HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 28 October 1992

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

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 65 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reduce the waiting lists at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question asked during the Estimates Committees be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

SMALL BUSINESS

In reply to **Mr Olsen (Kavel)** 24 September.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On behalf of the Minister of Small Business, I supply the following information: Financial Institutions Duty (FID) is payable at a flat rate of 0.1 per cent on deposits other than amounts received in the course of short-term dealings. The amount of duty payable on short-term dealings (amounts of $50 000 or more invested for less than 185 days) is calculated at a lower rate, 0.005 per cent of the average monthly balance of the account. FID on short-term dealings is calculated on a uniform basis in all States. The concessional treatment of such dealings is designed to facilitate the continued operation of the short-term money market. There is no way of defining this market precisely, so the States jointly settled on a figure of $50 000 as the minimum to qualify for the concessional rate.

People dealing in lesser amounts are implicitly regarded as being unlikely to be regular investors of funds on a short-term basis. For sums of less than $50 000 the position in the other States is only marginally different from the position in South Australia. At the most common rate of FID (0.06 per cent) a sum of $40 000 would have to be invested for at least five days to produce a return which exceeded the amount of FID payable. In South Australia the minimum term would be eight days. With any transactions tax such as FID the disincentive effect is smaller the longer the period of time for which the money is invested. FID is not therefore considered to be a major disincentive to the sort of investment which will have most benefit for the economy.

MURRAY, THE COD

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Yesterday in Question Time the member for Victoria raised the very sad ending of a codfish known as Murray, and I undertook to obtain further information and report to the House on the circumstances surrounding Murray's death. Murray was tagged by departmental officers in 1979. It is thought that Murray was the progeny of spawning during the 1974 flood. In September of this year, for the purposes of a live native freshwater fish display at the Royal Adelaide Show, Murray was taken to the show from the Murray River. Weighing 38 kilograms and greater than one metre in length, Murray was displayed at the show where he served to promote public awareness of this species and the Department of Primary Industries' program with respect to the enhancement of native freshwater fish.

Subsequent to the royal show, Murray was transferred to a large aquarium at the department's premises in Pirie Street for the treatment of an eye disease before being returned to the Murray River. It was here while awaiting treatment that Murray's life support system failed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: No, he was the only patient. Murray died primarily as a result of the failure of the biological filter on the aquarium. The cause of death was misadventure and not any deliberate act. Otoliths (the equivalent of ear bones) taken from the deceased fish will confirm whether in fact Murray was spawned during the 1974 flood, providing valuable information. Murray has been forwarded to the South Australian Museum so that a plaster cast can be made for future public displays. An incident of this nature is sad and regretted, but at the time of his death Murray was a mature fish with plenty of offspring in the river. In raising the matter in the House I am sure that, thanks to the member for Victoria, the memory of Murray will live longer than otherwise would have been the case.

QUESTION TIME

INDUSTRIAL ACTION

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. As the Government has its own direct evidence of the abuse of WorkCover, encouraged by the same union officials who have declared all out war on this Parliament and threatened the staging of the Grand Prix, will he join the Liberal Party in condemning their behaviour as a blatant attempt to maintain rorts in the building industry? The officials who made their threats inside and outside this Parliament yesterday represented the building unions in this State. They are the same officials whose actions added well over $100 million to the cost of the Remm project—a cost now borne by the taxpayers. In December of 1990, the Government was given documentary evidence of this cost of union actions, which were illegal in some cases. The Government was advised that union tactics which contributed to the massive blow out in the cost of the Remm project included abuse of WorkCover.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Deputy Leader is drawing a very long bow here, based only upon some press reports of incidents that regrettably took place in this Parliament yesterday. It certainly is to be noted with regret that there were disturbances in the galleries that would certainly not be supported by anybody and I believe they were appropriately handled. Since that time, as I understand it, there have been press reports about two members of unions who have made comments about industrial disputation in relation to the Grand Prix, and I have seen no further comment other than that. I have full confidence that the broad union movement would not condone these sorts of comments that can be attributed to

two individuals, one of whom comes from the building industry and the other does not. So, I think what we need at the moment is not an attempt to try to inflame the situation but rather an attempt to recognise that there are some reactions in the union movement to changes decided in this House in respect of the WorkCover legislation.

Indeed, the points were publicly canvassed that they did not support any of the proposals that were before this place. The most appropriate course of action at this stage is to keep on progressing the matter as reasonably as possible and not to try to deliberately stir up a provocative situation between this Parliament and people within the community. I am certain that wise counsel will prevail in the broad union movement with respect to suggestions that there be industrial disputation within the Grand Prix. I am very confident that that will not happen, because of that wise counsel that I am certain will prevail. On the matter of trying to link in the Remm project and other events that have taken place in another time, as I have said, the honourable member is drawing a very long bow, and I do not believe much is to be served by such activities.

HEALTH MINISTERS CONFERENCE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services advise the House of the outcome of his discussions at the Health Ministers conference held in Adelaide last Friday? Was the Minister able to convince the Federal Minister to provide funds to reduce waiting lists in South Australian hospitals? On a number of occasions this month I have indicated my concern at the waiting lists at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In the *Australian* yesterday an article headed 'Howe releases cash to cut waiting lists' stated in part:

> The Federal Minister for Health, Mr Howe, yesterday signalled an imminent agreement with Western Australia on Medicare by releasing $4.5 million to cut the State's hospital waiting lists.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I thank the member for Albert Park for the question, because it deals indeed with a very important issue in the health care system at the moment. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to chair the national Health Ministers conference last Friday, at which all health Ministers and the Commonwealth were represented. The main topic was the new Medicare agreement which will apply for a five year period, and a very important part of that is the negotiation on Commonwealth waiting list money. South Australia stands to benefit substantially from those funds over the next two years; some $6.7 million is targeted in that area. I certainly approached the conference from the South Australian Government perspective to find a solution to the matters that had been raised and the technical difficulties that needed to be resolved with the Commonwealth, and I believe all States and territories bar two approached the conference with that perspective in mind. We were looking to an agreement to find a way of releasing these funds straightaway so that the practical impact on patients could be immediate and beneficial.

