

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 August 1992

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

**TOBACCO PRODUCTS
(LICENSING) (FEES) AMENDMENT BILL**

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

PETITIONS**JUVENILE OFFENDERS**

A petition signed by 3 676 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for juvenile offenders was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 463 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain the Queen Elizabeth Hospital rehabilitation woodwork centre was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

BUS ROUTE 275

A petition signed by 821 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain bus route 275 was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

MORPHETT ROAD

A petition signed by 239 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to

reopen the southern side of Morphett Road was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

GAMING MACHINES

A petition signed by 610 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to repeal the gaming machines legislation was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

A petition signed by 182 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 Mrs Hutchison.

Petition received.

PUBLICATION STANDARDS

A petition signed by 12 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to stop reduced standards being created by publishers of magazines and posters debasing women was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Acting Premier (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Remuneration Tribunal—Reports Relating to Determinations—

Member for Alexandra.

Judiciary—Travelling Allowances.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—Port Augusta.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985—Regulations—Code of Practice—Animals for Scientific Purposes.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Industrial Court and Commission of South Australia—Report, 1991-92.

**ASIA PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION
FORUM**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am pleased to inform the House that last week, representing my State and Territory ministerial colleagues, I attended several key meetings in the United States of America. Education Ministers and other senior education officials from Australia and some 14 Asia-Pacific nations attended the meeting, which was held in Washington from 5 to 6 August.

For the interest of members, I table the Declaration of the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC)

Education Ministerial. The Ministers agreed that high-quality education for all has a positive impact on the level, growth and distribution of income in the region and on the quality of life of the region's people. They affirmed that education plays a valuable role in developing students who are tolerant and respectful of others, view learning as a lifelong pursuit, possess a sense of their own cultural identity and are responsible citizens of their communities, their societies and the world.

This declaration then relates to the values and attributes placed on the education system in the Asia-Pacific region, and paves the way for continued regional cooperation. It is interesting to note that it mirrors the historic agreement made at a meeting of the Australian Education Council in 1989, which I attended and which established national goals for schooling in Australia. It also reflects South Australia's charter for education for the twenty-first century.

I also was present at the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation in Education and Related Training between the Government of Australia and the Government of the United States of America, and I table a copy of that for the interest of members. While a substantial program of exchanges of people and information at all levels of education and training already exists between the United States and Australia, the memorandum creates an environment for the enhancement and extension of the existing commitment to cooperation. I also attended the opening of the Australian Education Office in Washington and a meeting of the Education Commission of the States in Cincinnati, Ohio.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I wish to advise that questions otherwise directed to the Premier will be taken by the Acting Premier, and questions otherwise directed to the Treasurer will be taken by the Minister of Finance.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Minister of Labour sit in silence at the recent ALP convention while a union motion on WorkCover was passed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That motion will delay some crucial amendments to the WorkCover legislation that should be introduced into this House this year.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question? On the last sitting day I gave a ruling on questions and answers and conduct in this House. I would draw the Leader's attention to Standing Orders which clearly lay down that a question may not be debated—it must be directed to the Minister. I would remind Ministers that I shall be looking for clear, not debated, answers. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Do you wish me to proceed with the explanation?

The SPEAKER: If the Leader wishes to explain the question, he may do so with the leave of the House.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The motion passed requires the Minister to report to a special ALP convention before amendments are introduced. A year's delay in introducing those amendments, because that is obviously the time frame in which the motion would be passed, would cost businesses \$42 million in extra premiums, and that is equivalent to about 1 200 jobs in this State. At no stage during the debate did the Minister attempt to amend or oppose the union motion, which will prevent the adoption of select committee recommendations that he agreed to in this House in March of this year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will clarify the responsibilities of members and Ministers. They are responsible to this House for actions that impinge on their duties in this House. The attitude of a Minister or a member at a Party conference is not a responsibility to the House. A question can be ruled in order only in respect of actions for which he is responsible to the House.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I point out that the question specifically related to why the Minister allowed certain actions to be taken at an ALP convention which would delay the introduction of legislation into this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I reiterate that the Minister is responsible to answer in this House only for his actions in this House. The timing of the introduction of legislation into this House by a Minister or any private member is in their hands. Once it is put into the hands of the House, it comes under the rules of debate in the House. The timing of legislation is not a matter of debate.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: With due respect, Mr Speaker, I point out that the question specifically relates to actions that the Minister has taken outside this House with respect to the timing of the introduction of legislation into this Parliament, and that has everything to do with the business of this House. Therefore, it is legitimately a question for the Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is not responsible to the House for the timing of the introduction of legislation. He is responsible for the framing and presentation of the legislation, but the timing of that presentation, in the opinion of the Chair, is not a responsibility to the House. It is totally in the hands of the Minister. To the extent that the Minister is responsible to the House for the legislation, I ask the Minister to respond.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Alexandra for his question. What we do within our own councils—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was put by the Leader of the Opposition. That is his position and that is the term of reference that will be used.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: What happens within the councils of the Australian Labor Party and what people do there is within their own province and is no real business of the Opposition. However, I would like to

draw a comparison. When the Australian Labor Party has a conference, not only are the delegates admitted to it, but the doors are kept open. The press is allowed in and is allowed to record on sound or video or in writing. If the member for Alexandra or any other member opposite wanted to go to our conference, provided a delegate vouched for them, I am sure they could come and sit through the whole of it.

I doubt whether that sort of courtesy would be extended by the Liberals to any member of the public, because they have to close their doors as they have short knives and long swords stabbing each other. That is what they get up to: that is why they do not want the public looking at what they do.

In relation to which Bills I will introduce in relation to workers compensation, as I said last Thursday, wait and see. The honourable member will be able to make his own assessment as to what they will do. I remind the House that the Government has undertaken a number of reforms, and with WorkCover we are seeing the ultimate aim—the introduction of WorkCover. Incidentally, I might add that, when the current Leader of the Opposition was the Minister of Labour, he was not prepared to introduce reforms which, had they been introduced at that time, would have brought about a significant drop in injury rates, would have seen the cost of workers compensation come down considerably and would have seen greater productivity for employers.

A number of business places in this State were not doing very well at all. In one particular case, the manager was sent here by the Sydney office to run a company, work out its contracts, wind it up and close it down. That person had one look and said, 'I can make this work', and that factory is now a leading light in how to manage a place by involving the workers and reducing the injuries. It racks up, nearly every time, in excess of 500 000 hours of work without any time lost for injury. It varies between \$36 million and \$42 million worth of product without anyone losing a day through injury. That company is making money and is a product leader.

One has only to look at other companies where there has been a decrease in revenue through prices not having gone up in accordance with the CPI and where there has been a fall-off in sales but where profits have increased tremendously because the accident rate has been reduced. What we are talking about is reducing the accident rate, improving productivity and making more money.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Victoria again interjects. He ought to know that, if we can bring about these changes, we can then become the smart country and sell our products overseas. But when we adopt the old attitude of abusing workers and when we masquerade as being their friend but say that when people are injured they are rotting the system—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The honourable member continues to interject. He says he cares for people, but it is a sham. He knows that. He knows that if we bring down the rate, if we think about it and plan it, we can bring down the costs. That is precisely what is happening now. As I said on Thursday, over the past three years the injury rate has come down slightly in excess of 31 per cent—and that is not a bad effort.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The know-all from Goyder—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to draw his response to a close.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: —says, 'The highest in Australia.' We have been able to bring down our injury rates to a greater extent than have New South Wales and Victoria. I suggest that he should go and have a look. We have brought them down 31 per cent, and members opposite now say that it is a lie. They would not know what they are talking about.

BEACH CHARGES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of proposals that people should be charged to use Adelaide's metropolitan beaches, and will she indicate the origin of this proposal? Following speculation on this issue in the media, I have received many telephone calls in my electorate office expressing strong opposition to this proposal. I happen to agree with that opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot comment.

Mr HAMILTON: An article in the *Sunday Mail* of 9 August is headlined 'User-pays beach plan outrage', hence my question.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As members would know, the honourable member represents a district that incorporates quite a large section of our coastline—as do you, Sir—and a number of his constituents will be interested in my answer.

I would like to begin by, first, congratulating the *Sunday Mail* on its editorial in which it said that the idea of imposing a beach charge is so outrageous it deserves a prize. I think it is important to look at where this idea originated. The idea was raised by an employee of the Glenelg council at a meeting of seaside councils to discuss the Coast Protection Review. How do I know this? I was actually in the discussion group when this idea was raised. It was very clearly rejected by all people participating in that group. As if that were not enough, the Mayor of Glenelg, in the article to which the honourable member referred, was referred to as follows:

However, Glenelg Mayor Mr Brian Nadilo, said his council would seriously consider the option of charging a fee to use the beach.

The Mayor went on to say:

We would be looking at people having to pay to park their car anywhere along the foreshore, charges to use the jetty and certainly charges to use the beach.

I was a little concerned by this, because I actually released this review into the Coast Protection Act. So, I went back to the review and had another look at it. The only two references to any kind of charging at all that I can find in the whole review are under headings such as 'Suggestions for Discussion'. One suggestion on page 17 states:

That councils consider charges where practical to recover at least some of the costs of providing the coastal facilities.

That certainly in no way refers to anything to do with charging people to surf, to be on the sand or to enjoy themselves on the beach. Let me finish by saying—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —that the poor, hapless, new shadow Minister has to jump on the band wagon, does not bother to read the report and is quoted in a press release as saying that he is talking about the possibility 'of fencing off beaches' and—wait for it—'erecting turnstiles to charge families to enter public beaches'.

Let me put this clearly on the public record. This Government is not about charging young people, people in their middle years or elderly citizens for enjoying the pleasures of our beaches. If Opposition members and their running mate, the Glenelg council, want to charge people—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —to use the beach, let them come out clearly and say that, because it seems to me that that is exactly what they are saying. They want to charge people. They are now going to try to dress it up under some kind of coast protection review. I refer members to this review of the Coast Protection Act. I remind them that it is 20 years since this Act was implemented in this State, and it is certainly long overdue for review. I would ask members to please address the very serious and long-term issues contained in the review. We look forward to their response. Let us have rational debate and let us stop this nonsensical political point scoring.

SEPARATION PACKAGES

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Why are some public servants being allowed to return to work for the same Government department for which they worked previously within months of taking voluntary redundancy packages, which can be worth up to \$100 000 and more? Will the Minister ensure that this abuse of taxpayers' money is stopped immediately?

This practice is occurring in at least three departments: the Education Department, the Department of Agriculture and SACON. A public servant who took voluntary redundancy last year has provided information that those involved have taken their redundancy payments and then registered with a temporary employment agency so that they can be re-engaged through the agency to work in their former department. Our informant was himself offered the opportunity to participate in such an arrangement, which he says exists with the full knowledge of departmental administrators.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Bragg for his question. I would appreciate it if he would give me the names of those people so that I can have their contracts terminated immediately. The condition for taking a voluntary separation package is that for a period after taking that package a person cannot be re-employed by the Government. If the member for Bragg gives me the names of those people, I will ensure that that matter is rectified straight away.

RACING INFORMATION

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether a licensed bookmaker may offer a recorded information telephone service in which he recommends horses to punters? My bookmaker recently drew to my attention the fact that his 0055 telephone tipping service on Adelaide races has been proscribed by the Bookmakers Licensing Board. The telephone service duplicates his tips, which he now gives on ABC radio.

An honourable member: Is he any good?

Mr ATKINSON: Splendid! Some leading interstate bookmakers provide a similar 0055 telephone service.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Spence for his question and acknowledge his long-standing interest in the welfare of bookmakers in this State. It is a very important part of our racing industry, and I am sure the member for Morphett will endorse those comments. It is important that the community know that what is being done is legal and an acceptable community practice.

Section 119 of the Act prevents the communication of racing information for profit. I have taken advice and it appears that Telecom is immune from prosecution under any legislation apart from Commonwealth legislation in this regard. A consequence of the advice I have received is that no offence is being committed provided Telecom is prepared to sanction the service that is being offered.

In fact, the honourable member can advise his constituent—and I am sure that the service being offered is being taken up by many members of the community—given that Telecom will continue to sanction the services, it will continue to operate. I am sure that that will be the case in respect of the honourable member's constituent. I undertake to communicate that advice to the Bookmakers Licensing Board so that it has that information as well.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Will the Minister of Labour explain why carpenters working on the eaves lining of a house will now be required to surround the house with scaffolding, and will he say what he has done to stop this stupidity? This is the result of the latest national occupational health and safety decree, which will be administered by the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. The Housing Industry Association is informing its members that this decree will require two carpenters working on the eaves lining of a house who now use saw tools and a plank to scaffold the whole perimeter of the house with an approved type of scaffolding and hold a certificate of competency to use the scaffold. The HIA says, 'The cost in both time and money to the builder and subcontractor will be totally unacceptable.'

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I would have thought that, given that he was shadow Minister of Labour at one time, the honourable member might have learnt a thing or two about how industrial safety codes, practices and regulations are formulated. Those codes and practices, which previously were considered by the State occupational health and safety committees, have more

recently been considered by the national organisation, whereby the three social partners involved, including the building employers, the unions and the Government, prepare a code of practice and a regulation. That code of practice and the regulation are then sent out to the industry for initial consultation.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: They come back and are consolidated, and they then go out again for further consultation before being formulated and becoming a code of practice. It takes an inordinately long time. It takes 23 to 28 months to do it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Newland calls it stupidity and the member for Goyder echoes her. We have here a classic case of people wanting to risk other people's lives. They are not prepared to accept—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: They are not prepared to accept the fact that these codes of practice—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: —are not obligatory. They require the employer to provide a safe method of working. I find amazing the interjections from the member for Goyder. I heard him stand up in this House a few years ago and ask the then Minister of Labour (Jack Wright) to relax the safety standards in a machine shop in Maitland so that it could continue to operate.

Mr Meier: Hear, hear!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: He says, 'Hear, hear!' What he wants is for those people in Maitland to work in substandard, dangerous conditions so that they can get hurt, so that they can be maimed, so that they can be killed.

Mr Meier: It's been like that for hundreds of years.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: He says that it has been like this for 100 years. Sure, it might have been like that for 100 years, and they built the pyramids 4 000 years ago. Is the member for Goyder suggesting that we should have a safety record like they had with the pyramids? Is he suggesting that families should see their breadwinner go out to work in the morning without a chance of coming home that night whole?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Victoria laughs about this, but one of the most dangerous areas in which to work is the construction industry. The member for Mitcham selected something that might not have been applied properly and thought it was good fun to ask that question but, if the member for Mitcham and other members opposite were fair dinkum about this, they would be looking at how to bring about safe working practices. I do not believe that an employer has any right to take risks with workers' lives, no more than any person has the right to take risks with the lives of other people when they drive motor cars or do other things. They do not have the right to say that so that they can make money and place people's lives in danger. That is precisely what they are on about.

I know of an honourable member in another place who complained about the quote for repairing and painting a flagpole. He complained about their having to put scaffolding around the flagpole. He wanted to know why they could not put up a ladder. I do not know whether members opposite have thought about this, but, in this case, the flagpole was made of wood. If the ladder had been up on the flagpole and it had broken, the worker would have been impaled on the flagpole.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Victoria laughs about that, but let me tell him about an agricultural worker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Minister has fully answered the question and I ask him to draw his response to an end.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will, Mr Speaker. This incident happened at Nelshabee. The owner of the property had a reaping machine that was converted for reaping peas. It had long fingers of metal tubing. He was working underneath the comb when it collapsed. By the grace of God and with all good fortune, the two fingers fell either side of his shoulders. If they had fallen anywhere else, they would have killed him. A number of things had gone wrong in that area because of inexperience and a lack of knowledge by those people. I just hope that, when the member for Victoria works on his farm equipment, he uses all the skills and knowledge he has gained. I would not like to see that happen to him because he is a very good Port Adelaide Football Club supporter.

INDIAN PACIFIC

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Transport provide details of the recent announcement by the Prime Minister to refurbish the Indian Pacific passenger train and say what this will mean for Port Augusta, in particular, and South Australia generally?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was a very significant day on Sunday when the Prime Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members for Mitcham and Murray-Mallee are out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. It was a very significant day on Sunday when the Prime Minister made his announcement on the rail industry, particularly as it affected this State. Under the One Nation package, the Prime Minister had already made some significant announcements, including standardisation of the Adelaide-Melbourne line, the loop-line to Outer Harbor, and so on. But it was with particular pleasure that I heard the Prime Minister make some further announcements specifically about the Indian Pacific, which I am sure every member here who has had the pleasure of travelling on it will agree is one of the most spectacular train trips in the world. To have the trains brought up to an international standard is something that I am sure everyone here will applaud.

I was disappointed to hear the Federal Liberal member, Mr Hawker, castigate the decision. The Federal Liberal Party opposed that decision to refurbish the Indian Pacific. I thought that was appalling; it was a dreadful

thing to do. I know that the refurbishing will go ahead; it will be done principally in the Port Augusta railway workshops, and the credit for that can to a great extent go to this Government and, in particular, to the member for Stuart for her advocacy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —on behalf of the workers in the Port Augusta railway workshops. I was also pleased at the announcement that funds had been released for the standardisation and certain associated works, and that 3 000 tonnes of 60 kilogram rail will be ordered for this work. I know that the workers at Whyalla will tender for this contract, and I have every confidence in their ability to win it. Again, the Iron Triangle has done particularly well out of the Prime Minister over the past few months.

There is a very real issue regarding the National Rail Corporation. Although I will not go into the background of it in any great detail, suffice to say, that for the first time Australia will finish up with an integrated rail service operating from Perth right through to Brisbane, with one gauge carrying a large part of the nation's freight efficiently, economically and safely. After over 100 years of rail service in this nation, people will, for generations to come, thank the Federal Labor Government, which has been able to achieve this against a considerable amount of opposition.

NATIONAL WAGE

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I address my question to the Minister of Labour. Will the South Australian Government support the ACTU's claim for a national wage increase of \$10 a week, to be paid prior to the end of this year?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Government has yet to make its decision in this area.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr HERON (Peake): My question is directed to the Acting Minister of Tourism. What overall impact would a goods and services tax, or GST, have on the tourism industry in Australia, particularly South Australia? Today's *Australian* carries a report stating that two confidential reports have warned the Federal Opposition that its GST policies would spark a decline in the tourism industry.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in the tourism industry. I note the groans from members opposite but, of course, it is very important that we debate these issues about what impact different proposals federally would have on regional economies.

According to the two reports, a GST would threaten not only current jobs but also the 200 000 new jobs the industry forecasts will be created by the end of the decade. The Inbound Tourism Organisation of Australia claims that a 10 per cent loss in returns from tourism due to the GST would not be an unrealistic assumption. Indeed, others are saying that it is likely to have a greater

impact than that. This amounts to \$372 million and about 600 jobs lost in one year. I believe that 15 per cent GST would add about \$1 000 to the cost of a six day, seven night holiday in Australia for a Japanese visitor. Despite earlier assurances that it is aware of the economic importance of tourism, the Federal Opposition has done a complete about face and has ignored the tourism industry's pleas to be treated like other export industries and to be exempted from the GST. All tour packages purchased by inbound tourists—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There is far too much noise in the Chamber. The Chair cannot hear the question or the response, and I am sure that no other member can. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I understand from Federal members that the honourable member opposite who is calling out is keen to make a come-back. After the performance of his Leader in the past couple of days, it is not surprising. All tour packages purchased by inbound tourists will be subject to GST, as will accommodation, entertainment and other expenses incurred in Australia.

According to these reports, we will see a heavy detrimental impact on the Adelaide Festival, on the Grand Prix and on small and large tourism operators and a devastating impact in country areas. Air fares to and from Australia will be exempt: fares within Australia will not. The recent deregulation has shown how large an impact price has on air travel. Domestic air fares will increase significantly, quite possibly to the detriment of tourism, particularly in States like South Australia because of the negative impact of the GST. It is very important that the Leader of the Opposition, whose current policy is to try to remain mute and keep out of the headlines while some of his crew attack him for not being more prominent, should have a clear look at this policy's impact on tourism and take it up with his Federal colleagues.

JULIA FARR CENTRE

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Has the Minister of Health been advised of two recent cases of alleged sexual assault on female patients at the Julia Farr Centre? Will the Minister ensure that practices at the Julia Farr Centre and other institutions under his control are adequate to guarantee the personal safety of residents and patients? Police are currently investigating allegations that two female patients at the Julia Farr Centre have been sexually assaulted by a staff member who has now left the centre. In each case the patient had been left alone with the staff member. When inquiring why the centre was not providing two nurses to attend patients of the opposite sex, my informant was told that the centre did not have sufficient resources to maintain that practice.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Sincerely, my answer to the first question is 'No' and to the second question 'Yes'.

DRY LAND SALINISATION

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What steps have been taken by the State Government to address the problem of dry land salinisation which was described in two articles in today's *Advertiser*?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member and indeed other members who have indicated their interest in this very serious problem. In answering the question, I should like first to pay tribute to the *Advertiser's* environment writer, Sylvia Kriven, for having summarised the problems of salinity in the Upper South-East so comprehensively. As the feature article accurately points out, salinity in the Upper South-East has been a direct result of vegetation clearance during the past 40 years. If we look at what has happened as well as that, we can see that at the same time, with the advent of laser levelling, this has allowed farmers to expedite the surface run-off which in turn has contributed to the ponding of surface water elsewhere in the system.

The report is also correct in suggesting that the solution must lie in a combination of deep drainage and the massive replanting of native trees and other deep rooted pastures. As members of this House would be only too aware, the issue of dry land salinity in the Upper South-East was brought to the attention of the Land Resource Management Standing Committee shortly after the problem was first recognised, and in August 1990 the committee considered a report on this problem. Since that time, a steering committee has been established to explore the options both for drainage and for better management and control, and to investigate the various funding mechanisms by which the work might be financed.

I am advised that a draft report on these issues will be available for release to the public and comment by the public in November of this year. It is important that public meetings take place in order for people to comment on the report when it is released in November. I believe that it is important to note that the issue is one of the gravest environmental and financial concerns to the rural community, in particular, in the Upper South-East of South Australia and, indeed, to the whole State. It is an issue of great scientific and technical complexity.

In conclusion, I wish to pay tribute to Mr Vince Sweet and the members of the Upper South-East Dryland Salinity and Flood Mitigation Plan Steering Committee for the work they have put in to try to resolve this problem. I am aware that this committee is working tirelessly to find financial as well as technical and practical solutions. I look forward to launching in November the first draft of that committee's report for public consultation, and I ask all members of the House to give this matter their support when the report is released. We look forward to gaining comment from various members, particularly from the local members for the area.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): How does the Minister of Water Resources justify the appointment of a consultant at a cost of \$2 000 a day to tell the Government how to reduce E&WS Department staff by 800 by December? The consultant, Miss Vivien Reid of the Sydney based CrossTech, was employed in February for an indefinite period. No local consultants were invited to tender for this work. Her brief is to give advice on managing a reduction in the departmental work force by 800, and many staff are asking how an expensive consultancy can be justified when their positions are being cut back because of budget restraints. I have also been told that workshops, concluding with free drinks, are one device being used to soften up employees in this exercise.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I take this matter very seriously. The honourable member who asks the question is the same person who, at Estimates time, actually asks what we are doing to become more efficient and more effective in the provision of a service to the community that is user friendly and responds to the community in terms of community expectations.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have been asked a question and would be delighted to answer it. As members would know, during my time as Minister of Water Resources we have had a particular responsibility to look at making the department more efficient, to having a better bottom line and, at the same time, to providing a service to the community that it quite properly expects from us. There are a number of ways to go about this.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I could have rushed in with a slash and burn approach and removed people willy nilly across the department, or we could have looked at a proper and sensitive restructuring of the department whereby we called in a consultant to look at those functions we needed to carry out and those functions which, perhaps, are relics of the past and which we may not need to proceed with in a modern, streamlined and responsive department.

I would have thought that the honourable member would congratulate me on a professional response to a problem. I think it is important to recognise that, if we were to remove about 850 employees from a department, we would want to ensure a proper restructuring of that department.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member does not like this answer because it is, in fact, accurate.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: They do not like this answer, and it shows what little business acumen and understanding the member for Heysen has. We on this side of the House well know that. The fact is that the

Government has employed consultants to assist in this restructuring in a very sensitive way that will achieve the results that we want and at the same time ensure that we can deliver the kind of cost savings that the community—forget about the Opposition—is demanding. Let us be very clear on the difference between the Government and the Opposition. I do not intend to march into my departments with jack boots on and destroy people and their careers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume her seat. The member for Heysen has asked a question. If he wishes to ask another question, he should let the Chair know. He will also have an opportunity during the grievance debate or a later debate, but he will maintain order while he is in the House and cease interjecting. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: What I was attempting to say is that I will restructure my departments with some degree of humanity and sensitivity, unlike the Opposition, whose policies would be just to get rid of people and not to consider the kinds of functions we need to retain within government to provide the services required by the community, on the one hand, and to fulfil our statutory requirements that are given to us by this Parliament, on the other. I will stand very firmly by the fact that we are restructuring, we are reducing the size of the department and we will have a department that is more responsive, efficient and sensitive to the needs of the community.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House how the results of negotiations between the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments on a new national system of vocational education and training will affect South Australia? Education professionals approached me recently unsure as to whether a national TAFE system would mean that TAFE colleges in South Australia would be less responsive to South Australian needs.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Minister, I remind him that he is able to give a full and free statement by way of a ministerial statement. I ask him to keep that in mind when making his response.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will endeavour to be brief and off the cuff, Mr Speaker. I think it is important to recognise that what has been reached by all State and Territory Governments, including Liberal and Labor Governments, with the Federal Keating Government, is a truly historic change in vocational education and training. Mr Speaker, you will remember that last September there was a bid by the Commonwealth to take over TAFE funding totally. This proposal was fought by a number of State Governments around the country, excluding Victoria. It was fought by the Western Australian and South Australian Governments and others because we believed it was vitally and critically important for regional industry in an economy such as exists in South Australia that we had a TAFE system that was flexible, dynamic and responsive to industry. It was also felt important, too, that we had a TAFE system that was

industry driven and not driven by bureaucrats from DEET in Canberra.

After months of very hard negotiations with the former Minister (John Dawkins) and the present Minister (Kym Beazley), we saw an announcement by the Prime Minister (Mr Keating) that there would be not only a takeover of funding but a complete takeover by the Commonwealth of the running of the TAFE colleges around Australia, and that would mean direct operational control as well as management and policy control from Canberra.

South Australia put forward a position called the 'national partnership model' that was supported by the Liberal Government of Tasmania, the Liberal Government of the Northern Territory, the Labor Government of Queensland and the Labor Government of Western Australia. I am very pleased to say that at the last minute the New South Wales Liberal Government, with John Fahey and Virginia Chadwick, came in behind, and we now have agreement on a national partnership.

That national partnership will involve TAFE systems that are jointly funded by the Commonwealth and the States, but it will also, of course, be a real partnership and not a token arrangement in both policy and operations. So we will see a national training authority that will look at the national training agenda, coordination and national standards.

That national training authority will be appointed by and responsible to the State, Territory and Commonwealth Ministers, not just to the Commonwealth. There will be shared funding and shared control. That is vitally important for this State, and it will mean tens of millions of dollars more for our TAFE system and thousands of new TAFE places here in South Australia.

SAGASCO

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Minister representing the Treasurer. Will the Government consider the option of seeking changes to SAGASCO's memorandum of articles of association, while the Government maintains the 57 per cent shareholding in the company, to ensure that SAGASCO's head office and its financial controls and administration are retained in South Australia after the Government has sold its shares?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Premier and Treasurer made a very clear—I thought it was very clear—press release on the sale of SAGASCO.

Mr Lewis: What about Parliament?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not quite sure what the interjection is supposed to mean. The press release was very clear; it announced the Government's intention. The Premier also gave a press conference—which, again, was very clear. I am not sure whether the Leader of the Opposition has a copy of that press release. I will make it available to him, and he will see that this is a conditional bid. It is a—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —conditional offer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Does the honourable member want me to send him the press release? It is quite clear; it is a conditional offer. The press release states that what any bidder wishes to do with the company is something that the Government may take into account when deciding which buyer it will choose. I would have thought that was clear enough. However, if the Leader wants it spelt out in a little more detail, I can assist him. Some of the things that will be borne in mind by the Government when considering any offers include the questions of employment and the head office, just to name two. Those factors will be taken into account.

I would have thought that anyone who had had the slightest business experience would agree with a testing of the market—what the Government is doing—that is, seeing what the company shares are worth. We are establishing what that parcel of shares is worth. When we have tested the market, we will make a decision.

All the things that all the 'experts' have suggested we should do will be taken into account and given the weight they deserve. The Government will then make a decision and convey that decision to the people of South Australia, including the Leader of the Opposition. Without getting into repetition, I do not know that I can make it any clearer for the Leader of the Opposition.

