met and decided not to take the issue lying down; it decided to fight back. The determination to get up and go was sparked by a rather adverse article in the *Advertiser* about 12 months ago which referred to the dying town of Tumby Bay. That article incensed the local people, who knew that it was not true and decided to do something about it. The community has met on a number of occasions and has held well researched and deep thinking meetings. In turn, a series of independent subcommittees have been set up to tackle the respective areas of concern in the community. That community is fighting back.

I am concerned because that group recently invited the *Advertiser* to return to have another look at what the

Tumby Bay community was all about. The *Advertiser* would be shown that the community was not a dying town but a town with the get-up, the go and the wherewithal to make a go of it. The sad part is that the *Advertiser* management, because of financial reasons, chose not to allow the journalist to visit Tumby Bay. On the one hand, we have a community that has effectively been kicked in the guts yet, on the other hand, when the reverse side of the coin was there to be seen and demonstrated, Tumby Bay was no longer a newsworthy issue, because the community had knuckled down and had been prepared to get up and go. I hope that the *Advertiser* will review its attitude and ensure that what is really occurring within the Tumby Bay community is properly recorded. I believe that that sort of example of failing to recognise a situation or to report it accurately should not be repeated.

In 1986 the Wudinna community lobbied strongly for a rural counsellor and was successful; it identified that there was a problem in the area. Since 1987 the Central Eyre Development Organisation (CEDO) has tackled economic problems in the district, many caused by the drought in the early and mid-1980s. Many social problems were unsolved and were worsening. There was considerable loss of Government services, unemployment was climbing, farming families and youths were leaving and the community was losing its self esteem. The problems were highlighted at a public meeting in February this year, when more than 120 locals met to voice their concerns. The meeting prompted the establishment of the Directions Group, concerning which one reads the following report:

'We've started to give the community some direction—a base from which the region can be developed so we can attract more Government services, more tourists,' she says.

Directions Group Chairman, Malcolm Heddle, says the group works well and exchanges ideas with existing groups such as CEDO and the local tourist centre.

'We all share a common goal—the future of the region. It makes sense that we work together and share our ideas and enthusiasm,' he says. 'Government money has been more readily available because we have consolidated.'

I refer members to a series of articles in the Rural Times section of the *Australian Farm Journal*, where reference is made to a number of communities—both within South Australia and across the nation—accepting the challenge of deciding that they are not going to take the recession lying down and will demonstrate that they have the wherewithal and the will to fight back. I applaud what those two groups are doing in my community. They are leading this State and this nation as community organisations that have demonstrated their willingness to get up and go.

Finally, I wish to refer to a development that hopefully will be under way very shortly, namely, the Wallaroo to Cowell ferry project. That project has enormous potential for South Australia and for the Eyre Peninsula. The bread and butter of the enterprise involves heavy haulage transport between Melbourne and Perth. The figures I have seen demonstrate that the project will succeed. A number of very large organisations are involved in the final fine tuning of the package, and a short list is being established comprising not only the financial backers but also the management companies that may well be involved in the final analysis. At the present time the

project is awaiting finalisation of the environmental impact statement.

I am absolutely amazed at the nature of the questions being asked. I trust that with careful working through of those questions and reasonable explanations the project will not be halted in any way. I can only hope that the Government and Minister of the day will see fit to ensure that fair competition or a fair appraisal of the project is allowed. If the project can get up, it can breathe new life into Eyre Peninsula. It can ensure that new services are readily available and it will make Port Lincoln and the Eyre Peninsula a weekend destination for tourists. It will open the transport corridor to a new and different form of transport and provide for the area many opportunities that are now just too far away from the major commercial centre of the State. I trust that that project will get going. I support the motion.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** It is nice to be last sometimes. I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on the way that she serves this State and fulfils her office with pride and dignity as far as the citizens of South Australia are concerned. On a previous occasion I expressed my appreciation and at the same time my condolences on the loss to our community of the Hon. Joyce Steele and the Hon. Bert Shard. Today the House showed its respect with a two-minute silence at the passing of the Hon. Dick Geddes. I did not choose that occasion to say anything, because I knew that the opportunity would arise this evening.

I should like to convey my condolences to the family by having my remarks recorded in *Hansard* now, even though I expressed them in person at the funeral. Dick Geddes was a man for whom I had great respect. He had a good corporate brain and was loyal to his cause and his personal beliefs. He stuck to his guns when things were tough—something which many in this place do not do. By doing that I believe he gained greater respect from those who knew him well and who then knew him even better. Even when people have to stand firm on an issue and pay a penalty, they lose nothing in the long term.

I want to record to Mr Geddes' family, to Pam, the children and the grandchildren, my respect for his attitude, his contribution to the Parliament, to the political Party to which I belong and to his own local community, whether in sporting, soil conservation, business or church activities to which he contributed so much. I am sure that Pam and her family will always be proud of the contribution that he made and also of the way in which he served this country as a serviceman. I suppose that is where kind words stop when we think about the position of this State. Somebody asked me recently what this Government could do for the worker.

**Mr Such:** Resign.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I told them that. I said that the best thing that it could do was resign, and I think that is true. The Government's own class know that they have been deserted. I do not suppose that any of us ever dreamt that a country like Australia, or South Australia as a State, could ever fall so far into debt or have so many people unemployed. We can grow any crop that is grown anywhere in the world because we have the weather and reasonable working conditions. There is no great extreme for most of the workers or for those who manage them.

We have vast mineral and energy resources, some of which we have not tapped.

We have a continental shelf around this country of 200 kilometres which is equal to two-thirds of our total land area. We have hardly sniffed at it as far as research goes. Yet, with a very small population, we have a huge number of unemployed, and one must ask why. The only disadvantages we have are the long distances between our communities and that our State is a reasonably long distance from the more populous part of the country as far as consumers are concerned and, as a country, the distances from other countries we may wish to trade with.

However, all that aside, there is no reason why we had to end up in the position we are in. It is because the Government had a flair different from that of the Hon. Don Dunstan, who was its previous Leader. His flair was for change in community attitudes, in our social way of life and our morals and so on. That was his flair—a sort of theatrical performance—and he was good at it, but I believe even he would be sad at what is happening to the State. I know deep down he would like to be like Clyde Cameron and come out and say some strong things about it.

One statement he made was true, when he expressed the views on my side of the House or the views of the biggest percentage of the people in this State at the moment. He said that all that Alan Bond, Skase and all these people—even Murdoch—were doing was simply passing bits of paper around the world to make an extra half a per cent or X number of millions of dollars that were not theirs, in the main. In other words, they were paper pushers.

They produced absolutely nothing that would be of long-term benefit to our country. They lived on champagne and caviar and entered yacht races and so on. Prime Minister Hawke went along with them as part of the scene, brother in hand with them. We had similar people in this State and the Premier let it go on. He knew; he must have. They were investing in all sorts of big operations and we know that, right through the history of mankind, the property market has never held for the long term when there has been a boom. Never in the history of mankind has it held, and each and every one of us knew that. If we did not, we were blind to what had happened in the past. So, this flair to get out and be big in projects with the people's money was part of the scene—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The honourable member would know, if he went back and read what I said, that I was talking about the way these people were spending money. If he wants, I will give him a copy of a letter I wrote to Mr Murdoch about six years ago after he sent me a copy of the *News* annual report, which he sent to each member. He did not have the courtesy to answer it, but I told him then where we were going.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I am not talking about the State Bank; I am talking about the flair to invest money. I will not get into the area the honourable member mentions, because an inquiry is going on and I do not want to transgress on any of that. If the honourable member reads back over what I have said, he will see what my attitude has been. Now we have a huge debt, and yet we still

have Ministers who have fancy ideas. For example, there is not a qualm, not even a flinch of conscience when a Minister says to people in the Hills, 'We want to take away the rights to some of your land use—your title—your superannuation, in other words, for protection of water quality.'

However, if we go to other countries, we see that, for example, the European community is saying to its members, 'Your reservoirs should be used for other than just holding water for human consumption, because it has to be purified anyway.' The European community is telling them this, whether it be Ireland, Wales, Scotland or England. In fact, a yacht club has been built on the latest reservoir opened in Carsington in England on 22 May. They have their own yacht club, which is established and has membership and they are allowed to use their yachts on a third of the 370 hectare reservoir. In another section of it there are windsurfers where young people can windsurf, and there are horse riding and walking trails right around its outer perimeter. In fact, the rules are now that, if a reservoir is built, the public must have access to it for recreation.

They have areas where the water birds are allowed to be free from any other interference, except from, bird watchers. They have top class and second class restaurants. They have a car park which holds 870 motor vehicles, apart from those going to the yacht club. They charge one pound fifty for each car park. However, in the Hills we are told that human activity is polluting the reservoirs. In Europe human activity is encouraged around the reservoirs, and they also have many shops of trade around a brand new reservoir. Our climatic conditions are a little different, but not that different that we have to go down the path that we are going down. All around this reservoir in Europe, except at the top end away from it a few kilometres where there is a national park, is agriculture of all types. The only thing not allowed is waste from the piggeries or waste from enclosed sheds for winter stock holding. Waste is not allowed to flow straight into any stream in the European community—that is the new law. It will take time to apply in total, but they hope to do it.

What is the position with water? About 97 per cent of the world's total water supply is held in the seas, two per cent is held in snow ice caps and one per cent is held in the lakes, rivers, the atmosphere and underground. Only one per cent is available for human use out of the entire water supply of the world. The amount of water in the world never decreases but remains constant. It is a reusable item and can never be destroyed, so it comes back to a management approach and people using commonsense.

While on the subject of commonsense, I point out that the Government is keen to allow Craighburn to be subdivided, yet it knows that on bad bushfire days the water supply to much of the Mitcham Hills is inadequate. It is all right in normal circumstances but, when people really need it for the protection of home or life or to stop a fire progressing into another area, the water supply is inadequate. I offer the challenge to the Minister to tell the House whether the supply is adequate, because the next time a fire starts in the Shepherd's Hill Reserve, Brownhill Creek, above Torrens Park or in the Sturt Gorge and there is not enough water we will know

whether or not people have told the truth and done their research correctly. We will increase the population by many thousands in the area, if Craighburn goes ahead. We presently have trouble with the road. The Old Belair Road is already inadequate with queues of up to 7 kilometres long some mornings.

The piece of land to be subdivided is one of the most beautiful pieces of open spaces left in metropolitan Adelaide. It is equal to if not more beautiful than the Belair Recreation Park ever was. When our forefathers said 100 years ago, 'Let us keep the Belair Park as a national park', people in those days took a lot of convincing. It was through the efforts of the *Advertiser* that that land was preserved and the works and efforts of individuals recognised, pushed and promoted until it was eventually declared a national park. Not to deny Minda anything, but it is unfortunate in this day and age that we do not have somebody in the media who will take up the challenge of Craighburn. Even if it were worth \$25 million, that is peanuts given that this State has lost over \$3 000 million in the past few years.

**Mr Such:** The State Admin upgrade of \$25 million?

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The honourable member points out the State Admin upgrade by way of example. But we do not have to find it all at once: at this stage, all we need to find is about an extra \$6 million. The rest does not have to be found for years to come. Minda is looking for some accommodation to cater for its ageing clients. The Julia Farr Centre has wards that are completely empty, with nobody in them. Why can we not say to Minda, 'We are prepared to make these facilities available to you to upgrade a little; use that for your aged until we have the money to buy all the land at Craighburn'?

I doubt whether 10 out of the 69 members in this Parliament have ever inspected closely the Craighburn property. I can understand that, if something is out of sight, it is out of mind. As a person who is considered by many to be more of a pro-developer than a pro-conservationist, I have never bent on this issue.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The honourable member states that it is in my electorate. When I first raised this issue in 1971 or 1972 and tried to stop the council rezoning that was going on at the time, my views were just as strong then. There were no ifs or buts about the electorate I was representing; the electorate was more rural, and the percentages were different. So, I have never changed just for political reasons: I have always believed the area should be preserved. When it was rezoned, it was set down as rural A, to be available for subdivision when all the services were available.

The area contains inadequate roads and water, and it is in the same boat in relation to sewerage, because inspection plates overflow and put raw sewage into the Minnow Creek, which flows down the Sturt Creek and the Patawalonga. At this stage, the area is not ready for development. Our local high school is sending away children; it cannot take all the children who wish to attend it. It has an attendance of 1 300 students. The other neighbouring school is also full. There has been no talk at all of providing extra accommodation to the secondary or primary schools in the area. What is happening is wrong.

Today, in relation to another area, the same Minister (who is referred to as 'logger Lenehan' in the Hills) introduced a paper in relation to a piece of land adjoining the Eden Hills Primary School. Back in the Hon. Hugh Hudson's day as Minister, a house and piece of land was available for sale. The land adjoined the Eden Hills Primary School, and it was for sale for about \$9 800 in 1972 or thereabouts. I asked the Minister whether he would consider buying it for the school, because it had very limited playground area for its students. That request was refused verbally, in a private discussion. So, the next day I went to the Minister and said that I had contacted the person who had signed the contract on the land and had withdrawn. I said that I would sign the contract in my name as nominee and that, if the Minister did not buy it, I would pester him until he did. The Minister was very good about it. He said, 'I know your point. The school needs it; they are short of space.' So, I transferred the contract and the department bought the piece of land.