Unfortunately, two States approached those discussions last Friday without an intention, in my view, to resolve the question. It is regrettable that New South Wales and Victoria allowed that politics to get in the way of patient care. I think that the other States, such as Tasmania and the Northern Territory, showed a very positive and constructive approach, unlike some of their colleagues. At the end of the day, in discussions between the Commonwealth Minister for Health and me, we agreed immediately to set about direct negotiations between the Commonwealth and South Australia to ensure that those benefits are made available as quickly as possible. There are a number of technical difficulties and issues that we need to resolve. Once that takes place, I believe that the funding will flow very quickly in that area, and I am sure South Australia will be able to join with Western Australia in taking a lead in signing that very important agreement.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. What action has the Government taken to investigate direct evidence that it has had since December 1990 of rorts and abuse of WorkCover in the building industry practised by union officials on the Remm site? At a meeting on 4 December 1990 the Government was given a document which itemised the cost of union related delays and costs on the Remm site. That document stated that union tactics on the site included abuse of WorkCover. During the Remm project, more than 430 WorkCover claims were lodged. The pay out on these claims, including more than 20 still to be settled, is expected to exceed $8 million.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. Yesterday this Parliament observed a situation where interjections from the gallery were definitely not in order. At that time I explained that interjections in the Chamber are out of order. This is a very important and significant question given the legislation we have just considered, and it will be listened to correctly.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the Leader for his question. The premise of the Leader's question is that any claim by a building worker on the Remm site is bogus, a rort and a fraud; that is what he said. If the Leader had been in the House and had listened, he would have heard that WorkCover itself has a fraud department which, in the past 12 months, has saved WorkCover approximately $2 million. It has done that by prosecuting people who have been engaged in fraud. It has also done it by referring the activities of medical practitioners to the medical authorities so that they can review the activities of those medical practitioners. They have, I think, been very successful in getting back to work people who have been using the scheme, possibly for their own advantage.

However, the point I want to make is that it is very easy to stand in this place and make all the accusations in the world, but we need to remember that there are a number of checks and balances when claims made on WorkCover. Just because someone makes a claim on WorkCover does not mean to say that it is paid. Those claims are investigated. If the employer is of the view

that it is not a valid claim, they can object to it and the matter goes to review. In some instances when that happens and the matter is reviewed, the review officer rejects the claim, but in other instances they are upheld. So, there is a series of checks and balances.

If employers feel aggrieved about the decision of the review officer, they can appeal to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Appeal Tribunal. So, there is a series of checks and balances in this matter. I do not believe that, just because someone makes a claim, it necessarily has to be a rort because they are a member of a union that members opposite just do not happen to like at that particular moment.

We also need to remember that, if there are over 1 000 people on a site and if the supervision of the safety of that is not adequate, we will then have problems in terms of safety. As I have said in this House repeatedly and as I will be saying again when I am asked these questions, if there is proper supervision in relation to safety, accidents just do not happen.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr HERON (Peake): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training confirm that South Australia will be able to respond positively to future demands for children's services and the expectation by the community that these services will be responsible, accessible and of very high quality?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The short answer is 'Yes'; I can give the honourable member that undertaking. South Australia has positioned itself as a national leader in the provision of children's services. This includes the quality and range of access to pre-school education programs, the development of nationally consistent child-care regulations and, indeed, the development of an accreditation system for child-care centres. Also, we have seen the establishment of a children's services industry training structure and the development of a new resource efficient model for community based occasional child-care.

South Australia now has a single authority with the ability to plan and deliver children's services on a comprehensive and cost effective basis. Programs include the State Government's long-standing commitment to 12 months of pre-school education for all children prior to their starting school, the provision of early childhood services in rural areas, child-care services for parents in the work force, programs to meet social justice objectives for disadvantaged groups and the provision of services to children with special needs. I am delighted to inform the House that South Australia is now finalising an agreement with the Commonwealth Government for the development of children's services in South Australia over the next four years.

INDUSTRIAL ACTION

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety investigate activities on the Grand Prix site by officials of the Australian Building Workers and Construction Federation (formerly the BLF) which involve part-time workers being bullied into paying membership fees to the federation?

The Liberal Party has been provided with information that these union officials are claiming to control access to the site by all workers. While many part-time workers, such as cleaners, are already members of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union, they are being forced to join the BLF before they will be allowed onto the track.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Kavel for his question.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I think that we need to appreciate that the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board has an arrangement with the United Trades and Labor Council that has been signed by 12 unions.

An honourable member: What about Father Christmas?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Electrical Trades Union, the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union and its successor, the Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union, the Federated Furnishing Trades Society, the Operative Painters and Decorators Union, the Transport Workers Union, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of Australia, the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation, the Australian Theatrical and Amusement Employees Association, the Australian Workers Union, the Construction, Mining and Energy Union, and another union, the initials of which escape me—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The interjection by the member for Bragg shows that he has not learnt anything. I was never chairman of the United Trades and Labor Council. The agreement covers the normal construction period for the event, which is approximately three months. The on-site allowance is a standard system applying to any major construction site. The major points of the agreement are: the rostered days off have been negotiated to fit in with the construction schedule; a recognition of the need for the event to proceed on schedule; a recognition of the temporary nature of facilities for the workers; and a recognition of the casual nature of the employment.