GOOLWA POLICE STATION

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Emergency Services advise the House of the current position at Goolwa in relation to the police and the police infrastructure? I have received some correspondence from a Mr D.W. McLaren, secretary of the Finnis ALP sub-branch. He states, in part:

At a meeting of the Finnis sub-branch held at Victor Harbor on 2 August 1992 some concern was expressed at the possible closure of the Goolwa Police Station and the transfer of its operational activities to Victor Harbor.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is interesting that the member for Stuart should ask that question because, when Caucus met last week in Victor Harbor, I also had some approaches from people from Goolwa, so it is obviously a matter of some concern down there. Because I had those approaches, I was able to contact the Police Commissioner and get an answer, which I can now give the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The answer is that there will be no relocation of the police officers at Goolwa and the police station will not be closed. I think, from memory, that a new police station will be built at Goolwa at some stage, which further mitigates against the notion of the police station's closing.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Why is the Minister of Employment and Further Education trying to hide the tragedy of long-term unemployment in South Australia? The Minister's response last Thursday to the July labour force figures made no mention of the fact that long-term unemployment is increasing at a faster rate in South

Australia than in any other mainland State. Figures from the Department of Social Security, which were released at the same time, show that in July 32 991 South Australians were receiving the monthly Newstart allowance for those who have been unemployed for at least 12 months. That was a rise of 6.3 per cent over the previous month, well above that of any other State. These figures also show that 42.9 per cent of South Australians receiving some form of unemployment allowance are now classified as long-term unemployed, which is the highest proportion of all the mainland States.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have had the advantage of having seen the honourable member's question because he faxed it around various radio stations and to people in the bush yesterday. I know that he is new to his job but his apparent misunderstanding of labour force statistics is akin to moving the goalposts and still kicking out of bounds on the full. The simple fact is that he is following in the footsteps of the former Leader of the Opposition. I know it is confusing, but I am talking about the most immediate former Leader of the Opposition, not the one who almost got there, who in May last year issued false figures. He issued Tasmania's figures and tried to confuse people about the nature of the figures being released.

Australia is a signatory to the ILO convention—my colleague is an expert on that—regarding labour force statistics, which is why Australia-wide we use ABS statistics, not CES statistics, as measures of unemployment. To try to compare the two is simply political mischief-making. Australian Bureau of Statistics' figures show that the number of people seeking work in South Australia dropped by 7 800 in July whilst the number of people in jobs rose by 5 000.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In the time that the Hawke/Keating Governments have been in power, there has been a growth of jobs of 1.5 million or 24 per cent. Since the Bannon Government replaced the Tonkin Government, in which the present Leader of the Opposition was the Minister responsible for employment, it has created 84 500 jobs in South Australia.

I know that the *Advertiser* will not run this point about youth unemployment, because the news is too good, but the fact is that members on the other side of the House were very depressed the other day at the first signs of that good news. You could see it; you could see the actual depression on their faces. The fact is that the Leader of the Opposition, who called out and jeered about youth unemployment, as tragic as that is, refused to recognise the fact that it was 66 per cent higher in 1981 when he was the Minister. However, we will not read about that in the *Advertiser*. On many occasions the South Australian Government has put forward what needs to be done to assist our unemployed. Obviously, the member for Fisher did not read my press release on unemployment last week. I am happy to provide it to him. I put forward a multitude of proposals aimed at a national recovery from recession as a result of the national summit on youth unemployment.

The other former Leader of the Opposition called out, too. I know that he is a bit sensitive. We saw his sensitivity in the question about being impaled on a flagpole.

That is because the one who said he was not a quitter was quick the next day to fall on his sword.

BARTON ROAD

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Transport instruct the Adelaide City Council to remove the 'No Entry' signs at both ends of the Barton Road junction with Mills Terrace pursuant to section 18 or section 31 of the Road Traffic Act? Adelaide City Council closed Barton Road in November 1987, thereby cutting the last link between Hindmarsh and North Adelaide. The City Council then constructed a bus lane through the closure to accommodate STA buses on the Hawker Street run and directed 'No Entry' signs at each end of the lane, purporting to exclude all vehicles except buses.

Mr Justice Duggan, in Supreme Court case No. 1063 of 1990 (better known as Howie's case), found there was no warrant for the closure and that the 'No Entry' signs were of no effect. The police traffic infringement section now withdraws all expiation notices issued to motorists for driving through the bus lane, and it is in the process of refunding thousands of dollars in fines paid over the past 4½ years.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Spence for his question and for the interest he has quite properly shown in this matter on behalf of his constituents. Whilst some people may think this is a relatively minor matter, for many people who live in the western suburbs it is a very important matter indeed. For some people, particularly those in distress—for example, those being carried by an ambulance—it could involve a life threatening situation. So, nobody ought to take this matter too lightly.

I would love to be able to do as the member for Spence requested and cover up those signs. However, my advice from the Department of Road Transport is that, whilst theoretically I may have the power to do that, in practice it would not be a sensible thing to do, because other traffic management devices close Barton Road (in the form of special kerbs, and so on) for the bus lane, which makes it quite dangerous for motorists to use that stretch of road unless they take extreme care.

I would not want to be a party, and nor would the member for Spence, to putting motorists at risk. So, the position is clear: it is not just the signs but also the special kerbing put there for the bus lane which need removing, and the road requires opening. I recommend to the constituents of the member for Spence and others who work in or travel to the western suburbs that they take extreme care when using that road.

The situation is further compounded, because it has been brought to my attention that the Adelaide City Council is proposing to utilise the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act to close the road. If it does this, the legal status of the bus route, which currently passes through the 'closure', may be brought into question as there is no clear mechanism for exemptions for any class of vehicle or special use in this Act. So, if the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act is used, buses will not be able to use that stretch of road, and that will further inconvenience people in the western suburbs. That position will not be

tolerated. We cannot tolerate the Adelaide City Council's preventing buses from using the road in the guise of protecting a handful of North Adelaide residents. The whole of the western suburbs are entitled to buses and to free movement around the city.

If I can presume to give the member for Spence some advice, the advice is this: that he ought to contact all western suburbs members of Parliament, all western suburbs candidates, and enlist their support to lobby the Adelaide City Council to open this road that it has illegally closed. That is what is required because, rather than getting into the legalities, technicalities, injunctions, court cases, and so on, commonsense ought to prevail and the road ought to be opened.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I wish to bring to members' attention the plight of the Kadina Primary School involving its maintenance needs. At the end of June this year, I received a letter from the President of the Kadina Primary School Council, Reverend Steve Kitto, together with a booklet entitled 'Maintenance Needs, June 1992', detailing the significant problems with the Kadina Primary School buildings. It is interesting that this school caters for approximately 430 students from reception through to year 7, and it is the largest primary school on Yorke Peninsula. In fact, I believe it is the second largest primary school in the Western area.

The school's buildings exhibit a wide variety of school architectural styles dating from 1879 through to the 1970s. Therefore, it has a keystone building which certainly will be preserved, it has a couple of Samcon type buildings and many timber and iron clad buildings as well. It is a great shame to see how the maintenance needs of Kadina Primary School have been ignored and neglected over many years, to such an extent that a huge amount of money is now needed to upgrade the school. It is even more disappointing to note that at the beginning of this year some money was spent on upgrading the stone building, only to find within a matter of weeks after the work had been completed that large cracks again appeared. It shows that the money was not spent wisely. It would have been much better to spend additional money and to make a good job of it rather than spend a minimal amount and make it a poor job.

It is in that respect that I wish to bring to the attention of the House the massive problems associated with the timber frame buildings occupied by the junior and middle primary sections of the school. These buildings in many areas have rotted wood that needs replacement; they have window sills with bare timber, showing that they have not been painted for many years; they have gutterings with holes or with no downpipes; and they also have very poor plumbing. Generally speaking, it would require tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars to upgrade them. I believe that it has got to a stage where in this school, and probably in many other schools in my electorate, money spent will be wasted in the short and long term because it is going to be a makeshift job.

Therefore, I propose that at Kadina Primary School the buildings used by the junior and middle primary sections should be replaced and a new building program undertaken similar to that which has occurred at the Minlaton Primary School section of Minlaton District School. The Minister of Education will be aware of the building undertaken at Minlaton, and he is to be congratulated on the way it eventuated. He will be aware that originally they were going to use re clad wooden buildings there, but the community kicked up a fuss and said that it wanted decent buildings, so brick buildings were erected. Whilst it costs more at the time of construction, at least the Minlaton Primary School probably over the next 20 years will be virtually maintenance free. Therefore, I suggest that a similar thing needs to be looked at for Kadina in its junior and middle primary sections. I am writing to the Minister in that respect.

As regards the yard at Kadina Primary School, I would hope that a program could be implemented involving unemployed people to replace the unsatisfactory paving with paving blocks so that the drainage can be improved and lakes of water will no longer remain, thus removing a situation that has been very unpleasant for the students. I could address many other areas, but I will take them up in writing with the Minister.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In the many years during which I have been on this earth, one of the things that I have believed is that I am very fortunate in that I have not had the disabilities we see in some people out in the community. As one who has a slight disability, it brings to mind the sorts of problems that other people may have. It is very easy for one to feel sorry about one's own problems but, when looking at someone else's difficulties, one realises that in the overall scheme of things one does not have much to contend with.

I have a nephew who was born deaf and had to be brought from the country to the city to be educated in a speech and hearing centre. The reason why I raise this is because of the profound impact it had upon my brother in relation to the way in which he had to reorganise his family to cater for his son. The Woodville Speech and Hearing Centre comes within the electorate of Albert Park and, on 2 June this year, I received correspondence from Elizabeth Graham, the Principal of the centre, seeking a portable unit for the centre, at the same time as my colleague the member for Walsh corresponded with me because one of his constituents had a problem in terms of accommodation for these students.

The centre does a marvellous job. The teachers, parents and Principal do a marvellous job for those children—not only those who are deaf but also those who are hearing impaired. They contacted me because they had some difficulty in terms of accommodation, and I took up the matter with the Education Department, particularly through the Adelaide area of TASC (the Teaching and Support Centre). Kevin Stacey and Don Aplin, two of the people in that area, were marvellous in their attempts to facilitate the finding and installing of such a unit at the Woodville Speech and Hearing Centre.

My correspondence reveals that a considerable amount of discussion took place between these departmental people and the Minister's office, and I should like to place on record my appreciation of the wonderful service they provided to my constituent and to those children who are so important and who need every assistance that can be provided to them through the Woodville Speech and Hearing Centre. On Sunday last, I went down to the centre to ensure that the unit would be on site, as the department promised that it would be there by 12 o'clock. I arrived at about 11.20 and, to my delight, the unit had already been transported to the school property, and I was excited to see it there.

Those students deserve the best we can provide to them. I have always believed that these most formative years of a child's life set the scene for the sort of citizen he or she will be later in his or her adult life. I want to place on record again my appreciation to everyone concerned, particularly to the Minister, who has been tremendously supportive of my request and my harassment—and I say that in a nice way—of the department and the people who work there. I hope that they appreciate what we were trying to do.

I speak for a number of parents who were ecstatic because we were successful in getting not only a single unit but a double portable unit as well. Whilst the Minister is here, I indicate to him that tomorrow I will ask when that unit will be available for occupation by those students at the CHIC speech and hearing centre at Woodville. Again, I would like to congratulate all those involved in this important project.

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

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I have always understood, or at least it has been claimed ever since I can remember, even before coming in here, that unions were organisations that were supposed to be, by their own proclamation and that of their advocates, caring and sensitive, considerate of feelings, especially of the common man and woman, and willing to support, indeed to champion, the cause of the underdog—I am not sure whether speciesism prevents us from using that term—but at least someone less fortunate than someone else.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I thank the Deputy Premier for his assistance. I draw attention to a problem which arose in consequence of the absolutely ridiculous industrial law that is at present governing this country and sanctioning the behaviour of unions where they choose to be indifferent to the kinds of sensitivities to which I first alluded. In particular, I want to draw attention to what I think is the atrocious manners of the Australian Workers' Union—atrocious because they are grossly insensitive and offensive. Let me explain.

I am sure, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you would be offended if, after the death of your father or mother, some not five but seven years later you, as the person responsible for the discharge of business relating to the deceased estate of your father or mother, received a letter from a union demanding that you do certain things and alleging that you had committed some grossly offensive acts towards people who had been working for you, that you had been inconsiderate of their needs and insensitive

to their requirements, and requiring you to appear in court to answer those charges.

That is exactly what the Australian Workers' Union has done to a very distressed woman whom I represent. This woman forwarded to me a letter which she received from the Australian Workers' Union which had caused her great distress. She is a retired person. She sought advice as to how best to handle this matter and was told to come to me. I endeavoured to handle the matter with some sensitivity, but was promptly abused or at least treated with arrogant high-handed indifference by the union.

The gentleman in question has been deceased for seven years. The letter was sent to him at 'Mallee Downs', which was the name of the farm which the woman and her husband had farmed 25 to 30 years before, and they had not been there since that time. In fact, there is no such farm now as far as I am aware. I agreed with her son (the son of the deceased man) that the union at least owed his mother an apology for having done that. It would have been very easy to establish that the man in question had died, because it was not as if it had happened last year as he had died several years ago.

So I wrote to the union asking it to do that. It refused to do that: the union told me that its records indicated that a pastoral industry log of claims was forwarded to the deceased man last year. Subsequently, a notification of an industrial dispute was also forwarded. The woman did not know what was wrong. She had never been in court for anything and had never done anything wrong. She was suddenly confronted with this sort of demanding and abusive requirement.

Mr Michael Foreshore, the General Secretary, simply ignored my request that he apologise to the woman. He demanded of me that I now tell him who now owned the farm called Mallee Downs. He did not even bother to ask whether such a farm or a name was in existence. I do not know; that is not my business. I now tell him that I think he is an arrogant, insensitive dolt who does nothing to help better understanding in this community.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I rise this afternoon to read into the public record an article that appeared in the Broken Hill *Barrier Daily Truth* on 6 August this year. It is a very interesting article, entitled 'Pokies issue—a storm in a teacup', and it states:

Opposition to the introduction of poker machines in South Australia is regarded by at least one Broken Hill social worker as a storm in a teacup. The Director of the local LifeLine service, Reverend Brian Nicholls, yesterday offered little support for South Australian doctors and Opposition politicians who have claimed that poker machines make people sick and that they are intended only as a revenue raising exercise for a Government in financial strife.

He says that in his 20 years experience in Broken Hill there have only been about 10 or 12 instances where people have been brought to crisis point by a gambling addiction—and they were not isolated to poker machines.

Reverend Nicholls is quoted as saying:

Sure there are many people with gambling problems, those who gamble excessively, but only a minute number present with that as a problem. When times are tough people look for a way out; people dream and they like a flutter.

There is no doubt that there are people who ought not gamble, but similarly they probably shouldn't watch 20 videos a week either; the fact that they do is the price we pay for democracy

What is certain though is that legislating to stop poker machines won't stop the problems associated with gambling to excess. Those who gamble to excess will find a way to do so—at the Casino or the TAB.

The article further states:

Reverend Nicholls described himself as having a 'healthy suspicion' of those who tried to stop others doing what they choose. He said he couldn't understand the uproar over poker machines when South Australia already had a casino. In fact, he said he recognised Government desires to keep money spent on gambling within the State, and not at clubs on its borders.

Further, Reverend Nicholls states:

There are many benefits for Broken Hill derived from pokies and the profits stay here. The development of the BH Golf Club is just one advantage of local poker machines.

LifeLine counsels thousands of people each year . . . by far the majority with relationships, marriage and family difficulties. Gambling to excess is a very minor part of far greater issues, of which excessive alcohol consumption is one. And at the moment we have far more pressing problems (than the impact pokies might be having).

Australia's current unemployment problems could be with us for 60 years, if something isn't done soon.

I read this article into the public record because, as I am sure every member in this House knows, there is currently a great debate about the poker machines legislation which, because of technical errors, was not enacted after long and tortuous debates in this place some four months ago. I believe that in many respects a cruel hoax is being perpetrated, because those small errors do not affect the basic substance of that Bill. The reason the legislation is to be represented to this House has nothing whatsoever to do with the substance of or any of the principles in this legislation. It is apt that the Rev. Nicholls should make sensible comments on that issue.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I regret that I rise on this occasion to grieve in this House on a matter that I have raised previously. This Government has repeatedly and continually denied the right of this House to question Ministers of the Crown and to expect from them an intelligible, if not an intelligent, answer. Again, in this grievance debate, I raise the problem for the Opposition of Ministers' performance in Question Time. This House has usages and customs that are based on centuries of tradition, and in addition it has the Standing Orders. Those Standing Orders are important, but they are important as an administrative framework. If the usages and customs are manipulated by members, particularly by Ministers, in a narrow and legalistic way, the institution becomes a sham and we move, as we have under the gaggle of geese opposite, from a parliamentary participatory democracy to a bureaucratic autocracy.

Four out of five South Australians readily acknowledge the perils of this path. The State Bank, WorkCover and the work done by the member for Napier, as Presiding Member of the powerful Economic and Finance Committee—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr BRINDAL: I do apologise: I was, in fact, referring to the member for Hartley.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that that resolves the issue.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, it does. I was in the District of Napier on Saturday at a conference, and the member for Hartley was present. Most people at that conference thought that the member for Napier was the member for Hartley, and *vice versa*. So I do hope that both members will forgive my confusion in this matter.

As a member of a number of select committees in this House, and as a member of a standing committee, I am bound by a penalty enforceable by this House to keep confidential deliberations into which we might enter and in which I am involved and not to divulge evidence before it is given to this House. Yet Ministers in this place, whose authority is, as is that of any other member, based in and upon this House, seem to ignore the traditions and to treat this House with absolute disdain. I do not think that that should be tolerated by you, Mr Deputy Speaker, by the Speaker or by any member of this Parliament.

At least three Ministers in Question Time today referred to press releases as though they were documents of some consequence or importance to this House. When members of the Opposition ask questions, I believe they have the right to an answer and that the public has a right to read that answer in the public record and not to be referred to some press release.

Mr Lewis: Drawn up by an apparatchik—

Mr BRIDAL: As my colleague says, 'Drawn up by an apparatchik', and one of the bureaucrats at that. If we go to the Parliamentary Library—where, I believe, law requires Ministers to deposit these press releases—we find that for 1992 the Ministers' files are very scant indeed. Indeed, some Ministers have not provided to the Parliamentary Library one press release. Yet we are berated and told that, as members of the Opposition, we should have scuttled down to that library and read those non-existent press releases, known their contents and not wasted the time of the House. I put to the House that it would be better, when Ministers were asked questions, if they answered them honestly for the public record, for the people of South Australia, than continued to govern by press releases. Troglodytes who presume that the populace can be fed a continual diet of tripe, and that that will sustain the population indefinitely, might soon discover that there was a sequel to *Animal Farm*. We might remember that the message on the barn 'All animals are equal' was subtly changed to 'All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others.' The day of the pigs is ending, and there will be a day when all people are equal and this Parliament is treated as it deserves to be treated.

Mr HERON (Peake): I want to refer to a decision that was handed down by the Australian Industrial Relations Commission on 21 April this year. I must say that that received very little publicity, but it was of great importance for Australian workers.

The South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, in conjunction with the South Australian Funeral Directors Association, led an attack to abolish the annual leave loading from their award. This was set up as a test case and not only was it crucial to workers in the funeral industry but it could have flowed through to workers in other industries throughout Australia. This challenge, mounted by the Chamber of Commerce and

Industry on behalf of the Funeral Directors Association, was a typical example of employers trying to cut costs at the expense of workers, but I am very pleased to say that the application by the employers to abolish the annual leave loading was rejected by the Federal Commission and that the 17.5 per cent annual leave loading will remain. Commissioner Lawson, who handed down the decision, said:

It is for employers to find innovative solutions to productivity rather than simply to negatively cost-cut by bargaining away a well established condition of employment.

He also said that he found that this award gave considerable scope for the employers to maximise their efficiencies and productivity through other mechanisms than merely renegotiating the application of an annual leave loading clause.

Annual leave loading is a small part of today's wages bill, and it has a most important impact for workers as it also has a snowballing effect on consumer spending throughout Australia, especially in the tourism industry. The research manager for Tourism South Australia, Mr Bill Furse, also agrees that leave loading has a significant impact on the tourism industry. A report on leave loading states:

He said that although he was not aware of any research to quantify the impact there were obvious implications for tourism if leave loading was abolished. Without a shadow of a doubt it would have a noticeable impact on the industry. It would be a safe assumption that not everybody would save to cover for leave loading, and there would be a loss of holiday activity and expenditure. He said the expenditure was good in terms of employment and wealth distribution in South Australia, providing a boost for regional employment. It helps tourism, which is labour intensive, and spreads the money around the State. It would not be hard to make a qualitative case on its impact.

The Federal Commission agrees that annual leave loading should remain, the major industry that it affects wants it to remain and the workers around Australia want it to remain. Guess who wants it abolished? The large employer groups, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Employers Federation and, of course, the Opposition.

The Chamber of Commerce and Industry was obviously hoping for some easy win in that case so that it would set a precedent for all its other awards and industries to abolish it. However, it goofed, and let us hope that the employers—and I hope also the Opposition—have learnt the lesson not to abolish annual leave loading.

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

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS (LICENSING) (FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr S.J. Baker: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is denied.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Public pressure to discourage smoking has intensified in recent years. By 1991-92, all States and Territories apart from Queensland had tax rates equivalent to 50 per cent on purchases of tobacco products. Even Queensland, which for many years had not applied a tobacco tax had, by then, introduced a tax on tobacco at the rate of 30 per cent. During the first half of 1992, the Commonwealth and State Governments received lengthy submissions from groups supporting the Anti-Cancer Foundation advocating further increases in the Commonwealth excise on tobacco and in State licensing fees for tobacco merchants. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have acted in accord with those representations in announcing their intention to increase the rate of tax on purchases of tobacco products from 50 per cent to 75 per cent.

There is no doubt that successive increases in tax rates on tobacco products, over recent years, together with comprehensive anti-smoking campaigns, have assisted a shift in social attitudes away from smoking. Bodies, such as Foundation SA, which receive a share of taxation revenues on tobacco products are directly experiencing the effects of declining levels of tobacco consumption. In order to ensure that the programs supported by Foundation SA can continue to expand, the Government proposes to increase Foundation SA's share of tobacco tax revenues from the equivalent of a 3 per cent levy to a 5 per cent levy. This levy is not additional to the proposed 75 per cent tax rate on tobacco products but, rather, is included within the 75 per cent rate.

Under the Tobacco Products (Licensing) Act, consumption licences are required to be taken out by people who choose to consume tobacco products purchased from unlicensed tobacco merchants. Fees for consumption licences have not been increased since their introduction, when the duty rate for merchants was 28 per cent. To remove any incentive for tobacco consumers to attempt to avoid higher rates of duty by purchasing from unlicensed tobacco merchants, the Government proposes to increase the fee for consumption licences from \$40 to \$110 for a three month licence, from \$80 to \$210 for a six month licence and from \$160 to \$430 for a 12 month licence. The proposed increases are in line with increases in the duty rate for licensed merchants over the period since consumption licence fees were introduced. The increase in the duty rate is estimated to yield additional revenue of \$34.4 million in 1992-93 and \$37.5 million in a full year, of which Foundation SA is estimated to receive as additional revenue \$2.6 million in 1992-93 and \$3.1 million in a full year. Allowance has been made for a fall in consumption due to the impact of the duty increase on tobacco prices.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 relates to the fees payable for a consumption licence, so that the licence fee for a three month term will be \$110, for a six month term will be \$210, and for a 12 month term will be \$430.

Clause 4 relates to the calculation of the fee for a tobacco merchant's licence under section 13 of the Act. Various increases are to be made to the rates on which the fees are calculated. An amendment to subsection (7) will ensure that any reassessment of a licence fee by the Commissioner under subsection (6) can have retrospective effect.

Clause 5 amends section 24a of the Act to increase the amount payable into the Sports Promotion, Cultural and Health Advancement Fund from 6 per cent of the amount collected as fees for tobacco merchant's licences to 6.67 per cent. The effect is to increase the amount payable to Foundation SA from a 3 per cent levy to a 5 per cent levy.

Clause 6 provides that the amendments made by clause 4 of the measure apply in relation to any licence in force on or after 1 September 1992 (including any such licence issued before that date).

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

STAMP DUTIES (RATES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is denied.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Three categories of amendment to the stamp duties legislation are proposed. The first relates to the stamp duty concession on first home purchases; the second relates to various minor stamp duties which have remained unchanged over many years; and the third relates to adjustments to rates to accommodate the Commonwealth Government's decision to phase out one and two cent coins. First home buyers are presently exempt from stamp duty on the first \$80 000 of value of the home they purchase, regardless of the value of that house. In 1990-91, some 685 applications for stamp duty concessions were received and granted on first homes valued in excess of \$130 000; the most expensive first home to receive the concession was valued at \$441 500. Apart from Queensland, no other State provides such a generous and unrestricted concession.

In the current economic climate, the Government does not consider it appropriate to continue to give concessions to those who can afford to buy expensive homes. Accordingly, the concession on first homes valued above \$80 000 will be reduced for every multiple of \$1 000 of value above \$80 000 so that on house values above \$130 000 the concession will be eliminated. Based on recent experience, 60 per cent of first home buyers will remain fully exempt from duty and 34 per cent will receive a partial but lower concession; only 6 per cent will receive no concession at all. Even with the introduction of a ceiling on eligible first homes, the concession

remains very generous compared to similar schemes in other States (apart from Queensland).

Various minor stamp duties have remained unchanged over many years. The duty payable on instruments such as powers of attorney, deeds and miscellaneous conveyances has remained unchanged at \$4 since 1971; the duty payable on agreements has remained unchanged at 20 cents. The duty payable on some other instruments has not changed since the duty was first introduced (in 1974 in the case of the discharge of a mortgage and in 1988 in the case of a caveat). The Government proposes to raise the rate of duty on all but one of these instruments to \$10. Duty on powers of attorney will be abolished. More often than not, these documents are executed by the aged or the infirm and removal of the duty will represent a saving in money and effort for these people.

The removal of one and two cent coins from the financial system has created a minor problem in relation to the collection of duty on the sale and purchase of stock and marketable securities of a value less than \$100, where duty is currently payable at the rate of 14 cents for every \$25 or fractional part thereof. Where the value of the stock or marketable security is more than \$100 the duty payable is 60 cents per \$100 or part thereof. It is proposed to amend the Stamp Duties Act so that the rate of duty on the sale and purchase of any stock or marketable security will be a flat 60 cents per \$100 of value or part thereof.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides that the measure will come into operation on 1 September 1992.

Clause 3 relates to the rate of duty payable on an application under section 71c of the Act (relating to the payment of duty at a concessional rate by a 'first home buyer'). The effect of the amendments is to limit the concessional rate of duty to contracts where the consideration does not exceed \$130 000. Furthermore, between \$80 000 and \$130 000, the concession will reduce for every \$1 000 multiple of value (or part thereof) in excess of \$80 000 so that the concession will be \$30 for contracts with a consideration of \$130 000. The amendments will apply in relation to contracts entered into on or after 1 September 1992.

Clause 4 amends section 82 of the Act to increase the duty on a caveat to protect an interest arising from an unregistered mortgage.

Clause 5 makes various amendments to the second schedule of the Act, which sets out most of the rates of duty. The rate of duty on a number of instruments that are not subject to an *ad valorem* scale of duty is to be increased. The duty on stock and marketable securities where the value is less than \$100 is to be made consistent with the duty on stock and marketable securities valued at \$100 or more. Duty will cease to be payable on powers of attorney.

Clause 6 provides that the amendments effected to the Act apply to instruments executed on or after the commencement of the measure.

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

LIQUOR LICENSING (FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Licensing Act 1965. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

State liquor tax has not been increased since 1984. In that time, the Government has abolished tax on low alcohol beer as a health and road safety measure and has abolished tax on cellar-door sales by wineries to assist the wine and tourism industries. For the 1993 licensing year, the Government has decided to increase the liquor licence fee from a rate of 11 per cent to 13 per cent, in line with increases announced in New South Wales and Victoria. As from the 1993 licensing year, South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria will apply a uniform rate of tax equivalent to 13 per cent on full strength alcohol.

The tax-free status of low alcohol beer will, however, be retained. South Australia, Queensland and Victoria are the only States to grant this exemption. There has been a pronounced trend in recent years towards consumption of low alcohol beer and the proposed tax increase on full strength beer is expected to accelerate that trend. The Government expects to receive an extra \$7 million from the 1993 licence fees which are based on sales for the 1991-92 financial year. An estimated \$4 million of this will be received in 1992-93. In future years, however, the trend to consumption of low alcohol beer is likely to reduce this figure.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 increases the licence fees for wholesale and retail liquor licences (other than producers' licences) from 11 per cent of the gross amount of sales during the relevant assessment period to 13 per cent.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 6 August. Page 26.)