On the other side of the school there is a piece of land with three cottages and also some vacant land, with a laneway of just over three metres which gives access to the three properties. The STA applied to subdivide one piece of land, of 1 144 square metres, for another housing allotment—that is, a piece of land right alongside the railway line and adjoining the school property. I am grateful that the Mitcham council said that it should not go on with it. The CFS, according to the Minister's paper that was tabled today, said that there should be all-weather access and a minimum formed road surface width of three metres. That could easily be done, but it would still cost a few dollars because that road would need to be 140 metres long.

However, the State Planning Commission goes on with other reasons why it should not be subdivided and supports the council's view. I make the point to those who are in the House now—and I hope they take it back to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Transport—that that school community deserves more playing area. Here is a piece of Crown land—STA land—adjoining the school, and all it needs is to be fenced off and either leased to the school or bought by the Education Department—or we should just let the kids use it and leave it fenced.

I know that the present ALP Government is strapped for money, but it is pretty poor when it will not consider the kids. It has not even approached the school to ask it—the school had never heard about it—nor had I until I saw the paper that was tabled today and the words 'Eden Hills' mentioned. I asked myself, 'What gives?' And that is what I find—anything to get a few bob. The kids do not have a large playing area around that school—and they deserve one. It is on the side of the school and, if a bushfire comes, that area can be pretty hot. So, a bit of open space without a house, gardens and fences would be extra protection for that school.

I now turn to another area concerning the Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Water Resources and Minister of Lands. As long as she lives she will be known as the Minister who was in control of the most destruction that has ever occurred—apart from bushfires—in the Belair Recreation Park (which is now called the Belair National Park). She stands condemned because she permitted more trees to be destroyed in the

Belair National Park than had ever been destroyed in its 100 years of existence. Yet, she does not bat an eyelid.

When I raised this matter and said that eight sugar gums had been destroyed, people went on TV and said that only five sugar gums had gone. I do not give a damn if it was only one sugar gum. But, I can count, and I went back and wrote numbers on them so that I could provide it to people, and I took photographs. Eight sugar gums were destroyed. A couple of the workers said, 'You are a bit slow, because two sugar gums of only about nine inches in diameter were removed.' But, some of these trees, one in particular, were nearly three feet in diameter.

I respect the man who was recently in charge of the park for a brief time (and he might still be there) because he contacted me after this fiasco and said that he would like me to look at a tree which he thought would be dangerous—and it was. It was a sugar gum that was split at the fork about 4.5 metres from ground level. It could have been used as the biggest nutcracker in the State; it was opening and closing in the wind by up to six inches. I take it that by now the tree has been removed.

Then, alongside the Belair National Park the STA used people who were doing community service to clean up some of its area, so it believed; they knocked down a heap of pine trees and, in doing that, knocked down the lucerne trees. The lucerne trees were the feeding ground for the lorikeets, which used to come and feed in large numbers. Fortunately, one of the residents photographed them before the lucerne trees were destroyed. I give the STA credit for saying that it admits it made a mistake and that it should not have happened—that the STA will replant. But when it comes to Minister Lenehan and the national parks, when I raised the matter about the gardens, the story was that the trees were damaged when the pine trees were felled, and they would have been dangerous to the public.

I do not know who fed that story to the Minister or to those immediately below her, but it was not the truth. Those who know are embarrassed that people should pass on non-factual information. I cannot use the word that some locals use. I have a photograph of all the pines that were felled around one of the gums, and not one of those pines fell near enough to take a strip of timber or a bough from the largest gum. So, why were they removed? Was it because we wanted to plant some other type of native species in the area and that these sugar gums are not really in their original habitat? Was that the reason? If it was, the Minister should tell the truth.

The Minister would still have an argument on her plate. The sugar gums were planted by people associated with the park: they were not naturally germinated. We know that, but I thought that the letter I started to read and did not complete the other evening in a grievance debate explained the position very well, that is, that there is some beauty in exotic trees, and much of the beauty that exists within our community is a blend of the exotic and the indigenous, the evergreen and the deciduous in the Belair National Park.

However, there is a group of people who have an agenda to have grow in the Belair National Park only those species that were originally in the park and, in the long term, even the monkey puzzle pines and other types of exotic trees face danger. Why does the Minister sit

back and not become concerned about what is happening? A tree is a tree. We have a Federal and a State Government that say, 'We want to plant more trees to help improve the environment by breaking down the gases and other pollutants that the motor cars and other combustion engines are creating.' There is some hypocrisy in this.

I finish on a note about the attitude in other countries. I found it strange that in northern Europe there is a concern about acidity within the atmosphere, which the trees tend to collect and pass down to the soil, and that causes an increase in the acidity of the water supplies. Some people in our country say that they want 50 metres planted each side of the rivers and streams for environmental purposes, and on the northern continent people are saying that they do not want any trees within 50 metres of the streams because of the acidity being dropped into the streams from the trees. My attack has been mainly in an area that is of interest to my electorate, but the message still stands: there is only one thing this Labor Party, Federal or State (and particularly in this State) can do to help the workers, and that is resign.

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** It is with pleasure that I join this Address in Reply debate. The first matter I would like to raise tonight concerns the growing power and influence but total non-accountability of the media within our society. The power without responsibility of newspapers has long been recognised as a major feature of our society. However, the abuse of that power was tempered in the past by competition between newspapers and the high quality of many journalists. Until Rupert Murdoch came along, newspapers were generally content to restrict their bias to editorials and headlines. Unfortunately, technological change, economic forces and Rupert Murdoch—one can choose which one likes—have spelt the end of competition, fair play and investigative journalism within Australian newspapers.

It is very sad to see the degeneration of the Adelaide *Advertiser* from a conservative but quality newspaper into the appallingly biased and insignificant rag it now is. There is no doubt that our city of Adelaide is the poorer because we have such a poor newspaper, and only one at that. Other members have referred to the appalling behaviour of the *Advertiser* with respect to poker machines: it has totally changed its position within a couple of years.

**Mr Atkinson:** And it has misrepresented members.

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** Indeed, it has misrepresented members in this place over the way they have voted, a matter which I am sure the member for Spence will take up in the appropriate forum. About the only constant thing we can say about the *Advertiser* over the past few years is that it has been biased against the Labor Party. That has been the sole thread in the *Advertiser's* views over past decades. Obviously under instructions from its new proprietor, Rupert Murdoch, the *Advertiser* is now reaching new lows in its distortion of news.

It seems that no lie is so monstrous that it cannot be told by the *Advertiser* in the service of the Liberal Party. No principle is so sacred that it cannot be debased by that newspaper. Sadly, a tabloid format and nudes on page 3 can only be another fall in circulation away for the *Advertiser*. Just as our economy has faltered along



with the rest of the global economy, so too our media have shared falling standards with the rest of the world.

Some notable journalists have recently reflected on the sorry state of the media in their country. In a new book on the British press, the *Financial Times* media correspondent in London, Raymond Snoddy, states:

Three characteristics seem to mark the behaviour of British newspapers: an almost pathological reluctance to admit errors and say 'sorry', a deep sensitivity to criticism and a marked distaste for thinking about the consequences of what they do. Ironically, newspapers which feel entitled to hold every institution in society accountable and to criticise incompetence and folly in the most vigorous and often personally wounding terms have very little taste for being held accountable themselves.

In an article for the *New Republic*, the Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Carl Bernstein, who exposed Watergate, observed:

In covering American life, the media—weekly, daily, hourly—break new ground in getting it wrong. The coverage is distorted by celebrity and the worship of celebrity; by the reduction of news to gossip, which is the lowest form of news; by sensationalism, which is always a turning away from a society's real condition; and by a political and social discourse that we—the press, the media, the politicians and the people—are turning into a sewer.

He went on:

We have failed to open up our own institutions in the media to the same kind of scrutiny that we demand of other powerful institutions in the society. We are no more forthcoming or gracious in acknowledging error or misjudgment than the congressional miscreants and bureaucratic felons we spend so long scrutinising.

The article concludes:

For more than 15 years we have been moving away from real journalism towards the creation of a sleazoid info-tainment culture. In this new culture of journalistic titillation, we teach our readers and our viewers that the trivial is significant, that the lurid and the loopy are more important than real news. We do not serve our readers and viewers, we pander to them. And we condescend to them, giving them what we think they want and what we calculate will sell and boost ratings and readership.

The changing nature of the role of the media in our society can perhaps best be seen in the treatment of the royal family, particularly by the British tabloid press. Such speculation about the state of royal marriages, as we have seen in recent times, would simply not have been published 20 or 30 years ago, I suspect not because deference to royalty has changed but because of taste. Unfortunately, the *Advertiser* has celebrated its decline as a major newspaper by following the British tabloids into the gutter. I refer to a recent article on the royal family with the headline, 'Royal womanising pledge'. Beneath this incomprehensible but irresistible reference, the following appeared:

LONDON, Prince Philip told his son, Charles, he could return to his womanising bachelor days after five years if his marriage failed, it has been claimed.

This is the latest startling revelation in the controversial book *Diana: Her true story*, which is being serialised in the highly respected *Sunday Times* newspaper . . .

Of course, that is a newspaper like the *Advertiser*, owned by Rupert Murdoch. The report spilled into page 2 when the headline became, 'Duke in shock womanising pledge'. There were further references to 'The royals in crisis' on three other inside pages, but there were no further references anywhere to the opening paragraph—no elucidation, no substantiation. For those members on the Opposition benches who have so lavishly pledged

their loyalty to the Queen during the Address in Reply debate, I ask: how can any institution, including the monarchy, survive the continuing speculation and attention given by publications such as the *Advertiser*?

Parliament and the judiciary have also been the subjects of such scrutiny. When every institution in our society is devalued by over exposure and cynical reporting by media hungry for sensation, what will society hold sacred? Presumably, freedom of the press. But, of course, Opposition members have not remarked adversely on the behaviour of the *Advertiser*. In reality, the true loyalty of those opposite is to their political self interest, represented as it is by the favourable treatment given them by the *Advertiser*.

I turn now to another feature of the media which deserves comment, namely, the changing nature of talkback radio. As the print media suffers declining influence due to its trivialisation of news, many people are turning to talkback radio for their primary source of information. Regrettably, gossip and hearsay can travel faster over talkback radio than facts. The rapid dissemination of erroneous information, via ill-informed talkback radio callers and their hosts, is another factor which is making our society harder to govern.

In the latest issue of the *Adelaide Review*, David Bowman points out some of the tricks of the trade used on talkback radio. First, he points out how calls can be manipulated. He writes:

This is really pretty easy if calls are taken in the first place by a producer, who identifies the would be participants, learns what line they propose to take, then relays the information to a monitor facing the broadcaster. He or she can then handpick the next caller.

He goes on:

. . . broadcasters have more tricks than this up their sleeve . . . It seems that the technology allows the broadcaster to break in at any moment he or she chooses, and without any change of voice simply override the caller and cut the voice out automatically. It isn't even necessary to throw a switch. In an ordinary debate you would probably hear the caller's voice continue in competition with the broadcaster, perhaps arguing back, so that it would be clear that an interruption had taken place. With this device in use, however, callers can't contest an interruption and indeed may not even know that they aren't going to air.

When one takes into account also the expertise of the experienced broadcaster, it seems that the apparent openness of the open line may be something of a delusion . . .

It appears that these manipulative and deceptive practices have been employed by a controversial broadcaster on 6PR in Perth, a station wholly owned by the Western Australian TAB, to incite racial hatred towards Aborigines. I believe that we could examine the behaviour of certain talkback comperes on 5AA, our TAB owned station in South Australia. Further, I believe that the Federal Government, through its appropriate agencies, will ultimately have to consider appropriate guidelines for talkback radio. We have run away from requiring responsible media behaviour because it is all too hard, but sooner or later we will have to bite the bullet and demand that the press be accountable for its actions.

I would now like to turn to the state of the economy. We are now, of course, in a recession and members opposite have certainly discovered that, to their glee. We have just heard 23 speeches in the Address in Reply debate from members opposite which have ranged from delighting in either the problems of the State Bank or the

current recession that we are in. I believe it is appropriate that we should put the current recession in its proper perspective. Recessions are a cyclical feature of mixed economies such as ours and in many cases they are a self-cleansing process to the excesses of the market: heaven knows, we have had enough excesses in the market during the past decade of greed, which was widely worshipped by members opposite.

This recession is also a worldwide phenomenon and it is absolutely absurd for members opposite to suggest that the recession is restricted to South Australia, let alone to Australia. Recessions have been part of our history every 10 years or so and, if we go back since the Second World War, we see that the previous recession was in 1982, when members opposite were in Government. In 1973 we had the oil crisis in the Middle East and the associated inflation and recession. In 1961 we had the infamous credit squeeze during the Menzies Government, and in the early 1950s we had the Korean War and the wool boom. About every 10 years in our society we have had a recession, and it is no surprise that we should be in a recession now.

What is different about the current recession is that it has originated from a collapse in financial markets rather than in the real economy and, in that sense, we are sharing this recession with the 1929 financial crash, and it differs from the previous recessions since the Second World War that I have mentioned. It is important that we recognise the contribution that the collapse in the banking sector has made to this recession. Of course, it is related to the commercial property sector, which is also a worldwide phenomenon. If anyone has observed the state of the economy in Japan and Germany, they will be aware that there has also been a large crash in property values, which in turn has led to problems and large losses by many banks.