That means that the United Trades and Labor Council and those unions have negotiated an agreement that sets out the conditions of employment for the people who work there. They also have an arrangement that the people who work on that site are members of the appropriate trade union. I think that is how it ought to be, because the appropriate trade unions have negotiated the wages and conditions of employment on that site.

It seems that members opposite fail to appreciate that, if proper industrial relations are required on site, it is necessary that an agreement be signed with someone in the event of a problem. We have been able to demonstrate our capacity to hold successive Grand Prix events, followed by the quick removal of equipment. Workers on site, those providing leadership and management need to be congratulated on the

arrangements that have been reached. If the member for Kavel thinks anything is wrong or that fraud is taking place, there is an appropriate way in which he can raise the matter, and that is for him to report the matter, together with any information he may have, to the police.

Mr Olsen: Answer the question!

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

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

RECREATION CENTRES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training provide details of the program to provide new school and community based recreation centres?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I can, and I thank the honourable member for his continuing interest and support in this area. More than $1 million of building work will create four new recreation centres for students and families in local school communities. The successful partnership between school communities and the State Government has resulted in more than $34 million being invested in recreation and education facilities in more than 144 school communities. Work will now proceed on four more centres.

I am delighted to inform the member for Albert Park—and I am sure that he will be pleased to receive this news—that Semaphore Park Primary School will gain $238 000 for a recreation centre, which replaces a smaller building destroyed by fire. The centre will enhance opportunities for dance, drama, music and physical education, and work is scheduled to commence early next month, in November. The program also provides for new facilities at McLaren Vale Primary School; the recreation centre there has an allocation of $274 000. An activity hall will be provided at the Smithfield Plains Primary and Junior Primary School at a cost of $289 000, and for the Flaxmill Primary and Junior Primary School there is an allocation of $257 000 for a multi-purpose hall.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is directed to the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services. Does the Queen Elizabeth Hospital still have patients who have been waiting more than 12 months for vascular surgery to deal with conditions that could become surgical emergencies with the possibility of the loss of a limb or the development of a stroke?

In July this year the Government received the much quoted Hunter report into waiting lists which identified that 51 people had been waiting at least 12 months for vascular surgery at Queen Elizabeth Hospital and stated that 'potentially most of the cases on this list could become surgical emergencies with the possibility of the loss of a limb or the development of a stroke'. The Hunter report, which the Government received nearly four months ago, recommended additional resources for vascular surgery at Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but with an average seven operations a day being cancelled early last month because of bed shortages the evidence would indicate that the situation is deteriorating since the report was received.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: In relation to the particular speciality that the member raises in relation to that hospital, I will have to examine those statistics, and I will certainly examine them immediately and find out just what the position is. Obviously, the Hunter report was an important strategic document in the overall management of waiting lists in this State and I believe that its recommendations should be implemented and that a package of action measures to do just that is under way at the moment. An important part of that, of course, is the Commonwealth's waiting list money which as I have described in reply to a previous question on this topic will be forthcoming shortly.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Obviously, as my colleague says, that would have been available much more quickly if, in fact, New South Wales and Victoria had cooperated in this process. I believe that we can address those issues. Certainly, I will examine the speciality that the honourable member raises, because in relation to particular hospitals and specialities there are difficulties that have to be worked through which cannot be done as part of an overall strategy outline in the Hunter report.

Obviously, medical management and coordination of those waiting lists between hospitals, which Hunter recommends, is a very important part of this. I have discussed this with the AMA and I believe we will be able to implement an appropriate strategy there. Initial meetings have taken place already between the executives of the various teaching hospitals in Adelaide.

The Hunter report was a very valuable document. I believe it does point a useful way forward, and with the Commonwealth waiting list funding plus the cooperation of each of our hospitals in the metropolitan area I am sure that those waiting lists can and will be addressed.

LUXCAR LEASING

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Will the Treasurer provide full details of the $52.5 million of taxpayers' indemnity money used to settle a Beneficial Finance tax liability relating to the Luxcar Leasing joint venture? Has the Government sought a briefing to determine whether the Federal police are still pursuing issues of fraud, corruption, conspiracy or other criminality involving Beneficial and Luxcar Leasing, and whether any current State Bank group officers are involved?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will bring down a report on that matter for the honourable member.

POLICE COMMISSIONER

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. How long will it take the Government to make a policy decision on recommendations by the Police Commissioner that he be given increased powers to deal with officers under

suspicion for corrupt or other criminal practices? The Police Commissioner first put these recommendations to the Government in February this year in his report on Operation Hygiene. The former Premier told this House on 12 February this year:

> . . . in relation to the policy arising from that, that is a matter for recommendation of the appropriate Ministers, in the sense that both the Attorney-General and Minister of Emergency Services have some role in that.

The Commissioner has again raised the issue in his annual report, but the only response of the new Minister of Emergency Services so far has been to say that he would be happy to discuss the matter with the Commissioner, indicating that nothing has been done by the Government in the eight months since the Police Commissioner first made his recommendations.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Certainly it is a matter that I will be discussing with the Attorney-General. No doubt there will be a need also to discuss it with the Police Association. Obviously, what has been suggested by the Commissioner is a major departure from existing practice, and there will be a need for the issues of natural justice to be addressed in the process as well. I am sure that the honourable member would appreciate that. As I told the media yesterday when asked about this matter, I will be discussing it with the Commissioner, the Attorney-General and the association, and we will try to obtain a resolution as quickly as we can.

SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Given that up to 56 per cent of teachers in some northern suburban schools believe that discipline problems in their schools are 'serious' or 'very serious', does the Minister concede that, after a decade of experimentation, Labor Government policies have failed? The survey was disclosed in a recent article by two South Australian university academics, Mr Bruce Johnson and Mr Murray Oswald, in which they pointed out that 56 per cent of teachers in northern disadvantaged schools believe the discipline problems to be serious or very serious, compared with 42 or 43 per cent in southern or central disadvantaged schools.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member asked if I believed that the last 10 years have failed. The answer is, quite categorically, 'No'. The honourable member would be aware that at the moment we are introducing a policy in consultation with the whole education community that will look at trialling the suspension, exclusion and then expulsion of students. We are working with school communities. We will certainly be working very hard with the school communities in the northern suburbs. I would ask the honourable member to support this approach because it is an enlightened one and will certainly reap benefits for South Australia and the South Australian education system.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr BECKER (Hanson): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Has the Government issued a gaming machine monitor licence for the introduction of poker machines? If so, what scale of fees has been approved for the monitoring of poker machines, and what assurances can the Treasurer give that proper procedures have been established for the selection of a company or companies to provide these services? The Gaming Machines Act empowers the Government to issue the first gaming machine monitor licence to the Independent Gaming Corporation and to set a scale of fees for the provision of monitoring services.

Before the Act was passed by this Parliament, the Independent Gaming Corporation sought expressions of interest for the lucrative contract to provide monitoring equipment. At least 25 companies expressed an interest. I have been approached by a representative of one of those companies who is concerned about the selection procedures. This company has heard nothing more since responding in July to the request for expressions of interest. Further, it says there is widespread speculation within the industry that the procedures for selection have been deliberately established to guarantee that a particular group (International Gaming Technology) will obtain this contract.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The short answer is that to my knowledge there has been no allocation yet, but I will speak to the Casino Supervisory Authority, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, the State Supply Board and all the other people who are putting the project together to see whether there is anything in the honourable member's question that they feel requires a response.

McKINSEY REVIEW

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Minister of Primary Industries. Has the $900 000 spent on the McKinsey organisation development review of the restructuring of the Department of Agriculture been wasted now that the department has been amalgamated with the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Woods and Forests to form the Department of Primary Industries, or have the consultants been asked to alter the report in somewhat of a hurry to accommodate the new circumstances? I have heard from a source within the department that the McKinsey report on restructuring the former Department of Agriculture is now being scrapped as irrelevant and is yet another example of expensive Government reports by consultants that have been commissioned, paid for and then dumped.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I appreciate the honourable member's concern, but I want to put that concern to rest promptly. The restructuring of the department has caused a modification to the report, but in all essential respects the ODR report will be intact. There has been no alteration or scrapping of the report in that regard, only modification because of the amalgamation. The report will be a far reaching document that will harness the three departments (Agriculture, Fisheries and Woods and Forests) into one. I have had to authorise reconsideration of that last aspect, but it has not altered the substance or the direction of the report at all. However, it has been necessary to incorporate into the review the appropriateness of the Waite campus being used as the administrative headquarters for the Department of

Primary Industries. That is an independent assessment. If that assessment recommends that, in view of the integration of the three agencies, that is not an appropriate course, that means that $6 million will not be spent at the Waite campus.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: You will find out in due course. I expect to receive the report at the end of this month, and then it will be released for public comment. It is a very important document. Work practices in all three agencies need to be reviewed and upgraded. My task as Minister of Primary Industries is to bring about organisational efficiency within these three agencies so that the resulting cost savings can be passed on to rural South Australia, to our primary industries. In that way we will bring down input costs. The South Australian Research and Development Institute is absolutely critical with regard to primary industries in South Australia. It must underpin development of primary industries, and research and development must be properly used for that purpose—that is part of the review. Those aspects will not change. However, I do concede that there has been a modification because of the amalgamation of the three agencies, but what will emerge will be in the interests of primary industries in South Australia.

DUCK HUNTING

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. How many duck hunting licences has the Government now issued in return for the payment of the $20 fee specifically for that endorsement, and have the regulations and the licence fee been gazetted yet under the Act and, if not, when will they be?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will certainly obtain a full report for the honourable member as soon as I can.

STATE BANK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is to the Treasurer. In what account or accounts is the unused $1.57 billion of State Bank indemnity money located, and how much of that money has been lodged with SAFA? The Treasurer told the Estimates Committees last month that as at 30 June 1992 the bank had been paid $2 300 million of the currently expected $3 150 million taxpayer indemnity, but it had so far used only $720.8 million of the indemnity funds. This leaves $850 million yet to be paid by the Government to the bank and $1 578.8 million which has been paid but which has not yet been used.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That question obviously requires an update of the material and information I gave to the Estimates Committees. I will be very pleased to provide the member for Coles with that update.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TIME ZONE

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I direct my question to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. Has an assessment been made of the business trading losses that will occur with our international trading nations such as Japan and South-East Asia when assessing the changing of time zones in South Australia? My constituents, many of whom are involved in processed and live fish exports to Japan and South-East Asia, are concerned that the changing of time zones to the east instead of to the west further disadvantages exporters who are involved in the export of highly perishable and live products. As this House would know, the true central standard time is the same as Tokyo—a major trading nation to South Australia—and eastern standard time has no trading equal and is equivalent to an area at sea in the western Pacific Ocean and would not be considered of trading value.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Government's decision to move our standard time to the same as that of the eastern States is to ensure that South Australian business can communicate with the principal competitors and partners in the two other principal States of Australia involved in manufacturing.