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I endorse most of the remarks made by the member for Napier in his contribution—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Well, the only area in which I disagree with the member for Napier is that I am not quite such a vehement royalist as he is. Other than that, I concur with the sentiments he expressed towards Her Excellency the Governor. I would like to take the 30 minutes available to me to make a few remarks about the maintenance of this building and its furnishings, our responsibility to its owners—namely, the citizens of South Australia—and the strained relations that have sometimes existed between its two co-tenants, that is, the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. I will also make some passing reference to—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The front door.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Yes, the Centre Hall doors, as the Minister has just reminded the House. In the

course of my remarks I may draw attention to a few public symptoms of things that have not been as they should have been in the past and some less publicly known symptoms. In so doing, I will put a few remarks on the historical record, not only for the benefit of the public but perhaps for some members of Parliament who may not be aware of the Byzantine workings of the building in which they operate. In doing that I hope that all members will bear in mind that ultimately we are responsible to the landlords of this building, of which we are just temporary tenants. It is our responsibility to maintain the building in good order and to look after it as a heritage building as well as looking after it as an institution.

The Address in Reply last Thursday was the first use that we had of the new carpet that had been laid on the floor of another place. I compliment those associated with the installation of that carpet, notwithstanding the somewhat unkind remarks made in the media by more than one commentator regarding the cost.

Mr Ferguson: Name them.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: No, Randall Ashbourne does not need to be named; he knows who he is, so I will not respond further to that interjection from the member for Henley Beach. However, I will respond—inappropriate as it may be—to the remarks of the member for Henley Beach regarding the condition of the carpet in this Chamber, which is not all that it should be, although I think it will last a little longer in terms of the actual wear of the carpet itself. One of the problems we have here is a problem shared by the carpet in the Legislative Council. The carpet was not broadloom—it was strips of carpet—and it kept coming apart at the seams so that we have had the unsightly appearance of quite a few strips of masking tape around the building holding the carpets together.

The same problem has also been encountered with the horrible yellow carpet laid on several floors. Several years ago I investigated whether it would be possible to replace that carpet and I found out two things: first, that it would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to replace it; and, secondly, it unfortunately is of very good quality and is not likely to wear out for a good many years! It is also unfortunate that the yellow carpet is running in a north-south direction in the corridors, which means that in the east-west corridors it is laid down crosswise and gets very badly scuffed up by the wheels of trolleys and so forth. This creates an occupational health and safety danger—and I mean this literally—for it can very easily cause broken ankles and injuries to staff members where it is scrunched up into folds.

I will now return to the subject of the carpet in the Legislative Council Chamber. Members will have noticed that the motif on the new carpet is similar to that incorporated in our red bloodline or swordline in the green carpet in this Chamber, namely, the State flower, the Sturt Pea. Prior to that, members might have noticed on previous occasions when we were summoned by His Excellency or Her Excellency the Governor to visit the Legislative Council Chamber for the opening of Parliament, that the carpet in there was a plain red or crimson colour with a black fleur-de-lis pattern. It is my understanding that this is a parliamentary accident. Prior to 1954, and the Royal visit of that year, the carpets in

both Chambers were a very motley Moroccan pattern and no attempt had been made until that stage to try to follow the British Commonwealth tradition of red for the Upper House and green for the Lower House. However, for Her Majesty's visit in 1954 it was decided to upgrade the carpet in both Houses. That is probably when the original of this green carpet was installed and it is certainly when the Legislative Council received its red carpet.

No suitable red carpet was available in large quantities in Adelaide at the time, and the only carpet that was available was one that was fashionable at the time, because it had the *fleur-de-lis* pattern that one sometimes sees on curtain rod ends, wrought iron fences and theatre foyers of the time. It has no parliamentary significance, although it does have some royal significance, going back to the time of Eleanor of Aquitaine, when the Crown of Britain laid claim to Calais and to vast tracts of land in France. One possible interpretation that could have been put on the good people of the Legislative Council in 1954 is that they wished to curry favour with her Majesty by suggesting that we pay particular acknowledgment to the several hundred years' old claim of the British throne to that of France. However, I do not think that is actually the case, nor do I think that the emblem was selected because it is sometimes seen as an emblem of purity, as it is when it appears on the school crests of St Aloysius College and Mercedes. Rather, I believe that it was an accident, that it just happened to be a fashionable design at the time, and that is how it came to be used.

Mr Ferguson: Solomons had a special!

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Solomons had a special on it, or possibly even John McLeays—I don't know. However, in the course of the television news last week during the obituaries for Prime Minister Muldoon of New Zealand, my eagle eye noticed that in one segment he was standing in the old House of Representatives of the New Zealand Parliament and quite clearly the green carpet there contained the *fleur-de-lis* motif. So, I made some inquiries of the New Zealand Parliament, and I received the following fax yesterday from the secretary to the Clerk:

Following up your inquiry concerning the *fleur-de-lis* pattern on the carpet in our old Parliament House, the Clerk tells me the reason it was chosen was not because of any parliamentary significance but because the Speaker, about 20 years ago, liked the pattern! He had probably already seen it in another Parliament House.

Whether it was our Parliament House, I do not know. The Clerk's secretary then goes on to say:

It doesn't seem to have been an altogether appropriate choice, especially for a lower House, and it will be interesting to see whether the pattern is used again when the buildings have been renovated.

It may be that at the moment they have a fire sale on in New Zealand of carpet oddments, as someone alongside me has just suggested. However, the most interesting aspect of the design of the carpet are some circumstances that I understand arose in 1973, when people went absolutely mad in this building with renovations and when a whole lot of officially-sanctioned vandalism took place. The red carpet had to be replaced, because it had worn out after nearly 20 years of use, and the architect at the time thought that there was some intense parliamentary significance in the *fleur-de-lis* in that original carpet and so had some new carpet specially

made up to match. Of course, the new carpet we saw last Thursday is much more appropriate to its location.

The yellow carpet in Centre Hall was taken up in 1989 to reveal the original 1939 linoleum, which was placed there when the building was extended, courtesy of the £100 000 contribution of Sir Langdon Bonython. It occurred to me at the time that it would be even better if we could revert to the original 1889 design for the Centre Hall and have a marble floor there. But the cost of that is obviously out of the question. Nevertheless, it may well be possible that there is a potential donor out there in the community, one or more individuals with a philanthropic bent of mind, like Sir Langdon Bonython who donated that £100 000 in the 1930s. By some sort of public subscription it might be possible to get it done. So, I commend to the Presiding Officers any scheme that they can come up with that might result in the Centre Hall finally being completed, with a marble floor similar to that which was originally designed 103 years ago, if that could be made possible by public subscription.

We also want to see Centre Hall used as much as possible, of course, by opening the Centre Hall doors, the way they should be. Unfortunately, the barrier that is preventing our doing that is a psychological Berlin Wall, which runs north-south across this building at the half-way mark through that Centre Hall, dividing the two Houses. The actual concrete Berlin Wall has long since crumbled, and I believe it is long overdue that the psychological Berlin Wall between the House of Assembly administration and the Legislative Council administration should go the same way.

Mr Atkinson: The Berlin Wall is made of bricks.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I wish the honourable member who is interjecting would try to cement good relations with his Whip. Over the years, some of us have been well placed to be aware of petty instances of the natural differences that will exist between two Chambers being carried to ridiculous extremes. In the case of preparations for the centenary of the House of Assembly side of the building in 1989 and the fiftieth anniversary of the Legislative Council's side, we had a situation where, following a change in Presiding Officer from one individual to another, a remarkable change in attitude occurred with the administration of another place.

An honourable member: Who was that?

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: After Anne Levy moved on and became a Minister, a change in Presiding Officer occurred, and the new Presiding Officer, unfortunately, was unavailable (because of a previously planned overseas tour) to take part in those celebrations as one of his first responsibilities. That was most unfortunate because, as I said, there was an immediate change of stance at that time regarding cooperation from another place towards the various committees established within the building, especially concerning the centenary. For example, I was told that it was considered most inappropriate for the Legislative Council to cooperate in any way with the House of Assembly in redrafting the pamphlets that we had produced for school children.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Speaker, could I call on you to give me some protection from the member for Spence?

The SPEAKER: Certainly; however, I point out to the member for Walsh that he is in a considerable position of power as Whip of the Party, and the interjector is a member of his own Party. I suggest he may have as much power in his own hands to protect himself as the Chair does.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is just that I thought that it might be unseemly for me to be publicly using threats with respect to one of my colleagues in these circumstances. In relation to the organisation of that centenary, we discovered that this sudden withdrawal of cooperation led to a *de facto* boycott on the part of the Clerk of the other place, who wrote back (in response to repeated invitations) with the following letter, which is dated 1 June 1989:

Dear Mr Speaker,

With reference to your letter dated 1 June 1989, I confirm that neither I, nor Mrs J.M. Davis, Clerk-Assistant and Usher of the Black Rod, will be at the Table for proceedings to be held on Monday, 5 June 1989.

Yours sincerely,

That was signed by the then Clerk. I then faxed the President at the Hotel Etap in Istanbul on 1 June 1989:

Dear Gordon,

The Clerk of the Legislative Council is apparently boycotting the proceedings in which Anne Levy is representing you next Monday 5 June and is refusing permission for the Clerk Assistant to sit as his deputy at the Table in the Chamber where the anniversaries are being jointly celebrated.

A large number of past and present Legislative Councillors will be present and I would appreciate your instructing your Clerk to cooperate on such a significant Parliamentary occasion.

The SPEAKER: Order! One of the protocols of our House and the Upper House is not to reflect on members of the other House. We comply with that fairly well, I believe. Reflections upon staff, although they are not covered by Standing Orders, in the general conduct of our Chamber, should be considered. I ask the member to be very careful about references to staff in the other place, because they cannot protect themselves. I think it is most unseemly. Standing Order 144 provides that the decorum and the dignity of this House must be upheld at all times, and I feel that reflections upon staff who cannot defend themselves will fall within that Standing Order.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Indeed, I am being extremely cautious not to refer to any present member of any staff.

The SPEAKER: Former members also should have some protection.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I simply draw the attention of members to *Hansard* (page 4829) of 6 May 1992 for further explanation of that particular matter.

The operation of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985 has included difficulties that stem in part from the unfortunate relationship that has existed over the years between the two Houses. The member for Elizabeth has on a previous occasion moved a motion in this House in which he has drawn attention to some of the inadequacies of the Parliamentary (Joint Services) Act, and there was some debate on that matter at that time. That Act has been nobbled by two aspects in particular. One is the requirement for a quorum composed of one member from each Party from each of the two Houses. That requirement has in practice often made the situation unworkable, because any archaic practice or privilege can be protected by a member of one Party in either House

deliberately choosing to absent himself or herself thereby making the operation of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee inoperative. I am sure that present members of the committee and those who have served previously will acknowledge that that is indeed a problem.

On more than one occasion, as a member of the previous Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, I was told that if I tried to persevere with any attempts to have the Centre Hall doors opened or even to question the very aspects of the Act that I am placing in question now, a particular member of a particular Party in a particular Chamber would absent himself from meetings of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee and bring it all to a halt.

Mr Ferguson: Who was that? Martin Cameron?

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: It is a member of another place who is not available to defend himself. I am not quite sure whether he is covered under this particular ruling, but I will not mention him at this time anyway.

Mr Ferguson: Tell us his nickname.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask for your ruling on the matter. I believe that Standing Order 122 provides that a member may not use offensive words against either House of Parliament. In the context of this debate, I believe that the member for Walsh is continually denigrating either/or both Houses of Parliament and the relationship between both Houses of Parliament. The Standing Order provides that he has to use offensive words not specifically against a member but against either House. I ask you, Sir, to rule whether this debate is not offensive to either one or both Houses of this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I understand the honourable member's point of view. I do not uphold that it is offensive in the sense of the Standing Order. The relationship between both Houses is a mine field, and I think we should be careful at all times in our references to the other place. I do not uphold the point of order, but I am sure that the member for Walsh is aware of the feelings within the Chamber.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I believe that this is an extremely serious matter. I believe that some aspects of the past relationship between the two Houses should be of great concern to our masters outside this building. I am surprised that any member of this Chamber should be trying to gag me so that I cannot canvass matters that ought to be drawn to the attention of our masters outside in the community—those whom we serve.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I exercised my right to ask for your ruling on a point of order. I object to the words used—that I attempted to gag the member for Walsh—and I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. Both members have the right to take offence at each other's comments. I do not believe that we achieve any purpose with these points of order taken across the Chamber. I ask the member for Walsh to be careful in his comments and not to be provocative, and I ask the member for Hayward perhaps to listen with a more gentle ear. The member for Walsh.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: It is a serious matter. For example, we had difficulties with the operation of the Fire Committee within this building because of instructions that came from particular directions. I believe

it is inappropriate that mail has apparently been misdirected within the building purely out of pettiness. It is inappropriate that two filing cabinets intended for me were recently held up at the other end of the building for several days because of a deliberate lack of cooperation.

Most important of all, I believe that the security of this building and of us as members was put at risk by a lack of cooperation between the two Houses. On one occasion, we had a dangerous member of the public who had harassed and threatened members and whom I at the time declared *persona non grata* because of his behaviour. I had him excluded from the House of Assembly part of the building, only to discover that he was being allowed in at the other end of the building to wander through to our end at will. I believe that that lack of cooperation at the time was a serious matter, and I believe that I am fulfilling part of my duties to this Parliament, to this Chamber and to the community by drawing attention to those matters in this Address in Reply.

I mentioned that there was another problem with the Parliament (Joint Services) Act other than the difficulty involving a quorum, and that was the way that that Act did not accept the concept of a building manager as such. The position of secretary to the committee was designed at that time to be of much lower status than that of a building manager. At that time, in the course of debate some members stressed that they really only wanted someone to take minutes, not a building manager, and there was to be no disruption of any existing operations within the building. As the Act is drawn up, the Clerks of the two Houses take it in turn to appoint the secretary of that committee. It was not the Presiding Officers—the Speaker or the President—who would alternate in selecting the secretary of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, but the clerks. I believe that was a deficiency.

I also believe that the very concept of the annual rotation of appointments was absurd. The Legislative Council made the first appointment through its Clerk appointing a particular person. I do not in any way criticise that person, because he has tried very hard to fulfil all the duties that were placed upon him. However, it meant that, by default, whoever was selected on that first occasion, unless we were to have the situation of that person's being sacked in alternate years was, in effect, the permanent appointment. I believe that there were probably better ways of defining the duties of the executive officer to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee and to conduct the making of the appointment than was done in that instance.

I turn briefly to the subject of the Centre Hall doors, which I believe is not a petty matter. I believe that in drawing this issue to the attention of this House and the community there is the risk of taking oneself down to the same level of pettiness as those involved, and the suspicion that one is demeaning oneself by even participating in such a debate, but to do otherwise is to concede victory to reactionary forces. As a result of the stances that I have taken on this matter, I have been personally abused and I have had to put up with absolute nonsense.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I am very persistent. For example, there was the nonsense that was spouted by Mr

Gilfillan on the Philip Satchell radio show on 8 July. His objection to the opening the Centre Hall doors and the closing of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly doors, converting them to some sort of key card operation, was that 'it would be inconvenient for people coming into the Legislative Council from King William Street'. He personally would have been inconvenienced because he would have had to go 10 or 15 metres out of his way. That shows an arrogant attitude.

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is there not a requirement that one refers to 'the other place'?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold the point of order; 'the other place' is the usual term to use.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: It is customary, Sir, but I was quoting from the Hon. Mr Gilfillan himself on the Philip Satchell show. I have been accused of all sorts of things in respect of this matter, and I will skip over them for the moment. The record of this House on the matter is clear. We have tried to resolve the problem, and the problem has been exacerbated in other areas. On 15 February 1990 this issue was fully canvassed in a grievance debate in *Hansard* (page 229). The resolution was unanimously carried by this House on 5 April 1990 (page 1283), but a few minutes later on the same day (page 1252) it was rejected by another place on a very dubious technicality. The House then carried a similar resolution, with appropriate words carefully added, to overcome that specious technicality as recorded on page 357 on 16 August 1990.

It was then moved in another place by a Government member on 22 August 1990 (this is on page 479), and it then sat on the Notice Paper in that other place for four months before finally being rejected on the voices on 16 December 1990. One of the things that I quoted during earlier contributions on this matter was a joint letter written by the Speaker and the President to the two administrators, the Clerks of either House, on 11 December 1986, and a reply that we received, before that had even arrived, from the Hon. Martin Cameron.

At the time, the Presiding Officers (myself and the Hon. Anne Levy), had asked the two Clerks jointly to organise a feasibility study of how security could be maintained and access facilitated by reopening the Centre Hall doors. I have now discovered, several years down the track, that SACON was actually asked to conduct that feasibility study, a copy of which I have here. It came back to Parliament House, yet neither of the two Presiding Officers at the time was ever made aware that the feasibility study had been carried out. I put to you, Sir, that that would not be looked on very kindly in the relationship between senior public servants and their Ministers, and the relationship between the administrations of Parliaments and the Presiding Officers is somewhat parallel to that sort of relationship.

Our Chamber and its costings and operations are subject to fairly close scrutiny during the Estimates Committees. I pointed out on previous occasions how other aspects of Parliament's operations are not placed under quite the same degree of scrutiny.

You, Sir, provide your Clerk to be present when the Treasurer explains the relevant budget lines to the Estimates Committees of this Parliament. Unfortunately,

it seems to stop there. I draw members' attention to the 11 September 1990 Estimates Committee where I commented at some length on that deficiency in our operations. Some other difficulties that have arisen in recent years were outlined by Randall Ashbourne in a basically good article in the *Sunday Mail* of 8 October 1989. Parts of that article are not correct, but its basic thrust is. Certainly, the fine details of the correspondence that flew backwards and forwards as a result of a question asked by Ms Gayler in the Estimates Committee at that time regarding more efficiencies being introduced into the printing operations of the Parliament—

The SPEAKER: Is that a member of Parliament to whom the member for Walsh is referring?

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I believe that it is acceptable to refer to the name of individual members or former members of Parliament when one wishes to distinguish them from other members for the same district. Sir, the Berlin wall has collapsed: the invisible Berlin wall that has existed between the two halves of this Parliament must likewise collapse. I believe that relationships are on the mend and that they are improving, but the historical records show quite clearly what can happen when the spirit of cooperation does not exist.

Above all, we must not get bogged down in these petty disputes. We must not lose track of who are the proprietors of this building and who are our employers. We are merely the custodians: the landlords should be able to enter through the central public entrance and not need to come in through the servants' entrance. We should take good care of this Parliament while it is under our stewardship.

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In rising as the first speaker from the Opposition, I should like the Speaker to note that I am not the lead speaker. The Hon. Dean Brown (Leader of the Opposition) will take that role. In rising, I note with regret the passing of Mrs Joyce Steele, who was the first member for Burnside. When I entered Parliament, one of the first people who came to see me and to give me advice was Joyce Steele. I remember clearly some of the things she said to me about members of Parliament, about our role as members, and, interestingly enough, about the need to negotiate and be part of negotiating with members of the Government if you are in Opposition, and *vice versa*. That advice was very handy. I hope that it will be useful to me with the Deputy Premier in the next 12 months or so.

Secondly, I note with regret the passing of Albert Shard, a former member of the Legislative Council. When I first became President of the Pharmacy Guild, Albert Shard was Minister of Health. I spent several occasions arguing with him about how pharmaceutical services should be supplied to country hospitals. Although I had a very short involvement with him, I was very interested in the way in which he ran the Ministry of Health.

I note also that, since the last Address in Reply, the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy and the Hon. Ted Chapman, two very distinguished members of the Liberal Party, have retired from this House. The Hon. Roger Goldsworthy was a long serving Deputy Leader of the

Opposition. Roger and I spent many times discussing the future of the Liberal Party, not always in agreement, but one thing I learned from Roger is that, if you persevere in this place and are prepared to work very hard to be part of the Liberal direction, eventually you will achieve the goals for which you aim.

Roger was very strongly involved in ensuring that the Liberal point of view was expressed in this House and, in his memory, it is our duty to ensure that we are on the other side as quickly as possible. The Hon. Ted Chapman was one of the first members of this House to take me aside and help me understand some of the ways in which people in this Parliament act. I became a very good friend of Ted Chapman, and he taught me much about people, the way in which they act in Parliament and the way in which you can work with people on both sides of Parliament. I enjoyed the Hon. Ted Chapman's time in this place and hope that the current sickness and problems he has will be healed very quickly.

In farewelling those two retired members, I welcome back the current Leader (Hon. Dean Brown) and Mr John Olsen. I believe that both members will make a very significant difference to our front bench, and all of us on this side will enjoy working with them.

While reading the speech of the mover, over the weekend, I hoped that some thoughts on the future direction of this tired Bannon Government would be spelt out by the long serving and well respected member for Napier. It is a pity that so much time was wasted on worrying about when I was going to get to this point about future direction, as I would have thought that the exercise of providing jobs for the future, particularly in the area of Elizabeth, would be one of the main objectives. Unfortunately, that was not to be.

I wish to discuss three issues: first, the issue of industrial relations and changes that ought to be made to the industrial relations system; secondly, workers compensation; and thirdly, tourism, a very exciting portfolio for which I have the privilege to be shadow minister.

With respect to industrial relations, we need to recognise that we have to introduce into this State for the first time true enterprise bargaining so that large, small and medium sized businesses can act within the law. To do that, both parties need to have freedom to negotiate at the enterprise level; that is, we need to have a system in which employers and employees can sit down and genuinely work out an industrial enterprise agreement. Therefore, we need to give both parties the right to choose their negotiator. It is absolutely critical that employers, if they want to use their association or a professional, or the employees, if they want to use their union or someone whom they believe can do a better job, be given the choice of sitting down at the enterprise table and enter into that bargaining.

Governments need to insist that there be a basic safety net for all such contracts. There should be minimum conditions which include base wage rates, holiday pay, sick leave and maternity leave. Fair employment and dismissal conditions should be included in this basic safety net. Outside those very fundamental and basic conditions, employers and employees should be able to sit down and bargain an agreement that is based specifically on the productivity and profitability of the

business, so that not only the owner, who is risking his capital, but the employee, who is risking his labour, gets a fair share of the profit at the end of the day.

Several very significant enterprise agreements have been entered into in Australia but, unfortunately, in South Australia there have not been very many. The SPC case in Victoria is probably the most significant because the employees sat down with the employers and worked out an agreement which allowed for an increase in work time but a drop in wage take home pay. That agreement was entered into 12 months ago. Interestingly enough, at the end of 12 months, not only have wages increased but there has been a 40 per cent increase in productivity.

There is nothing very special about the SPC agreement other than the fact that it recognises clearly that, when two groups of people sit down with one goal in mind and negotiate at enterprise level without the interference of outside forces, they can enter into a positive agreement that is beneficial to both employers and employees. As everyone would be aware, the SPC company would have failed, gone to the wall, if that agreement was not entered into. Today, we have another Australian company surviving because old fashioned work practices were discarded, but, more importantly, because both sides recognised that they can sit down and negotiate agreements if they want to, provided they have the legal industrial framework within which to work.

It has been pointed out on many studies recently that industries in our State need to increase their productivity by between 40 and 100 per cent. To do that, there need to be some very fundamental work practice changes, changes which 12 months ago would not only have not been considered but would not have been believed to be necessary. Today, as we move very quickly into this internationally competitive market with which we are now involved, we have to make sure that our work practices are consistent and of an international standard.

It is incredible, for instance, that in the tourism industry, if a restaurant decides to open at 3 o'clock in the afternoon and work through until 12 o'clock at night, because that is what the customers want, there are four regimes of wage payment covering an employee's hourly rate: between 3 pm and 6 pm a normal rate applies, between 6 pm and 9 pm it is a 50 per cent on cost, after 9 pm it is a 100 per cent on cost and after that it is triple time. So, in one normal working day, in a business that trades between 3 p.m. and 12 midnight, there are four different wage schedules. That is a nonsense in modern times. We need to sit down and organise our business and enable individuals within that type of business, both employers and employees, to negotiate those work practices and changes. It is interesting to note that many of the right-wing unions in this State, particularly in the chemical engineering area, have recognised already that those sorts of very important changes in work practices are beneficial to not only the employer but also the employee. The Retail Traders Award was a very important breakthrough as it recognised that if you wanted to remove penalty rates of some type there had to be an increase in the base rate. That was a very significant and important change which, as the member for Spence knows, I supported at that time.

I believe that the only way we can make these very significant changes to work practices that we need to

make is not to expect employees to go backwards in terms of the income they take home. There has to be a recognition that if something has to be given up on one side then changes may have to be made in an add on way to the base. However, the final decision as to how much must be geared to productivity and profitability lies with the company. In all of this industrial relations change it is very important that we recognise that management standards need to be improved right across this country, because there is no doubt that all of the studies done show that there is a poor understanding by many people in management of the way they must communicate, change and be part of this very important move to implement enterprise bargaining.

Unfortunately in this State we have the most restrictive, inflexible and centralised system in Australia. We must recognise that we need full cooperation between State and Federal Governments to make these important changes. However, referring back to the State level, it is an unbelievable situation that small business in this State—principally employers who have virtually no union involvement—cannot enter into enterprise bargaining before our State Commission unless a union is involved. That is absolute nonsense. We should have a system in which, if employees wish to get together with their employer—with or without a union (I have no opposition as to whether or not a union should be involved) and those employees do not want a union involved then they should be able to enter into an enterprise bargain and have it registered with the commission and carried out within minimum standards, as mentioned earlier.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Well, you know how many members there are in our companies. It is absolute nonsense to argue that the only people who have any knowledge about how to work between employers and employees are the unions. It seems to me that we must very quickly remove that hurdle to enable enterprise bargaining to take place more quickly in this State.

I have been fascinated in the past few weeks to see the sudden push by the Federal Government, and supported by the State Government, to emphasise training. Whilst we all support the need for training, it is an absolute nonsense to train everyone if there are no job opportunities at the end of the line. So, unless we reorganise our industry and give it an opportunity to organise itself through enterprise bargaining, all the training and retraining we enter into will be cost-ineffective and very difficult to justify at the end of the day.

It is very important that in a new industrial system we give small business and, for that matter, large business—but particularly small business—the ability to stay in or to opt out of the existing rigid system. There are many small businesses in this State that will not have the opportunity to employ lawyers, accountants or negotiators to argue their case, and the same applies, of course, for employees. So, it is important that they be given the choice to be part of an award-structured system or to opt out and be part of a 'through the door' system of enterprise bargaining.

I note again a comment in the address by the Governor about the need to do something about red tape. Ever since I have been in this Parliament this Government has

promised that red tape would be removed, that it would set up a system of a one-stop shop and that it would remove the multiple licences and amalgamate them. Here again in the Governor's presentation we have the same tired old recommendation about red tape. The most important thing to do in relation to Government and industry—whether it be small or large—is to ensure that the licences required are as simple and consolidated as possible, that industry is able to get those licences through the respective agencies of Government and that that process is quite easy.

Another area to be investigated would be to go to the industry associations and offer them the ability to self-regulate and for the Government to monitor that self-regulation. I was fascinated the other day when we visited the Motor Trader Association to find that it had offered to implement a system of self-regulation of all licences required in the motor industry, only to find that the Government has not even bothered to reply to what on the surface seems to be a very practical and simple method of regulation guaranteed by the Motor Trade Association that would cost the Government no money. It seemed to me to be a very logical way to go. We will look at that area very seriously, not only in relation to the motor trades industry but also in areas affecting all small business and their regulation.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I suppose that is true. Another major issue in this industrial relations area, and one which the Government has promised to look at for some time, is the problem of age discrimination in the employment of young people. I am aware that the legislation in relation to age discrimination has been brought into this House and fully debated, but at the time of the debate I can remember many of us saying to the Government and in particular to the Minister of Labour at the time that there would be significant problems in advertising for the employment of young people. It has now become very apparent in the past 12 months that we have a major employment problem in terms of young people and that the Age Discrimination Act as it is currently written makes it impossible for an employer to advertise for young people for positions which they may want to fill.

Only last week a garage owner in my electorate wanted a young person to work on the drive to serve petrol and to do general cleaning around the place. Because of the Act that currently applies, he could not put in an advertisement to say he wanted someone between 15 and 20 (because that is basically what he wanted); he had to put in a general advertisement. He had 400 applications and nearly 300 of those people did not fit the bill. He then had to recognise, in turning them away, that if he mentioned in any form whatsoever that it was because of their age he would have difficulties before the law. Here, he had 400 people who applied for a job which more than 300 had no chance of getting.

I understand that the Attorney-General has said that there will be some major changes to the Age Discrimination Act in this area but, unfortunately, I note that for this session there is no mention of that in the Governor's speech. It is a major area of employment difficulty, and it is an area that we need to look at. I also note that, whilst there are difficulties for young people, at the other end of the employment scale there are also

difficulties; if one wishes to employ a mature aged person, one cannot advertise for them, either. So, whilst the intent of the Act might have been good, the practical ramifications that are now coming forward in relation to this whole area of employment have created some very difficult situations.