It is for that reason that many commentators expect the recovery from this recession to be slower, largely as a consequence of the debt burden. In April last year the Reserve Bank observed that a substantial proportion of banks' capital—about one-third on average in Australia—is tied up earning no return for the time being. It is not just the State Bank—that is for all the banks and it is something that we need to realise is a feature of this economy. Nevertheless, the capital position of Australian banks is considerably healthier than in many other countries like Japan. It is also interesting to observe that in the current recession it is the first time since the Second World War that Japan and Germany have really suffered in a recession.

Again, that illustrates the fact that it is a global problem that we now have. The effect of the accumulated bank losses on the current recession are at least threefold. First, because of the problems in Japan, Germany and other countries that have traditionally supplied capital to the world, we can expect that there will be a decline in investment from those countries in the future. That may tend to slow our recovery from recession. Also, as a reaction to the bank losses of the past decade, there is undoubtedly an over-conservatism in bank lending, and I would like to quote from the recent July 1992 edition of the *Reserve Bank Bulletin*, where Bernie Fraser, Reserve Bank Governor, made the following comment:

In our view, the recent absence of any growth in bank lending—outside the housing sector—mainly reflects a lack of demand for loans from business, as well as efforts by borrowers to reduce their indebtedness wherever possible. This should change as the recovery gathers momentum. Nevertheless, it is almost certainly the case that some bank managers are being excessively cautious, notwithstanding Head Office directives. That is to the detriment not only of the borrower and the recovery but ultimately also to the bank itself.

Of course, predictions that the recovery from recession will be slow are not confined to this recession. In his Address in Reply speech of 23 August 1983, the current Leader of the Opposition stated:

When recovery comes in 1984, many of the jobs already lost will not be recreated. Companies will increase production, not by returning to previous employment levels, but through increased automation, greater efficiency, and increased imports. Therefore, unlike previous recessions where recovery has led to a sudden jump in demand, stock shortages and increased production and employment, this is not expected to occur this time. Recovery will be very gradual and will not lead to a sudden improvement in jobs.

He went on to point out the fall in manufacturing employment, as follows:

In 1971, 25 per cent of all employees had jobs in manufacturing industry. By February 1983 that level had dropped to 19 per cent. During the next few years that percentage will be reduced substantially further. The present recession is speeding up the permanent loss of jobs from manufacturing industry, where more people are employed than in agriculture, mining, construction and building combined.

I looked up the actual percentage of jobs in manufacturing and at September 1991 the figure was 18.9 per cent. In fact, the current Leader was wrong in that prediction. Due to the efforts of this Government, employment in manufacturing has held up remarkably well. Nevertheless, I think that the Leader's observations in 1983 may well come true in relation to the current recession. I quoted those figures to illustrate why we should not be too pessimistic in assuming that jobs will be lost forever, as the Leader did in 1983, because it proved not to be the case in that recession and it may well not be the case in the current recession.

I again quote from the latest *Reserve Bank of Australia Bulletin*. In a survey of the current state of the economy, the article concludes:

... the decline in employment over the past two years has had both cyclical and structural elements. This has been true not only of total employment but also within those areas of the labour market where the falls in employment have been greatest... At an aggregate level, the falls in employment attributable to structural (productivity) measures appear to be significant, but much smaller than the general effects of the business cycle.

I do not believe that we should get too pessimistic about change. Certainly, let us all hope that in the federal budget, which is being handed down this evening, the measures that are no doubt being put in train will assist in speeding the recovery and providing the jobs we need for those who are currently unemployed.

One of the contributing factors to the slow recovery that we appear to be having at the moment is the very doom and gloom that members opposite are spreading. As I said earlier, in their speeches every member opposite has concentrated on negative factors; they have made no constructive suggestions. Certainly, the Leader of the Opposition attempted to present a package, but it was full of vague generalities, and I will refer to that in more detail in a moment. However, no-one opposite tried to

suggest anything positive. Indeed, members opposite concentrated entirely on doom and gloom. The fact is that in the past 18 months members opposite have become so used to dwelling on the problems of the State Bank they must be very fearful that at the end of the Royal Commission they will have nothing to say and nothing to sustain them in this place. There is no point in hiding the fact that the State Bank has lost \$2.2 billion and as a result of its losses the bank acquired commercial property, and so the value of its losses will depend on changes in the state of that market.

I should also like to make a positive comment about the present state of the property market. There is no doubt that it has had a very large influence on the depth of the recession that we are in at the moment. In its latest magazine *BT Investors Circle* from the Bankers Trust Australia Group, one of our leading private banks, this was the comment made in relation to property:

Past experience suggests investors have a required rate of return from commercial property of 3-5 per cent above the long-term bond rate. Therefore, any reduction in the long-term bond rate also adjusts investors' required rate of return threshold. This means that, subject to all other factors remaining the same, property values will rise.

They are talking about the current year. It goes on:

Over the past year this 'rise', caused by lower bond yields, has been offset by reduced rental growth expectations. Future reductions in long-term interest rates are unlikely to be offset as they have been in the past and are expected to flow directly through to support property values.

Let us hope that is the case and that we can get some recovery in commercial property values. Then, of course, the losses of some of our institutions will also be reduced. However, there is no point in dwelling upon those losses because all the hand-wringing by members opposite will not change the state of the property market.

In the remaining time available I should like to return to the so-called master strategy that the Leader of the Opposition put forward in his speech on the Address in Reply. The first point that he made was that he would ensure that Government services are at least as efficient as services provided in New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland. The example that he gave was electricity. I am not quite sure what the Leader of the Opposition intends to do about that—whether he intends to move the Latrobe Valley or the Hunter Valley close to Adelaide. We have a fundamental problem in this State. The raw materials for our electricity generation are unfortunately not located close to Adelaide.

The coal that we have at Leigh Creek is of poor quality and is expensive to mine, and gas resources in our part of the Cooper Basin are somewhat limited. One option that we have is to join a national electricity grid, which has been suggested by the Industry Commission, but with that comes some risk with regard to the control that we would have over our electricity supplies for the future. That is a real issue facing this State. What is the Leader of the Opposition's response? He does not have one. He is saying that our electricity is slightly dearer than in the Eastern States. That is hardly surprising given the basic economics of electricity.

One could also say much the same about water. We have expensive water in this State. We have to filter it because, unfortunately, the quality is somewhat lower than in places like Sydney where they have large dams like the Warragamba Dam and a totally closed catchment

very close to the city. We have to focus on the services where we have an advantage. The Leader's cheap throw-away lines about our services being as efficient as services in New South Wales and Victoria do not help at all.

I turn now to planning, because that was another criticism made by the Leader of the Opposition. He referred to tourism developments taking place in Queensland and compared them with South Australia where some projects have not proceeded. One project that immediately came to mind that had not proceeded in this State was Wilpena Pound. Members opposite were quite prominent in doing everything that they could to spike that tourism development, so I think that the Leader of the Opposition has some problems within his own Party. I would also point out that this Government introduced the planning review, which is an exhaustive process over two years. Changing planning laws is not an easy task. It has been a massive task and it is almost complete. Members opposite are now trying to jump on the bandwagon and claim credit for what has happened.

I again make the point that the Leader of the Opposition will have to look at some of his own members if he is to speed up planning on tourist developments such as Wilpena Pound. The Leader of the Opposition also talked about community services such as health. He criticised the closure of parts of hospitals over Christmas. I guess the implication is that the Opposition would increase funding in such areas.

**Mr Atkinson:** That is not likely.

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** As the member for Spence says, that is not likely. Of course, he also went on to the very next point to talk about smaller and more efficient Government. How can we have smaller and more efficient Government yet at the same time do such things as increasing services over Christmas and so on when it is so much more expensive to provide them? The Leader also ignored the impact that ageing of the population will have. His comments about these matters really are a cop-out. In fact, we all know from past experience and from Federal policy, which has been spelt out much more clearly (at least Dr Hewson has had the fortitude to do that) is that there will be massive cuts in community services.

Perhaps the most curious suggestion of all was the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition to increase accountability, and he talked about requiring major Government trading organisations to have their directors comply with the same laws as apply to private companies. I would want far better than that: I would have thought that what we should be requiring from our organisations is far better conduct than what we have seen from the corporate sector over the past decade. Indeed, the Leader even went on to refer to Christopher Skase and Alan Bond. I think his comment was that, if it was good enough for the Alan Bonds, the Skases and others, why is it not also good enough for the directors of Government instrumentalities? I would certainly hope that our directors would be required to behave to standards much higher than those required of Alan Bond and Christopher Skase. Indeed, it seems a very strange point that the Leader is making.

In fact, for every dollar that has been lost and is a bad debt on the books of the State Bank and other banks, a

dollar was lost out in the commercial and private sectors by directors whose standards were obviously less than desirable. I think it is interesting at the moment that we have the Federal Attorney-General, Mr Duffy, trying to increase the laws to require much more ethical behaviour on the part of directors, and I hope he is successful in that; he certainly needs to be. Certainly, we should be requiring much better behaviour of our directors, whether they be from the private sector or the public sector.

In relation to directors' behaviour, I would also like to quote the statement from the Managing Director of Bankers Trust Australia at a seminar held by the Reserve Bank last year to look at the effects of deregulation. Mr Ferguson commented:

... it is clear that the lack of vigilance of some directors in the 1980s [and he is talking here about bank directors] reflected their conflicted role. Often a board seat was in response to other business being done between directors' organisations and the bank. This raises the broad issue of the relatively low level of directors fees and the often very high level of other income that a director of a company can participate in. It is my conclusion that these conflicts are too difficult to be left to directors to grapple with and therefore no director of any company should, beyond a shareholding, gain any financial benefit from his position as director except from directors fees.

I believe these are the sorts of things we should be looking at in requiring ethical behaviour of directors. We certainly should not be relying on the existing laws, which have allowed people like Alan Bond and Christopher Skase to get away far too long with behaviour that was far less than ethical. I should also point out that it was the Leader of the Opposition as a member of this House during the 1970s who opposed the actions of Hugh Hudson to restrict Alan Bond from taking up a major shareholding in Santos. That should not be forgotten when the Leader talks about ethical behaviour.

Finally, the Leader of the Opposition talked about producing a 4 per cent annual growth rate. One would certainly hope we could achieve a growth rate of that order. One of the problems that we all face is with his Federal colleague's Fightback policy in relation to the removal of tariffs. If tariffs are removed, the destruction of the motor vehicle industry in this country is almost a certainty. The textile, clothing and footwear industries will be struggling whatever happens but, certainly, if Ian McLachlan has his way (I notice that in the press recently he has again made comments on it), we will have the destruction of the motor vehicle industry in this country. So, it will be hard enough to create enough jobs for those unemployed, without having to replace all the additional jobs that will be lost in the motor vehicle industry, and we certainly need to do all we can to oppose that reduction. The Opposition has certainly tried to make much headway by concentrating on the negatives.

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

Motion carried.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

#### SUPPLY BILL (No.2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 74).

**The SPEAKER:** Before debate on the Supply Bill begins, I remind all members of the need for relevance and the fact that all contributions must be pertinent to the finances of the State. The member for Mitcham.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** It is appropriate to reflect on the Supply Bill in relation to the Federal budget just handed down. I noted in this morning's *Australian* that my colleague in the Federal sphere, Peter Reith, said that the books are cooked and that he is sick and tired of the lies and cheating of the Federal Government. That is what he said in the paper today and we have a reflection here in the Supply Bill. I will be addressing that issue shortly as we have had a change in the method of accounting by the Government to hide its misdemeanours. It is creative accounting—the Government has changed the rules again.

However, in looking at the Federal budget and what it means to South Australia and to the supply of money to this State, we can conclude that the Federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister have tried to buy the people of South Australia. They are throwing money at the electorate in the vain hope that they will be forgiven for their sins, that people will forget the unemployment level of 11.5 here in South Australia and that they will receive the votes and accolades of the people at the next Federal election.

**Mr Meier:** Where are we getting the money from?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** That is a very good question. We have a \$13.5 billion overhang in the Federal sphere. South Australia will benefit from some of those moneys. I remind members that it would be hard for the Premier of this State to cry poverty under the circumstances. Federal Treasurer Dawkins has provided the State with a 10 per cent increase in the funds available. One would assume that the Federal Treasurer is being unduly generous to South Australia, but he has done it right around the country in the hope that he will somehow repair the enormous damage he has done.

I remind members that whilst as a State we welcome the \$2.86 billion total net payments to South Australia for the 1992-93 year, which is an increase of \$280 million, the job buying encompassed with those larger grants to this State will not result in enduring employment prospects. It is merely a means of getting through the election process with as little damage as possible and with, perhaps, some uplifting of popularity.

No-one is really convinced, with unemployment at record levels, that the budget strategy that has been adopted by the Federal Treasurer will do anything for the country or for South Australia. It is interesting to note that the budget papers reveal that in 1991-92 the South Australian Government borrowed an extra \$1 962 million, or \$1 349 per head of population in South Australia. We have two big-spending Treasurers: we have the Treasurer of this State, who has not balanced the budget since he has been in power and who has run up increasing deficits; and we have a Federal Treasurer who believes that the electorate can be bought with cheap money.