Mr S.J. Baker: What about Queensland?

The SPEAKER: Order! What about the member for Mitcham complying with Standing Orders?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: As I have explained previously in the House, the whole concept of having the same standard time as the eastern States is so that the triangle of manufacturing industries that exists in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia can compete together and effectively. The submissions we have had from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in this matter indicate that it regards that as a very vital ingredient in ensuring that industry is competitive and that it can compete and be more profitable.

GAWLER RIVER

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): My question is to the Premier. When will the consultation that was promised to the people directly affected by flooding in the Gawler River commence? Following the problems which arose, a guarantee was given by Government that Government and local government, if not others, would become involved in dialogue to look at the necessitous circumstances of river control. As late as this morning I have been informed by one of the chairmen of the councils involved that there has been no further contact from Government with local government.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly get a report on that matter. I know there was a public meeting last Sunday night. As a result of that public meeting, a residents group, or something, was established.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Just let me finish the answer. They have contacted my office asking for a meeting and I have said I will meet with them, and a time is being arranged. As to the mechanism between local government and State Government on the matter of flood mitigation and the general issues involved in that regard, certainly I undertook that that would take place; the State Government is willing to be a party to that. I will find out when the first meeting is to be called, but I see that really as being driven as much by local government as by State Government, because it is local government that will have to get its own act together between the various councils in that area to ensure that proper schemes are considered. The State Government can facilitate that process, but it is really up to local government in that regard. I will get a report as to when the meetings will take place.

HEALTH CARE

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Health inform the House when he became converted to the virtues of the Federal Opposition's Fightback package as a method of tackling the crisis in health care today? In an earlier response to a question I asked today, the Minister said that he endorsed the findings of the Hunter report, which he described as a very important report.

On page 49 of the Hunter report it is indicated that a number of issues to be discussed and debated with the Commonwealth include, first, tax deductibility for private health insurance contributions and, secondly, compulsory private insurance for people with an income over a certain figure, for example, $50 000—both of which, of course, form part of the Fightback package. On page 7 the Hunter report states:

> A significant change in philosophy is required to encourage support for the private hospital system and prevent over-burdening of the public hospital system.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Of course, had the member for Adelaide been taking down every word I said, he would have recalled that the context of that was management of public sector waiting lists. My support for the Hunter report in the reply I gave earlier clearly related, and I expressed it at the time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Adelaide asked his full question and had more than a reasonable chance to put his question and explain it. If he continues to interject, the Chair will have to take action. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I am quite aware that in preparing that report Mr Hunter went beyond the terms of reference that directly related to the matter under his examination. But, quite clearly, those areas of the report which are within that and which deal with the management of public waiting list reform were something which I strongly endorsed in response to the honourable member's question earlier and which I still endorse. The reality is that those matters will have to be actioned and are being actioned now. But, quite clearly, when we look at the topic that the honourable member has sought to raise in this place about changing the nature of the health insurance debate in this country back to the situation of private health insurance predominating, we see that a number of other difficulties arise in that regard.

The Fightback package, as I understand this proposition, while it would certainly provide subsidies for private medical insurance, would take some $1.3 billion out of the public sector to provide that assistance. Every dollar that goes into a subsidy for private insurance, as I understand the proposal, comes more or less directly out of the assistance which is to be provided for public hospitals. That clearly does nothing at all to assist in that context, unless one happens to be able to pay for the private health insurance with a subsidy.

The reality is that our public hospitals provide good service to our patients; and they are able, with the assistance of the funding through Medicare, to continue to deliver that service. I believe that the Hunter report was a valuable document, which has assisted us in providing waiting list management strategies. I did not endorse the parts of the report that clearly go beyond the responsibility of the State and deal with Commonwealth medical insurance matters.

HOSPITALS, COUNTRY

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Will the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services give the House and the people of this State, particularly those in rural areas, a clear undertaking that neither he as Minister nor the Government, or particularly the Health Commission, will in any way downgrade the effective role that local hospital boards play in the administration of health in rural South Australia? I have received a letter from the Orroroo and Districts Hospital following a document which was circulated by Dr Blakie, who is well known to many of us. The letter states:

> My board does not agree that rationalisation in South Australia is the best alternative available to this State for the management of its health services.

There is a matter that is dear to the Minister's heart in terms of cost comparisons, and the letter goes on to say:

> There appears to be, within the commission, some mistaken idea that the small country hospitals are a drain on the health budget of this State and there is a burning desire to create large regional units in the belief that this will solve our financial problems. A survey of the cost analysis of units in this area completely contradicts this opinion.

That is the reason for the question and my seeking the assurance of the Minister that these well managed and well run hospitals will not be interfered with by centralist planners in the Health Commission.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The management of our country hospitals by the boards which are in place now, I believe, is something that this Parliament would continue to support. Local boards are a very useful way of providing, in country districts, local leadership and of ensuring local participation in the management of those health units, and in the country, as we all realise, those hospitals and health units are very close to the people whom they serve. The metropolitan area is a different proposition, given the nature and density of the population that it serves, but in the country, particularly in small country towns (and I know there are a number in the area represented by the member for Eyre), those hospital boards are able to work effectively with local

hospital management and relate back to the central administration in Adelaide, where necessary, in terms of funding and assistance for the hospital.