The second issue I would like to talk about is workers compensation, and the current position here in our State. I noted with interest that the Minister intended to introduce a Bill on workers compensation this session. I also noted that earlier this year the Premier said clearly that he wished to change the Workers Compensation Act to make it competitive with the rest of Australia by 1993-94. It is fascinating that that position was virtually overturned at the weekend at the State ALP Convention, when a motion was moved which, in essence, guarantees the *status quo*. It is impossible to reduce the average levy rate for workers compensation and make it competitive with the rest of Australia unless there are some very significant changes to the Workers Compensation Act.

Nearly two years ago the select committee was set up to look at this whole area of workers compensation. We have made one recommendation to this House, suggesting a significant series of changes to the Act, but in the end this recommendation was rejected by the Government in the meeting of the joint Houses. It was quite an incredible decision because those three very significant changes would almost certainly have reduced the long term funding liability of workers compensation by \$100 million.

It has been put to me in the past few days that if we are to get any changes in workers compensation the Liberal Party, the Government, the unions and the employers will have to agree; otherwise nothing will happen. I find that totally unacceptable when the biggest single complaint that I believe all members of Parliament get in relation to business is that the cost of workers compensation is ignored because this Government is totally locked into a no-change argument by its union mates.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: If you read the motion that was passed, I would say the Government is totally locked into a no-change situation by its union mates and that will not enable the promise that was made by the Premier to make the workers compensation rates competitive with the rest of Australia by 1993-94 to be fulfilled.

I should like to conclude my presentation today on the matter of tourism. There is no doubt that tourism is one of the biggest potential creators of jobs and wealth in this State and country in the short and long term. If the tourism portfolio is properly promoted, the opportunity for the young and the old in our community to get new jobs is enormous. To do that Tourism SA needs a leader and a Minister. We have had acting Ministers now for about four months. We must have a permanent department head. We have had an acting department head in Tourism SA now for nearly 12 months. No business, no department, no commission can go anywhere when they only have acting heads of departments. It is no wonder that we hear the discontent coming from the Department of Tourism and concern in the tourism community about the direction of tourism in this State when we have the two major positions, Minister and

department head, as acting positions. I find it incredible that this Government can be serious about tourism when we have those two positions as they are at present.

In a review of the Little report, it was pointed out that about nine major tourism projects had fallen over in this State in the past five years for some reason or another. Those projects are Jubilee Point, Sellicks Beach, Mount Lofty, Kangaroo Island (Woods Bagot and Paradise Investments), Barossa Valley, Zhen Yun, Marino Rocks and Wilpena. Wilpena has not fallen over, but it has not yet started, and I doubt whether it will ever get off the ground. Those projects have a total investment of \$600 million. The Business Review Weekly of 31 July 1992, with regard to the Little report, stated:

The Government-commissioned report by consulting firm Arthur D. Little has pointed out how crucial such developments are to the State's economic future, and highlighted the opinion of Australia's business community that the State is a problem environment for investment.

South Australia has fallen behind other States in its market share of tourism dollars, and the report makes it clear that growth will depend on essential development, with 'particular effort required to upgrade accommodation'.

It says these essential projects include waterfront accommodation along the coast around Adelaide, a golf course and conference resort in the Barossa Valley, new accommodation at Wilpena in the Flinders Ranges, and 'accommodation more convenient to the national park' on Kangaroo Island.

It goes on to say in essence that this Government, whilst it talks about tourism, really has not been very serious about making sure that the tourism infrastructure side has been properly looked at.

One of the most important things that is needed in tourism in South Australia is a Government committed to tourism, a Government not just purely and simply saying that it can create more jobs through tourism but putting priority into its spending and into ministerial direction.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Meier): Order! The Deputy Leader's time has expired. The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): In the nearly 22 years that I have had the privilege of being a member in this House, we now face the worst economic climate that I have seen. I have seen some difficult economic situations in this State and in this nation. However, on this occasion we have in place not only a minority Government—at the very best, it received only 48 per cent of the vote at the last election—but a Government that has proved beyond doubt that it is the most incompetent and worst money manager in the history of this State.

The people of this State are now having inflicted upon them draconian measures being brought forward by the Government, such as increasing taxation, out-of-control bureaucracy and mismanagement, which affect not only our employment levels but the ability of business to get on with its correct role. We have watched as the Public Service has been hijacked by trendy academics, most of whom have never been in the real world. They have followed this level playing field concept, which is a nonsense.

As someone who has been involved in the agricultural sector and who has supported the orderly marketing of primary products, because I believe that is in the best interests not only of producers but of the nation as a whole and it has created thousands of jobs and has provided massive income for the community, I see nothing

wrong with the Government's being involved in the marketplace.

Mr Atkinson: What about the orderly marketing of labour?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: If the honourable member is a little bit more patient, I will deliver my argument. I have a fair bit to say about orderly marketing, whether it be in relation to railway workshops at Port Augusta, or the primary producers in the west or the mid North of South Australia. Last week, I was interested to read in the business section of the *Advertiser*, Sir Arvi Parvo's column, which stated:

While business generally and quite naturally dislikes restrictions on its freedom of action, some intervention is clearly proper and necessary.

I support that statement entirely because, if we create this perfect level playing field and if the economic rationalists have their way and achieve this perfect economic situation, what will we do in this State and in this nation with the hundreds of thousands of people who are unemployed and all the bankrupt businesses, as well as all the businesses we have exported overseas?

As a member of this House, I believe that the proper role of Government is to create the economic conditions so that business and agriculture can prosper, we can create jobs and guarantee employment. The best social welfare program that any Government can be involved in is to create sound economic conditions so that people have jobs, so that businesses can prosper, and a large social welfare budget is not needed, because people look after themselves. We should not be in this horrendous situation in which rural South Australia is being destroyed. The regional and rural centres of this State and nation are being destroyed on a daily basis.

However, for some unknown reason, those trendy economic theorists who have hijacked the political debate in this country, who have hijacked the Labor Party, are inflicting policies that have no relevance to common-sense. They have created a situation in which they have completely ignored the people of this country who have built the nation; who are used to getting dirt and grease on themselves; who have been the foundation of this nation; and who are prepared to be isolated in uncomfortable parts of this State and build industries and create the wealth for this community. Yet, this Parliament and this Government idly sit by. It is about time we had the courage of our convictions and stood up in this place and said, 'Enough is enough. How many more jobs do we want to export?'

What has happened is that bureaucracy has become all powerful, as always happens under Labor Governments. Most of the Ministers have never run anything themselves and are easily influenced by bureaucrats and trendies who themselves have never faced the real world. Bureaucracy has become too powerful and this Parliament has to exercise its authority, take charge of the situation and ensure that the public interest is put first and the advice of these people is ignored. If we do not do that, there will be no employment in the regional and rural centres of this State.

Members should go out to these centres and see what is happening. Jobs are evaporating in the agricultural sector, where there used to be many hundreds of machi-

nery agents employing mechanics, spare parts people and other skilled people. Members should look in the regional towns and note the number of businesses that have closed down and the number of houses that are up for sale. Yet, we have had a proposition put to us—

Mr Atkinson: And you will reverse that, will you?

Mr GUNN: I think the honourable member opposite is probably more conservative than most of us in this Chamber, and not particularly practical in his outlook. If he listens, he may learn something. The point I was about to make is that this Government has the authority to stand up to the Commonwealth Government and say, 'If you do not guarantee the future of the railway workshops at Islington and Port Augusta we will not agree to the National Rail Corporation having running rights over STA tracks in this State.' It is a very simple proposition.

Mr Atkinson: They have just done that.

Mr GUNN: No, they have not. The Commonwealth Government agreed to put up \$12 million of the \$17.5 million that Australian National requested. I support that decision, as I strongly support the construction of the Darwin to Alice Springs railway line, which to the eternal shame of Prime Minister Hawke did not eventuate. He went back on his word.

Unfortunately in this country there are three political forces—the Australian Labor Party, the Coalition and Eastern Australia, and Eastern Australia dominated again over the best interests of the rest of Australia. If it had not been for Bob Hawke going back on his word and if Malcolm Fraser had waited another three months before he called that election the railway line from Darwin to Alice Springs would have been constructed. It was all ready to go, and the only thing that prevented it was that Prime Minister Hawke got his mate Hill, who is now the General Manager of the ABC and who was then the head of the New South Wales Transport Commission, to intervene. Everyone knew what he was going to say because he wanted Eastern Australia to benefit; he was not doing it in the long-term interests of Australia. That is why we do not have that railway line, and it is to the detriment of South Australia and the nation as a whole.

Let us go on further. The proposition has been put to us that we should have a national freight rail corporation to shift freight quickly across Australia. Everyone would agree that on a large continent such as Australia we should have an effective, well-run and well-managed rail system: there is no argument about that. Such a system would be the most efficient way to handle freight, particularly large volumes of heavy freight. However, what is the point of creating this new organisation if you destroy existing industries and the employment base? The \$12 million which has been allocated, with a promise of a further \$5 million, will not create any more jobs but will maintain existing employment at Port Augusta, and that is to be commended. But what about the long-term future? We heard the Minister of Transport today accuse the Federal Opposition of not supporting this.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is not true. The Minister did not tell the House that he has benefited but Colleen Hutchison missed out in relation to the refurbishment of the locomotives in Whyalla. He has not given us the story on that. That has cost jobs in Port Augusta. Twenty-five locomotives are to be refurbished and new facilities built in

Whyalla. Facilities already exist in Port Augusta. The Minister has not said much about that. Let him come clean and tell the House and the community how he organised that at the expense of Port Augusta. There is dead silence. We and the unions at Port Augusta want to know and I will tell the House in a moment the motions they passed in relation to that. However, I return to what the Coalition said.

Following the public controversy, which was right, in relation to the refurbishing of the Indian Pacific, I wrote to the shadow Minister for Land Transport (David Hawker), and in reply this is what he had to say:

Dear Graham,

Thank you for your letter of 14 May in which you enclosed a letter you sent to the Premier of South Australia concerning the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific. I feel that the Indian Pacific could be one of the 'great train rides'. It travels through country that most people in the world would not get to see otherwise. However, the Coalition feels that having only one system manage the train is imperative to its survival.

I think we would all agree with that. The letter continues:

We also are very much in favour of reform of our total rail network. In fact, we see it as a key priority in Australia's microeconomic rehabilitation. Rail services must be cost effective. As you would know, under a Coalition Government, AN would save about \$32 million per year because of the abolition of fuel excise and payroll tax. This is nearly twice as much as what the refurbishment and upgrade is likely to cost. I was pleased to see that AN have engaged consultants to determine the benefit of refurbishment of the Indian Pacific, and would encourage any effort to save this 'rail experience'.

That is not opposition. That is contrary to what the Minister had to say today. He should have his facts correct when he stands up in this House, because we know already that he has been too quick for the member for Stuart. He has taken jobs from Port Augusta and she will be left in the wilderness after this exercise. The South Australian Government has the authority to guarantee the future of the Islington and Port Augusta workshops. I have a letter dated 9 June from the Australian Government Solicitor. It is headed 'Memorandum of understanding' and reads as follows:

In my opinion the recent Memorandum of understanding between AN and the ACTU and various unions concerning restructuring and redundancy, as you have said, does not and in fact could not change the arrangements that were put in place by the so-called 'Transfer Agreement' made between the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of South Australia on 21 May 1975. I note that there is a clause in the Transfer Agreement that touches on the question of reduction in employment by reason of redundancy. Clause 17 provides:

The Australian Minister will obtain the prior agreement of the State Minister to the implementation of any proposals for reducing, by reason of redundancy, the general level of employment at railway workshops to be vested in the commission pursuant to this agreement, and failing agreement the matter shall be determined by arbitration.

It will be noted that the clause is limited to employment at railway workshops vested in AN pursuant to the agreement.

That letter is signed by P. R. Charlton, Australian Government Solicitor. So, the Premier has a very strong weapon with which to ensure that the National Rail Freight Corporation does use the existing facilities. Blind Freddy knows what they are going to do. If anyone has sat through a lecture by Mr Vince Graham and listened to his plans and the manner in which he intends to go about them, one can only have fear for the future of these people. For the life of me, I cannot understand why anyone would want to destroy this regional centre, because that is what they will do if they reduce employ-

ment at Port Augusta. What will people do at the end of the day? Unfortunately, there is no other employment up there, and there is no employment in Adelaide.

If people have to leave Port Augusta and put their homes on the market, they will hardly get enough to provide a deposit on a house in Adelaide. They will become an unfortunate expense on the taxpayers and go on the dole. Is it not better for the Australian Government to continue to support those workshops and allow those people to be gainfully employed? When people are employed they have an expectation of a future.

Is it not better and is it not more common sense for the South Australian Government to stand up and say, 'We will not give you access unless you give an assurance.' It is all well and good to talk about economic rationalism and say that we need to have an efficient rail system, but at the end of the day we have to consider what we are doing to people. This country should have woken up to itself, because we have just about destroyed every effective industry that we have.

We are talking about level playing fields in agriculture to the detriment of the average Australian and their employment opportunities. I believe that common sense should prevail, but I do not believe it is prevailing at present. Let me explain to the House just what the general view is in that part of the world about the mood of the rail unions at Port Augusta. Certainly, I am pleased the member for Albert Park is present, because a meeting was held at the Port Augusta workshop on Monday 20 May 1992. The meeting, which started at 1 p.m., involved AN workers and union officials from Adelaide. The first motion moved was:

That the Port Augusta employees of AN call on the State Government to resist signing away running rights to the NRC till the future of AN and the rail industry in this State is guaranteed.

The second motion states:

That the Port Augusta employees of AN call on the Federal Labor Government to reexamine the NRC concept and ensure that the NRC does not interfere in the continued operation and survival of AN and the rail industry in this State.

That motion was carried. The third motion states:

That the Port Augusta employees of AN call on all rail unions to conduct a campaign to ensure the continued viability of AN.

The fourth motion states:

That the Port Augusta employees of AN call on the ACTU to conduct a real process of consultation with rail workers and all rail industry unions on the NRC. That rail industry unions withdraw their contributions from the ACTU as if do not receive same.

It goes on further to state:

That this meeting of Port Augusta employees of AN expresses no confidence in the ACTU's handling of the NRC agreements.

That motion was carried. The next motion states:

That all paid officials of unions present oppose the deal done by Russell King concerning the sale and refurbishment of AN locomotives at Whyalla by Morrison Knudson and that they be done at Port Augusta workshops. That all unions present at this meeting ban any attempts to move CL2 or any other locos to Whyalla for major repairs or redevelopment.

That motion was carried unanimously. The following motion was also carried:

That all unions present at this meeting demand that the Government commence work on the Darwin-Alice Springs rail link and release the \$17.5 million to refurbish the Indian Pacific.

They have gone most of the way there. The next motion states:

That this meeting of all unions held this 20th day of July 1992 at 1 p.m. in Port Augusta moves the following—that Dominica Whelan, Industrial Officer with the ACTU, resign immediately.

Members can see from those motions that there is a degree of anger in that part of the world. People cannot understand how the deal has been done to allow locomotive refurbishment at Whyalla when they have to take the equipment in and build a line from the main line across to the big shed where they are going to do the work, especially when all the facilities at Port Augusta are there but will be destroyed. No wonder there was anger. It appears that the National Rail Corporation is paying lip service.

I attended a public meeting at Port Augusta at which Mr Vince Graham spoke. He put a chill through the people there about their future job prospects. I was amazed that a fellow would have such arrogance. He did not seem to understand that, if they proceeded as he outlined, hundreds of jobs would be destroyed. Those people were given an ultimatum. Those who are offered jobs must accept and come across, but they will lose their future benefits. They might only get a job for six months and, if they become redundant, they will lose everything, anyway. People do not know which way to go. Some people said to me after the meeting that, if they were offered a redundancy package, they had better take it because, if they go with the new corporation, they might only be wanted for six months. What is their future? There is grave concern about that.

I turn now to one or two other matters. What people should understand when talking about this matter is that there has been a massive reduction in the number of people employed in railways in this State over the past few years. As I understand it, in 1978 approximately 11 000 people were employed. Today, approximately 5 000 people are employed. That is a massive reduction. It has been done and I believe that all the people associated with it have been reasonable and have accepted the mood for change.

However, there is a line that people are not prepared to step over. What is the point of destroying people who are experienced and capable and who want to remain in the industry at Islington and Port Augusta? Unless the State and the Commonwealth Governments step in, there is nothing surer than that, when they contract the maintenance work out, as they plan to do, the State rail authorities in New South Wales and Victoria will have an advantage. What people do not understand is that those organisations can afford to do the work for the National Rail Corporation at a greatly reduced rate because they can offset it against their State operations. They must have those workshops and maintain them to look after their ongoing State rail systems.

However, in South Australia, which does not have that system, the workshops at Port Augusta will not have that opportunity. I believe that, at a bare minimum, these people ought to be given a five-year guarantee so that the workshops have existing and future work. Otherwise, the effects on Port Augusta, Islington and the rail system in South Australia will be horrendous. In my judgment, only a fool would throw those people out of work or cause that dislocation and a downturn in a place such as Port Augusta. We are the most urbanised State in the nation and there is no point in continuing that trend because it is

essential that those centres remain at a size where such facilities can be maintained. The State Government has a heavy responsibility in that regard.

After those resolutions were carried, the State Secretary of the Australian Workers Union received a letter from Mr Martin Ferguson of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. I do not think Mr Ferguson was particularly impressed with the resolutions that were passed. I will quote from a letter dated 27 July, in which Mr Ferguson said:

I note the receipt of the resolutions attached to your letter of 22 July 1992 which does not indicate whether your branch endorses the resolutions or not. I should trust that you are not victims of the same misinformation which seems to have motivated these resolutions . . . 'It is accepted by the unions that the National Rail Corporation will not bear any financial responsibility for the accrued entitlements of former employees of the existing rail systems. Transfers of rolled over superannuation entitlements would be in accordance with the trust deed of the NRC's superannuation fund.'

This is what he said, and people should be aware of this:

It is time that unions in South Australia confronted the facts of the situation and directed their energies towards positive steps towards the future.

That is all very well if you have a secure position, but not when you are facing redundancy and the destruction of half your town. It is all very well to adopt the isolationist policies of the high and mighty in Canberra—out of sight, out of mind. He goes on:

Secondly, AN fought the establishment of the NRC and tried to use their work force in a cynical political exercise to thwart the Government's intentions. They were paying Port Augusta workers to go to Canberra to lobby against the NRC (a futile exercise), and at the same time doing a deal with Morrison Knudson to take work away from the Port Augusta workshops.

He concludes by saying:

It is time that union officials in South Australia addressed the future of the rail industry in that State in a constructive and realistic manner. I understand the frustration of those workers who are unsure of what the future holds. It is the responsibility of the trade union movement to lead these workers in a positive direction.

That is very positive if you do not have a job. He continued:

Significant gains were made last year in improving redundancy payments and gaining Federal Government funding for retraining. Port Augusta can have a future as a railway town, not by trying to reverse decisions which have already been made but by establishing the capacity to meet the future needs of the industry.

That is all very well for someone who has a secure position in Canberra or Melbourne, but it is not all right for those people. Under the proposals for the National Rail Corporation, it will not own any rail workshops. The future of Australian National is not clear. What will happen? Who will have control of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line? If we are not very careful, the only railways operating in South Australia will be the Pichi Richi Railway Preservation Society, the Peterborough Steamtown and the SteamRanger when it goes to Victor Harbor. That is all we will have left in South Australia if we are not very careful, because there will be no workshops left. No-one knows what is happening to Australian National. Unless it can maintain some of its core business it will not be viable, and that will provide an excuse to wind it up.

What is required is a definite and sensible plan to be put forward to operate both organisations. In my

judgment, the National Rail Corporation could and should have been run by AN, because it has the existing structures and there would have been no dislocation and no threat of job loss or of running down an existing regional centre. As I said earlier, regional and rural Australia have borne the brunt of the nonsense put forward by the Government. There has been too much reliance on theory and not enough on common sense and practical realities.

In my few concluding remarks, I want to refer to my concern about the continued viability of rural industry in this State. As I said earlier, I do not have any problem with the Government being involved in support mechanisms that will assist industry in this State or in this nation. In my view, in the successful economies in the world, such as Japan and Germany, the Government has been involved. Just to show the sort of protection barriers that we are facing, I quote from a press statement by Dr Neal Blewett of 19 May 1992 in which he states:

... the annual transfers to agriculture since 1989 in the EC had increased by US\$40 billion (or 40 per cent) to US\$140 billion, and in the USA by US\$10 billion (or 14 per cent) to US\$80 billion. Although transfers have fallen 4 per cent in Japan since 1989, they were still over US\$60 billion in 1991... The market situation and outlook points to the inadequate adjustments in agricultural policies over the past few years, thereby thwarting competitive conditions [which prevail].

What we are trying to face in this country is those massive subsidies and, unless the Government is prepared to give support to the agricultural sector through some realistic and sensible policies, not only will the rural industry in this State be destroyed but also more businesses in rural South Australia will close down and more people will be forced off their farms. At the end of the day, what is the benefit of having the most perfect economic situation if people are unemployed?

The role of Government is to create conditions that will improve the general welfare of the average Australian. That is the role of Government, not to take notice of trendy academics who have hijacked the economic debate in this country at the expense of the average Australian. I have been called everything from an agrarian socialist to a right wing extremist. I make no apology for the stance I take, because my views are based on one thing—to ensure that the average Australian has a fair go and is treated fairly. The best social welfare policy is full employment so that people can look after themselves. The role of Government is to provide the basic necessities of education and health and not to get diverted, as this Government has, by academics, theorists and, in some cases, villains.

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): In rising to support the Address in Reply, I would like to offer my condolences to the family of Mrs Joyce Steele. I was not fortunate in having had the pleasure of meeting Mrs Steele, but I recognise the contributions she made to this place and to the State of South Australia. I also welcome the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Dean Brown, to this Parliament, and I look forward to his leadership and to what I am sure will be his very positive contributions in this place. I also look forward to the parliamentary contributions of the member for Kavel, Mr John Olsen,

who also rejoins this Parliament and adds valued experience to the Liberal Opposition.

Never in the history of this State have its citizens—including its children—been so badly served by its elected Government and by the members of that Government. We have had a decade of Bannon-led Labor Governments, a decade in which the people of South Australia gave their trust, hope and aspirations into the hands of the Australian Labor Party led by Premier Bannon and touted by the media as the Government most likely to succeed in improving the quality of life, work and service provision in education, law and order, and health, including hospitals. This was to be the Government most likely to succeed in all those areas for all South Australians.

A decade further down the track, the results are there for all to see. I do not believe that the term 'disaster' in relation to the end results of this Premier's decade of mismanagement and ineptitude is at all too strong. In fact, if the Premier were to visit some of the hotels in his electorate and speak to the locals who frequent those hotels, I am quite sure he too would agree that the word 'disaster' is a medium term, because the words that have been used to describe the Premier and the Government cannot be repeated in this place. I am quite happy to pass on to the Premier the remonstrations indicated to me by people across the State that the most horrifying thing they have to contemplate at present is the possibility that this Government will remain in power for a further 17 months.

Every day over the past year 57 people have joined the ranks of the unemployed. That is one in eight South Australians out of work. That is a disaster and it is totally unacceptable. When I came into this Parliament in 1989, unemployment was already a concern, with 47 500 people being unemployed. The number of unemployed people since that time has almost doubled in just under three years. The 1989 unemployment figures were surely an indication to this Government that, with an economy in recession, and given the Government's inside knowledge of a staggering State debt climbing out of control, the Labor Party policy direction was due for a major change. However, this Government's ideology is far removed from reality, stagnating in the hands of consultants and committees that produce report after report on our past and our future—but there is no action at the present time.

This Government has assisted in the escalation of the current unemployment crisis by not supporting Liberal Party amendments which were put forward to reform key pieces of legislation and which would have created jobs. WorkCover has been continually identified by small business throughout this State as the major deterrent to job creation, but Labor members of this Parliament refused to accept valid amendments by the Liberal Opposition. Employers in South Australia suffer the highest workers compensation levies of any employers in Australia. WorkCover has a monopoly advantage in this State, but levies imposed on employers feed a deficit funding liability, whereas a private enterprise, commercially viable entity would be forced to provide equitable terms to both the employer and the employee or get out of the industry.

Average levies increased from about 3.2 per cent of total payroll in 1989 to the current average levy of 3.5 per cent whereas, by comparison in New South Wales, the average levies have been reduced substantially to 1.8 per cent. While South Australia's WorkCover maintains a \$100 million deficit, New South Wales can boast a \$650 million surplus. If this Government cannot make the moves necessary to create incentive and confidence in industry and investment in this State, it is time the Government listened to the voices of discontent that range across this State and resigned.

I would remind the Premier of his own words on the subject of resignation, which were recorded in the *Advertiser* of 21 December 1991 and written by the political writer, Rex Jory, who states:

In his first public speculation about the future [Mr Bannon] said leaders stayed in the job as long as they were effective and as long as others wanted them. 'If it becomes apparent that I am not able to deliver the goods or work our way through this current very difficult recessionary period in South Australia (I hope) that I will have the sense to know and understand that and bow out gracefully,' he said.

I would suggest that the time to bow out gracefully is fast diminishing. I would also suggest that the people of this State are far better equipped to handle the effects of recession than to accept the massive economic and financial blunders that surpass and accentuate recessionary disorders.

Mr Meier interjecting:

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

Mrs KOTZ: When the Bannon Government came to office with its 48 per cent minority vote, the net State debt was \$2.6 billion. When I came into this Parliament in 1989, it was with a deep concern that the State debt had already escalated to \$4.4 billion. Since then, I have watched in dismay, with every other South Australian, seeing the State Bank debacle, the SGIC fiasco, Beneficial Finance, Scrimber and all the others far too numerous to mention in this debate. All these financial blunders came about with the approval of our Treasurer and Premier and with the aid and support of inept Cabinet Ministers. So, from the 1989 election to June 1991, a matter of 18 months, the State debt was further increased by another \$2.2 billion to \$6.6 billion.

Although not yet acknowledged by this Government, it is most likely that at this time the State debt is closer to \$8 billion. The Standard and Poor's Australian ratings report of 30 June last year stated that South Australian total net debt was \$7.8 billion at that time, which means there was a debt of \$5 381 on the head of every South Australian. Only last week a further \$100 million was added to the State Bank debt, which does not relieve the State's anxiety that further State Bank indemnity costs could well still be forthcoming.

Labor's financial mismanagement has lost to this State the advantage of our once prized triple A credit rating, having been downgraded twice by both Standard and Poor's and Moodys since the 1989 election, which means that a further \$50 million per year could well be added to our State's borrowing costs.

This Government continues to defy economic rationale by increasing its upward spiral in the area of recurrent expenditure in the public sector. Annual consumption in 1988-89 was \$4.123 billion. In each of the three years

since 1988-89 we have seen an average annual increase of \$223 million, bringing total spending in this sector in 1991-92 to an estimated \$4.792 billion. Keeping in mind that we have lost considerable financial advantage by a downgraded credit rating, prior to the 1989 election, in the year to June 1989 the service cost on net interest for the Consolidated Account alone was \$440 million, which is the equivalent of 35 cents in every tax dollar collected. The comparison today is that the net servicing interest cost in 1991-92 for the Consolidated Account has grown substantially to an estimated \$694.2 million, which also means the revenue raised tax dollar is eaten away to the tune of 47 cents.

This Government has shown a complete inability to understand the necessity of slowing the growth in program expenditures and to take a directional change in policy which would halt the upward spiral of escalating debt and at the very least stabilise current debt. It was this lack of any cohesive medium-term policy direction by the South Australian Government that caused the downgrading of our State credit rating to such a negative level. Greater expenditure into welfare and service provision areas has channelled the State's finances out of productive zones into non-productive zones and, coupled with high risk investment ventures, has, on the one hand, seen massive losses of State funds with less provision of services to the people of this State, on the other hand.

Capital spending, which in itself could provide job opportunities, private enterprise investment, support for small business and provide the panacea to the dramatic effects of a mismanaged economy, has been cut from the budget programs of this Government. During the decade of the Bannon Government, capital spending outlays have diminished from 21.7 per cent to 13.6 per cent.

The Arthur D. Little report makes strong comment on this very aspect of the State's need to develop an economically stable base combining the elements of welfare, social, cultural and environmental requirements with a more rational emphasis placed on industrial and economic development, and stresses throughout that greater private sector involvement is necessary, which will require high levels of Government support to stimulate that impetus of economic development by private sector industry and business.

The last major paragraph on page 24 of the report qualifies the important undertaking for success or, if you like, a philosophy for success, and I quote:

To the maximum extent possible, however, there needs to be a gradual transfer of responsibility from Government to the private sector for the economic development of the State. It is, after all, the individual decisions of the firms that will determine the extent to which wealth-generating activities are embarked upon and the degree of success that they enjoy.