It is interesting to note that, in relation to the problems that could be created, the Treasurer, on one of his budget speech lines, says:

We will make the fiscal adjustments later.

It is a high risk budget which will shove an extra \$14 billion into the economy above what the economy is producing. That is what deficit budgets are all about: you shovel money into the economy in the hope that economic activity will improve. That is the strategy of the Treasurer, and it will not work, because some fundamentals are totally missing from the economic dynamics of Australia. The level of investment by firms will not pick up until such time as they can see some responsibility. The share markets are still waiting with bated breath to see how the international markets will react with the news. We believe that the dollar will stabilise at around 72c against the US dollar, but there is no guarantee.

If the next balance of payments figures are as large as those for the last quarter, we will see further deterioration. Inflation will run loose, and any economic gains that can be produced from a low inflation rate and a low increase in real wages will be rapidly lost. It is a dirty budget for Australia's future, because it is irresponsible to the extreme. Some severe corrective measures will have to be taken later unless the Treasurer wants to see inflation on the march again and unemployment continuing to increase.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitcham will resume his seat. About four little meetings are going on in the Chamber. Members will either resume their seats or, if they need to discuss matters, they will go outside the Chamber. The member for Mitcham.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Leaving aside the issue of the general money that will flood across the border and be injected into roads, rail, TAFE and into areas of job creation and training, I suppose the most interesting item for South Australia is the extent to which our beleaguered hospital system will be assisted. Unfortunately, South Australia does not feature as highly as we would like. However, the hospital system has received an increase of \$11.5 million, which will increase our grant to \$345.1 million for this financial year. It is a bandaid measure, but it is better than nothing. However, I was a bit bemused to see the Federal Treasurer say that, with all these wards being closed and these beds being shut off, he was going to embark on buying beds from the private sector when he did not wish to fix up Medicare, which is the basic problem.

When my Federal colleague, Peter Reith, said that the books were cooked, he was quite correct—the books are cooked, and so is the Supply Bill. The Supply explanation makes quite plain that the Treasurer, the Minister of Finance or whoever will look after Treasury when the Premier returns, will ask for \$1 billion to fund Public Service expenditure—that is, wages, salaries and general running expenses—through to the beginning of November. This happens to be \$200 million less than applied last year. The obvious question is: has the Premier or Treasurer of this State suddenly taken control of the budget? Has he reduced his budget expenditure in order to present a responsible budget this year? But, no: the rules have changed.

The \$200 million less represents a change in attitude and procedures by the Government. The Minister of Finance explained in his second reading explanation that

departments will now be allowed to retain their revenue and offset it against their expenditure. This has a number of impacts. It does blur the edges and we do not really know whether the Treasurer or the Minister of Finance will need more money for this period before the Appropriation Bill is assented to; we do not know whether departments are spending more but will have a means of topping up and offsetting that through increased taxes and charges; and, we do not know whether the Government is embarking on a full user-pays system. There is no explanation.

So, the Treasurer and Minister of Finance of this State jointly stand condemned for not revealing to this House exactly what is happening with the State's finances. The House should note that Premier Kirner in Victoria had the intestinal fortitude to come clean on Victoria's budget. She stated, quite categorically, that the Victorian budget was in a very difficult situation—approximately \$1.67 billion in the red this financial year. But, at least she told the people of Victoria what her budget situation was.

We do not have the same detail in South Australia, and we should have. The Premier and Treasurer and the Minister of Finance obviously must have that detail available, because they are right now madly in the process of writing the budget speech. I challenge the Minister of Finance, during his response and in the Committee stage of this Bill—and it is unusual for the Assembly to consider questions on Supply, but on this occasion we will make an exception—to reveal which departments are allowed to keep their revenue and on what basis this revenue retention has been determined.

Are we now going to a full user-pays system? Are the taxes and charges that are collected by all departments able to be retained by those departments, or are some of them still going into Consolidated Revenue? There was no answer to those questions in the second reading explanation. I demand of the Minister of Finance, at the appropriate time (when we reach it on Thursday), that he reveal to the House the basis of the change in policy, and which departments are affected and which revenues are affected. I can see some problems, because I do not know what the real answers are. It raises the question whether the police can increase their revenue-raising efforts should they be running short of cash. We all know that many people are upset about the various cameras being used on the roads to entrap speeding motorists. We know that all those cameras and devices raised in excess of \$20 million last financial year. However, we do not know whether this new accounting basis which has been introduced by the Treasurer through sleight of hand or the back door will give the police a desire to increase or even double that revenue in order to sustain their place in the field.

So, we could have the black comedy of police officers being taken off rapes, murders and mayhem and put on to speed cameras in order to sustain their budgets. That is one extreme example. Many Government departments have a range of penalties and charges under the statutes for which the Minister is responsible. It raises the question: does the Fisheries Department, for example, spend its time sending out inspectors to catch wayward fishermen or undersized catches in order to top up the fisheries budget?

We can go through almost every Government department and find areas in which those departments have the capacity to increase their revenue through increased surveillance and inspectorate levels. So, it is a dramatic change to the finances of this State, and this House and I would like to know exactly what is occurring and what is the basis for the decisions being made. I should like to reflect very briefly on my findings in relation to a number of American States and cities which tie revenues into their budgets. Most cities and States of America now have their budgets revenue driven. That is a historical relationship.

It means that, if there is an economic downturn, if there is a fall in property values, schools, for example, which draw a large amount of their revenue from property taxes, are the ones to suffer. We can see a great deal of deprivation in America in many areas as a result of their whole budget process. Whilst I believe that there is scope for the user-pays system, I would hate to see us go down the track of revenue driven budgets in the same way as the States and cities of America. So, I demand that the Minister of Finance provide the details to this House.

The process of budgeting is very important, and I should like to reflect on the contribution to the budget of the South Australian Government Financing Authority. This happens to be a very important component of the budget. It seems to come up with revenue at the right time for the Premier. We saw that the State Bank also seemed to come up with revenue at the right time for the Premier. Even when the bank made a loss, the reported profits were poured into the Treasury's coffers in order to sustain this Government in power.

I raise the matter of SAFA's contribution to the budget for a very important reason. Its contribution for the past four years was as follows: in 1988-89, \$294 million; in 1989-90, \$385 million; in 1990-91, \$270 million; and in 1991-92, although we have not yet had the budget, the sum expected is \$400 million. SAFA has played a very important role. For example, we know that this role changes depending on the climate and, particularly, the election climate.

I bring to the attention of the House the record level of input from SAFA during the 1989-90 financial year, which was, of course, the year of the election, when some \$385 million was poured into the Treasury coffers to sustain a bountiful budget for the re-election of this Government. Then, of course, it dropped off the following year. It should be noted that, for the 1991-92 year, the only way we got \$400 million out of SAFA was through the sale of assets. Members will reflect on the extent to which that occurred and the reason why, without that injection, the budget deficit for the past financial year would be well over \$500 million and heading for \$600 million, which is a record in anyone's terms.

Drawing the thread of that together with the net financing requirement of the budget, we find in 1988-89 a net financing requirement of \$273 million, although a SAFA surplus of \$74 million brought that figure down to \$199 million. That SAFA surplus was brought forward from the previous year. In 1989-90, when the Premier wished to present a very healthy budget situation, there was, of course, a cross-subsidisation—if I can call it

that—between the SAFA contribution and the net financing requirement to give some semblance of the budget being balanced, and the net financing requirement fell to as low as \$181 million. In 1990-91, with the election out of the way, the net financing requirement for the budget rose dramatically to \$359 million, or double the amount of the previous year.

This year, the budget estimate was \$330 million, and one would assume that the outcome will be somewhere above that figure, although there are some offsets from the contingency item which covered the tax problem created by the lease back arrangements in which the Treasurer indulged. However, we will have to await the bringing down of the budget to find out whether that is included in last year's or this year's budget.

The most important thing to remember about the juggling of these finances is that they are totally dishonest. In the same way as the Federal budget is totally dishonest—it is just a buy-back votes budget—the process of budgeting in this State by the Premier and Treasurer has been totally dishonest, and the figures and finances have been manipulated to suit the occasion. We know, for example, that there will be budget manipulation this year to an extraordinary level given the expected blow-out in the State Bank deficit and the need to top up SGIC by \$200 million or \$300 million. We know there will be some financial gymnastics of extraordinary proportions, and it is appropriate to reflect on that given the situation in the Federal sphere.

I made the point earlier that in 1990-91 the strong SAFA contribution was made possible by the selling of shares, and of course SAGASCO featured heavily in that buy-out situation or floating of the budget. The Government sold off its bonus share issues to provide extra cash for the budget, and that has been fed into the 1991-92 financial year. I estimate, without any magic tricks being played—that is, looking at the assets that are available to it as against its liabilities—that SAFA has a baseline earning capacity right now of less than \$250 million given the decrease in interest rates. We know that the budget, in order to be sustained, will have to keep coming up with about \$400 million to \$500 million a year from SAFA just to keep the net financing requirement within reasonable bounds, otherwise that will blow out and the State debt will blow through the ceiling.

I do not wish to go through the mathematics of all the possibilities, but it will be a budget of interesting proportions—interesting from the point of view of what the Treasurer is going to do about some of his major problems in the form of SGIC and State Bank and how he is going to keep his net financing requirement under control. It will also be interesting from the point of view of what his borrowings portfolio is to incur in relation to interest rates, and that will, of course, impact on the budget.

The sale of SAGASCO shares is now thrown into a particular light. It is not through altruism or best practice or any other good reason that the Premier has suddenly embarked on the sale of SAGASCO shares: it is because his budget is in such deep strife that he has to embark on this measure. I will reflect on the SAGASCO situation, because I believe it is pertinent to the budget strategy employed by the Premier and Treasurer of this State.

Mr Such: If it moves, sell it!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** As the member for Fisher says, if it moves, sell it. I believe that is the philosophy of this Government. The Premier and Treasurer of this State was quite willing to sell off those SAGASCO shares without any guarantees that the head office ownership or control would remain in this State for the benefit of the people of this State. The other issue is whether it would pay off debt. My figures show clearly that, in order to float the budget this year, it will have to be swallowed up in recurrent revenue paid back through SAFA. I will return to SAFA because it is an important monument and I believe it reflects the ultimate stupidity of a Government which has lost control of its own capacity, abilities and any sense of propriety in the way it is running the State.

I will cite figures concerning the SAGASCO situation, because I have an independent analysis. SAGASCO has been one of the bright lights on the South Australian horizon for some years. In 1989, sales revenue was \$293 million; in 1990, it was \$340.2 million; the estimate for 1990-91 was \$354.5 million; and the estimate for 1991-92 was \$373.8 million. What has happened over that period with the net profit? It has gone from \$26.2 million to \$42.2 million to \$44.4 million to \$49.8 million. That means that the dividends have gone up from \$15.7 million in 1988-89 to an estimate of \$26.5 million for this last financial year. The price per share has increased from \$1.33 to \$2.33, whilst the earnings have increased from 15.9c per share to 25.6c per share. So, the net yield is currently running at about 6 per cent and the gross yield is currently running at about 8 per cent. That is better than bank interest and is probably the best buy on the market.

I do not wish to go through all the details and sing all the praises of SAGASCO, but I will say that it has the capacity, if properly managed, to improve the position of this State immeasurably. I point out that we have been through the takeover period, that time when the world went a little mad and the Australian entrepreneurs went madder and Governments lost their heads—particularly the Bannon Labor Government in the way it managed the State Bank. Now we have to go through a period of reconciliation. SAGASCO is in a position to do a great deal for South Australia, because there are many bargains out there waiting to be snapped up at prices that will never be lower. Members should appreciate the extremely strong balance sheet position of SAGASCO. It would be a disgrace to allow it to go down and be sold off without a fight. We have a debt to equity ratio of only 4 per cent and 10 per cent of assets and cash.

The debt is the lowest of almost any major company in Australia, and the company is well cashed up with \$80 million in the bank. So, we have a huge capacity with those resources and by having the right sort of management. Certainly, we have had wonderful management of SAGASCO Holdings in recent years. It is a head office that not only could be sustained in South Australia but also an organisation that can move its boundaries interstate and be a major player in the delivery of energy in Australia if it is used properly.

This means that we must have the right sort of management of SAGASCO. We cannot afford to lose it to an interstate concern, and it must be controlled within these State boundaries: it must be controlled by South Australians and, of course, we want to retain the same

quality of leadership that we now have. That does not mean that we give it out to a major player and say, 'Buy me, buy me at the highest price,' which is, of course, the Premier's objective.