If we can encourage some cooperation between those hospitals and some regional grouping of those units, there may be advantages in that. Those questions were raised in the light green report—I think that is the terminology—which the honourable member has seen recently and which was circulated a month or two ago. Those are internal proposals within the Health Commission. They are for information, consultation and discussion, and I certainly look forward to continuing to receive comments from the public and from members of Parliament on that report.

I support the role of local boards. I believe they have a valuable role to play in country districts. Certainly, we would not want to do without their advice and assistance. At the same time, I want to ensure that there is the maximum degree of cooperation and assistance across regions where they share a common requirement for health care. That has to be examined for ways of doing it cooperatively, and indeed voluntarily, to ensure that the maximum benefits are obtained. The honourable member has my personal assurance that I believe those country boards perform a valuable role and I would not look at altering their role or structure without very serious consideration.

HOME ASSIST PROGRAM

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services. What progress has the State Government made in determining the future funding for the Home Assist Program? An article in the *Courier Messenger* of 21 October referred to the services manager of the Unley council, Mr Ron Green, and stated:

> Vital home-based assistance programs for the frail and elderly are being jeopardised by a slack State Government . . . Unley, along with other metropolitan councils and the Local Government Association, have been lobbying State MPs to resolve the funding delay and guarantee the Home Assist Program for the next two to three years.

The Home Assist Program, which I believe has operated for the last eight years, was set up to help frail and aged people with cleaning, repairs, home maintenance, security and shopping. In the Unley area alone, it assists over 500 elderly people. I have been asked to make representations on this matter since I am given to understand that the electors of Unley are less than happy with what their local member has been doing about this matter.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The honourable member certainly raises a useful point in this House about the program. Obviously, it has provided a valuable service in that regard through local government constituencies, and I know that many families and individuals, particularly in the aged community, have benefited well from it. Obviously, the funding of that is something that has to be examined in the long term and I will be doing that. Certainly, we need to ensure that our services for the aged, the disabled and people who have any difficulty in that regard are well coordinated. Indeed, the home delivery of services is an important part of that.

Activity levels are on the rise in those areas, despite the economic constraints under which we operate. The number of home visits by organisations that provide that kind of valuable service has increased in the past 12 months, and I hope that we can extend that to take the maximum possible advantage of keeping people in their homes for as long as possible. Institutional care is not a way to go when one can provide people with assistance on a day-to-day basis in the place where they normally live and where they are their most comfortable. Obviously, that is an important part of the policy and I will follow up the issues that the honourable member has raised.

PUBLIC SECTOR DEBT

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Has the Treasurer read the Public Service Association's 1992 budget submission, and does he agree with the association's analysis that it is highly misleading to compare current public sector debt as a percentage of gross State product with levels under past Governments when up to four times the proportion of spending was directed to public infrastructure and capital outlays compared with today's situation; and, if so, why did he make such a misleading comparison during the Estimates Committee last month?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Clearly, I do not agree with the Public Service Association. It is legitimate to make those comparisons and I am happy for those comparisons to be made. In deference to the Chair, I will not go through those comparisons again, other than to make one comparison that the level of debt in this State as a percentage of gross State product today is about the same as it was in 1982, and again I fail to remember any talk of financial crisis, bankruptcy of South Australia or any of those things. In fact, I seem to remember a very vigorous campaign then by the Tonkin Liberal Government saying how wonderful the finances of this State were, even with that level of debt.

WASTE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister of Public Infrastructure immediately investigate claims that allegedly contaminated material was dumped at a landfill site known as 'McMahon's landfill' at Halls Road, Highbury? These claims were made by *Advertiser* journalist Phillip White in a column written by him on 24 October. It was suggested that this material was part of a shipment of earth removed from Maralinga for radiation testing, and it was also suggested to me that this site is in fact in the Minister's electorate. My informant suggests that the Minister will be most concerned to follow through with this investigation.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the member for Newland and, indeed, the member for Bragg for that question. Certainly, it is a matter—

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Did he not provide the honourable member with the question?

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In any case, I will inquire into the situation because, clearly, if the allegation is true, as stated, and that is always a problem with the Liberal Party, it is a serious one and it needs to be looked at.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Minister of Business and Regional Development, representing the Minister of Transport Development. Why is it possible for a person to have a motor vehicle registration transferred to his or her name merely by quoting the registration and engine number of a vehicle even if the current owner of that vehicle has expressly forbidden any transfer to occur? I was contacted by a person who informs me that he recently lost the registered ownership of his car to his former wife. It was quite by accident that he found that he lost ownership since he himself paid the $170 for six months registration renewal. He had in his possession the new registration disc current until 17 January 1993.

When he informed his ex-wife that she could expect the disc in the mail, she informed him in turn that he need not bother since she had gone to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles subsequent to his registering the car and had obtained permission and paid for the car to be transferred to her.

The person who approached me cannot believe that he has lost possession of his car, since he expressly wrote a letter to the Motor Registration Division earlier this year stating that his car 'cannot be transferred without my written consent'. This gentleman has been informed that the only way he can get his car back is to produce receipts from when he bought the car. After 13 years, he no longer has those receipts. Checks with the car dealer reveal that no longer is there a record of when he bought the car new. To top things off, he has only received back $152 instead of $170 from the Motor Registration Division because he was liable for the cancellation fee.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am happy to take up this matter with the Minister of Transport Development in another place. However, just a few words of advice to the honourable member: I know that he has his mind on other things, such as cat fish and Wardang Island, but he can always write a letter to the Minister and obtain a reply, rather than just trying to fill some space because the Opposition ran out of questions.