On page 33 of the report, which deals with coordinating strategy and implementations, six key strategies are outlined under the heading 'Improved Business Climate and Strengthened Business Culture'. The top two strategies underline the areas to which I have referred in this debate: first, to provide funding for the development of the strategic infrastructure and, secondly, to streamline Government regulatory requirements and improve business access to Government.

My main concern is that this Government, which is so entrenched in socialist ideology, will be unable to interpret the strategies inherent within the Arthur D. Little

report. The main thrust of these strategies will mean an evolution of major change to the attitudes and ideology of Labor Government and Labor Government members. Therefore, part of my concern is focused on the willingness and the ability of Government members to accept the report, which strongly endorses the basic philosophy of the Liberal Party.

That brings me to the second part of my concern, that is, that this Government will only partially embrace the concepts detailed in this very expensive report and reshape those concepts to suit the entrenched socialist and welfare-driven mentalities of the past decade, which would most certainly negate positive reforms and, in this instance, would also deny South Australians the opportunity to prosper to the optimum potential of this State.

If the Premier and his Cabinet need any further persuading as to the extent of their liability placed upon this State and its people, I shall offer into this debate the results of a recent small business survey, which was published in June this year. The survey was carried out for *National Business Bulletin* by Quadrant Research Services. The majority of answers came from owner/proprietors representing three dominant areas, that is, manufacturing, wholesale, retail and business services, with annual turnovers ranging from \$500 000 to several million dollars per annum.

The survey results confirm what most of us have already recognised for some time—except for the Government—that stagnant and inept Government policy, lack of Government support for business and industry and stifling Government taxes and charges are slowly destroying the very industries that can provide growth in economic development and provide the necessary employment opportunities and, therefore, secure the future prospects for the thousands of young people whose futures look extremely bleak. The survey results show a decline across the board in sales, in profits, in staff and in capital expenditure. Profits compared with the previous six months indicate a negative trend. It is certainly no surprise to note that employee levels have decreased over the past six months.

One healthy aspect was that 15 per cent of businesses were exporting, but unfortunately the majority were holding back because of financial difficulties, incentives and export problems. It was also pointed out in the report that small business had very few Government contracts at any level, and one third of these businesses believed that Government attitude to small business is getting worse.

It may also be of interest to this Government that Federal issues were canvassed following the results. The general reaction to Keating's One Nation package was a resounding thumbs down. Of the 11 incentives offered under the One Nation package, the majority of respondents to the survey rated them as having little or no effect on their business although they believed that the introduction of the superannuation guarantee level would have a significant impact on their business.

It is most interesting to know that, when asked the direct question of the best economic package for their business and for the nation, John Hewson's Fightback led Keating's One Nation package on a ratio of five to one. When comparing the GST to the current sales tax approach, the indications were that business and the

consumer would indeed benefit from the GST. The final question in the survey asked respondents whom they believe better understood the needs of small business, Keating or Hewson? The result was overwhelmingly in favour of Hewson, with a ratio of more than seven to one. How many more pointers does this Government need before it takes some positive steps in the right direction? In the two and a half years of this current Parliament I have not seen any Government initiative that gives me confidence to believe that this Government has the ability to take this State out of its current malaise, let alone lead us successfully to the year 2000.

During the first day's sitting of the Parliament, the Premier was asked a question by the Leader of the Opposition about the fire sale of Government-owned assets at heavily under-valued prices. The Premier went quickly into his normal acting mode, fudging with rhetoric and commenting on anything that came to his mind, other than answering the question that was asked. The media reported that the articulate John Bannon was in fine form, giving a credible performance. Well, the media got part of it right: there is no doubting John Bannon's acting ability. He has had many years experience. But those talents are more suited to the Entertainment Centre where people pay for the privilege of seeing illusion, subterfuge, farce and many other thespian antics.

I would also like to pass on to the Premier one last comment that comes directly from the community. I have lost count of the number of people who have made this comment to me and I would like to quote it in the first person: if I as an individual or anyone else in private enterprise had committed the financial atrocities of this Government, I would undoubtedly be in gaol now.

Members interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: A great number right across the State have made that very same comment to me on many occasions—some just before this parliamentary session. I would like to conclude my comments in this debate by referring again to the Arthur D. Little report. This is one time when I hope the comments that I make are in fact wrong and that the Government can change its direction.

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

Mrs KOTZ: Prior to the dinner break I was about to read part of the summary at the end of the Arthur D. Little report, but I wish to defer that now that I have more time. I want to refer to a report from the Public Service Association of South Australia on the Impact of Budget Cuts 1992, which is headlined 'False economies'. Inside the front page is a series of dot point areas, which I should like to read into the record, Under the heading 'Tax cuts mean our standard of living drops', the Public Service Association states:

We are aware that the State Bank debt crisis is a disaster. However the association is concerned at the false economies that public sector cuts are producing, such as:

- the false economy of deferring investment in assets and infrastructure, leading to greater and earlier replacement costs
- the false economy of not marketing public services in a positive way yet expecting taxpayers to understand their benefits

- the false economy of not fully harnessing the goodwill and intellectual skills of public sector workers through investing in equipment and marketing
- the false economy of cutting public services which support industry, manufacturing and agriculture
- the false economy of cuts in one area that simply transfer the problem to another area, creating more cost and inefficiency
- the false economy of having workplaces where morale is so low that productivity is almost destroyed
- the false economy of services contracted-out to the private sector which are more expensive than the public services they replaced

Although I believe that this is an area the public sector would have difficulty in substantiating. It continues:

- the false economy of cutting socially useful public sector jobs, transferring people on to the dole—and not productive at all

And we heard today that the Government's economies of scale are somewhat contradictory, when public servants can accept voluntary separation packages and are immediately rehired as consultants. It questions again the validity and the credibility of this Government's business management. The last dot point states:

- the false economy of not supporting young, disadvantaged and poor people, thus creating bigger, more expensive, socially divisive problems, further down the track.

Then a qualifying sentence states:

No politicians are in a position to score points at each others' expense from this document. No politicians appear to be offering a viable model for the public sector.

This may be an attempted disclaimer by the Public Service, but I suggest that this document is an indictment of the Bannon Government. It is time that the Public Service accepted the fact that the funds that would have supported the Public Service were lost to South Australia by the risk-taking investment ventures entered into by their Government, despite advice from an Opposition which was smarter than this Government and which had been proven right in its predictions.

Advice from sources other than the Opposition were also ignored by our Treasurer and, if my memory serves me correctly, one example was the purchase of the New Zealand timber company. The advice in that instance was offered by the Auditor-General who, quite rightly, pointed out that the New Zealand timber company's liabilities far outweighed its assets. But that fact did not deter our Treasurer, and further millions of South Australian taxpayers' funds floated offshore to be lost for ever.

I would now like to refer to the statements I wanted to put on record from the summary of the Arthur D. Little report. I think I also stated earlier that this is one time that I would trust that I am wrong. The summary states:

Along with the change to the structure of the economy, the role of government will change from leadership to facilitation of private sector activity.

The report finishes with this statement:

The objective should be to transfer as much responsibility and resources from the public to the private sector as development conditions will permit. By the year 2000 a slimmed down public sector in its economic development role should be concerned primarily with facilitating business activity and creating the conditions under which business in the State can flourish and grow.

I hope that this is an area this Government will take seriously and initiate the strategies that are inherent in this report.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I support the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech and, like many other members, I offer my condolences to the family of the late Mrs Joyce Steele. I also congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Alexandra, his re-election to this Chamber and I also congratulate the member for Kavel on his re-election. I can remember only too well the member for Alexandra when I was first elected to this Parliament many years ago.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the contributions by members opposite today; they have been interesting, although I must say that I was disappointed by the contribution of the member for Newland, who still does not have the capacity to address this Parliament without having copious notes (to put it into parliamentary jargon).

I am not an uncharitable person, but if the member for Newland aspires to be a Minister I believe she will have to lift her game and be able to stand on her feet and speak off the top of her head. I do not want to be uncharitable but, at the time when I was elected to this Parliament, copious notes certainly were not the order of the day and I can remember the member for Eyre was a strict person in that regard. I will leave the matter there, because I do not want to be seen to be too uncharitable.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The reason is that I am not of that nature, as my colleagues understand. However, the member for Newland touched on a couple of matters that are dear to my heart. They relate to WorkCover. In my opinion the member for Newland's political ideology is lacking in compassion. I say that because, whilst she and her colleagues talk about the costs of WorkCover, I have yet to hear her talk about the traumas and problems associated with people who have been injured on the job.

As a proud former trade union official I am aware of the traumas in which workers are involved. I am aware of the tragedies of persons being injured on the job, perhaps being severely maimed or in some cases being killed. That aspect has not been addressed by the Opposition in my opinion. We hear talk about money, industry, the business community and the costs to the business community but little do we hear about the traumas caused to people who have incurred injury. For the edification of the member for Newland, let me give her a few facts.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am not being patronising. The honourable member has made her contribution and I was not rude; I did not interrupt her. The member for Newland is a silvertail and does not understand what workers are talking about. For her edification, I will explain the problems with which workers are confronted. In the meat industry, 60 per cent of workers have been injured. All we have heard from members opposite is about the cost to industry and management but absolutely nothing about the traumas and injuries to workers or about rehabilitation. We have heard nothing about what we can do to try to address those problems. Nor have we heard about management. Why is management not getting workers or workers representatives involved?

Only yesterday on talkback radio I heard a businessman—a consultant—speak about his experiences in Barcelona. He was full of praise for the manner in which business people in Barcelona involve workers on the

boards and in consultation. Workers are involved in discussions. However, we have heard nothing tonight from members opposite about similar involvement of workers in South Australia or about what workers may perceive to be good for their industry.

In manufacturing, 40 per cent of workers were injured last year. If 40 per cent of road users were injured, there would be one hell of an outcry in the community along the lines of, 'What is the Government doing about this issue?' One could just imagine what the *Advertiser* would print. That great bastion of the working class would create uproar if that was the case out there on the road, if people were being injured and killed. Last year, one in eight workers was injured in the workplace. That is a national disgrace; yet not one word have we heard from members opposite about the trauma, the injury and the cost to the community, let alone the cost to insurance companies and hospitals, and the costs associated with rehabilitation. Not one word have we heard in relation to the problems that face injured workers. If the honourable member had the intestinal fortitude, she would have stood here tonight and copped it sweet. But, no, like a political coward she ran out of the Chamber.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: False laughter does not impress me. Last year, 75 000 workers were injured in South Australia. I ask members to think about that. Have we heard anything from members opposite who, supposedly, are concerned about the cost to employers, about the cost of WorkCover and about occupational health and welfare? Their hypocrisy has no bounds. As a union official for many years, I have related it in the past, and I will relate it again and again, that, during the years—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The smart, *ad lib* puerile comment from the member opposite does not do him justice. I believe that he has compassion but, if he wants to make a political comment, so be it. In my years in the work force I have seen my work mates injured on the job under Labor Governments of which I am not proud. That is one of the reasons for my getting involved in the trade union movement.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The member for Mount Gambier, for whom I have a lot of respect, does not do himself any justice by making snide remarks. I have a lot of respect for the member for Mount Gambier and his ability, but he does no justice to this debate about workers injured on the job. Well may he go red. The rehabilitation of injured workers is one of those critical issues that we as a community must address. The current Leader of the Liberal Party in South Australia, when he was Minister between 1979 and 1982, showed very little compassion for workers, and I will tell the House why.

On 4 October 1979, the then Premier (David Tonkin) opened the Alfreda Rehabilitation Centre at Royal Park. He was asked by a very close friend, a doctor who was known in medical circles as 'Bunt'—and I will not say any more than that—for \$300 000 to set up a rehabilitation centre at Alfreda. David Tonkin's response was: 'I have learned three new words since becoming Premier; the first two are "How much?" and the third is "No".'

With respect to every Bill that came before Parliament between 1979 and 1982, I remind the now Leader of his

mock concern and that of his Party and the then Premier about workers and injuries that occurred in the workplace. The complete difference, the contrast between what the Liberal Government was prepared to do to rehabilitate workers and what this Government is doing, is very stark. We now have a rehabilitation centre and a hydrotherapy pool at Alfreda which I was given the privilege by Dr John Cornwall to open on 11 April 1986. This Government has also been able to provide funds to set up the new Alfreda Rehabilitation Centre at Royal Park.

An honourable member: Really?

Mr HAMILTON: You ought to go down and have a look at it. If members have not seen it, I ask them to have a look at it. It is rather interesting. I understand that members opposite who were members of the Public Works Standing Committee, prior to looking at it, were opposed to the proposition, because their mates in the medical profession could see the money that they could make out of it. However, this Government, to its credit, has been able to provide this facility. I congratulate my colleagues on getting that facility up and running. I hope it will be finished before the end of the year because in my view it is testimony to this Government's desire to look after the people who contribute to the wealth of this country. Whilst they might not have the money in their pocket, they are prepared to provide the labour to create the wealth of this country.

This leads me to the so-called compassion of members opposite. It is fair to say that Labor members of Parliament, both Federal and State, sometimes commit *faux pas*. I remember Robert Hawke, the then Prime Minister, calling a pensioner at Whyalla 'a silly old bugger'. The media went absolutely berserk, castigated the Prime Minister and really gave him a going over.

An honourable member: He did not like being called old.

Mr HAMILTON: None of us does, I suspect. Be that as it may, I think Hawkey copped it on the chin at the time. Recently I was appalled that the media did not take up an issue that I believe it should have addressed. I refer to an event at Whyalla, the same location at which Dr Hewson, that man who is so concerned about the unemployed, had the gall and temerity to call the unemployed youth of that city 'couch potatoes'.

I have listened with a great deal of attention over the years to the utterances of members of Parliament on both sides at both Federal and State level in relation to the issue of unemployment. Very few of us have all the answers. However, I wonder why the media has not latched on to the Federal Opposition's terminology of 'couch potato'. I think it is a disgusting and demeaning description. It puts down these kids who quite properly have the right to exercise their democratic views in a public forum to the Leader of another political Party. They were not prepared to cop that. Members of the Opposition are quite happy to tip a bucket all over people on our side but, when it comes to their own, they make excuses. They want to make excuses all the time; they are not prepared to cop criticism.

They are the ones who have also been prepared in the past to talk about dole bludgers in the community. However, they are the very same people who now stand up and profess their concern about the unemployed in our community. Their hypocrisy has no parameters. It is

rather sad to hear the hypocrisy that is coming from members opposite because we on this side of the House know the facts with respect to the achievement of industrial conditions—whether it be annual leave, sick leave, long service leave, maternity leave, paternity leave or annual leave loading. We on this side know how those conditions were achieved and why they were achieved. They came about as a result of the struggles of workers in the workplace and they were given to all workers but not by conservative Governments. I am yet to hear from any member opposite about any one condition that a conservative Government ever gave to the workers. No way; they want to take away conditions from workers.

We saw demonstrations of that during the last debate on workers compensation legislation. Let us look at some of those issues. The Liberal Party and its ilk proposed that weekly payments to workers injured on the job through no fault of their own—as a result of unsafe work practices—be slashed to 80 per cent of average weekly earnings after three months and to 75 per cent after 12 months. Those proposals have the full support of employer groups such as the Employers Federation and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

In addition, those employer groups and the Liberal Party are also trying to change the law so that compensation to most workers with severe injury—and I stress 'severe'—would have their payments cut dramatically after two years. In effect, this would consign these workers to a life of extreme poverty. Many would not even be eligible for social security benefits. That is the compassion demonstrated by members opposite! I have related an example to the Parliament previously and I will do so again.

A young fellow who grew up with my second son and who got a job came to me and said he had a few problems on the shop floor. I said, 'Why don't you go and see your union official?' He said, 'Mr Hamilton, I cannot do that.' I said, 'Why not?' and he said, 'My boss would sack me if I went to complain. We have no union and we have no shop steward.' It was not long afterwards that he came to my place with a busted leg from the thigh right down because of the machinery he was using, but if he had complained he would have got the proverbial big A.

It is very sad that this Government, despite all its efforts, has been frustrated by some members opposite. In a question I asked in the last session to the Minister of Labour in relation to workplaces, the Minister said in part:

During the past 12 months or so, the department has conducted 120 audits in workplaces across a range of industries. It was noted during audits, that in many cases, the companies in question had been making serious efforts to improve their safety performance. The audits extended these efforts. Nonetheless, inspectors found it necessary to issue notices to roughly 20 per cent of the companies audited; 62 improvement notices and 10 prohibition notices were issued.

I find it very sad when we talk about industrial matters and industrial safety that the workers are held up by members opposite to be the reason why we have all the problems in the economy in this country.

During the break I availed myself of the opportunity on the allowances provided to me by this Parliament and the taxpayers of South Australia to journey to Burnie in Tasmania. It was a revelation in many ways. I left here

on the Wednesday and got into Launceston and was picked up by one of my ex-AAU colleagues and on the Thursday we journeyed up to Burnie. As an aside, I mention that in that area of Tasmania under the Hare-Clark system during the last election six out of the seven seats went to the Liberal Party, and I wondered why the conservative Premier of Tasmania was so concerned about the Burnie dispute. When I got there and talked to the union officials, it was obvious why the Premier was so concerned and why he came out in support of workers in that location. I read from an article as follows:

Workers at the APPM's Burnie paper mill have won a tremendous victory for union members in the settlement of their prolonged dispute. New Right employer North Broken Hill, owners of APPM, have conceded all key union demands, which led to a return of work last month.

I had a brother who worked in the Pilbara, and I went up there and looked at the problems there. The same sort of extreme right people from the H.R. Nicholls Society, who are running Dr Hewson and his ilk, are behind this Burnie dispute. They want to smash the conditions of workers in this country; they want to decimate them; they want to set up the New Zealand experience. Is it any wonder that Premier Kirner has struck a very raw nerve with the very conservative Prime Minister in that country? They know and we here on this side of the House know what is the agenda of the Liberal Party. I wish I had another half an hour (and I know members opposite would not like that) to talk about some of the issues that the Liberal Party has on its agenda.

For example, I put on record the fact that they want to employ youth for \$3 an hour. How generous, how magnificent, how their hearts thump and go out to the working class in the community! Their hypocrisy knows no bounds. We know what they want. They want to set up cheap labour to look after their mates in industry, and they support them. Is it any wonder that Hewson and Howard and others of their ilk are also supporting the Chamber of Manufactures and all those other groups in the community that want to smash the trade union movement? Let us look at some of those issues. An article in the *Advertiser* of 9 July this year reads:

Youth wage hits existing workers. The coalition admitted yesterday that its youth wage proposal would dent the pay packets of some young workers as it continued to come under fire from unions over the issue. It also maintained its silence on plans for an adult minimum wage.

I wonder why? The reasons are patently obvious.

An article in the *Advertiser* of 8 July, in relation to Tamara Foster, which I will not go into, explains how, if she were employed under the Federal Opposition's youth wage plan, \$114 would be ripped from her 38-hour a week salary. How outrageous! Let the workers pay is what they are all about.

I should now like to look at some of the issues that would be under threat by a conservative Government not only federally but also in terms of this State's agenda. As regards rights at work, how many workers under the New Zealand and Hewson package would be told what their rights are? How many would have put before them documents explaining their award provisions? Would they know that it was illegal for an employer to pay less than award rates of pay? What would they know of their rights on awards? Is maternity leave under threat? We have not heard anything from the Opposition in that

regard. Do women know that they cannot be dismissed because of pregnancy or if they are sick at the workplace because of it or if the doctor decided that they may endanger their health? Would that be explained under a conservative Government, under the extreme Right Wing—the H.R. Nicholls society? Of course not. They will not tell workers what their rights are.

I have been to Burnie and I have been up on the Pilbara. I have had a look at a couple of their disputes. I have a pretty good understanding from the number of occasions on which I have been to the west and the north-west and looked at those disputes. It saddens me because very little recognition is given to those workers. Many of them work in extreme conditions, not only climatic conditions but also shift work under very harsh conditions. No mention is made about the spouses and their children in terms of education and a whole range of other areas. It irritates me intensely when I hear people, particularly members opposite, talk about their concern for workers.

Finally, there is one thing that I want to mention in relation to the Governor's speech. She said:

My Government wishes to promote the celebrations in 1994 of the passage of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill 1894 which gave women the right to vote in South Australia. The Bill was a pioneering achievement of South Australia and of great significance to Australia and the world. The objectives of the celebrations are to stimulate artistic, cultural, sporting, community, political and intellectual activities which involve individuals, organisations and groups within and beyond South Australia. The Women's Suffrage Centenary will be a timely reminder of the important role which women have played, and continue to play, in South Australia.

I congratulate the women on their support for workers, particularly in this country in relation to the traumas that they have had to put up with. I believe that the centenary of women's suffrage in South Australia should be celebrated very widely indeed.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I would like to acknowledge the dignified way in which Her Excellency the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, is carrying out her role. She has justified her appointment and continues to fulfil those duties with dignity and to the credit of that position.

In recent times, much discussion has occurred about the royal family and, irrespective of what certain members of the royal family do or do not do, the Queen herself continues to uphold her role with great dignity. I believe she is one of the great women not only of our time but also of all time.

The speech which outlined the Government's program is probably more notable for what it does not say than for what it does say. It makes reference to the need for employment growth and refers to the Economic Development Board, the planning review and the MFP. I do not believe that the document really signifies to any great extent the serious position that we face in this State in relation to employment or, more accurately, unemployment. It is a critical issue that needs to be addressed.

If we look in the Little report, which I will call the big Little report, we will see the worst case scenario that it paints is that, unless we in this State change, we will have an additional 130 000 unemployed by the turn of the century. That situation is not acceptable. The current level of unemployment is not acceptable, but that worst case scenario is absolutely horrendous when we in South

Australia have a population of about 1.5 million, and to countenance an unemployment figure of well in excess of 200 000 is totally unacceptable. If we look at the statistics relating to unemployment, we note that for last month the ABS figures suggested that a decline in unemployment had occurred. We must bear in mind that those statistics compiled by the bureau are an estimate and, in many ways, understate the real unemployment situation in this State.

So, before the Government or others get too confident and cocky about the decline in unemployment, they need to bear in mind that the situation is camouflaged somewhat by the statistical process, with many people coming within the category of the hidden unemployed. Also, those figures are seasonally adjusted, and that means that at this time of the year we must be very cautious in interpreting those figures to ensure that they do indicate a trend towards reduced unemployment. In particular, more than 40 per cent of our young people are unemployed and, although once again a marginal drop was reported by the ABS, we must bear in mind seasonal factors and the fact that many of our young people are really unemployed but are within the education system, and that tends to camouflage the seriousness of the problem.

A very accurate indication of the serious problem that we face in relation to unemployment is provided in respect of the figures issued by the Department of Social Security, notably New Start and Job Search. In contrast with the ABS unemployment figures, New Start and Job Search showed an increase for the past month of 1.2 per cent. Nothing of an estimate is contained in those figures; they illustrate an actual increase in the number of recipients of unemployment benefits.

In contrast to the unemployment figures, these figures relate to actual recipients in one or other of those two categories of benefit. The tragedy of those figures, particularly in relation to New Start, is that they represent an increase in the number of long-term unemployed: in other words, the number of people who have been unemployed for more than 12 months in South Australia has increased in the past month, and that is a very concerning situation.

It is one thing to have short-term unemployment—that is a tragedy in itself—but, where people are unemployed for more than 12 months, that situation generates social problems such as a lack of confidence and initiative—it is a double tragedy. Before the Minister of Employment and Further Education treats this matter light-heartedly or tries to score a cheap point he should be reminded of the seriousness of the figures that indicate the number of people who are unemployed and who have been unemployed for more than 12 months.

I believe that a large group of people in our community have been overlooked in this current debate about unemployment, and they are those who have disabilities of one kind or another. These people suffer not only the disability of unemployment but also, for example, a significant physical disability, in some cases a multiple disability. An unpublished report of the Department of Employment, Education and Training (which is due to be published shortly) estimates that something like 16 per cent of unemployed people have a significant intellectual, physical, visual or hearing disability of one kind or other. That report goes on to suggest that up to 38 per cent of the unemployed have a disability of one

kind or another which makes it harder for them to obtain work, and in that category it includes people who have various medical conditions such as back problems, asthma and so on.

Some critics might suggest that that is stretching the definition of 'disability' somewhat but, whether or not those statistics are accurate, we should remind ourselves that, whilst the situation is very difficult for those without a disability, it is even more difficult for those who have a disability, whether that disability be minor or major. Those people who have a disability are not seeking charity: they are simply seeking a fair go. What they need is specialised training—training that is appropriate to their disability—support services, such as liaison officers and supportive attitudes from employers and fellow employees. In addition, the community needs to have an appreciation of the work that people with a disability can perform. Often these people are very good employees; they are very loyal and dedicated to the organisation for which they work.

One category of people with disabilities is those who have intellectual disabilities. My research indicates that sheltered workshops have significant waiting lists; in fact, one sheltered workshop has closed its register and is not prepared to take more names of people with intellectual disabilities because there is little chance of their being offered work within that workshop.

One of the ironies of the rehabilitation programs that companies are offering with respect to WorkCover—and this is not a criticism of that rehabilitation—is that they are assigning light duties to employees, who are being rehabilitated, and this has further diminished the work that is available for people with intellectual disabilities. I am not passing judgment on that: it is a fact. One of the consequences—I suppose an unfortunate by-product of the wider rehabilitation process—is that some of the people in the community who would normally do that sort of work are no longer able to obtain it.

We can isolate and identify various categories of people in the community who are suffering because of unemployment. I am not suggesting that professional people or groups are suffering more than others, because I do not believe that is the case. Nevertheless, in respect of nurses, the figures I was able to obtain from the various associations suggest that there are at least 500 unemployed nurses in South Australia. Personally, I believe there are many more than that. Quite a few people who trained as nurses do not even bother to seek employment because they know that the situation is very difficult. So, 500 would be the actual number who have registered with their association in terms of seeking work, but I believe that the figure would run into several thousands if we carried out a survey in a very thorough and comprehensive way.

It is the same with teachers. Approximately 4 000 teachers are identified by SAIT as being unemployed. Once again, I believe the figure would be much higher than that if we looked at those who would be deterred from seeking employment because they were aware of the tight financial and employment situation facing teachers. Similarly with engineers: 400 graduate engineers, of whom the Institute of Engineers is aware, are unemployed in South Australia.

I could go on for various other categories, but the point is that we have a tremendous amount of talent in the community, not only at the professional level but at other levels, which is being left idle and underutilised and, in many cases, not utilised at all. That is a tragedy in terms of wasted talent, wasted experience and wasted expertise. There is also the problem of the older unemployed which, in many ways, is a more serious problem than that of youth unemployment. I do not want to play down the seriousness of that, but one could argue that at least the young unemployed have time on their side. The statistics available suggest that anyone who becomes unemployed beyond the age of 40 or 45 is likely to spend on average two years being unemployed. A figure I heard today, which I have not confirmed, suggests that in many cases it could extend to an average of four years. So, there is a very serious problem not only amongst younger people but also amongst older people.

The question was raised earlier: what do we do about it? I will tell the House. The immediate future is bleak, but I believe that, provided that we have the right policies and we get the right Government, the long-term future is good. There will be significant pain, to use the old expression, before we have some gain.

What we need in this State and in this country is, basically, a revolution—a peaceful one, I trust, but one that involves a change in attitudes, first of all, and fundamentally, a change in the attitude to work. Sadly, in recent times there has been an attempt to denigrate work, and I believe it is time that we resurrected the importance of the work ethic, not as an end in itself but as a means to providing a better lifestyle for people.

It is worth reflecting on the importance of the work ethic and the fact that work gives us discipline, purpose, direction and satisfaction. We need to change attitudes towards profit. Profit is not a dirty word: profit leads to investment; investment leads to jobs. So, we should get away from the idea that making a profit is somehow a sin or is evil. When a company announces a profit, it is almost as though there is something immoral about it. It is fundamental to a healthy economy and fundamental to creating and sustaining employment.

We need to change the attitudes in the workplace and get away from the 'them and us' mentality that has divided many employment situations for far too long. Often what is in the best interests of a company can be in the best interests of employees. We need to get management and shop floor personnel together and get rid of what I call the class system that often exists in industrial situations. That is the change in attitude that must come about: people must come to see that working and cooperating together, sharing ideas and allowing genuine participation and involvement by all levels in an organisation is not only productive but also leads to a more harmonious and satisfying work environment.

I note as an aside that recently, during my visit to the State Library and from talking to the new State Librarian, one of the policies she has introduced is that all library staff must spend time on the front counter. That is an old principle and many organisations do not apply it, but she applies it to herself and it is a useful strategy so that everyone in the organisation is aware of the coalface situation and service delivery. It brings about a lift in performance and attitude. In terms of attitude, I believe

there needs to be a change in respect of items that we could call technical or technological. Sadly in Australia and in South Australia in recent decades there has been a tendency to down-grade craft skills, technical skills and people who use their hands as part of earning their living.