*Mr Such interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** We do not want any liquidation sales, as the member for Fisher rightly points out. We want a strategic launching of SAGASCO shares in order to retain the ownership and control of SAGASCO within this State, because it can be a mighty institution for the future of this State.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member for Henley Beach says, 'Sell it to SANTOS.' The Trade Practices Commission might have difficulty with SANTOS being the major supplier of gas also owning the distribution utility.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Already it is clear what the strategy is. There are two major ways to control it, that is, through changing its articles of association to ensure there are principles that say that the head office shall be retained, and another way is to launch the shares in small parcels so that no major concern can take control of the company.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member for Spence knows little about share markets.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The honourable member says that as a journalist he worked at the Stock Exchange, but I do not think he learnt too much, because it is clear that, if we want to retain control of a company, we issue an amount of shares that will let us test the market. We can issue 5 or 10 per cent of the shares and see what happens under a controlled situation through local brokers. We can test what level of control can be retained and how predatory companies from outside will act. There are ways and means. So, there are ways and means of doing this, there is the changing of the articles and the strategic release of those shares to ensure that they are spread amongst as many small investors as possible. The honourable member well knows that.

Some of the great successes of privatisation (I mention privatisation because I am sure the Premier would like it mentioned in the same breath as SAGASCO) in Britain have involved the successful sale of companies to a large number of small shareholders and that stands to the credit of the Thatcher Government. As we have only one company to deal with here, the Premier could achieve the same result.

We are now talking about the budget, which the Government will bring down in about nine days. We keep asking why the Premier has not revealed some of the results of his enterprise, or lack thereof, in the past financial year. We reflect on the future of South Australians. We know that the Premier will attempt, as far as possible, to trade off his borrowings and his sale of assets to fund the budget.

This situation brings to mind the city of New York, which has a population of nine million people. It had a debt overhang of \$25 billion and was declared bankrupt. Our debt per capita is 60 per cent greater than the debt per capita in New York and the same applies to Philadelphia, which has recently been declared bankrupt.

A scheme has been put in place to get it out of debt. So, they are two major cities of the United States that have debt per capita far less than we have in this State, and they have been declared bankrupt. It is useful to reflect on the state of our finances in South Australia.

I will not go through the other matters affecting the budget. It is important just to plead with the Treasurer to come clean with us this time and that he does not keep changing the rules as he has with Supply. We ask that he present a picture that is consistent with previous years so that we as South Australians know exactly where we are heading with our budget, because at this stage the waters are very muddy.

On that note, I support the second reading. We will be debating some taxation measures next week and, of course, the debate will then become somewhat more vigorous than it has been today. I conclude on the note that nothing that we have seen from the Premier will repair the damage that he has done; nothing that we have seen from the Premier suggests that he is making any attempt to take the hard decisions in relation to budget strategy. I suspect that we will see the sale of more assets and a growing public debt to be paid off by future generations.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I support the Bill. However, I will not talk about a sum of \$1 000 million. I will just talk about one person's salary in that \$1 000 million, namely, that of the Ombudsman. It is pretty fair to say that all of us in this Chamber have at one time or another received complaints from constituents who say that they have written to the Ombudsman or made inquiries of his office. Because of pressure of work in that office and the many facets of investigations that it carries out into all areas of government, they complain about having to wait for some considerable time.

Yet, over the past three or four days we have had an example of someone creating mischief and thereby causing both the Speaker of this House and the President in the Legislative Council in effect to ask the Ombudsman to drop all work and conduct an urgent investigation as to whether there were secret files on certain members of Parliament in this House. The Speaker and the President were quite correct in doing that because of the gravity of the allegations, which were first highlighted by the *Advertiser* as a scoop story and a shock horror expose about what the State Bank was doing to individual members of Parliament, so that, if things did not go correctly according to the State Bank, it could use that information against those individuals.

That was the scenario that was painted by the *Advertiser*. It went to town on that right the way through and milked every bit of press it could get out of it. I was anxiously waiting, when I saw what the Speaker and the President had done, to know what this was all about. I was very surprised to see on page 2 of schedule 3 a statutory declaration by a Michael David Hughes, who said:

I was of the opinion that the most convenient source of information would be supplied outside the bank by people with special knowledge of politics. Accordingly, I approached a reporter from the *Advertiser* to ask whether he could supply me with some background biographical detail on the three politicians. At the same time I approached a political lobbyist employed by a public relations company and asked for a commentary on the same persons.

That is what we see in the Ombudsman's report on the statutory declaration by Michael David Hughes.

It is common knowledge in this House that the reporter named in the statutory declaration is Rex Jory. Rex Jory has admitted that he was the journalist in question. You, Sir, will read it in the *Advertiser* tomorrow. Before any members opposite stand up and jump around about my denigrating a journalist and using the protection of this House, I point out that they will see an admission in the *Advertiser* tomorrow morning that Rex Jory was the journalist in question. Yet Rex Jory was writing the articles in the *Advertiser* on Friday and Saturday expressing shock and horror on behalf of the people of South Australia that the State Bank had had the temerity to have a dossier on the Speaker, the Independent member for Elizabeth and the former Leader of the Opposition.

Rex Jory freely confesses that he was the person, but one could say that is a sophisticated case of damage control. We had a Prime Minister who, to offset any opposition, had his autobiography written and bared his soul to everyone. Let them know in advance and they will not think it is so bad! That is what we have had. The Speaker, the most senior officer in this Parliament, has had his name dragged through the mud. My colleague the member for Elizabeth—I do not have a true friendship with the member for Elizabeth but I respect him and will fight for him as a member of Parliament and as a colleague—has had his name dragged through the mud.

The former Leader of the Opposition, the member for Victoria, has also had his name dragged through the mud. That article talked about a relationship that the former Leader of the Opposition had had with someone—'a friend'. That is low. That information was compiled by Rex Jory who then, on the instructions of his masters at the *Advertiser*, wrote these shock horror stories. I will leave Mr Jory alone for a little while. Who is the political—

**Mr MEIER:** On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, in light of the Speaker's ruling before this debate commenced that all comments had to be relevant to the Supply Bill, I would ask for your ruling on the relevance of the honourable member's comments so far.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blacker):** I think the honourable member is testing the original ruling. However, the member for Napier related his comments to the expenditure by the Ombudsman. The member for Napier.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. You are spot on. I am talking about one salary paid to the Ombudsman and the waste of time—

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Goyder should have been present right at the very beginning.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The Minister on the front bench is very correct; one would have thought the member for Goyder would be just as concerned as I am that his ex-Leader's name was dragged through the mud. A 'friend' was talked about, and that friend was not Fido the dog or his pet heifer; it was a woman, and that is awful. I will go back to Mr Jory and the *Advertiser* later.

Let us look at the second person, the political lobbyist. I will stand corrected, but I very much doubt whether the person whose name I will mention will have the temerity



to deny that she was involved in giving information to the State Bank. She was a certain lobbyist (who at that time was employed by Michels Warren), a lady by the name of Joan Hall. That is out there in the corridors of this Parliament; it is out there in Adelaide; and they tell me at the royal commission there was more information being traded about Joan Hall than there was about the evidence being given by the Premier to the royal commission. So, again, I am not using this place as coward's castle.

I now come back to the role of the *Advertiser*. I have been pretty scathing of the *Advertiser* of late about its double standards in relation to poker machines and, at some time when I can talk on a debate that is not related to the Supply Bill, I will talk about the role the *Advertiser* had in the Remm development in 1988 and some of the things it is saying now. I know that is against Standing Orders, so members will have to wait patiently for that at some later date.

Again, one is forced to question the role of the *Advertiser* in all of this. Is the *Advertiser* saying that, when it commissioned Mr Jory to write this article the other day, it had no knowledge that Mr Jory had been paid (I take it he had been paid by the State Bank) to provide that political profile on the Speaker, the Independent member for Elizabeth the ex-Leader of the Opposition? Is it saying it did not know? Is it then saying that, if it did not know, we are now expected to believe that its senior political journalist did not tell them when eventually these things were leaked back? They went from the *Advertiser* to the State Bank and straight back to the *Advertiser*; is it saying that no-one knew? They are the questions the *Advertiser* needs to tell us and, more importantly, not just us but also the people of South Australia, because, when we look at that, we see that there are other questions.

In his report, the Ombudsman states that he has asked other members of the public or even the *Advertiser* to approach him if there was any other information that could come to light after he has finished this report to the Speaker and the President of the Legislative Council. Do I know that they are the only three files which the *Advertiser* might have in its possession and which may ultimately create a situation where the Speaker on our behalf will have to ask the Ombudsman to conduct an investigation, again at great expense, incorporating that \$1 000 million? Will that happen? We do not know. You, Mr Acting Speaker, are in a unique position in this Parliament, as you are the only National Party member. I would be willing to bet, Sir, if I were a betting man (and I am not), that they have a file on you.

I have four questions that I think are very relevant to the role of the Ombudsman. They are: will the *Advertiser* release its files to the public; not only its files on politicians but also its files on all prominent members, because, let us face it, if Mr Rex Jory was doing files on politicians, there is a good chance that the *Advertiser's* financial writer has created files on the banking industry?

There is a very good chance that its religious writer has files on the heads of churches in South Australia. That is the first question. Secondly, will it release its files to concerned members of Parliament who are worried about any inaccuracies? That is very important. Again, that could create even further strains on the Ombuds-

man's office. It could well mean that this Parliament has to consider increasing the size of the Ombudsman's office. Fourthly, who was the person who made the decision to create this mischief? Was Rex Jory authorised by his Editor to compile secret dossiers on prominent Independent MPs and the former Leader of the Opposition (the member for Victoria)?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blacker):** I would be grateful if the honourable member would bring his comments back to the Supply Bill.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Yes, Sir. I will, because the final question was in relation to another form of expenditure, and that is in the area of privacy. This House has debated privacy legislation and it will incur a considerable cost to the State through Consolidated Account, which is what we are talking about. The *Advertiser* was at the forefront of the crusade against any form of privacy legislation. Now that it has been caught with its pants down, do you think it will change its mind, Sir? Will it now actively support privacy legislation? I very much doubt it. It may well be that my concerns about whether \$1 000 million is sufficient to pay for all of that are unfounded at the present time.

I have a final comment. During the Address in Reply debate I made a fairly scathing speech about the *Advertiser* and in particular about its Managing Director, Peter Wylie. It seems that Peter Wylie's only concern is that I, along with *Hansard*, spelt his name incorrectly. In fact I received a letter to say that I spelt his name wrongly. He tells me how to spell it, rather than the way I pronounced it with my English accent and the way *Hansard* picked it up, whereby it was incorrect in the transcript. With the problems we have, along with considering the \$1 000 million before us at the moment, is that all that worries the *Advertiser*, considering the way it has embarked on a mischief-making exercise, ably abetted by Joan Hall and Rex Jory, creating mayhem out in the community and besmirching the name of our Speaker, the Independent member for Elizabeth and the member for Victoria? It does not care a damn—it is simply worried about whether I and *Hansard* spell Peter Wylie's name correctly.

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** In rising to speak on this Bill, I note that it provides \$1 000 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions. I note also that that amount of money is less than half of what has been lost during the State Bank fiasco. It is always good to remind ourselves of what the financial mismanagement of this Government has cost the people of this State. I note that in the explanation of the Bill reference is made to a change in accounting procedures and the way funds are made available to departments. I trust this is all above board and that there is no attempt in any way to try to hide reality or the financial facts from the people of South Australia.

Of course, as I said before, Supply relates to payment for the Public Service. We should remind ourselves that, with very few exceptions, we have a very fine Public Service in South Australia. I take exception to the derogatory tone that some people often use when they refer to our public servants as bureaucrats. Traditionally, that term was not a derogatory term, but it has come to be, and I remind people, before they use that term, that the overwhelming majority of public servants are fine, dedi-

cated people. I am proud to have a few of them resident in my electorate.

The Supply Bill must be seen in the context of the financial management of this State or, more correctly, financial mismanagement. Earlier, I indicated that the whole population has been a victim of what this State Government has done in relation to the State Bank, SGIC, Scrimber, and so on. We must bear in mind that what has happened has set the stage for a situation in which people are reluctant to invest in this State, whether they be local, interstate or overseas investors, because the financial incompetence of this State Government has created a barrier that deters such people. One of the things that investors seek is an assurance that the Government of the day is capable and competent, and they certainly do not have that assurance when they look at the performance of this State Government.

Investors look for predictability and consistency and, once again, that has been lacking in terms of the performance of this Government. In order to be able to pay our public servants in the future or for the Government to carry out any financial tasks, we need to restore confidence and get people investing in South Australia again. We need to remind ourselves that investment leads to jobs, and that is one of the things that is sadly lacking in this State.

Another consequence of the Government's financial mismanagement—and all these factors are interrelated—is that the ordinary South Australian is paying the penalty. This will flow through even to aspects directly related to the Supply Bill. We are seeing the consequences of this financial mismanagement in negative impacts on schools, hospitals, kindergartens and in a whole host of areas. The would-be investors, the people of South Australia, have lost confidence, and that is a very sad situation, because this State should be in the forefront of economic activity and in terms of living standards. However, we have a situation in which South Australians will have to pay off a debt for many years to come, with our children and grandchildren facing a serious debt situation.

If we look at the economic indicators since this Government came to power in 1989, we will see that in almost every respect there has been a negative outcome. There has been a deterioration in the economic situation. Unemployment has increased substantially and, despite a temporary reduction in the past month, the trend is quite worrying, particularly in relation to young people but also in relation to people over the age of 40 years. So, against the background of a very bad economic situation, we are addressing this Supply Bill.