WATER QUALITY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): What representation has the Minister of Public Infrastructure made to his Federal colleagues in support of the establishment in South Australia of a cooperative research centre on water quality? The cooperative research centre on water quality proposal between the South Australian Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Universities of Adelaide and South Australia, and the CSIRO would mean a multi-million dollar Commonwealth investment for South Australia, and could involve a range of research areas with respect to new filtration systems and the blue-green algal problem.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question because it is an important one. My department has briefed me to a very considerable degree on the issue that he has raised, and I will certainly be taking it up with my Federal colleagues.

PATAWALONGA

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Can the Minister of Public Infrastructure confirm that the trash rack for the Patawalonga River and Sturt Creek, which was promised by the previous Minister of Water Resources and budgeted for in this year's State budget, has now been abandoned and, if so, what will take its place? The Town Clerk of Glenelg has advised me that there is no doubt that reports and correspondence received by the council from the Trash Abatement Committee and the Patawalonga Task Group recommended that a gross pollutant trap was the most practical means of addressing the Patawalonga pollution problem; that preliminary design details and costings had been prepared; and that the council and the Friends of the Patawalonga organisation were in no doubt that the Government intended building the trash rack as part of a gross pollutant trap.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am pleased to see that the honourable member has benefited from the briefing he was given by my officers an hour or two ago.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: And he knows the answer. He knows he is telling porkies.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The situation is that there is no going back on the promise that a trash rack will be provided. The research done by officers of my department has indicated that a trash rack by itself is unlikely to be sufficient of a solution to the problems in the Patawalonga because of the very large area that it needs to cover. Indeed, the research done by those officers, in going to other States and looking at problems there, has shown that, for very much smaller areas, a trash rack is not sufficient.

Consequently, the floating booms, as my predecessor announced, are an excellent way of getting hold of some preliminary information as to where trash racks, floating booms and gross pollutant traps, etc., should be situated, because I suspect that it may well be necessary for there to be more than one if it is to be done properly. So, the floating booms, which are paid for by the Government and not by councils, are on top of and a way of getting information for the later placement of one or more trash racks. I am pleased in principle that the Glenelg council has offered $100 000 towards that first trash rack, although I think its letter offering $100 000 was probably an ambit claim rather than a definite offer. I hope it is a matter of the department and the Glenelg council sitting down and discussing the eventual outcome, because at the moment that offer of $100 000 is hedged with too many requirements and conditions for it to be considered seriously and genuinely by my department.

BLANCHE FLEUR VETCH

Mr VENNING (Custance): Does the Minister of Primary Industries believe that an article written two weeks ago by two Adelaide scientists warning of the toxicity of *blanche fleur* vetch will have an adverse effect on the South Australian export industry, which is at present worth millions of dollars, and what action will he take to ensure that satisfactory tests are carried out urgently to prove or disprove the scientists' argument? Dr Max Tate and Mr Dick Enneking of the University of Adelaide and the Waite Institute have issued a warning to the Government, the grain industry and farmers that *blanche fleur* vetch (a substitute for red lentils) is toxic to humans and therefore should not be exported. Their findings have been disputed by the Grains Council of Australia, which is most concerned about the damage being caused by the report to the industry.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I will have the department examine the matter. I am familiar with the contents of the article and I will bring back a report for the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! All members have a right to ask questions. The member for Napier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Thank you, Sir. With you sitting there, I always feel safe. In light of the fact that the Liberal Party has, with the exception of three questions, dominated Question Time, does the Premier feel that the frontbench of his Government should have any concern at all about the matter?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is quite clear that the very bottom drawers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Every member has the right to answer a question that has been asked. The Premier.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Members opposite rifled around the place to quickly find questions to fill in the gap, but they missed the key issues of the day. As they quickly scribbled away, writing at their desks, we saw how they were struggling to find questions, especially as they repeated questions that had been asked on a previous occasion. That happened not only in one instance; there were other instances where matters had been raised before. The frontbench on this side of this House is ready to answer many more questions, and the performance of members opposite has been pretty abysmal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is your Question Time. The Opposition is dominating Question Time and not allowing it to flow. The Leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow an extension of Question Time for a further one hour.

We have a stack of questions which could keep us going for two hours.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has moved a motion. I have counted the House and as there is an absolute majority of the whole number of members present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is pretty obvious that we have plenty of questions on this side. We have been trying to get these questions up for ages but that has not been possible because of the long-winded, superfluous answers and the dorothy dixer questions put up on the other side on GST and Fightback and everything else, trying to shield Ministers from the questions from this side of Parliament. We are only too happy to extend Question Time for another hour. We all have questions here. The only embarrassment for the Government is that it has not been able to answer any of the questions asked of it. So, let us get on with it: let us have another hour of Question Time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I oppose the motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will resume his seat. If the Chair cannot hear the contributions, action will be taken.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I oppose the motion, because anybody who has witnessed what has occurred here today would not want it perpetrated for another hour—not for another minute. What we have witnessed here today is blind panic—absolute blind panic. Members opposite should have seen their faces when the horrible realisation came that the Government was not going to help them at Question Time. I defy anybody—any commentator—to suggest that, unless the Government helps the Opposition, Question Time is a total flop. That was exposed today, if anybody had any doubt. To see the look on the Opposition Whip's face—he went white. The Opposition Whip ran up and down the benches and there was a huge scurrying down to offices to find even the most menial letter—anything at all. There were no questions on the major issues of the day—not one.