We have to get away from that silly nonsense that, unless one wears a collar and tie, somehow a person is an inferior member of the community. That is a nonsense and, for those people in the community who have never used their hands at technical skills, I invite them, for example, to try their hand at laying bricks, and seeing their skill and competence when they get beyond 20 metres and how straight the bricks are at that height.

We need to change the investment climate, which is an area where the present Government has gone off the rails. It has created a climate which acts as a disincentive to investment. We will not get job creation, we will not get real jobs and meaningful long-term jobs until we get genuine investment. Investment is the key to creating jobs, and investment is something that we are sadly lacking in this State and country because of the disincentive policies of the Labor Governments both State and Federal. Certainly, I acknowledge the importance of training schemes, because we need a skilled and trained work force, but training in itself is not sufficient: there must be jobs at the end of the training program, and that is where I come back to my earlier point about investment.

To bring about investment we need to look at things like WorkCover to make sure that we are competitive, that we do not have unnecessarily burdensome taxes and charges, unnecessary bureaucratic red tape, and that we do not have uncertainty in dealing with applications for investment. In South Australia we must have a cost advantage so that we can compete not only interstate but also overseas. It is not necessarily a question of paying low wages or working longer hours: it is a question of working and being smarter, being more efficient and being more effective.

My commitment is to see higher wages and a more enjoyable work situation, but that is possible only when we have an increase in productivity. We tend to focus on hourly rates of pay and the length of the working week but, whilst they are critically important, they should not be our principal focus.

What we should look at is what people produce because they can be paid accordingly. If their productivity justifies it, they can be paid a considerably higher hourly rate and they can be offered and provided with better working conditions. The word that has to be put on the forehead of every South Australian and Australian is 'productivity'. It simply means an increase in output per person. To some extent the debate has gone a little bit off the rails with people focusing simply on wages and conditions without looking at what is really important, that is, the question of productivity.

There is no virtue in having a peasant-type economy with low wages and poor conditions. In South Australia and Australia, we should be aiming for the highest standard of living consistent with protecting the environment and other aspects that make up our quality of life. Part of the challenge of bringing about that productivity involves not only workers at the shop floor level but the contribution of management. I believe that in Australia

and South Australia many areas of management could be improved significantly. Before people assign themselves high corporate salaries and packages, there should be an onus on them to deliver in terms of management skills. I am not convinced that that is as wide a practice as it should be.

Other reforms that must accompany the change of attitude to which I referred relate to a flexible industrial relations system with the option for enterprise bargaining. However, for those who want to stay within a centralised or more rigid, traditional, adjudicated system, our policies provide for it. It is one of the areas in which the Government has moved very slowly, and that is to allow enterprise bargaining within the confines of a safety net.

That is happening now at Holden's, Kimberly-Clark and other organisations and, as more and more decisions are made in the local work environment, workers will be rewarded financially and in terms of working conditions as a flow-on from enterprise bargaining. Once again, it comes back to getting rid of the 'them and us' mentality and seeing it as a joint venture in which employer, employee and the wider community can benefit. This country and this State have the resources, the climate and the talented people. We should be number one in the world, which is the position we held at the turn of the century. We are a long way from that at present.

The speech by the Governor, which was given on behalf of the Government, made reference to the national TAFE system and changes to it. Changes to that system are vital if our economy is to become competitive. It is important that we have national standards of accountability in terms of the TAFE system and that it is more flexible than it has been in recent times. It is also important that State Governments retain significant control and influence over what is taught and that programs that are offered have a local relevance, are related to the needs of industry and do not exist in isolation.

I am aware that there is considerable unmet demand in the TAFE system and the figures that I have been able to ascertain indicate that, in the first semester of this year, approximately 5 000 course places were unmet in South Australia. Whether or not that figure is the best indicator of unmet demand, the point is that many people did not get into a TAFE course who would have benefited from doing so. One of the changes that has the support of the Opposition is the greater financial commitment by the Federal Government to expand and revitalise the TAFE system. Similarly, the universities, which do not come under the direct control of State Governments, must look at what they provide, not only their emphasis on research but on the quality of teaching.

I believe that avenues and opportunities exist there for improvement in terms of the programs that are offered and the selection of people who undertake them. It seems ironic to me that before you can train to work in the fine art area you have to go through an interviewing process, demonstrate a commitment and produce evidence of work done; yet, to become a teacher or a doctor you do not have to do any of those things. It seems ironic that you do not have to demonstrate compassion or concern for or interest in the welfare of people, yet you can become a teacher or doctor simply on the basis of an academic score. I realise that it is difficult to take those factors into account in the selection process, but it seems strange that

we put a lot of emphasis on ensuring that people who wish to be painters or fine artists go through that process when we do not apply it in other areas.

It is important that universities not be seen as ivory towers; they must be part of a process whereby their role is demystified. Universities are a vital part of the community. They are involved in research and, as I mentioned before, teaching. They can play a critical role via the MFP, and we as a State (as has been indicated in the Little report) can sell our expertise, particularly in the Asian-Pacific region in areas such as training, education in general, medicine and engineering.

One of the tasks and challenges that face our universities is the question whether or not they should focus on young people who wish to enter university, or mature age entrants or, what is more realistic, a balance between those two groups, and whether they should focus on undergraduate and post graduate training in an endeavour to get a balance and a mix between those various categories. Just as with TAFE, unmet demand also exists in relation to universities. In South Australia this year, between 2 800 and 4 100 people wanted to do some form of tertiary study at a university but were unable to.

That is a significant number of people who have been denied the opportunity to participate in the university system. As someone who left school at 14, went back to school and gradually worked through the education system, I am a great believer in giving people a go. I think most people are capable of achieving a lot more than they have currently attained; so, I commend and support the universities where they extend the opportunity to people to give them a go.

Finally, I wish to say a few words about youth, which is one of my portfolios areas. There is little reference in the Governor's speech to youth, and I think that is a pity because young people obviously are a critical part of our society. I do not believe that in many ways they get a fair go or the consideration to which they are entitled. All levels of Government should look at the way they address issues that affect young people and make sure that they get a reasonable share of the resources. I mix with young people in my electorate frequently at schools, and I am very proud of them in terms of what they have to offer. Only a very small percentage go off the rails, usually at about the age of 15, because of hormones or whatever it is that sends some of them off the rails temporarily.

This is not surprising when we look at some of the messages that we as adults send them. For example, laws that apply to young people are varied and confusing. When they reach the age of 15, they are able to leave home and cannot be returned against their will. They can buy cigarettes and drive a car when they are 16 and they can buy alcohol when they are 18. We send them a mishmash of messages via videos, television and films and then we are surprised when they engage in violence and bash up elderly citizens. This is something that we as a society need to tackle. A lot more could be said about young people. I believe we should inspire them in terms of what they can do for the country and for the State, not the jingoistic nationalism which involves hatred of other people, but to believe in themselves, their State and their future.

There is no place for negative indoctrination. Our young people have the potential, they just need the opportunity to deliver the goods, and I am sure that they will. It is up to those of us in authority to ensure the climate is right for them to do just that. The Governor's speech sadly was lacking in respect of our young people and I hope that that does not mean that this Government intends to overlook their needs in this current session.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In commencing my remarks this evening, I would like to record my appreciation for the work the Governor does in this State and to congratulate her on her presentation in another place on opening day and assure her of support and loyalty from the electors of the seat of Morphett that I represent in this place.

I have spent some time reading the Governor's speech. Indeed, I have read it on four occasions. Having tried to digest it and the philosophy behind it, I have to say that I am still extremely worried about the direction of this State. I could find very little hope in the proposed legislation in relation to doing something for the unemployed of this State, for those who have been in business in years gone by and who are seeking to get back into business, for those who hope one day to raise a family and who wish their children to go into a productive work force and into jobs, as I expected when I was a young fellow. The Governor's speech was devoid of all those things that a family man, his wife and children would hope to build a future on. As far as I can see, this State has about as much life left in it as a stunned fish floating in the backwaters of the Patawalonga. There is absolutely no life in this State; there is no hope or inspiration. There is nothing upon which to build.

As I said, I read the speech with great interest and anticipation, to see whether it contained any new direction for a recovery in this State. I wanted to see some changes that would make up for the Dunstan years—those years when the State was a social laboratory, but which resulted in absolutely no progress. We then had 10 years of financial mismanagement by the Bannon Government. At the conclusion of some 20 years of socialist Government we are still in a state of technical bankruptcy and the State is going nowhere. Over those 20 years we have seen the State suffer from so many lost opportunities that, as I said, we are now almost technically bankrupt and there is no financial structure in place upon which we can move the State in a new direction or upon which we can fall back, if we continue with the current Administration occupying the Treasury benches.

There is no development happening in this State and there is little prospect of any development on the horizon. There is no infrastructure. The Arthur D. Little report and the media have talked about the Bannon Government shooting at passing projects, hoping to pick them up and to employ people in the short term. Over the years we have seen the trade union movement philosophy of having large development projects, such as Remm, and, when finished, moving on to another development. That was to be Jubilee Point. When that project was completed they would move on to another project. We would be living from one three-year cycle to the next. There was no thought at all about a long-term philosophy for business, social and economic development in the State.

There was no long-term contingency plan that, if we ever fell on hard times, we could fall back into a mode of survival that was based on sound business principles. There was nothing like that; there was just a plan to get them through one three-year period to the next. If one were lucky enough to have a job, that was fine. If one were unlucky enough not to have a job there was always the Federal social security system upon which to fall back. That is no way for a State or country to survive or progress. We have reached the point of no return in this State and in Victoria—the two socialist States that have now been labelled the 'rust bucket States' of the Commonwealth.

We have reached that stage of no return. There is no hope, and the public out there are quite correct in wishing to throw out those two Governments and to put in a new team which will have some direction. It can turn this State around and give it some hope; give it some new direction. That is what the public are looking for. They do not want any more of the present direction in which we are going.

What has this Bannon Government done over its 10 years? I will give it its due: we have a Grand Prix. I will also say that we have the submarines, but after that it becomes very difficult to find what else we have to offer. We have uncontrolled debts now of some \$6.6 billion; we have uncontrolled unemployment; and I say to the House that we have uncontrolled complacency. This complacency is one of the most dangerous things out there in the community at the moment. I was extremely worried on one occasion about a month ago, when someone said to me 'Well when you fellows get in everything will be all right,' to think that people just do not understand the gravity of the situation out there, that this State will bounce along in the bottom of this depression for some years, because there has been no financial or social infrastructure put in place that can bring this country and this State back onto an even keel.

Even the Grand Prix is something we should look at very carefully. Over the past few years Australia has been singularly unlucky in bidding for any international events. Despite the extraordinary amount of work that went into our bid for the Commonwealth Games (and another motion is coming up in private members' time where I will have an opportunity to congratulate the members of the bid team and say what a marvellous job they did in representing their State) we must bear in mind that we lost that bid.

We lost it on the international scene and, indeed, we have been losing other bids. We lost the Melbourne bid and the chances of our winning the Sydney bid are still up in the air. We must be very careful that we hang on to this Grand Prix as tightly as we can so it is not whipped out from beneath us as well. There is also the risk that at some international meeting somewhere people will decide that we will lose the Grand Prix. That will leave us even worse off. It is a very real risk, and I alert the House to it. It is something that on both sides of the House and in a bipartisan manner we should have due regard for.

In looking at where the State has gone over the past 10 years we have had many reports of developments and proposed developments. We have had many inquiries into what is wrong with this State; we have had numerous

environmental impact statements and SDPs. We have had more reports and inquiries, but what do we have? We keep getting back to the fact that we have the submarines and the Grand Prix and we have unemployment. What is happening to our industrial base? What is happening to our primary industry and what is happening to our future developments?

I thought it was interesting last week to see what happened in Cape Jervis. Every member of the House would no doubt have read with great interest and concern the sequence of events that resulted in the rejection of an application for planning approval for a project at Cape Jervis. On that occasion the project had the support of the Minister for Environment and Planning, it had the support of the Planning Commission, it had the support of the local council, and it had the support of the residents association. Yet, on appeal, a resident went to planning appeal, paid his \$20 and went before one commissioner.

It was not a full bench. It was one commissioner. I forget the lady's name, and I would not name her anyway, but it was one commissioner, and the project was thrown out. If that is not an indictment of something that is radically wrong with our system, I do not know what is. This State has had numerous projects put up and well supported, not the huge monstrous projects that engender enormous public opposition but reasonable projects that are supported well, yet on the planning appeal here we have one person who appealed and one person threw it out—against all advice. I put to this House that, had it gone to the full Planning Appeal Board, it would have got through.

I hope that the Government will do everything in its power to ensure that that plan is back on the agenda very quickly and that we see the whole matter resurrected. As everyone knows, every authority, including the Minister and me, thought that the project should have been taken one step further. I hope that we will see the Government make a move in that direction. If anything is wrong in this State, the Cape Jervis example typifies it. If we do not do anything about it, we will stay in stagnation like that stunned fish floating around under the jetty until all of us are out of this House. I was told by someone in the department that they are still not sure that the Development Bill will cover the Cape Jervis case. I hope that it does. Certainly we can take up this matter in debate on the Development Bill when it comes before the House.

We have the MFP on the horizon. We have seen some support for it from the Government, but again this can and does have the chance of becoming nothing more than a dream. The Commonwealth Government has shown singular lack of support for it. There is not much support for the site, but there is plenty of support among the Opposition for the concept of the MFP. However, again I do not think that any of us has any confidence that this Government has the ability and the expertise to bring it to fruition. It has not got a track record of bringing anything to fruition. During the 20 years of socialist Government under the Dunstan and Bannon regimes, we have had the Grand Prix and the submarines, but nothing else. I hope that this Government, if it manages to cling to power over the next 18 months, will do something about bringing some development on stream so that we can do some employing in this State and give hope to families who are trying to get their lads and daughters

lined up for future jobs and apprenticeships. I keep going back to the example of the stunned fish, but that is how I equate this State under this socialist Government.

The Little report has been referred to by several members. I was appalled to read in it the report on the export potential of this State, a State which, if it had been guided correctly by a Government which was attuned to business, would have seen that export potential realised and would have done everything possible to ensure that our manufacturing industry was involved in export. I read in the report that we export only 10.2 per cent of our gross domestic product. I was overseas recently talking to one of the officers from Austrade. He made the point that our interstate competitor, New South Wales, had several officers in that particular country helping its manufacturing sector to obtain customers. We have one, and I believe there is some thought of having that representation reduced. We must support our manufacturing sector. We have to get over there and help the market. This Government is not doing that.

There is another section in the Little report which I think is alarming. The report states:

Factors strongly indicate that South Australia is becoming increasingly less able to generate the wealth necessary to support its current standard of living.

Just think on it—'unable to support its current standard of living'. Where does that leave us when we have maximum unemployment and no prospect of any development? No development has come here for 20 years. The only development has been with the submarines but that involves Commonwealth money which is being recirculated all the time. No new money is coming in, and no new wealth is being generated. When the Liberal Government comes to power shortly, this State will again open for business. If we do not encourage business back into this State, we will finish up living on welfare payments from the eastern States, where business is being encouraged, established and is going ahead.

It is interesting to hear the Victorian Government at the moment getting stuck into the New Zealanders. However, it is also interesting to note that New Zealand is coming out of recession, and we are not. There are success stories in the eastern States and across the Tasman, but Victoria and South Australia are continuing to go backwards. Our jobs are gone and so are our young people. As we all know, many of them are now moving interstate to seek jobs for themselves and to establish families there.

The 2020 Vision document will shortly be introduced into this House. From my reading of the document, it is only cosmetic. Certainly, the Development Bill has some prospects in it to streamline development. However, until we set up a new infrastructure, a new economic base, a new industrial base, a new social structure in this State, until we get away from bouncing along as we have been through the Dunstan and Bannon years, we will go nowhere. We must attract large investors to come to South Australia and, if we do not, we will not get anything off the ground, however good our ideas.

We are not attracting venture capital. In my capacity as spokesman for planning, in three weeks I have had two developers say that they would like to re-invest back here in this State. They were in the multi-million dollar investment category, but not one would invest one cent in this State so long as the Bannon socialist Government stays in

place and shows a lack of leadership or any new direction for this State. Venture capital will not come here. What do we have as an alternative? We now have the almost technically bankrupt State Bank. The SGIC used to help out but has now, because of 333 Collins Street, been placed in a state of technical bankruptcy. All the institutions that used to provide us with some support, such as Beneficial Finance, are now out of the equation, because of the actions of the Bannon Government.

So, what is left is the need to attract back into this State, by incentives, business and financial institutions. However, they will not come here if this Government does not change its direction, it must ease up on those who want to put risk capital into this State and have a go. We will have to provide tax, property and a whole raft of incentives. However, if at the end of the day someone makes a profit, profit must not be treated as a dirty word, as it has been for the past 20 years. We can get out of trouble if the private sector is allowed to get on with it. If we create wealth, they will use it to re-employ. We in this State can get out of trouble if the private sector is allowed to get on with it. The Bannon Government has failed on all accounts in this area, and it does not deserve to govern. I am sure that the people will judge it accordingly very soon.

In relation to the Glenelg Primary School, devolution proposals have been put up by the Education Department which are an attempt to throw back the management at schools to the school community and, in particular, to the school council, to the principal and to some of the teaching staff. The Liberal Party generally supports the principle that local school communities should be given a chance to have a greater say in the operation of the schools, and I do not think that too many people here would disagree with that. However, a number of aspects of this Government's proposals and the processes which are occurring certainly need clarification, because not all schools are qualified to pick up the financial management for school.

Whilst the department talks in terms of training programs for school councillors, many school councillors serve on a voluntary basis and are prepared to give up a night a month to get involved in the canteen and other activities around the school, but it becomes very difficult for them to get involved in the management of the school. However, I guess that all schools have to take their own decision as to how far they want to get involved.

I place on the record, on behalf of the schools in my electorate, particularly the Glenelg Primary School, some thoughts about the devolution proposals and the difficulties those schools see. The paper they have given me states:

1. The consultation paper was not written for parents. It is rife with generalisations and assumed knowledge. The paper provides few if any details, especially for parents who don't necessarily have an in-depth knowledge of the school or the ways of the department.

2. The concept of local school management presupposes that school councils wish to be involved to a greater extent than they already are. The idea of greater involvement is being thrust upon parents who, in many instances, do not want to be further involved.

3. School councils are made up of volunteers. Parents give up their very valuable time to be a vital part of the school. Time for most parents is at a premium, especially in families where both parents work. To ask these people to give up more time, to

be more involved, to accept greater responsibility, to manage more money and to make more decisions, totally disregards the 'volunteer' nature of the people who are the school council.

4. Glenelg school council believes that local school management is first and foremost a cost cutting exercise that is unlikely to significantly benefit the Glenelg schools or, for that matter, any school, especially less advantaged schools.

5. While the consultation paper recognises the need to train school councillors, it fails to recognise three important points:

(i) the extent and ongoing expense of training a never-ending number of school councillors (two year term).

(ii) the time factor for parents. When will they be trained?

(iii) the willingness of parents to be involved in training.

6. The consultation paper does not explain whether school staff will be provided with training or if they will be given time to take on added responsibilities. Council is concerned that it will be yet another 'chore' to be added on to the list.

7. The paper doesn't detail how the Education Department will allocate funds to schools. What criteria is to be used? Will it be another famous formula? It is hard to imagine how it will be achieved. Dr Wilnot admits himself in the video that 'what will work for one school will not work for another'. This seems to be a system that may advantage some schools and disadvantage others.

8. Some important concerns were raised by council relating to the issue of legal responsibility—

- Who will be held responsible if the budget is not managed correctly? What protection from legal repercussion will councils have?
- What will happen to a school that 'runs out of money'?
- The legal issue of 'conflict of interest' for school councillors if they have a greater control over the school finances.

9. Council raised concerns about possible inequalities between schools becoming even greater. For example, small schools in remote areas, schools in low socioeconomic areas, schools that do not have active/full councils as compared to large schools with active councils and fundraising committees.

10. With the extra responsibility and time commitment, will parents be discouraged from joining school councils? Currently our council meets once a month and always has a full agenda. Where do we find the time to address even more issues?

11. Possibility of biased councils which don't necessarily reflect the views of the majority especially once greater financial control is passed over.

12. Minority groups tend not to be represented on councils. Councils may not be aware or be interested in the needs of these groups in terms of budgeting. How will they have a voice?

All members who have served on school council—and I guess there would not be a member in this Chamber who at some time or another has not been or is not on a school council and who has served or does serve in such a manner every month—would have an affinity with the concerns of the Glenelg school council. It has put together a particularly good summation of the difficulties. The Government would be well advised to take up the 12 points put forward by the Glenelg school council. I think that it is a meaningful resume of the concerns of the council and the Government should take it up with some urgency. The last issue I should like to raise tonight is that of national parks.

It has been put to me by many national parks organisations—by the Friends of National Parks, by the Conservation Council and by officers of the department—that there is a crisis within national parks at the moment. There is a crisis of funding and of staffing; the weeds are not being controlled; there is a lack of control of feral animals such as goats and rabbits; and little revegetation is taking place. All members would have received a copy of *The Environment South Australia*, the magazine put out by the Conservation Council of South Australia.

I refer members to volume 1, No. 2, the March-April edition. I will not read it in full, but members may like to refer to page 4, where there is a well researched article headed 'Government needs to be honest about national parks'. The article is an assessment of the condition of the Cleland Conservation Park which, as members would know, is some seven kilometres from the Adelaide GPO, yet it is threatened by foxes, cats, broom, blackberry, gorse and other weeds. The article states that, for weed and vertebrate pest control programs to be effective, the highest priority needs to be given to funding in order to achieve eradication.

The point made in the article, in summary, is that vermin and weed control is non-existent in the Cleland Conservation Park. As one travels around the national parks run by the State, the vermin and feral animals (goats and rabbits) are out of control. With all the goodwill in the world, the national parks staff—who are doing an excellent job—are so under-resourced that they cannot do anything about the outbreak of feral animals. They cannot get them under control with the resources they have.

They cannot get the weeds under control. They have certain programs, but they are losing the battle. The national parks in this State are in a state of crisis. Anyone you talk to with any connections at all with the parks, whether they be volunteers or paid staff, freely admit that the parks are now in a condition of which we cannot be proud. It is a matter that adds to the litany of disasters brought to this State by the Bannon Government: a Government which for years has prided itself on being one of the best managers this State has seen, and which we now know to be a total charade.

It has been a public relations exercise. At the end of the day we have found that, behind the charade, it has been disaster upon disaster: it is a State that now has no developments or prospects; a State in near bankruptcy, where the national parks are collapsing in the environmental area; a State in which for years we have seen EISs, reports of SDPs and changes to plans but, at the end of the day, as I said in my opening remarks, we have a Grand Prix and some submarines. The submarines are not generating new revenue.

We have a State with no prospects for future growth because we do not have a social, economic or business structure on which to fall back during a time of recession. The State has no hope, and I go back to my opening remark: the State has about as much life as a stunned fish, and the sooner this Government is replaced the better.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the motion before the Chair and I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, on presenting a fine speech to the Parliament. I take this opportunity also of joining members opposite in congratulating Dame Roma on the way in which she has been able to undertake the role of Governor. Some criticisms were made of her appointment: that perhaps she might have been a little too long in the tooth to take on this job. However, since she has been in the job Dame Roma has proved her critics to be wrong and I would like to express from this side of the House the

appreciation of members for the work she has done as Governor. I think that the appointment was well made.

Also, I express my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen even though, when the referendum will be before us, I will be supporting the move for the abolition of the monarchy and probably, by the time the people of Australia vote on this subject, many of them—I believe the majority—will be brought around to that point of view. Nonetheless, while we have a constitutional monarchy, I believe that the institution should be supported. I, therefore, have no problem in pledging my loyalty to Her Majesty.

Before taking up the main theme that I wish to raise tonight, I express my condolences to the families of Joyce Steele and Bert Shard, who were mentioned in the Governor's speech. Joyce Steele I did not know, but it is appropriate that we on this side of the House mention her. I knew Bert Shard extremely well because he was a leading light in the trade union movement. He was the Secretary of the Bread Carters Union and through his skills in negotiation he achieved something that was quite unique in South Australia: he achieved higher wage standards for bread carters than for the tradespeople who actually baked the bread.

Anyone who knows the history of the trade union movement would understand what a feat that was. Bert Shard was one of those people who continued his work in the trade union movement after entering the Legislative Council. He was the unpaid Secretary of his union for many years and did an outstanding job for the trade union movement. Certainly, he was suitably recognised when the Walsh Government came to power and he was made a Minister in that Government.

Along with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I wish to take industrial relations as the main theme of my speech tonight, and I want to refer particularly to industrial relations in the printing industry. I have restrained myself admirably over the 10 years I have been in this place by not discussing industrial relations in the printing industry, a field with which I was intimately connected as a full-time union official for over 16 years.

Because it is connected to what I am going to say I want to refer briefly to what happened in the last part of the last century, when a German watchmaker produced a machine that revolutionised the printing industry. That gentleman, who was called Ottmar Mergenthaler, introduced a machine called a linotype. He abandoned the idea of assembling ready-made type and produced what was, in effect, a slug casting machine. As the operator touched keys, matrices of the letters required fell into line on the machine composing stick. For spacing between words, there were wedge-shaped pieces which could be dropped into the stick at the same time. These then expanded until a line was justified to its proper measure and was ready for casting. Molten metal was poured over the assembled matrices and spaces and the machine automatically cast and trimmed its linotype.

This new invention was introduced into Australia in 1890 and was in full use in the newspapers and large printing shops by about 1898. The new machine cut costs and increased productivity by between 400 to 600 per cent. In writing to the Colonial Treasurer in 1902, the

New South Wales Government Printer claimed that the mechanical means reduced the cost of composition by fully 50 per cent. The installation of the machines suddenly intensified the severe unemployment in the industry which was based heavily on newspapers. Dismissal seems to have ranged between one half to two-thirds of the composing staff. At the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, the manager announced that he would dismiss 50 men out of a staff of 74. The old *Age* companionship was reduced from 120 to 44, and so the story was repeated all around Australia.

For the men dismissed there was scarcely a chance of another job. They could join the drifting army of casuals looking for a day's setting in the jobbing offices but, as newspapermen, they were at a disadvantage in work of that kind. They could also play the game of 'dodging the lino' by saying goodbye to their wives and children, tramping around country towns and sending home some money every now and then. Alternatively they could abandon their trade completely, head for the goldfields or New Zealand or South Africa, or compete with other workers and tradesmen for some kind of a job. Some machine compositors succeeded to exalted positions within the trade. Despite the depressed time, and in some ways because of it, those who quickly became proficient at operating the linotype machines were especially inclined to bargain without the union's assistance. Those people who were displaced 100 years ago were thrown on the scrap heap.

Apart from superficial changes in mechanical devices in the industry, from the 1890s through to the 1960s the printing industry basically remained the same. Linotype and letterpress printing was the main method of producing printing, especially with newspaper production. The introduction of the computer and the work that had been done by the American space program started to change the industry in the 1960s.

I was President of the South Australian branch of the Printing and Kindred Industries Union when the first computerised typesetting agreement was signed in Australia in 1965. Compared with the computers of this era, the methods were crude. This was the explosion of the new technology in the printing industry with the introduction of new lithographic printing plates, cameras and methods of printing which increased productivity in the printing industry not by hundreds of per cent but by thousands of per cent.

At that time, the union in relation to the industry was faced with a crisis that was very similar to the one that occurred in the late 1890s. The unions sat down to nut out policies to handle this technological explosion. Unlike other parts of the world (and you, Sir, probably know of the disputes that went on in the United Kingdom with the introduction of the new technology), the unions in Australia, and particularly in South Australia, determined that they would not be Luddites and fight the new technology, that it was inevitable. So, they sat down and negotiated the best way possible to get the best deal in relation to the introduction of the new technology.

In the first instance, their policy was: no redundancy, retraining, some of the spoils from the increase in productivity to go to people in the industry (in other words, increased wages) and reduced working hours. On

that basis, the union negotiated with the employers in the printing industry the way in which they should tackle the new technology. It is strange to say that the first people to be affected by the introduction of new technology in the industry were country printers. Country printers did not have any great bargaining power regarding their industrial situation, because they were mainly employed in ones and twos in country printing shops. However, negotiations were commenced and successfully concluded with the country printing employers who did the right thing for their employees with the introduction of new technology in country printing shops. They provided the four things that I have mentioned: no redundancy, retraining, increased wages and reduced working hours.