The Minister of Employment and Further Education has tried to down-play some of the points I raised in this place some days ago and tried to score a cheap point in relation to unemployment statistics. I remind the House that the unemployment situation is far worse than those Australian Bureau of Statistics figures would indicate, and we must remember that the ABS figures are an estimate. A few days ago, I was referring to Department of Social Security figures indicating actual recipients of unemployment benefits. So, I am contrasting actual social security recipient figures with Bureau of Statistics estimated figures.

It is useful to remember that the unemployment statistics are understated in two major categories, and the first

relates to under-employment. I am not sure whether all members appreciate this, but, to be classified as 'employed' in those ABS statistics, a person has to work for only one hour for profit or else be in a family business in an unpaid capacity for one hour during the period that those statistics are collected. It is not hard to see how those figures can understate the unemployment situation if to be classified as 'employed' one has to work for only one hour or, if you are in a family business, do one hour of unpaid work.

This is a serious deficiency which must be recognised in relation to those unemployment statistics. The other aspect relates to hidden unemployment, and that is the category used to describe people who are discouraged (sometimes called 'discouraged job seekers') and who do not even bother to seek work because they know that the situation is so bad. So, once again you get an understatement of the figures with respect to the real situation. Also, it encompasses people, particularly young people, who are studying and who stay on studying because they realise that the job situation is so bad.

It is pertinent to note that these unemployed people, particularly the young unemployed, represent what is probably the most disadvantaged group that we have seen in our society since the Great Depression, and that is a tragedy. Once again against the backdrop of this Supply Bill I have focused on the question of unemployment but, in respect of employment in December 1989 there were 650 900 South Australians in employment, but by June of this year that number had fallen to 637 800. That is nothing for this Government to be proud of. Since 1982—the total period of this Labor Government—something like 84 000 jobs have been created in South Australia compared with 355 000 jobs created in Queensland.

The Minister of Employment and Further Education in this place at an earlier time tried to get around that but was unable to come up with a satisfactory answer, because he does not have one—and neither has this Government. This Government has failed to create jobs. Whilst I, along with my colleagues, acknowledge the importance and need for training, the problem is that this Government, like its Federal counterpart, has failed to address the question of jobs, and that comes back to the point I made right at the beginning of my speech: that unless you have significant investment you will not create jobs.

The Federal budget that was delivered tonight will impact on the finances of this State and certainly on subsequent State Supply Bills. The Hon. John Dawkins was very apologetic in his statement—and I believe he should be—as should the State Treasurer: they should answer for the decimation of the economy, for which they are totally responsible. The Federal budget document which was delivered tonight states:

This budget has three fundamental objectives. The first is about jobs, jobs now and more jobs in the years ahead . . . the situation now is that there are not enough jobs. It is up to the Government to take action, to do everything in its power to provide jobs for those Australians without employment.

I would have thought that that was the responsibility of not only the Federal Government but also the State Government. It is a serious deficiency with respect to the economic performance of this State that the Government has not created the climate for jobs and has not used the

resources of the Public Service to assist in creating those jobs.

What it has done is create additional burdens for the private sector, so that people do not want to employ other people. One of the tasks of the Public Service and one of the reasons why we have a Public Service, although not the only one, is to create a climate in which people will want to invest in this State. The Public Service, through its various agencies, should be doing all it can to encourage investment and productivity, but we do not see that happening. This Government is not giving leadership or direction to the Public Service.

Despite the recent and no doubt ongoing recourse towards a greater use of consultants, we have talented people in the Public Service and we should be using their skills and talents to create the climate to develop policies that will encourage private investment. There is no point in training people, desirable though that may be, unless there are jobs at the end of their training program. That is where the Public Service has a critical role to perform.

I challenge the Government to demonstrate what it has been doing in relation to productivity enhancement, as that is one of the keys to future economic survival and the enhancement of this State. The word that should be on the forehead of every South Australian is 'productivity'. That simply means an increase in output, in productive capacity and in the output of each person. However, we do not see the Public Service used to facilitate that. What we see is the Public Service used for tax gathering purposes, to put on the brakes, to hinder and to restrict and to tie down and, basically, eliminate what would be useful and productive investment.

In addressing the Supply Bill, I believe that one of the fundamental tasks that needs to be recognised by this Government is that the Public Service should be there to serve the public. The Public Service is willing to do that; it is able to do that, but it must be directed and used in a way that will allow this State to have investment and to create the jobs that are so necessary. If we look at some of the other economic indicators since 1989, we see that the State's debt has increased dramatically.

When this Government first came to power, the State debt was of the order of \$2.6 billion; by the middle of last year it had reached around \$6.6 billion; and it is now somewhere in excess of \$7 billion. That tells a story that I believe the electors of this State and of Australia are fast realising; that is, that Labor Governments basically live off the economic achievements of Liberal Governments. For example, if we look at the Playford era we see that Playford laid an economic base for this State that has been gradually eroded by the policies and practices of subsequent Labor Governments.

Many of those initiatives are fine in themselves, but one of the characteristics of Labor Governments is that they take a good idea, whether it be occupational health and safety or equal opportunity, and extend it beyond the bounds of reason and commonsense. What you have over time is a gradual whittling down of the economic base that has been established by Liberal Governments. The same thing happened following the Tonkin Government, where the Tonkin Government was assiduous in reducing debt and getting the economy of South Australia on a firm and sound basis, and what has happened in the decade since then is that this Government, like a horde of

white ants, has eaten into that economic base. We can see the same thing happening in Queensland.

For all his sins and faults, Joh Bjelke and his group established a very sound economic base. Whilst I am in no way an apologist for him, we must note that in Queensland the Goss Government is living off the benefits of what has been created by previous non-Labor Governments. In that sense, Labor Governments act in a way that is akin to a parasite. They are the mistletoe—economic and social parasites that wear down the positive achievements that Liberal and other non-Labor Governments have established. We note also that this Government is a bankcard Government: it puts everything on the tick or books it up on plastic money or the equivalent.

It is not surprising that the credit rating of this State has gone down. That is a very sad reflection on the so-called financial managers sitting opposite. This State which was set up and established by pioneers who had a vision, standards and a commitment to sound economic management, has now had its credit rating downgraded like some company that cannot manage its affairs. I could go through a whole list of State liabilities and State taxes that have increased significantly. I must acknowledge that this Government has been very skilful in relation to its tax gathering and its use of the Police Department. I notice the honourable Minister sitting opposite. I am surprised he has not come up with a two for one offer or some variation on that so that there is some way of utilising speed cameras to increase even further the amount of revenue that is taken from the hapless motorist.

My time is limited. There are a lot of other points that I could make, and I know my colleagues will raise them. We are aware of the advantages that we used to have in South Australia in relation to low cost electricity. We have lost that advantage. Once again, it has been whittled away by the white ants sitting opposite and their financial mismanagement. Water charges have once again increased and now include the notorious wealth or property tax. About the only thing the Government does not tax these days is sexual activity, and it probably will not be long before it finds some way to tax that.

We are confronted with a depressing situation when we focus on the Supply Bill, but fortunately there is some hope and that lies in a Liberal Government. The next Government will be a Liberal Government, and it will turn around the situation so that the people of South Australia can look forward to a brighter future. Despite the fact that things are tough and depressing at the moment because of the mismanagement of this Government, fortunately in the not too distant future there will be a change, and it will be a change for the better. People keep asking me when that will happen. I trust that with the help of the Independents it will happen quite soon. To that end, I hope that the Independents will exercise their judgment and bring about a positive change so that the people of South Australia can look forward to a better Government.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blacker):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

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

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

Motion carried.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** In speaking to this Supply debate, I am conscious of the fact that this Bill appropriates a considerable amount of money for the payment of public servants. In that context, it is appropriate that we examine the Public Service in this State and the level of accountability that we expect from our public servants. For a number of years, under many guises, we have seen the restructuring of Government departments—The Education Department has undergone a number of restructures—and every time we have had a Minister coming into this place saying, ‘This will make the departments more efficient and save us money.’

However, every time it seems to me—and I think it seems to many of the public of South Australia—that we end up with more chiefs, more indians and a less efficient Public Service, a Public Service that seems to yearly cost more and more. All members in this place will understand that, for our society to truly thrive, we have to produce things. We have to grow primary products; we have to manufacture and sell goods and services. The creation of wealth in any country is based on manufacturing, primary production and mining. It is not based on the Public Service.

The Public Service is an important part of any society in that it provides a service to the creators of wealth but, as the member for Fisher said, unless we are very careful, public servants can easily become like the termites that undermine rather than support the structure. Therefore, it is quite clear that any Government should continue to carefully examine the structure and nature of its Public Service and see that the public, who after all are the employers of each member in this House and certainly of the Public Service, are getting value for their dollar. I do not think that that is always the case in this State.

As I alluded to earlier, in my career in the Education Department, I have seen more restructures of that department than I care to count. Each time there seem to be more and more people at the top and in the middle, with fewer students in our schools. At the same time, we see the teachers on the steps today complaining that, while the bureaucracy seems to be very pleased with itself, conditions in schools are not good. I read today on the front page of the *Advertiser* a heading that should raise a doubt in the minds of all members in this House, because either it is right or it is wrong. If it is wrong, there should have been outrage from every member of the Government benches, but I heard not one bleat from any member opposite.

**Mr Holloway:** What would you expect from the *Advertiser*?

**Mr BRINDAL:** Perhaps members opposite may have a grievance with the *Advertiser*. Perhaps that grievance may or may not be legitimate, but if members on the Government benches are going to sit there like mute ventriloquist dummies and say nothing when they believe that something very wrong is said, what are we to think? When you travel home tonight, Sir, look at the newspaper banners that are on nearly every street corner. It says, ‘South Australian school system in crisis’ or something very close to that. The front page headline of the *Advertiser* this morning stated, ‘South Australian school system

fails the test of time.’ That is either right or wrong, yet we did not hear one murmur from the Government today saying that it was wrong and putting on the public record, for the electronic media, some facts concerning the school system. Whilst members opposite say it is wrong, the article does contain this very interesting quote:

The Education Minister, Mr Crafter, admits that schools, like other public buildings, have deteriorated and money is needed to be spent on refurbishment.

In the context of this Supply Bill, we are forced to ask why. Only recently the State Bank bail out occurred, and it really was in the province of the last budget, but every member in this House who is honest knows that the deterioration of public assets has been progressive and goes back over the entire period of this Government.

Schools do not develop in 12 months gaping holes in their gutters that you can put your fist through. Many of those schools have not been painted for many years. The carpets are wearing out. Gutters in some of them have holes. I have detailed for this House previously the chronology of things wrong with the Brighton High School. The gutters are so bad that the water leaks straight down—

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member opposite said it was not too good when he was there 20 years ago. I would guarantee that they have probably spent nothing on maintenance for those sections of the school in the past 20 years since he was there.

*The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I do not know. The assets are diminishing, and I find it extraordinary that the Minister should say that they are diminishing when the problems we have with the State Bank are of relatively recent date. This House has every right to question why the assets have not diminished over the past 12 months because we have some extraordinary debts that we have to recover. Why were they allowed to diminish to the point where there is almost a crisis in our schools, admitted to by the Minister of Education, and why do we have people ringing us up almost daily about our public hospitals alleging all sorts of things, some of them probably quite wrong but others at least based in fact—always about diminishing resources and maintenance that the Government does not appear to be able to afford to do?

I put to the House that this Government has neglected many areas for far too long and in a sense has been caught by the State Bank and now, even if it wants to, cannot afford maintenance. That is the hallmark of this Government, which is a Government in crisis in more ways than one. I know that money is not unlimited and I will be very interested, as will be every other member on this side of the House, to see how the Premier cobbles together a budget for this year. If he does cobble together a budget for this year, I will be surprised if it can hang together for the whole year without substantial increases in taxes and charges. If it does hang together for at least part of the year, how will we present any budget to the people of South Australia in the year ahead?

In talking about diminishing assets, there are no two better examples than the State Administration Centre and Police Headquarters in Victoria Square. The State Administration Centre was to cost, from memory, about \$15 million. My recollection is that the bill for the work is about \$27 million at present, and there is a curious

thing: according to my reading of the budget papers for last year, the actual expenditure listed for the Premier and Cabinet last year was just over \$26 million.

The Minister of Housing and Construction assures me—and I will be questioning him carefully during the Estimates Committees on this—that, even though it was listed in actual expenditure, that money was somehow never spent and is part of the \$27 million now appropriated to that work. I am not an accountant; my friend the member for Eyre, who has just come into the Chamber, understands figures much better than I do but, as a simple person, I cannot understand how the Government can list \$26 million under actual expenditure and then say it has not spent it. If it spent the \$26 million, it means that, by the time the State Administration Centre is finished, it will have cost not the \$27 million the Government is talking about but \$27 million plus \$26 million which, by my reckoning, is \$53 million. I hope that I am entirely wrong but—

**Mr Meier:** I suggest that you are entirely correct.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I put that on the record and I thank the member for Goyder for his interjection because, if it is \$53 million, there is another scandal in this State. I know that there is much wrong with the building and I know that it needs refurbishment. Certainly, I do not expect, as no member in this House would expect, that any public servant should have conditions less appropriate than those laid down in the occupational health and safety legislation, but I point out to the House that many members in this place are expected to endure conditions that are much, much worse than those that exist in the State Administration Centre.