There were some difficulties at the time because many of the old printers did not wish to retrain, but the union was insistent that these people should attempt to take over the new technology and, with a great deal of encouragement, this was eventually achieved. The next time that technology entered the printing industry was in relation to the newspaper industry. The newspaper industry, particularly, the Adelaide *Advertiser*, changed its methods completely and increased productivity out of sight. I do not have time in this speech to enumerate the changes that took place in that industry, but one of the most difficult things concerned the scrapping of the linotype machines that involved the use of a linotype keyboard and the introduction of a 'qwerty' keyboard. In those days they were all tradesmen who had been working linotype keyboards for 20 or 30 years and then had to retrain on the 'qwerty' keyboard.

The 'qwerty' keyboard is an extended typewriter keyboard: it is a normal typewriter keyboard with extra keys. This was achieved to the eternal credit of the *Advertiser* management in this State. A 'no redundancy' policy was agreed to with the employees in the industry, there was a retraining policy and, eventually, when productivity reached its full capacity, increased wages and shorter working hours were introduced. Although through attrition the numbers in the industry have been declining, the employers in this State, to their eternal credit, have agreed that there would be no redundancies in the printing industry, and there have been no redundancies.

When the Government Printing Office, as it was then known, introduced new technology and computerised typesetting arrangements in its workplace, a training agreement was arrived at with the then Public Service Board. That agreement provided that the tradesmen on the job would be retrained, that there would be no displacements and that they would take over the new equipment; the people who had traditionally done this work would be retrained and continue with the work, even though totally new work principles were introduced.

So, the record of the industry, as far as both the employers and the unions are concerned, covering the introduction of new technology in South Australia has been an excellent one. I praise the various employer associations and I praise the old Public Service Board and the other employers for the way in which they handled the introduction of new technology in this State. That was in sharp contrast to the way in which new technology was introduced in the United States and the fights that occurred in the United Kingdom regarding the

introduction of new technology. We did not have the problems in South Australia that Rupert Murdoch had in the United Kingdom in the introduction of new systems.

Unfortunately, this brings me to the situation in this Parliament in relation to the introduction of new technology in *Hansard*. This Parliament should be leading the rest of South Australia in respect of industrial relations: in fact, we are faced with the very opposite. Someone is rubbing their hands together and saying that all the money that will be saved in relation to *Hansard* as a result of labour reductions—and particularly doing the Printing and Kindred Industry Union members in the eye—will be used to the advantage of members of Parliament. In the fullness of time, that should happen; I would be the first to agree with that. However, in the meantime, this institution has an obligation to look after the traditional members of the printing industry—those who have done the work for this organisation for more than 100 years.

You, Mr Speaker, would have intimate knowledge of this matter, having come from the wharves of Port Adelaide. You would know that agreements and retraining agreements were always completed with the labour force on the Port Adelaide wharves before the introduction of any new technology. In this instance, there has been absolutely no consultation with those people who produced and continue to produce the work for the members of this establishment. I find that to be absolutely disgraceful. I do not know who is to blame for this. I do not know whether it is a particular Minister or the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. I do not know who it is but, if the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee is to blame, it is absolutely disgraceful, because with the combined membership of that committee, as we would well know, lies hundreds of years of industrial experience. If the members of that committee have never thought about it, all I can say is that they should have thought about it, because those people who are being affected are the ones who have provided a service to this Parliament. If we look back and compare that service with the service provided in other States, we see that it is second to none in the whole of Australia.

Do you know, Mr Speaker, that in over a hundred years—the time in which that organisation (which has gone under various names but which is now called State Print) has been serving this Parliament—there has never been one day of industrial disputation? There has never been a stoppage in relation to the production of *Hansard*. This Parliament is saying thanks very much to those people by telling them to go and jump on the scrap heap and that we do not care what happens to them.

That is the present situation, but it is not too late to rectify it; it is time to do something. Every agreement that has been made in the printing industry contains two elements. They are, first, retraining, which was in vogue in the 1960s and 1970s. Secondly, when Mr Rupert Murdoch took over large sections of the printing industry, he preferred to provide redundancy payments, and I see nothing wrong with that. If there should be negotiations for redundancy payments, so be it, but something should be done.

Those people who have served this Parliament so well over many years should not be left to hang out to dry

like those members of the printing industry 100 years ago who were displaced with the introduction of the linotype machine and who then had to take their chances on the goldfields of New South Wales or Victoria as to whether or not they could scrape a living. In 100 years this Parliament has learnt nothing so far as industrial relations are concerned. I think it is absolutely appalling and absolutely beyond the pale that we as an institution should be sanctioning the introduction of new technology without doing something about those people who have served us for so many years.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: As my friend the member for Albert Park says, so much for industrial relations. The previous speaker from the other side said that as a nation and as a State we have to do something about increasing productivity, and I agree with him. He said something about profit being a dirty word. I have been in the Labour Movement since I was 16, and I have never said there is anything wrong with profit. There would be very few members on this side of the House who have come through the Labour Movement who have criticised profit at all.

What we do say is that profit should be shared, because there is an input from two sides. There is an input from labour and an input from capital. In my opinion, both put equally into the effort of increasing the profits about which companies talk from time to time.

Out of this exercise, in relation to the introduction of new technology into the Parliament, there will be a profit. We have increased productivity enormously. More than 20 people in State Print are now facing redundancy and some displacement because of the introduction of this equipment. I hope that the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee will do something about this. I hope that at its next meeting it will take an instruction to the Government that negotiations be entered into immediately with those people at State Print to make sure that this situation is rectified.

People down there are feeling absolutely bewildered because of the way in which they have been treated by this organisation. After the service they have given to this organisation they cannot understand why they are treated in this way. Those people have mortgages, young families and big loans to repay. They do not quite know where they are going at this time.

I would not blame them if *Hansard* was not printed. It would not matter. I could not cast any blame on them whatsoever because of the way they have been treated. They have been treated like serfs. I would say the same about any organisation or company in a similar situation. Before new technology is introduced, an agreement should be reached with those on the shop floor regarding what is to happen to them.

I do not care whether it is by way of redundancy payments. Personally, I prefer no redundancy, but retraining, and that has always been my view. However, if it is to be done by redundancy payments, negotiations on what is to happen to them should have started a long time ago. I promised the Whip I would finish my speech in 27 minutes so that we can get in a grievance debate tonight. Therefore, I hope that what I have said will be taken into consideration.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I congratulate the Governor of South Australia, Dame Roma Mitchell, on her fine contribution as Governor of this State for another year. She has received many accolades for the duties that she carries out with great humour and humility. She is a shining beacon to us all.

I welcome back my two colleagues, John Olsen and the Hon. Dean Brown, to assist the team to achieve government. Both are fine politicians and they will add greatly to the quality of debate in this House and ultimately to the quality of Government that this State deserves.

On reading the Governor's speech I was somewhat upset that she had not been given more material to work with on this occasion. I am upset that the Government saw fit to rest on its laurels and take us no further. This State is looking for leadership, for a change of direction and for hope. It will not fulfil that hope if we look at the contents of the Governor's speech. We will not have an EST led-recovery. The change to eastern standard time will not assist the recovery of this State, nor will the formation of the Economic Development Board, and neither the Environmental Protection Board nor Training 2000 will change anything in South Australia. One-stop shopping has been promised for the past 10 years and the Government has failed to deliver. It is another tired old promise.

Changing the Crown Law Act or the Real Property Act will make little or no difference. Consolidating Murray River legislation will simply be fiddling at the edges without addressing the main challenges of providing quality Murray River water. Changes to the Coast Protection Act will simply hide the Government's lack of commitment to our beaches. Controlling vicious dogs will not change things in this State. Fundamental changes to WorkCover, as promised in the Governor's speech, would seem to be further away, given the results of the recent Labor Party convention.

Changing the Harbors Act, the criminal law, the whistle-blower legislation, or legislation on professional qualifications, legislation revealing family trust details of members of Parliament, or changing the residential tenancies legislation, country arts provisions and taking up of some of the recommendations of the Aboriginal deaths in custody inquiry will not change this State. Each of those matters has a heartland within a South Australian electorate.

Let us be quite frank. The people of South Australia want jobs, they want futures: they do not want a Government such as that which they have at the moment. Those members who have been in this House since I was first elected in 1982 must admit that I have consistently espoused a conservative, economic theme. Unfortunately, some of my predictions have come to fruition, because under this regime we now have a State without hope, a State without leadership.

I become angry about the way in which this Government has operated. Members may recall my contributions over the past 10 years and my anger about the over-indulgence of the current regime, the lack of quality in administration, the lack of quality and effort, the dedication to big spending and largesse that has accompanied Premier Bannon's rise to the Treasury benches. I have also talked about the partisan approach

adopted by this Government, particularly in relation to the special position of unions and the way that they have held protected positions, together with the arrogance of a Government which, at one stage between 1985 and 1989, had a large majority in this House and which, of course, treated the Parliament accordingly.

I have also talked about the Government's broken promises and the lies we have been told over a long period. I have spoken about them in Address in Reply and in Supply Bill debates, and we are now seeing the end results. You cannot build if you continue to over-tax and over-indulge, as this Government has done. What this Premier has never done is looked at the productive effort of this State and said, 'I will ensure that my Government assists that productive effort'. The Government has continually belted citizens, particularly its productive citizens, the people who produce on the land and in the factories and who export goods overseas.

Over a period, we have seen a decimation of the ethic of the State and its capacity to perform. It has gone past the point of anger. We now have a population that demands change. At a time like this it is unfortunate that we cannot change the Constitution; we cannot actually change the way we have operated over the past 150 years so that we can have a peaceful transfer of power in this State.

Everybody on the other side of the House knows that as long as this Government stays in power the condition of the State will decline. I am tired of people coming through my door saying, 'When are you going to get rid of this Government?'. I reply, 'When the Government gets rid of itself. When the Government has the guts to take the decision.' But, we know that that will not happen.

As I said at the outset, it would be very useful if, for once, we could turn around the Constitution to enable a peaceful transfer of power, for without that this State will continue to haemorrhage and decline. Everybody on the other side of the House knows that. Every person knows that as long as this Government, which is tied and knotted with its own problems, looks inwardly and lacks the determination to change within itself and to change the way it operates it cannot provide that semblance of hope that this State needs. Until we get some fundamental changes and recognition of the problems that we face, this State is doomed to much of the same.

The June unemployment statistics showed that 90 000 people were unemployed in this State. The Minister of Employment and Further Education remarked to the House that we had failed to tell the good news—the good news being when the unemployment rate had declined to 11.5 per cent. However, we know from the statistical aberrations that take place with the ABS figures that the unemployment rate will be up where it was previously. There has been no change to the circumstances facing South Australia, more is the misfortune of the people. Everybody in this place desires full employment and an increasing standard of living, but that is not achievable under this Government.

I mentioned the tragedy of the young unemployed—those 42.4 per cent who are actually out there looking for work, those young people who are eligible and who cannot get a job. Mention has already been made of the many thousands or more of people within our educational

institutions who are there because there is no job available, yet members on the other side simply dismiss it and say, 'We are really doing very well because—'

Mr Atkinson: Not at all.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Well, I have actually heard your colleague the Minister for unemployment (as he should be called) remarking on how well this State is doing in the circumstances. The current situation, though, is an absolute tragedy. It was not enough for the Government to take this State to the lengths of depression that we are now in, because it has committed this State—unless there is a dramatic change and quickly—to a long-term situation which we would all wish to avoid, that is, a State debt as at 30 June 1991 of \$6.6 billion, up \$2.3 billion from the previous year. In fact, it is a debt of \$4 568 for every man, woman and child in this State.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Spence mentioned spending during the Playford era. Spending during the Playford era was on productive purposes—roads, bridges, schools and hospitals. They were all a product of a growth economy, all made to improve the quality and opportunity of South Australians. The member for Spence must have rocks in his head if he suddenly thinks that losing \$2.2 billion on the State Bank is a productive effort and is something that should be applauded.

I do not hear much now from the member for Spence. It is not only the \$6.6 billion of State debt that we have to think about but also the unfunded liability of \$3.2 billion for superannuation that has built up over the decades, long service leave liabilities of half a billion dollars, workers compensation liabilities of at least \$200 million within the State public sector and, at best estimate, \$1 billion for lease-back arrangements which have been used to avoid State debt (and we have seen some of those recently).

So, the indebtedness of the State is of the order of \$11.5 billion to \$12 billion. That has to be paid off not by the people who created the problem but by the people who are coming after. It is our children who will have to meet those debts. So, it is a sick and sorry State. The Premier has nothing to be pleased about or to pat himself on the back about, given the record that he will leave this State when he departs this Parliament and departs his job which, I presume, will not be long hence.

Mr Atkinson: We will wait and see.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We will, indeed, wait and see, as the member for Spence says. We know that the Premier no longer enjoys the confidence of his own members. We know that the Premier of this State has only a limited tenure in office. We know, for example, that no-one on the Government side actually trusts John Bannon as Premier of this State, and in many ways he is a victim of his own protection, of his own lack of capacity to make decisions and of the cotton wool that was bound around him for the past 10 years.

Everyone understands that he did not have people alongside him who could say, 'Dear John, you have a problem and it is about time you sorted it out', or, 'John Bannon, you have to go and talk to the State Bank and get some independent advice.' He never had anyone around him and never wanted to hear the bad news. The State will now pay a horrendous debt for the mistakes of one man.

Everyone on the Government side of this Parliament stands condemned, because they were hearing the same things as members of the Opposition were. People were actually talking to Government members first and, when they did not receive any appreciation of the problems being created, they came and talked to members of the Opposition. People came to us in frustration. Some members on the other side of the House came to us because they could not get Government members to listen. This goes back to before 1989, but particularly from 1989 onwards. So, every member on that side stands condemned for the lack of initiative he or she took to convince the Premier that he had a huge problem on his hands and that he had to sort it out; that he had to take a decision and he had to appoint, at least, an independent person to review the State Bank.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will indeed, Sir. South Australia deserves a change in direction from the way in which we have been operating for the past 10 years. It is not simply the State Bank but the whole mentality of Government that has left this State moribund. We do not need to go back very far in the statistics to understand that our population share has declined dramatically, as have our employment share and our share of gross domestic product. Every economic indicator you look at shows that this State has been going backwards.

The only non-economic indicator that has actually shown this State beating the rest has been in relation to crime—and that is hardly something of which we can be proud. But every economic indicator over the past 20 years has demonstrated one thing very clearly, namely, that this State under successive Labor Governments has been taken into the economic wilderness, and it is about time that it changed quite dramatically.

I am a South Australian who has great faith in this State and who believes great opportunities will arise with the change of direction. I believe that in South Australia we have something rather special. Certainly, if we look overseas at the development of what I would class as small cities and towns and look at the dynamics of the cities in Europe, we see that South Australia and Adelaide have a fantastic future. As an economist and demographer, I look at trends over the past 50 to 100 years and the changes that have taken place. We have marvellous opportunities to be taken, whether it be through people coming from overseas or people coming from within Australia, people wanting city living but not big city living as they experience in Melbourne and Sydney.

We have a fantastic future awaiting us, but we have a Government that will ensure that will never happen. I said that we needed a change in mentality. We can keep writing reports and commissioning people to tell us what to do, but it is really a matter of mentality and the way that we look at life and want to achieve. I refer to the Little report and the Access Economics report—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, the A.D. Little report and the report from the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. They have all said the same thing: unless there is

a dramatic change we will continue to go down the economic gurgler. That has been a consistent theme. What has the Premier of this State done about it? He is selling off SAGASCO shares to provide himself with \$40 million.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, of course we support the sale of SAGASCO shares provided two conditions are met. The first condition is that South Australia retains the SAGASCO head office.

Mrs Hutchison: That is happening.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Stuart has not read the Premier's statement on this matter. The Finance Minister had enough trouble getting it out today. He had enough trouble saying that the Premier was going to sell it off to the highest bidder at any price. We said that SAGASCO share sales—

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The ALP conference may have had a word to say about this, but I say that the Premier of this State was hell bent on getting the best price available and everyone on the Government side knows that. The second condition is that the moneys coming from the sale should be put to relieving the State debt. Those two conditions should be foremost in any strategy to reap the ultimate benefit from the SAGASCO share sales. The Premier's strategy is to sell off the shares at the highest price to the highest bidder, and that was his original statement—no conditions attached. Everyone here realises that.

The Premier did not wish to apply any conditions because he knew that it would affect the ultimate selling price, but there has to be a little more than the short-term money. The Premier may lose, say, \$15 million or \$20 million because of the conditions on the sale but the long-term benefits are incalculable if we retain the SAGASCO head office in South Australia and apply the sale proceeds appropriately. I was explaining that the only response from the Premier to date has been to sell SAGASCO shares, pick up \$40 million and throw it around on a few projects and look like he is caring, but that is not good enough. The Premier has not looked at the way he has operated his Government. He has not taken the knife to WorkCover.

I heard members on the other side of the House say, 'What about the workers?' What about the workers and what about jobs? How can New South Wales sustain a rate of 1.8 per cent while we send employers broke because they are not competitive with a rate up at 3.5 per cent? There is a dynamic situation out there and every percentage point counts, particularly in a deep recession as we are in now. Has the Premier looked at the way he functions and the way the Government functions? Has he removed the preference to unionists that applies in relation to Government contracts? Of course he has not. We just support so much inefficiency and largesse in the way the Government is run in South Australia that, if we could change those things around, we might actually have people believing that the Government is interested in change and change of a positive nature.

I know small business people who have come to me and said, 'Look, I can't get a job. I can tender at a lower price to SACON or to the Department of Road Transport but I can't get a look in because I do not have a

unionised labour force.' That is not fair. The benefits do not flow to South Australia. Taxpayers are paying for something that is illusory. Taxpayers are paying for goods and services at a price that is unconscionable. How do the taxpayers feel? The people who are paying payroll tax and land tax know that all they are doing is paying off the State Bank disaster. How do they feel? How do they feel when they go to their employees and say, 'I can't afford you any more.'? We know that major South Australian firms have had massive lay-offs because of the economic situation.

When is it going to get through your thick heads that there must be change? When are you going to come to grips with the fact that, unless you apply some very stringent rules in the way that you operate, without fear or favour, with assistance to industry and business in this State, we will continue to decline as a State? The Liberal Opposition through Dean Brown has laid down a strategy for putting this State back on the rails. It has laid down a recipe for hope. I am sure that, over the next few months—hopefully not too long—we will see that recipe implemented in this State because, without it, we will not have the hope that everybody desires, as I said.

I got whimsical during my contribution and said it would be wonderful if we could have a peaceful transition of power, that we could do these things without the acrimony that is usually associated with elections. I will finish on this note: if every Government member heard what their constituents are saying and looked at the current economic situation, they would demand that the Government resign.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

AMBULANCE SERVICES BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the licensing of persons who provide ambulance services; to repeal the Ambulance Services Act 1985; and for other purposes.

Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to repeal the Ambulance Services Act 1985 and to provide the legislative base for a new entity (the South Australia St John Ambulance Service Inc.) to operate ambulance services previously controlled by St John. The Bill also provides for the licensing of other persons who provide ambulance services in this State. Honourable Members will recall that the Bill was tabled earlier this year.

The existing Ambulance Services Act, 1985 was enacted as a result of the work of a Parliamentary Select Committee in 1984 which, among other things, recommended that ambulance services be licensed, and that the St John Ambulance Service be controlled by an ambulance board with responsibility for maintaining an appropriate balance between St John Ambulance Brigade volunteer ambulance officers and paid employees, training and development and general administration of the

ambulance service. The permanent licence issued to St John is currently in the name of the St John Council.

Volunteer and paid officers have worked together for many years providing a highly professional ambulance service to the South Australian community.

However late in 1989, as a result of differences between volunteer and paid staff, the Priory in Australia of the Grand Priory of the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem (the Priory) decided to withdraw St John Brigade volunteers from the ambulance service and to separate the ambulance service from all other St John activities.

This decision followed many months of discussion about the working arrangements between volunteer and paid ambulance officers. It was then resolved to move towards an ambulance service fully staffed by paid employees in the metropolitan area by 1993. In addition it was agreed that ambulance services with paid staff and volunteer involvement in some of the larger country centres would become fully paid and 64 country centres would continue to be operated wholly by volunteers.

Transition to these new staffing arrangements involves significant additional funds for the required increase in recruitment and training of additional paid officers.

As a result of Priory's decision and the consequential funding implications, a comprehensive assessment of the St John Ambulance Service was undertaken by a Steering Committee with the assistance of a private consultant.

This comprehensive assessment involved a review of the implementation process for the transition to a fully paid ambulance service in the metropolitan area, organisation and management structures, ownership and rights of use of assets used for providing an ambulance service, service standards, fee policies, performance guidelines and the handling of industrial issues. The Steering Committee also assessed the relevance of existing legislation covering the provision of ambulance services in South Australia.

As part of the comprehensive assessment, extensive consultation was undertaken with interested parties.

The Consultant recommended and the Government accepted that ambulance services should be provided by a new entity, which will be a joint venture between the Government and the Priory, as equal partners, to be known as the South Australian St John Ambulance Service Inc. The agreement between the Government and the Priory will be formalised in a 'Heads of Agreement' document. General agreement on principles such as continuity of employment of existing employees and access to existing property and equipment has been reached and the document has been drafted.

The new body will be incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act 1985 and controlled by a nine person Board of Directors. The Board will comprise a chairperson nominated by the Minister; a person nominated by the Priory to represent country volunteer ambulance officers; two additional persons nominated by the Priory; a person nominated by the Ambulance Employees Association who is a member of that Association; two additional persons nominated by the Minister; a person nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council and a person who in the view of both the Priory and the Minister has experience in community voluntary work or activities. The proposed Rules of Association require that all directors have proven management skills and that at least one be a legal practitioner and one a person with proven financial skills.

In order to achieve the necessary degree of public accountability, the accounts of the new ambulance service will be audited by the Auditor-General and audited accounts along with a report of the ambulance service's activities will be tabled in Parliament each year.

Considerable thought has been given to the operation of the new service and a document setting out the principles governing the conduct of the new ambulance service has been prepared.

The existing Ambulance Services Act 1985 does not provide an appropriate legislative framework for the proposed new entity and it is therefore necessary to repeal the existing Act and introduce new legislation to reflect the new entity's arrangements, licensing requirements and other related matters.

Following the introduction of a similar measure last year, some concern and confusion arose as to the apparent breadth of the definition of 'ambulance service'. The opportunity has been taken to clarify the definitions—it was never intended that community volunteer drivers, community buses etc. would be

caught by the legislation and legal advice was that they would not be. However, in view of community concern, the new definitions make the intentions of the legislation more explicit. There is also a further power to enable a person who may be unintentionally caught by the provisions to be excluded by regulation.

Concern was also expressed at the apparent 'open-endedness' of the licensing provisions. The concerns related to the ability to ensure the maintenance of high standards of service and the possible effects on existing ambulance services of any potential future licence holders.

The licensing provisions have therefore been redrafted and expanded to enable the Minister to take certain factors into account in deciding whether or not to grant a licence—

- (a) that the person has the capacity to provide ambulance services of a high standard and is a suitable person to hold a licence in all other respects;
- (b) the granting of the licence is not likely to have a detrimental effect on the ability (including the financial ability) of an existing licence holder to provide ambulance services of a high standard. Conditions may be attached to the licence.

Under the existing legislation, a number of country independent services are licensed and will continue to be under the Bill. Indeed, the Bill now contains a transitional provision 'grandfathering in' existing licence holders for 12 months. If some of them decide to amalgamate with St John during that time, there is provision to surrender their licence, but the transitional provision has been included to guarantee the stated intention that the Bill would not be used as a device to abolish them.

A new provision has also been included to clarify the situation whereby an unconscious patient is transported to hospital and subsequently disputes the need to pay the bill, on the basis that they had neither called the ambulance nor consented to the transport. The Bill makes it clear that the patient is liable for the fee, whether or not he or she consented to the provision of the service.

The Priory has endorsed the Bill and I commend the Bill to Members.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 repeals the Ambulance Services Act 1985.

Clause 4 provides interpretation of terms used in the Bill.

Clause 5 makes it an offence to carry on the business of providing ambulance services without a licence. Paragraph (b) enables a person who is unintentionally caught by the provision to be excluded by regulation.

Clause 6 provides for the granting of licences by the Minister. The Minister must not grant more licences than the need for ambulance services can support (Clause 6 (1) (b)). The term of a licence may be limited or unlimited (Clause 6 (4)).

Clause 7 provides for conditions to be attached to licences.

Clause 8 provides for revocation of licences.

Clause 9 is a delegation provision.

Clause 10 provides for the formation of the South Australian St John Ambulance Services Inc.

Clause 11 requires the Auditor-General to audit the accounts of the association. Subclause (4) removes the accounting and auditing requirement of the Associations Incorporation Act 1985. These are not required in view of the other provisions of this clause.

Clause 12 obliges the association to provide the Minister and the Priory with a report in respect of each financial year.

Clause 13 restricts the borrowing and investment powers of the association.

Clause 14 provides for the fixing of fees and makes it an offence to overcharge. Subclause (4) provides that the patient is liable for the fee even though he or she has not consented to the provision of the service. This provision is needed where an ambulance service is provided in an emergency. Subclause (5) provides for the disclosure of the identity and address of a patient to enable recovery of the fee.

Clause 15 is a holding out provision.

Clause 16 provides a general defence.

Clause 17 provides for the making of regulations.

Dr ARMITAGE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for the Aged) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision in relation to the care of persons in certain residential facilities; to make related amendments to the Mental Health Act 1977 and the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to ensure that any premises providing, or offering to provide, personal care services to residents in addition to accommodation and board, are licensed and meet minimum standards of care and accommodation. Personal care services include toileting, dressing, management of medication and the handling of personal finances.

Since the mid-1980's there has been a growing emphasis on catering for the needs of frail elderly people and people with disabilities in a community setting, rather than in institutional care. For many people this entails care being provided in their own homes with the coordination of home based services. Until recent years, when most people thought of care, and aged care in particular, nursing homes came readily to mind. Increasingly though a range of community based services and supported residential options are becoming available.

The Government is aware of the growing number of types of supported residential facilities which offer accommodation with some form of supportive care for which no regulatory mechanisms are currently in place. The aim of this Bill is to provide safeguards for residents where personal care is offered in the different types of residential settings.

Supported residential facilities providing care at different levels to residents include premises such as nursing homes, hostels, rest homes, mental health hostels, boarding houses and guest houses. The residents of such facilities are, increasingly, elderly people who are frail or persons with an intellectual, physical or psychiatric disability. Their quality of life is clearly a matter of interest to the Government, and to the community as a whole.

The Health Act 1935 has provided some protection for the well-being of residents in nursing homes and rest homes. However, over the years the Act has been seen to be limited by its focus on physical standards of accommodation, and by not adequately addressing standards related to the provision of care or quality of life of residents.

A 1988 South Australian Health Commission Review of the Needs of Disabled Persons in Boarding Houses found that the role of boarding houses has changed significantly from one which provided accommodation for an able, independent population to one which provides supported accommodation to people with varying levels of dependency. In this transition no mechanism has existed to provide and ensure a minimum standard of care for residents. The Review indicated a need for closer regulation of boarding houses to ensure a minimum standard of care for residents.

At present there are different arrangements for the licensing and regulation of facilities by Commonwealth, State and Local Governments. Since 1988 there has been a significant change in the level of Commonwealth involvement in nursing homes and hostels. The Commonwealth regulates through its standards monitoring activities, the standard of facilities and quality of care in Nursing Homes and Hostels. The State regulates Nursing Homes and Rest Homes through licensing by Local Government under the provisions of the Health Act.

The Health Act has been replaced by the Public and Environmental Health Act which addresses broad public health concerns. However, the Public and Environmental Health Act

has no provision for the licensing of supported residential facilities such as rest homes.

Mental Health Hostels are licensed by the Health Commission under the Mental Health Act. Some Local Councils licence boarding houses through by-laws made under the Local Government Act.

The development of the Supported Residential Facilities licensing legislation has proceeded on the basis of thorough and extensive consultation with the wide range of interests which may be affected by it.

A discussion paper on the Licensing of Supported Residential Facilities was widely distributed in the community from September-December 1989. The paper outlined current licensing arrangements across all forms of supported accommodation, and discussed options for the future. These options were:

- (1) the removal of all licensing;
- (2) maintenance of the *status quo*; or
- (3) the introduction of a single piece of legislation covering all supported residential facilities.

There was overwhelming support to pursue the third option. Current controls available under the Health Act were seen to need updating to resolve duplication between State and Commonwealth monitoring requirements, and to broaden the focus to include standards of personal care as well as standards of accommodation.

A working party comprising representatives from the South Australian Health Commission, the Local Government Association of South Australia and chaired by the Commissioner for the Ageing was established to develop the details of the legislation. A Reference Group of consumer and key agency representatives was established to advise and assist the Working Party on the development of the legislation.

A draft Bill was widely distributed for community comment during the period March to end of May 1991.

As a result, 65 written submissions on the draft legislation were received from a broad range of industry, consumer advocacy and Local Government interests, from both metropolitan and country areas. There was widespread support for the Bill, and many of the comments received were incorporated in the legislation.