One has only to go outside this Chamber to see an office that is an absolute fire trap. It is wooden, it is at the bottom of a stairwell and it has one door. If something were to go wrong in that office and it caught fire, it would go up like a funeral pyre and incinerate the occupant. I believe that the office of the Sergeant at Arms or one of the other offices in the corridor near the Premier's office is similarly constructed; it is almost a wooden prefab. at the bottom of a stairwell. We could go on pointing out the total inadequacy of the conditions in which many of the permanent officers are working in terms of occupational health and safety and basic fire safety requirements.

I do not mind and I am sure that most of my colleagues and most members of the Government do not mind about our conditions because we have other office premises that we can use and our time in this House is limited to when the Parliament sits. The frequency with which the Government has called the Parliament of late makes it no onerous task for us to share conditions that perhaps we would not choose to work in permanently.

However, for the permanent officers in this place, the accommodation is a real problem. Yet, we had the Premier grandly announcing that plans for the refurbishment of Parliament House had to be shelved because it was inappropriate at this time to provide for the occupational health and safety and fire prevention measures for the permanent officers in this place and for the members of Parliament. He said that it was totally inappropriate; he canned it with much fanfare and public trumpeting. Yet, he quietly goes along and says that it is inappropriate for the Parliament to be refurbished and to

meet appropriate standards but it is not inappropriate for the State Administration Centre to meet basic standards. I put to the House that, if it is appropriate for the State Administration Centre to meet those standards, it is more appropriate for this Parliament.

The other building to which I wish to refer is Police Headquarters in Victoria Square. Everything that has been said about the State Administration Centre is equally true for Police Headquarters building, as the Minister at the table tonight well knows. Indeed, just before the last election the Premier announced, quite publicly, that the building was a public eyesore and would be bulldozed in the next few years. He said that it had to be done quickly and he actually made a joke about it. He said, 'We have to bulldoze it fairly quickly lest it become preserved as a great example of late Playford architecture.' He went on to talk about the limitations of the building, limitations which I believe are far worse than the limitations of the State Administration centre; it does not meet the basic earthquake code. Yet, here we are refurbishing the Premier's State Administration Centre and nothing has been done to the Police Headquarters. I do not—

*The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The Minister reminds me that the police are moving out because they bought a wonderful super bargain basement deal and they are going into the Flinders Centre. I think that is an excellent idea. However, the Minister of Housing and Construction tells me (and I know that you, Mr Speaker, will not allow the Minister to interject, so he can correct me when he speaks if I am wrong) that Police Headquarters will not be entirely vacated; there will still be a police presence in that building. All the commissioned officers and those who wear brass on their lapels will be at the Flinders Centre. Then, if we have an earthquake, we will probably still have a Commissioner and lots of senior officers, but the other ranks might be squashed when the other building falls down, because only the lower ranks will be in the Victoria Square building. I do not wish any harm to the Premier or his Ministers: in fact, I would rather see them roundly thrashed at the next election and savour some victory at seeing them displaced from the benches opposite.

In the event of an earthquake, if we must have a choice whether it is essential for South Australia to save our Premier, Ministers and public servants or whether it is more essential to have a viable Police Force at that time, I would opt for the Police Force. In times of civil emergency, I think that the Police Force performs a more effective function and is needed more. Therefore, if we have to choose—I am being slightly flippant, because God grant we never have to choose—I would rather the State Administration Centre collapsed than Police Headquarters. I am trying to make the point that in terms of this Supply Bill there should be some priorities.

The Premier announced at the last election that something would be done about police headquarters. I acknowledge that some of the staff are moving out, but I also tell the House that the Minister of Housing and Construction told me that there is still a plan to bulldoze that building eventually and to put up a more suitable office structure for perhaps the police and other Government departments. Yet we are not seeing that; we

are seeing the refurbishment of the State Administration Centre.

I put it to all members that the State Administration Centre is a wonderful asset. It could be vacated and the departmental officers could go elsewhere until there were better times, at which stage it could be refurbished, or it could be sold as it is. We have had a wonderful example with the ETSA building on Greenhill Road. The State Administration Centre could be sold as it is, and I think it would be a prime development site. I am sure that the Minister of Emergency Services knows that the Flinders Centre has just been acquired, and there is the Education Centre. There are many Government buildings in which the Premier and his Ministers could be housed while capitalising on the asset which is the State Administration Centre.

I do not believe that at this time that expenditure is justified or that it is the best use of State moneys. I believe there are other things to which those moneys could be applied and we could still come up with creative solutions which put our public servants in the sort of accommodation that they have every right to expect. I do not think that any Opposition member expects anyone to work in substandard conditions. However, we do not expect those people who serve us so well in this Parliament to put up with what they have to put up with. I ask you, Sir, some time tonight to go round the building and look at the accommodation and the conditions that some of the officers of this Parliament put up with on a daily basis for 365 days a year.

Luckily we in this Parliament are getting to the nitty-gritty of things with certain Government instrumentalities. There have been some amazing revelations about the State Bank, and those revelations are now the subject of a royal commission. We have found some very interesting answers about SGIC. I note that the Economic and Finance Committee is probing very carefully into many other semi-Government instrumentalities, such as the Grand Prix Board. Hopefully, we will look at the Entertainment Centre, the Festival Centre and a number of others. It is important that the public of South Australia clearly know what we are getting, how much we are paying for it and whether we are getting value for our money. There are some very good, dedicated and hard working public servants, and nobody in this State should think otherwise. However, there are other people, as there are in all walks of life, who are less scrupulous and who have used the Public Service for their own gains.

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

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this Supply Bill debate, but I am very disappointed that I should have to be speaking in 1992 when this State is in a total mess. We have a tragic economic situation, and there is a feeling of despair and hopelessness in the community. We see the Government allocating literally \$1 billion to continue running the State on a day-to-day basis.

I guess we have learnt to deal with terms such as \$1 billion, \$2 billion, \$7 billion or however many billion dollars as though they just ring off the tongue, and that it is money that can be created at the flick of a finger. It

has worried me for the 10 years that I have been observing this Government's performance, and it worries me even more, particularly in the light of tonight's Federal budget, that Labor Governments have the horrible habit of spending other people's money and that, if things are going wrong, they will simply seek to spend more and more money that is not there. If we consider that it cannot manage, as the member for Custance says, and if we consider the Federal budget tonight, we see that, because of the way in which they are spending money, our foreign debt will blow out to nearer \$200 billion. I feel so sorry for my children and their children and what they will have to put up with, and I wonder whether they will be able to get out of the mess themselves. It is really tragic.

We have seen that, when this Labor Government (the Bannon Government at the present time, and it will probably not be long before it will be the Arnold Government) came to office, net State debt was \$2.6 billion, and by the 1989 State election it had risen to \$4.4 billion; and now it has topped the \$6.5 billion mark, and is estimated to be about \$7 billion. What a massive rise in a relatively short period of time! I would ask anyone, whether any of their salaries gone up by that proportion from 1982 through to now. With the exception of a few people such as the head of the State Bank, the answer would be a resounding 'No'. Few of them would have had a doubling of salaries, let alone a trebling. So, our State debt is a massive worry. The State Bank in itself, from its initial bail-out announced in February 1991 of \$990 million, had a bail-out of \$2 200 million in the last budget, and we have now heard on 6 August, only a week or two ago, that another \$100 million has been added to the bail-out—some \$2 300 million—a massive amount in itself.

It is an amount that has helped see us and our ratings on the international scale plummet so that Standard and Poor's Australian ratings have downgraded South Australia twice since December 1989 from AAA to AA, and its April 1982 report indicated a negative future outlook. As of 30 June 1991, it said South Australia's total debt was \$7.8 billion, which was \$5 381 per capita and 27.3 per cent of gross State product. In fact, even the Public Service Association has estimated that after the State Bank bail-out State debt increased in 1991-92 to \$7.4 billion, and that, similar to the other example I gave, is equivalent to \$5 000 for every South Australian and 25.73 per cent of the gross State product. Again, two completely different organisations came up with almost identical figures on the extent of our debt.

If we consider for a moment the capital spending over this period of time, we see that capital spending has fallen from 21.7 per cent of outlays in 1981-82 to only 13.63 per cent in 1991-92—a massive drop. To show how significant that drop is, it is significant to look at the figures for 1954-55, when capital spending was a massive 45.3 per cent of total spending. Some members would recall (and certainly, people who have studied their history books would know) that this was a period of great growth for South Australia. It was a period when the Liberal Government was in power, and when South Australia went from strength to strength.

In fact I remember that at about that time in the late 1950s there was a real competition between Queensland

and South Australia and our populations were almost identical. In fact I think we may have been a fraction ahead of Queensland. I was hoping that we would take the initiative, take the lead and stream ahead. What has happened? The exact opposite! South Australia under Labor Governments has gone backwards and continues to go backwards while Queensland under non Labor Governments had gone ahead in an astronomical way and is one of the few States still performing effectively and with some confidence at present, although I noticed an article in the *Australian* yesterday, indicating that there was great concern that unemployment could hit Queensland in a massive way as the Government was not providing for future development in that State as it should be. I thought, 'Golly, Labor has only been in for two or three years now and already it is starting to wreck the Queensland economy'.

It is all very well to talk about debt and the fact that we are burdened with it, but how do we go about doing something to alleviate it? Obviously any method of alleviating debt will be painful. Therefore, it was with interest that I read an article that quoted the new Director of the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies, Professor Cliff Walsh, in which he suggested that a tax of about \$2 per day or \$700 a year should be applied to each person. He said that he believed that the Government should try to pay off the \$2.2 billion State Bank component of the State debt within four years by imposing a special levy. What sort of reaction did the general public have? Did the public say, 'Yes, we acknowledge that the representatives, the Labor Government, put there by the people made a mistake and we the people who put them there are prepared to wear it?'

One could well imagine that the reaction was just the opposite. For the first time the people realised just how the Labor Government had mucked up this State, in a way that no-one ever thought possible. On 11 August this year we saw a mass of letters to the Editor of the *Advertiser* indicating just what people thought about the \$2 a day State Bank tax suggestion. Here is a letter from a Geoff Mitchell from Kapunda who states—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, it is in the electorate of the member for Custance. Mr Mitchell states:

We are already paying taxes, plus half of the State's facilities are being closed down to pay for the outrageous mismanagement of the supposed experts who all seem to have lapsed memories.

May I dare to suggest that the directors, executives and board members of the said bank, plus the State Treasurer, be made to pay \$100 a day restitution from their hugely inflated incomes which they are still getting.

I also refer to comments made by Mr Taylor from Whyalla, in the Minister of Transport's electorate. I do not know whether he has been a Liberal or a Labor voter.

**Mr Venning:** An old friend of Frank's.

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

**Mr MEIER:** Mr Taylor states:

It has been suggested that if the tax was set at \$2 per person per day, the debt could be cleared in a few years.

I would like to inform the Government that if it wants me to pay my share, it will have to break into my house and drag me out, I would rather donate all my money to some deserving charity.

No threat, jail sentence, torture or any other means would beat me into submitting.

So, you can see what Mr Taylor thinks of having to pay off the State Bank debt. We can look at what Kurt von Trojan from Mylor had to say. He said:

A tax on every household to pay for the State Bank disaster? Why don't we protest in the streets? Because we are impotent in our rage and disgust. We watch good money thrown after bad to stage royal commissions. What we want to see is people brought to trial, their assets confiscated. In the old Soviet Union, they would have been stood against the wall and shot.

I think Mr von Trojan is nearer to the mark than anyone in recognising the severity of what has happened to our State Bank and what this Government has done in not having identified the problems earlier.

I would also like to comment on a letter from K. Campbell, from Kensington Gardens, who said:

... it highlights the fact that no matter how this may be disguised it is the innocent and long-suffering people of South Australia who have to bear the burden.

I would suggest that if any semblance of justice be observed the entire senior management of the bank, including all directors and the senior directors, together with the Premier and any Cabinet Ministers who were in any way responsible for the overseeing of the bank's affairs, be levied at the rate of \$300 per week for as long as the debt remains unpaid.

Those letters, and many others in the *Advertiser* (and I am sure there were probably many that they could not print, too), identify the rage of the people of this State with what has happened. It identifies the fact that the people realise South Australia cannot afford this debt, and what are we going to do to pay it? Unfortunately, it will be hard times. Here was a little suggestion (I say little, because it was \$2 per day) and we saw the reaction from the people of the State - and I go along with the reaction and I acknowledge it. It is a tragedy that this Government has been allowed to go on year after year and fudge things so that people were not able to see what the truth was. It is quite easy to see in Question Time, on a day-to-day basis, and it is easy to see in the Address in Reply speeches, that the Government continues to fudge, to give unrealistic figures and to give the impression that everything is rosy in the State of South Australia. It is far from that and, unfortunately, it will be a hard road to get out of it.