Local Government was identified by most commentators as the preferred licensing vehicle for supported residential facilities. Local Government has an existing infrastructure in place for the regulation of several types of facilities. Authorised officers with appropriate expertise are already engaged in the inspection and assessment of physical standards of these facilities. Enhancing their role to take on care standard monitoring procedures offers a practical and locally-responsive method of administration and streamlines regulatory powers by enabling inspection of public health and personal care standards to be undertaken by a single responsible agency.

There is a need to ensure consistency in the assessment of standards and this will be achieved through:

- the capacity for individual licensing authorities to adopt a regional approach to inspection and licensing across council boundaries;
- training in assessment procedures for authorised officers;
- preparation of Guidelines in order to assist with the interpretation of legislation;
- the establishment of a Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee to provide advice and guidance to the licensing authorities on the administration of the legislation, and a vehicle for the preparation of guidelines.

Local Government has had a significant role throughout the development of the legislation. As a member of the Working Party, Local Government has had direct involvement in developing the details of the legislation. Throughout 1991 regular consultation with Local Government representatives occurred on particular aspects of the draft Bill.

The Bill aims to safeguard the interests of residents in supported residential facilities by defining standards for personal care services, and by improving the access of residents or their representatives to information about these services, and about the terms and conditions under which they are to be provided.

The accommodation market for older people and persons with disabilities is of course growing in complexity, with new options and products offering accommodation with care constantly emerging. It is important to emphasise therefore, that the legislation provides one consolidated piece of legislation for all

supported residential facilities where personal care services are offered or provided, irrespective of the chosen title of the facility or the clientele accommodated.

A licence will be required by any supported residential facility that offers or provides accommodation and personal care service to persons (other than members of the immediate family of the proprietor of the facility), for fee or reward.

Exemptions to licensing arrangements may be declared in relation to a specified agency or person, or class of person or agency, so long as this exemption does not affect the interests of residents. It is not intended to duplicate adequate inspection and monitoring procedures for facilities where these already exist.

The Working Party has recommended exemption from the legislation for Commonwealth subsidised aged care facilities on the basis that the Commonwealth extensively monitors nursing homes and hostels in terms of outcome standards for residents and a monitoring system by State and Commonwealth requirements would be duplicatory. Exemptions will also be considered for facilities accommodating people with disabilities where alternative monitoring mechanisms exist through conditions of funding or where the existence of operational procedures and principles reflect the Objects and Principles of the Bill.

As the licensing authority, Local Government will be responsible for inspecting, assessing and licensing standards related to the provision of personal care services and physical accommodation as they affect the quality of life and safety of residents in a particular facility. Where it is assessed that a prescribed offence has been committed against the Regulations, the licensing authority may place conditions on, or cancel the licence.

The licensing authority will be able to issue default notices to the proprietor where a proprietor has failed to comply with a provision of the Bill.

The licence will be issued to the proprietor of a supported residential facility whether the proprietor is the sole proprietor of a body corporate.

Disputes between a proprietor and resident will be conciliated by the responsible licensing authority. Where attempts at dispute resolution fail, both the proprietor and resident will have access to an external appeals mechanism.

The Government is keenly aware of community concern for residents who may require personal care, but who live in facilities such as boarding houses which are willing or able to provide nothing more than board and lodging. These facilities will not be required to be licensed. However, provision has been made for proprietors of both regulated and unregulated premises to notify a representative or relative of a resident, or an appropriate government agency, when the resident's care needs cannot be adequately met in the facility.

A transitional provision permits existing facilities to apply within three months of enactment of this section to be granted a licence for a period of one year. Where such a facility had been granted an exemption under another Act that exemption will continue to apply for the duration of that year.

Serviced apartments in some retirement villages offer residents a limited range of services to assist with daily living, such as the provision of meals, personal laundry, and cleaning services. Few villages in South Australia are currently offering more intensive personal care to residents at a level which would bring them within the ambit of the legislation. However, the Government recognises that with an ageing population and a growing preference amongst older people to remain living independently in the community, it is likely that market demand over the next few years will encourage administering authorities in retirement villages to extend the range of services to include personal care for their residents. As and when this occurs, villages will need to be licensed according to requirements of the Supported Residential Facilities Act.

The Bill moves the focus away from physical inspection of facilities and creates a more balanced approach to address standards related to the provision of care of residents.

The Bill updates the present system, protects the rights of residents, and resolves much of the duplication and inconsistencies between State and Commonwealth monitoring requirements.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 sets out the various definitions required for the purposes of the legislation. Particular note is made of the definition of 'personal care services', being the provision of nursing care, assistance or supervision in undertaking certain activities, the provision of direct physical assistance, the management of medication, substantial rehabilitative or developmental assistance, or assistance with personal finances. However, this definition will not encompass such things as the provision of routine advice or information, certain short-term help, or any other matter of a prescribed kind. The definition is particularly important for the purposes of the definition of 'supported residential facility', being premises at which, for monetary or other consideration, residential accommodation is provided or offered together with 'personal care services'.

Clause 4 relates to the application of the legislation. The Act will apply to facilities established before or after its commencement. However, it will not apply to educational institutions or colleges, to premises that form part of a recognised hospital or private nursing home under the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976, to facilities established under the Community Welfare Act 1972, or to premises where not more than two persons are cared for. The Minister will also be empowered to grant exemptions under the Act.

Clause 5 provides that the Act will bind the Crown.

Clause 6 sets out the objects of the legislation. These are as follows:

- (a) to establish standards for the provision of personal care services in supported residential facilities in this State;
 - (b) to protect the rights of persons who reside in supported residential facilities;
 - (c) to ensure that a resident or prospective resident of supported residential facilities has ready access to information about the scope, quality and cost of care within the facility;
 - (d) to regulate the responsibilities of service providers in supported residential facilities;
- and
- (e) to ensure accountability in relation to supported residential facilities.

Clause 7 sets out various principles that are to be applied under the Act. These principles provide an important 'keystone' to the purpose and application of the legislation and are to be applied to the administration of supported residential facilities. The principles are as follows:

- (a) residents are to be entitled to high quality care, to their choice of health services, and to an informed choice in the provision of appropriate care;
- (b) residents are, having regard to their needs and the type of service offered at the particular facility, entitled to receive reasonable levels of nutrition, comfort and shelter;
- (c) services should be provided in a safe physical environment;
- (d) residents are entitled to be treated with dignity and respect and afforded reasonable degrees of privacy;
- (e) residents are entitled to independence and freedom of choice (so long as they do not infringe the rights of others);
- (f) residents are entitled to manage their own affairs and to be free of exploitation;
- (g) residents should be allowed freedom of speech.

Clause 8 describes the role of the Minister under the Act.

Clause 9 describes the role of councils under the Act. In particular, councils will be responsible for the administration and enforcement of the legislation in their respective areas. The Minister will be empowered to take action in relation to a council that does not fulfil its legislative responsibilities.

Clause 10 provides for licensing authorities under the Act. In most cases, the licensing authority will be the council for the area in which a particular facility is situated.

Clause 11 establishes the Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee.

Clause 12 provides for the appointment of a presiding member of the committee.

Clause 13 relates to the conditions of office for members of the committee.

Clause 14 provides that a member of the committee is entitled to such allowances and expenses as the Minister may determine.

Clause 15 sets out the procedures to be observed at meetings of the committee.

Clause 16 provides that a member of the committee who has an interest in a matter before the committee is disqualified from participating in the committee's consideration of the matter.

Clause 17 sets out the functions of the committee. These functions include the provision of advice on the administration of the legislation and on supported residential facilities generally, the formulation of policies, the preparation of codes and guidelines for the purposes of the Act, and the provision of information to members of the public.

Clause 18 requires the committee to prepare an annual report that is to be laid before the Parliament.

Clause 19 relates to the constitution of the Administrative Appeals Court for the purposes of this legislation. It is proposed that the court sit with assessors, who will be selected from a panel established by the Advisory Committee. A person will be eligible to be a member of the panel if he or she has extensive experience in:

- (a) the provision or supervision of personal care services;
- (b) acting as an advocate for people who are elderly or disabled;
- (c) developing or implementing policies that relate to the control or development of supported residential facilities within the State;

or

- (d) monitoring or inspecting supported residential facilities.

Clause 20 sets out various provisions that are relevant to the exercise of the jurisdiction of the court under this Act. The court will be empowered to convene a conference of the parties to proceedings under the Act if it appears that the matter can be resolved by conciliation. The court will be required to act expeditiously.

Clause 21 provides for the appointment of authorised officers by the Minister or by a council.

Clause 22 sets out the various inspectorial powers of an authorised officer under the Act.

Clause 23 will require that premises must not be used as a supported residential facility unless licensed under the Act. The proprietor of the facility will be guilty of an offence if the provision is not observed.

Clause 24 relates to the making of an application for a licence.

Clause 25 sets out the matters that a licensing authority must take into account when considering an application for a licence. These matters will include:

- (a) the suitability of the applicant to be granted a licence;
- (b) the suitability of the premises;
- (c) the scope and quality of personal care services to be provided in pursuant of the licence;
- (d) any relevant guideline published by the Advisory Committee;

and

- (e) any matter prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this provision.

The licensing authority should not grant a licence if it appears that the facility will not be administered in accordance with the principles set out in clause 7.

Clause 26 provides that a term of a licence will be for a term of up to two years.

Clause 27 relates to the renewal of a licence.

Clause 28 provides that a licensing authority may refuse to renew a licence or on any ground upon which a licence may be cancelled (see clause 31).

Clause 29 relates to the imposition of licensing conditions.

Clause 30 will allow a person to apply for the transfer or surrender of a licence.

Clause 31 will empower a licensing authority to act to cancel a licence in specified circumstances. These circumstances will include a breach of the Act or of a condition of a licence, a failure to administer the particular facility in accordance with the principles set out in clause 7, a failure to provide appropriate care to a resident, the fact that the holder of the licence is no longer a fit and proper person or the fact that the premises are no longer suitable to be used as a supported residential facility. If necessary and appropriate, a licensing authority will be able to appoint a person to administer the relevant facility. Such an appointment will be for a period not exceeding six months.

Clause 32 creates a right of appeal against any decision or order of a licensing authority to the Administrative Appeals Court.

Clause 33 is a transitional provision that will allow facilities that are operating at the commencement of the new legislation to obtain a licence for one year. Any exemption that was granted under other legislation will continue during that period.

Clause 34 requires that a person must be specifically appointed as the manager of a facility if the proprietor of the facility is not directly involved in the management of the facility.

Clause 35 provides for the continuation of a licence in the event of the death of the licensee.

Clause 36 will require a prescribed notice to be displayed at each licensed facility.

Clause 37 requires that a prospectus be prepared for each facility, and made available on request.

Clause 38 provides for, and regulates, the creation of a resident contract between each resident and the proprietor of a facility. A resident will be entitled to receive a statement containing prescribed information before he or she enters into the contract.

Clause 39 regulates the ability of a proprietor to terminate a resident contract. In particular, the proprietor will be required to give 28 days notice before exercising any right of termination, unless the proprietor is acting with the agreement of the resident, or under another Act or the regulations.

Clause 40 will require that a service plan be prepared for each resident. The plan will set out the services to be provided to the resident on a day to day basis and will be required to be reviewed on a regular basis.

Clause 41 will require the person in charge of a facility to take certain action if it appears that a resident is in need of care that is not provided at the facility.

Clause 42 is a similar provision to clause 41, but will apply to residential-only premises (defined to mean boarding-houses or lodging houses that are not required to be licensed under the Act, or premises otherwise prescribed by the regulations).

Clause 43 will empower a licensing authority to act to resolve certain disputes within a supported residential facility. The authority will, in certain circumstances, be able to make orders to resolve a dispute.

Clause 44 sets out a right of appeal to the Administrative Appeals court against a decision or order of a licensing authority under clause 43. The court will be able to affirm, vary or quash the relevant decision or order, make its own decision or order, or remit the matter back to the licensing authority.

Clause 45 ensures that the preceding provisions do not derogate from other civil remedies.

Clause 46 will allow a person to act as the representative of a resident for the purposes of this Act.

Clause 47 empowers a health service provider, social worker, or other approved person to enter any facility, or residential-only premises, to visit or attend on any person residing there.

Clause 48 requires the person in charge of a facility or residential-only premises to take steps to prevent a resident from causing unreasonable disturbance to other residents or to persons who live in the locality of the relevant facility or premises.

Clause 49 allows a person to complain to a licensing authority about the management of a facility or residential-only premises, or about the conduct of a resident of such a facility or premises.

Clause 50 prevents a person arranging for the Act not to apply to particular circumstances.

Clause 51 provides for the protection of confidential information acquired in the performance of official functions under the Act.

Clause 52 relates to prosecutions under the Act. A penalty for an offence against the Act initiated by a council or council officer will be payable to the council.

Clause 53 relates to continuing offences.

Clause 54 will empower an authorised officer to issue a default notice where the officer considers—

(a) that the holder of a licence, or any other person involved in the management of a supported residential facility, has contravened, or failed to comply with, a provision of this Act;

(b) that there has been a failure to administer a supported residential facility in accordance with the principles prescribed by clause 7;

(c) that the holder of a licence has contravened, or failed to comply with, a condition of the licence;

or

(d) that irregularities or difficulties have otherwise occurred in the management of a supported residential facility, or in relation to the care of any resident.

Clause 55 will allow offences prescribed by regulation, or under the regulations, to be expiated if an authorised officer considers that the issue of an expiation notice is appropriate.

Clause 56 provides for the creation of a special fund under the Act. The fund will consist of money provided by the Treasurer, and a prescribed percentage of fees and fines paid or recovered under the Act. The fund will be available for use if a proprietor defaults in making payments to an administrator appointed under the Act.

Clause 57 is the regulation-making provision. A licensing authority will be able to exempt a facility from a requirement of the regulations in appropriate cases.

Clause 58 and Clause 59 set out consequential amendments to the Mental Health Act 1977 and the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976 respectively.

Dr ARMITAGE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAMING MACHINES BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance):

I move:

That the Gaming Machines Bill 1992 be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill pursuant to the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ended 30 June 1993. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides \$1 000 million to enable the public service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill.

Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$860 million and was designed to cover expenditure for the first two months of the financial year. This Bill is for \$1 000 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

The amount of this Bill represents a decrease of \$200 million on the second Supply Bill for last year.

This reduction has come about as a result of important changes which the Government has introduced in the way funds are made available to departments. The changes involve the transfer of departments, which previously operated through the Consolidated Account, to their own Special Deposit Accounts created under the provisions of the Public Finance and Audit Act.

Departments are now able to retain certain receipts, which previously were paid to Consolidated Account, and apply these funds towards financing their activities. The amount of approp-

riation required from Consolidated Account is reduced accordingly.

In other words most departments are now funded from Consolidated Account on a 'net' basis.

The aim of this approach is to assist in keeping the Government's net borrowing requirement to a minimum by providing the right financial incentives to public sector managers. The use of Special Deposit Accounts provides a mechanism which encourages managers to seek opportunities to raise revenue in those areas where a market for their services exists and to minimise the cost of providing services. The financial benefits which arise from those initiatives remain in the Special Deposit Accounts where they are available to finance new initiatives or activities of high priority for which funding might otherwise not be available.

Under the new arrangements there will be no reduction in the level of accountability by departments or the amount of financial information provided to Parliament. In fact the new arrangements provide a framework which has the potential to improve financial reporting in the future by including all activities of a department in the estimates documents rather than only those financed from Consolidated Account.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$1 000 million.

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

DEBITS TAX (RATES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Debits Tax Act 1990. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr S.J. BAKER: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On 1 January 1991, the Commonwealth Government transferred the debits tax to the States but undertook to continue to collect the tax on the States' behalf until 31 December 1992, provided uniform tax rates applied.

The rate structure of the debits tax is such that flat amounts of duty apply to debits that fall within fixed value ranges. Debits ranging from \$1 to \$100, for example, each attract duty of 15c while debits in the range \$100 to \$500 each attract 35c of duty. The maximum rate of duty per debit is currently \$2 on debits in excess of \$10 000.

The Government has decided to double the duty payable on debits to eligible accounts (being accounts with cheque-drawing facilities) following similar announcements by New South Wales and Victoria. The Australian Taxation Office has since indicated that it would be willing to continue to collect this tax on behalf of the States even if different tax rates apply across States. It is our intention to accept the offer from the Taxation Office. The extra revenue from this measure is expected to be \$12 million in 1992-93 and \$29 million in a full year.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides that the measure will come into operation on 1 January 1993.

Clause 3 amends schedule 1 of the Act so as to alter the tax rates.

Clause 4 provides that the amendments apply to debits made on or after 1 January 1993.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): It is incredible. I guess that, after I have finished what I have to say tonight, the news headline could read, 'Bannon goes for gold'. In this instance, the Premier is unable to give any reasons, so far as I am aware, as to why his Government departments have unlawfully and prematurely deducted rents from their blue collar workers right throughout the length and breadth of country South Australia. When it comes to money, there is no doubt about it: this Government cannot be trusted. It is now going to have to pay back, that is, return the rent moneys that have already been deducted unlawfully from the pay packets of its weekly-paid blue collar workers because it could not wait to hit them with the rent increases.

Earlier this year, quite properly, the Office of Government Employee Housing notified all departments that their employees would have a rent increase later in the year, in fact, in the first full pay period in July. Those departments hopped on the band wagon one way or another, quite out of the control of their Ministers and without their Ministers even bothering to take an interest in what was going on, and whacked on the increase, not in the first full pay period in July but in the first pay period, which was 10 July. It should have been on the 24th. Lo and behold, the house husbands or housewives, on receiving the pay packet to do their shopping, found themselves short, not by \$3 or \$4, or by \$13 or \$14, or by \$33 or \$34 but by amounts of \$60 and more, amounts which were gone from the pay packet without their knowing that it was going to go and without their expecting that it was going to go. Nonetheless, they were expected to make ends meet for that fortnight.

So, now you know why I think the headline ought to be 'Bannon goes for gold'. The unfortunate thing is that in the circular which was sent out quite properly by the Office of Government Employee Housing to each of those employees it was pointed out that a new rent would be set on their home, and I will have something to say about that in a minute. The rent was to apply from the first full pay period after 1 July and would automatically be deducted from their salary. To avoid large increases, the Government gave assurances to its blue collar workers—and, indeed, all workers—that adjustment in rent to existing tenants would be limited to a maximum charge of \$15 a week. What a joke! Imagine the shock of the house husbands and housewives when they took the pay out of their packets to find that it was not \$15, not even double that, but four and five times that amount that had been taken out prematurely and without the Minister's caring.

We will get to the good news in a minute, but there is more bad news yet. Not only were the Ministers unaware of what was going on in their departments but when it was drawn to their attention they did not ruddy-well care, because the next thing that happened was that a gazetial was made for the withdrawal of the rent from the white collar workers, the higher paid people in the Public Service living in country South Australia, but no rent has yet been deducted. The authority is there, but I wonder why no rent has yet been deducted. I have no idea. There has got to be some reason. It is probably because all these Ministers are so frightened about what is going on they are snap-frozen in their shoes behind their desk. They are preoccupied with their own survival rather than their responsibility to administer. They do not know what is happening, and they have not been able to do anything about it.

I have examples of pay advices to people from all over the State showing where this has occurred to the detriment of the interests of the workers who have been so affected. The bad news goes on because, although they were told it would only be \$15 a week, the Government sent the Lands Department's valuer around to revalue all the premises. As the value of the premises went up a new notional rent was set and that was increased by less than \$15 a week. So, that is the excuse the Government has for now renegeing on the commitment it gave not to increase the rent by more than \$15 a week. It says, 'You have not had an increase of more than \$15 a week. In fact, you have always been getting a rent which has been lower than it ought to have been because the value of the home you live in has actually been increasing but the rent has not.'

One of the homes of the people who have been affected by this decision is in a town in my electorate. A home that is in better condition than the one I am speaking about was sold for \$20 000 less than the value put on the home by the Lands Department valuer when he consulted his computer. I say 'his' because I do not think there are any female valuers in the office of the Lands Department that did the valuation. So, those valuations do not even look at recent sale figures of dwellings of a similar type in the immediate vicinity. Something has gone awry again. Accordingly, the value of a home set, say, at \$60 000, is more than \$20 000 higher than a home of better condition in the same town within a matter of less than 100 metres from that dwelling.

As if that were not bad enough, to rub salt into the wound further, two employees employed in the same department in the same category of job varied a little in their income last year. One had more call-outs while on standby, so the amount of overtime paid was greater. The actual amount of rent deducted from that man's pay and from his family for the rest of this year will be greater because his income was higher. The bad news does not stop there. They do not use just the amount of money that goes into the pay packet in assessing income. They require the employees to indicate what additional family support and income they have.

The additional family support and income if one has four children is, of course, greater than if one has two children. So, in the instance to which I am referring, we have the situation where one man with two children, because he worked less overtime last year and he

received less family support income, is charged less rent than his workmate next door who worked a little more overtime but who has four children. That person's rent is more than \$10 a pay higher. Members opposite call that social justice!

I do not know which members opposite could honestly and sincerely say that they really care about the workers employed by the Government in this State. I really do not know. It is the pits to penalise a man because he has four children and force him to pay higher rent when he is on virtually the same income. I ask any member opposite why the family support allowance was paid in the first place if it was not paid to look after the child?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Bannon goes for gold. It is pretty right; it is pretty straight. That is what it is about. The Government needs the money. Members opposite did not even bother to think about the administrative exigencies involved or the social consequences for the families. Imagine how it seems to the people who have been so hit. Imagine what the kids think of a Government that uses this kind of approach in the way it determines rents. There are fictitious values of the dwellings, plus total accounting of every dollar coming into the household from different sources—it is supposed to be for social justice purposes—in determining what those rents are and, more importantly, will rip it off people before we are allowed to. Lo and behold, they will be lucky if they could get it back. It is probably just as well the member for Murray-Mallee uncovered it because the good news for the blue collar workers is that they will get it back. If they have not got it back this week, they will get it back next week. It has been uncovered and exposed for what it is—gross incompetence!

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I have a particular interest, as most members know, in putting historical facts on the record. I am sure that people reading *Hansard* in the future will be intrigued by some of the *Hansard* references in an earlier contribution that I made in the Address in Reply, plus some documents that I may lodge at the Mortlock Library at a later stage. The history of this Parliament is a particularly interesting one, full of colourful personalities and colourful incidents. I would like to draw the attention of members to some of these facts, because they are very useful for enlivening those tours members take around the Parliament and, of course, they can appear in *Hansard* for the benefit of the general public.

The matter I wish to draw to the attention of members tonight relates to a particularly colourful political character called King O'Malley, who is getting some public attention lately as a result of the dramatisation of his life by Michael Boddy and Robert Ellis, first done in the early 1970s and which is undergoing a revival by the Adelaide University Theatre Guild as *The Legend of King O'Malley*.

O'Malley was an American from Kansas who passed himself off as a Canadian in order to have voting rights as a British citizen in Australia when he migrated here. He had a very colourful background. His biography is a bit hard to determine because he told about a thousand different stories to a thousand different people about all his interesting experiences as an insurance salesman here

and in America and about his representations for tax exemption for a church he set up in the Texas panhandle area called the Waterlily Rockbound Church.

Few people are aware that, as well as being a Federal member of Parliament, O'Malley was also a South Australian member. He was the representative in here for the District of Encounter Bay, also known as the District of Arcadia, I believe. He topped the poll in 1896 for a district that returned two members, the other member being the Labor Party representative, Mr Carpenter. That should be of particular interest to the current Leader of the Opposition, who now represents that district.

Some of the issues O'Malley took up were rather interesting. For example, he took up the issue of seating for women salespersons for reasons of the health of the next generation. If members look at the debate on the Seating in Shops Bill at page 297 of the 1896 *Hansard*, they will see that O'Malley stated:

Every thinking man and woman must admit that the system prevailing in South Australia . . . must inevitably in time produce a huge crop of human weeds. A State could no more expect to rear healthy, vigorous, manly men and womanly women from semi-crippled, exhausted, worn-out varicose-veined, weakened-genitive-organged mothers than a studmaster could expect to raise thoroughbred racehorses from broken down ring-boned mares.

So he had a great deal of interest in eugenics, it appears.

Another thing O'Malley campaigned for was improved lighting in trains so that patrons could read on board and not have to put lighted candles in the windows. He was also very interested in toilets for trains, which is something we take for granted today. He certainly campaigned very strongly for trains taking journeys of more than an hour to have toilets on board. He was an observer at the Federal conventions that led to federation in 1901, including the one that took place in this Chamber here in 1897. Unfortunately, he had a racist streak, and I would rather not read some of those remarks into *Hansard* today, but members can look for themselves at his remarks made on 5 July 1898 regarding non-European labourers in the Northern Territory, which at that time was under our jurisdiction.

He had a very ambivalent attitude to women, in whose company he was somewhat uncomfortable, and that same speech of 5 July 1898 refers to the need to teach cooking. It was important for them to 'train young women in cooking so as not to impair the digestions of their future husbands', and this was much more important, he said, than 'instructing them in how to dance'. That reference to the need to teach cooking is rather interesting, in view of the fact that when he died in 1953 he left his estate to gather interest for 25 years and then to be turned over into the King and Amy O'Malley Scholarship for Home Economics, which I think is still current. I must check with the Education Minister on that.

O'Malley was dedicated to temperance causes, even though as an insurance salesman and as a politician he did lots of his business in hotels and was very good at 'shouting' people. His insistence on temperance eventually cost him his seat in this Parliament in 1899, as a result of an amendment to abolish barmaids which he moved to the Licensed Victuallers Bill. That piece of legislation not only cost him his seat, because the barmaids did not appreciate losing their employment and the customers did not like losing their service, but it also led, when that

amendment was carried and went to another place, to the first expulsion from the Legislative Council of one Ebenezer Ward who, in 1881, had also been the first person expelled from this very Chamber in which we are seated now.

At that time, members of Parliament were unpaid and Ebenezer Ward kept himself by being the wine critic for the *Advertiser*. After leaving the Assembly he became a member of the Legislative Council and on 26 November 1896 he was ejected as a result of the stance he took to the amendment which had been made to the Bill by O'Malley and which had come up from the House of Assembly. He said in the course of his speech, following the remarks made by a Mr Russell:

Were the good and charming women who were occupied in the tiring occupation to be deprived by the Bill, introduced by a Yankee humbug, of the opportunity of earning an honest livelihood?

He then went on to say:

He would tell Mr Russell, with all his Pharisical ideas and pretence of piety—which was a pretence—that he would rather see his daughter in a public bar in the glare of public observation than employed as a chambermaid where Mr Russell might meet her.

This led to an absolute uproar in that Chamber, as a result of which Ebenezer Ward was named. After being named he declined to leave the Chamber. The Sergeant-at-Arms was sent over to tap him on the shoulder and get him to move but he still refused to move, and in the end the Constable was called in from North Terrace to forcibly eject him.

King O'Malley lost his seat in 1899, in an election held on 29 April, to a wealthy candidate by the name of Tucker. His loss, however, led to a petition to the Court of Disputed Returns, the result of which may be of great interest to my colleague the member for Napier. The decision of the court found Tucker guilty of a technical breach of the electoral code by offering his salary as a parliamentarian to various committees in the district. Unfortunately, King O'Malley was not able to capitalise on that, because he lost the subsequent fresh election.

Leaving South Australia, he went to Tasmania, where he was unsuccessful in attempting to join the Tasmanian Parliament by getting elected in the area of Zeehan on the west coast. However, a few months later he was elected as the first member for the new electorate of Darwin in Tasmania to the new Federal Parliament. He pushed for the old age pension and was very successful in instituting that. He was Minister of Home Affairs in the early Labor Governments; he founded the Commonwealth Bank and the Transcontinental Railway; and he was responsible for laying down the foundations of Canberra in coordination with a person who later became a good friend of his, Burley Griffin.

He clashed with some elements of the Party on conscription because he opposed that. He was eventually defeated in 1917 by a candidate who died on the day that the poll was declared. That candidate was even more unfortunate than was Mr O'Malley! However, King O'Malley was not able to capitalise on it. He did not push his luck by standing for the fresh election, and the Labor candidate who did get one hell of a hiding, so O'Malley showed some good judgment on that. He stood back for a couple of years and tried again for another Labor electorate in 1919, when he was defeated. In 1922

he tried to run for the electorate of Bass, but lost ALP preselection and then got a caning as an independent. As I mentioned before, he eventually died in 1953 in the suburb of Albert Park, Melbourne, at the age of 99 as the last surviving member of the 1901 Federal Parliament. He was a very interesting character indeed. I suppose I should in all fairness declare that I have a certain pecuniary interest in this subject, because I have 200

tickets for Friday's performance of *The Legend of King O'Malley*. If anyone is interested, they can come and see me.

Motion carried.

At 10.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 12 August at 2 p.m.