It will be a new Government, a Liberal Government, that will have to tackle the problems. So often we have seen that the Liberals have had to be put into power to fix up the mess of Labor—time and time again. I guess one of the classics was back in the Whitlam era when Whitlam spent money as though it were going out of fashion, and we had to try to start arresting the massive inflation and the massive spending and try to reverse things into an orderly economic situation. With the Supply Bill, a lot of the money will go into services such as hospitals, schools, roads, and the like. It concerns me greatly that all hospitals in my electorate had a very tough time. With the budget estimate given to them some weeks, if not months, ago they could see that they would have to screw their belt another 4 per cent at least, if not more. They will have to put off more staff and, therefore, the services will be diminished.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** The member for Custance interjects, 'Close Blyth', and I will comment on that shortly. They are right in the process of closing Minlaton already. Minlaton has been a disastrous situation, it was a

complete catch 22 for the people of Minlaton, because they were told, 'All right, the Government would like you to become an emergency outpost only; in other words, transfer your acute services to Yorketown, and we will support people in applying for a nursing home in Minlaton.'

Of course Minlaton said, 'We don't want that, we want the hospital; and if we can get a nursing home we will put in for that.' The Government said, 'If you don't go for that option you can keep operating, but we can't give any guarantee that funding will continue.' Therefore, people were made well aware that the Government would close them down at some future time and that the people would have no say. What a dastardly situation to be in. These people had a knife in their back and a knife in their front: they were in a no-win situation.

I know that the people of Minlaton and the surrounding districts need that hospital as much as if not more than anyone else in South Australia. They have worked hard for it over many years and deserve to retain it. This week's *Plains Producer* under the heading 'Blyth Hospital Funding Crisis' states:

Shock waves rocked the district last Friday following a decision by the State Government to withdraw funding for the Blyth Hospital.

What a shocking situation. Blyth and the member for Culance—it is in his electorate at present and I hope that it will be in my electorate after the next election—have fought with those people to make sure that they continue to maintain their hospital. Yet, we see the Government come in now with this big threat.

The one positive thing I noticed in tonight's Federal budget was that more money would be allocated for hospitals. I hope that a considerable proportion of that money will go to the Blyth Hospital and to many of the other hospitals in my electorate, and that the Blyth Hospital will receive a reprieve. The shadow Minister of Health, the member for Adelaide (Dr Michael Armitage)—and I support him 100 per cent here—has called for a moratorium on the closure of any country hospital until an area health management plan is introduced: in other words, the Government has no business to interfere in the affairs of these community hospitals. If anything is to be done, if any rationalisation is to occur, the people in the area and not some bureaucratic structure in Adelaide have to weigh up the options.

Also, the Kadina Private Hospital and the Ardrossan Private Hospital have both been under enormous pressure. The Government has not been supportive of them. Yet, they offer a great service to their communities, Kadina to such an extent that it has had to purchase the nursing home in the town at a huge cost in order to be able to continue to be viable. Also, other hospitals in the electorate—Balaklava, Wallaroo, Moonta, Maitland, Minlaton and Yorketown—have had funding cuts announced. I know, from speaking with various CEOs and other persons connected with the hospitals, that they are not happy with the way the Government has treated health in the country. For me to hear tonight that the citizens are to pay not 1.25 per cent but 1.4 per cent shows, after a promise from the Federal Government that it would never arise, that the Federal Government is never to be trusted, just as the State Government is never

to be trusted. The sooner they are put out of office the better it will be for South Australia.

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** In addressing the Supply Bill, I believe it is completely appropriate that I should speak immediately after the impassioned plea of my parliamentary colleague the member for Goyder who has given a litany of the dilemmas that are being experienced in the country, particularly in country hospitals. One of the things I particularly would like to address is the news from the Federal budget that would see money—\$1.6 billion over six years or \$300 million annually—put in to control the waiting lists. The reason the waiting lists are supposedly being helped by this injection of funds is not that it is good for patients or anything else. Even the Federal Minister for Health's media release stated that it was because it is electorally sensitive.

What a jolly good reason! He is the Minister of Health: he has a responsibility to the people of Australia to provide good health care, not to wait until the system is collapsing around his electoral ears and then doing something about it. The money being put into the waiting lists from the Federal system is an admission, at last, that Medicare has failed. The Liberal Party, both federally and the State, has been saying for as long as I have been shadow Minister that the Medicare system, which was supposed to provide universal access to health care, in fact provided nothing more and nothing less than universal access to waiting lists.

However, Medicare has failed; we all know that, and I believe that Government members know that. But now the Federal Labor Party has admitted it as well and is belatedly to do something about it. I am pleased, because at last we have a Labor politician admitting that waiting lists are a problem—admittedly, for the wrong reason, as I said before, but at least he is saying that it is a problem. Given that it is a problem, particularly for the people who have been waiting for such a long time, what is the solution?

The solution that the Federal Minister for Health has applied to this problem is the age old socialist solution: we have a problem; let us raise taxes and get everyone to pay for it—instead of addressing the issues, working out the problems and coming to grips with them, let us raise taxes. Make no bones about it: that is exactly what has happened. The Medicare levy, which supposedly was to pay for the health care of Australians—and it has not been doing that by a long chalk—has now gone up from 1.25 per cent to 1.4 per cent, an immediate tax slug on all Australians.

It is a classic socialist solution, and it could have been addressed so much more validly and sensibly by encouraging private health insurance through the taxation system. That is one of the major planks of the Federal Opposition's Fightback package. I do not suppose that my opponents will agree that it is a good idea but at least it is logical. The people who are able to pay for it will elect to do so. They will then be seen by their doctors within the private hospital system, and there will not be such long waiting lists.

Turning to a more immediate State problem, I wish to address the dilemmas of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, chosen specifically because a number of your constituents, Mr Speaker, would utilise that hospital as a



primary health centre. As you know, Sir, this Government has ostensibly pruned \$2.9 million from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's budget. However, when one adds such things as superannuation, wage increases, nursing rosters and so on, the figure becomes not \$2.9 million but \$5.1 million.

This will see the closure of 50 beds; major closures of the hospital between Christmas, New Year and Easter next year; a 25 per cent reduction in outpatient times; and staff reduction. This is directly the result of the policies of the Government and of the Minister of Health—and it is nice to see the Minister in the Chamber. This sort of problem is experienced around South Australia, in the Flinders Medical Centre, for instance. It has had a budget cut of \$2.3 million, which is bad enough, but when you add all the other cuts the total by which the Flinders Medical Centre budget will be behind from last year is, in fact, \$7.1 million.

**Mr Venning:** That's intolerable.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** It is intolerable, as the member for Custance says, but they are the bald facts. What does this mean for South Australia? I will quote some examples, one of which is Mr Bill Jordan from Penneshaw. Mr Jordan is an invalid pensioner and within 12 months he will be an aged pensioner. In a letter to the Minister, of which I have a copy, Mr Jordan says that he has a great amount of difficulty in walking, even with the aid of a walking stick. His right leg is affected by sciatica and cellulitis and he has arthritis in the right knee. The sciatica, which is pain going down the back of the leg from the sciatic nerve, has recently recurred after about 12 years. The arthritis in his knee has been present for 14 years. He is unable to take anti-inflammatory drugs, which is the standard treatment for arthritis, because they produce a side effect in his stomach. Clearly, taking large amounts of pain killers on a regular basis is not good for him, either.

On 21 May, his local general practitioner contacted the orthopaedic outpatients clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for an appointment with the clinic for his right knee. I emphasise that that was on 21 May 1992. His appointment at the orthopaedic outpatients clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is on 6 January 1993—seven months after he originally contacted his general practitioner. Given that his appointment at the clinic is seven months after his original contact with the general practitioner, Mr Jordan asks how long he will have to wait. This is the human face of what this Government is doing. A doctor decides that a person who has suffered from arthritis for many years needs treatment, but it is seven months before they get an appointment at the outpatients clinic and it is perhaps a year later before they are seen. That has a devastating effect caused not by the Fightback package or by the State Opposition but directly by the Medicare system and the failure of this Government which is propped up by the votes of the three Independents on a numbers basis. That is what this game is all about.

These human tragedies are caused by the policies of this Government. I remind the House that a couple of months ago the chief of the Ear, Nose and Throat Department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital indicated that it was not even worth seeing outpatients any more because there was no money to do the operations, they

were doing emergency services only, and people put onto the outpatient clinic lists would never get on. What an indictment!

Another human face of the tragedy caused by this Government's policy is that of Mr P. Coonrod from Mount Gambier. He wrote to the member for Mount Gambier saying this his 15 year old son had been waiting to have orthodontic treatment since he was 11 years old. That is only four years! He had just reached the top of the list having been waiting for four years when he was contacted by someone from the clinic who said that he regretted to inform Mr Coonrod that:

Due to the current economic climate, health card holders in rural areas would no longer be entitled to orthodontic treatment unless they were willing to travel to Adelaide for the treatment once every six weeks for two years.

This is from a Government that touts itself as a champion of social justice. What a joke! This is the human tragedy that one sees regularly, and it is caused directly by the policies of this Government.

Having indicated previously the figures from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I would like now to deal with some figures from the Lyell McEwin Hospital—again not chosen at random, but the Lyell McEwin Hospital is chosen because that is where constituents of the member for Elizabeth and the member for Napier elect are seen. I will talk about the paediatric allied health services at the Lyell McEwin Health Service.

I wrote to the Minister of Health on 10 June asking for waiting times for the paediatric allied health services. My reason for doing this was that I had been contacted by a number of people who had been devastated by the long waiting times their children had been experiencing. I indicate to the House that for children it is a vital factor in their treatment that they are seen before a problem has the opportunity to develop further. I was provided with the following figures. At the Lyell McEwin Hospital a child outpatient who needs a physiotherapy appointment can wait for between two and four weeks to be seen. Often the problem may have gone by then or, indeed, the problem may have become long lasting because of a lack of urgent treatment.

I am happy to admit that there are some good things in this report. Babies with feeding problems get seen within 24 hours, and that is quite appropriate. Fluency and voice disorders are seen within two months. That is only just adequate—in fact, I believe it is inadequate. If your child is an outpatient under three years and has a problem that needs treatment by a speech pathologist, you may wait 10 months to get seen. This, I remind members, is at a time when the child's voice is being formed, its whole speaking pattern is being formed and when its whole personality is being formed, because it is just beginning to go to things like playgroup and is becoming more of a social being. People can wait 10 months for a speech pathology appointment.

With respect to occupational therapy, children considered at risk have to wait for between two and four weeks. One wonders what can happen during that four weeks if they are at risk when it is first notified. Outpatient children under two years wait for two months. Outpatient children between two and six years wait for six months to see an occupational therapist. Children aged between six and eight at the Lyell McEwin Health Service paediatric allied health services for occupational

therapy wait for an appointment for between six and 12 months. I ask: what is this Government doing?

Surely the Government has a responsibility to the children of South Australia. Surely the Government has a responsibility to treat immediately these innocent children who are unfortunately in need of treatment. I can understand why some members of the Government might choose to feel happy if I, the member for Adelaide, had to wait for some treatment at the hospital. I can understand that, but I cannot understand why they would expect a child under three years as an outpatient to wait for 10 months to see a speech pathologist when that may have an effect for that child's whole life. Why should an innocent child under three years be forced to suffer because of the mismanagement and bungling of this Government? Those are the constituents of the member for Elizabeth and the person who wishes to be the member for Napier. People out in the community are suffering with those sorts of waiting lists. I can only hope that, if a vote comes up—and as far as I am concerned, the sooner the better—members will bear in mind the sufferings of these constituents caused directly by the policies of this Government.

Recently a Miss Marjory Lowrey from Seacombe Gardens contacted me to indicate that she has a chronic lung disease requiring 24 hour oxygen therapy. She has been treated at Flinders Medical Centre for four years. During the four years she has been supplied with an oxygenated machine that ran on electric power 24 hours a day. To enable her to leave the house she was supplied with two portable oxygen cylinders a week. The policies of this Government, propped up by the votes of the Independent Labor Party members, have told Miss Lowrey, 'You can no longer have portable oxygen.' Miss Lowrey is now literally confined to home. Miss Lowrey is a prisoner in her own home not because of the policies of the Federal Opposition and not because of what the State Opposition wants to do and will do as soon as it gets the opportunity: she is confined to her home directly because of the policies of this Government. The Minister of Health shrugs his shoulders and does not seem to care.

A constituent of mine, Olga Douventzidis of Prospect, who is not privately health insured, came to see me on the advice of her local doctor. She had been suffering severe right leg pain since August 1991 and the reason, as her doctor indicated, was quite valid. She had been assessed by the Royal Adelaide Hospital Spinal Unit and has been put on the waiting list for bilateral decompression to be undertaken on 17 September. She was told that on 16 July. She first saw her local doctor on 2 January 1992 and he rang the Royal Adelaide Hospital. He was faced with a patient with chronic pain on 2 January and the appointment given was for June, six months later. The delay was directly caused by the policies of this Government.

In fact, Ms Douventzidis could not go on with the pain and was forced to go to casualty. Thankfully, she was seen there and referred to an outpatient clinic on 17 April. As I understand it, she finally has a time in September for her operation. I repeat: the first time the hospital was contacted concerning her problems was on 2 January. January is the first month and September is the ninth month, and that clearly seems like an eight month wait caused by nothing more nor less than the policies of this failed, tired, lethargic Government, a Government that is fearful of losing the election, as it jolly well ought to be. The Government is called to account by the people of South Australia who want an opportunity to have a say whether they are getting a fair go from the Government. I believe that they clearly are not.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 August at 2 p.m.