It is totally out of order to refer to the gallery, but people do watch Question Time. People do observe it; in fact, it is the career of some people to watch Question Time. If we asked any of those people what was the big issue today, I guarantee they would all have the same answer: that the question was not asked here today—an absolute disgrace. The exception was the member for Flinders, who did have a genuine question. The member for Flinders had the only genuine question of the day. However, the Government and I would not inflict one more minute than necessary on the House or the poor saps who have to watch it.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In closing the debate, I throw out the ultimate challenge to the Deputy Premier: extend Question Time for one hour, and we will see whether he is serious about the lack of questions on this

side. We have stacks and stacks of questions. This Opposition has been trying for ages to get up a number of these questions, but the Government has deliberately been snowballing this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I was saying, we throw out the ultimate challenge to the Government. It thought it was on a winner with that last question. We have accepted its challenge and now it is running for cover.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before Chair is that the motion be agreed to. Those in favour say 'Aye', those against 'No'. There being a dissenting voice, there must be a division.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown (teller), J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Noes (23)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins (teller), G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, D.M. Ferguson, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

The SPEAKER: There being 23 Ayes and 23 Noes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

REMM-MYER PROJECT

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): My question is directed to the Treasurer, and I hope that he will at least answer it. Will he say how much the State Bank has written off on the Remm-Myer project, how much more may need to be written off, what the total State Bank exposure is to the project, both directly and indirectly, and how much stamp duty has been paid on mortgages associated with the Remm-Myer centre?

In the Estimates Committee on 16 September, the Treasurer stated that as at 30 June 1992 'the sum of $210 million was used as a partial crystallisation of the Remm losses'. However, the more recent State Bank annual report, at page 40, refers to a write-off of goodwill and reversal of provision for doubtful debt of about $340 million on the Myer Centre Unit Trust.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I think that the overwhelming majority of that question has already been answered, but I will examine it and see whether there is any new material.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Opposition has an extra hour of Question Time. If members continue to interject, they will not get the full time. If they want it, they should treat it properly.

SCHOOLS, BOYS-ONLY

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Is the Government planning to establish any boys-only high schools, given that there are currently three girls-only high schools, namely, Port Adelaide, Gepps Cross and Mitcham? Constituents have expressed concern to me that their sons are denied the opportunity to study at a boys-only high school and feel that this is not only a denial of freedom of choice but is sexist and discriminatory.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The department is not planning to establish any boys-only high schools.

SPEED CAMERAS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Emergency Services agree to table in Parliament every three months a report detailing the operation of speed cameras? It has been continually reported that the Government claims that speed cameras are being used for the purposes of reducing road accidents and not of raising revenue. It has been put to me that, if the Government is genuine in its claim, it should be prepared to table in Parliament a report—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I think this question substantially covers matters raised in Questions on Notice Nos. 231 and 232 on today's Notice Paper and therefore it is out of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will resume his seat. I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Bright.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It has been put to me that, if the Government is genuine in its claim, it should be prepared to table in Parliament a report detailing how many offenders have been caught, the areas in which the cameras have been operating and any links to road accident statistics.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think that this question is on the Notice Paper, but I will deal with it on the basis of the honourable member's question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright will hold his tongue.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am happy to discuss with the Commissioner, when I have a full briefing from him—which I expect in the next day—the whole issue of the management and processes which will operate with regard to speed cameras. It is one of the issues that I will raise with him.

SCRIMBER

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Is the Minister of Primary Industries yet in a position to announce recommencement or abandonment of the Scrimber project in the South-East or whether there is any other interested party wishing to be involved, bearing in mind that the Chairman of Scrimber earlier this year indicated that there could be a new investor by July of this year?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am reviewing aspects of the Scrimber project at the present time, and I have held a number of meetings with Woods and Forests officers. Most certainly there is another party interested in the technology of Scrimber, and that was one of the purposes of the recent overseas visit. In 1988 an agreement for confidentiality was entered into with that party, and I reviewed aspects of that confidentiality agreement to see whether it was warranted. I do not propose to disclose the name of that party and I do propose to respect the agreement that was entered into in 1988. It is clear to me that to do otherwise could jeopardise the alternatives that might be available with regard to Scrimber or, indeed, the technology.

At present, the most that I can say to the honourable member is that I am having discussions with departmental officers, and that was as recently as Tuesday of this week. I am looking for certain aspects with regard to the retention or disposal of the technology. It is a very important matter. In due course I will be able to provide the honourable member with more information when I have made a decision on the appropriate course of action.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bright.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair tries to work in with the Whips. If members do not want me to assist the Whips in performing their function, I suggest they do not answer the call but, if they do not answer the call, I will not take any notice of the lists. The member for Bright.

SPEED CAMERAS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Emergency Services advise the Parliament of the time at which the request was faxed to the Police Commissioner detailing his request for speed cameras to be withdrawn from roads in this State?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Chair thinks that that question—

Mr MATTHEW: I am asking about the time, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair feels that that is a repeat of a question already asked. Has the honourable member written his question or was it an unwritten question?

Mr MATTHEW: I am asking about the time, and that question has not been asked previously.

The SPEAKER: That is not the question I am asking: it sounds like a repetitive question and, without having something to check, I ask the honourable member to bring his question in writing to the Chair. The member for Murray-Mallee.

BARLEY

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): In view of the fact that next week barley harvesting will commence—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Standing Orders provide that the question is asked first and then the explanation is given. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture—or Primary Industries, as I think he is now known, but the Act does not name him as such. My question relates to the Barley Marketing Act. In view of the fact that harvesting of barley commences in the Mallee next week and that in South Australia this year we have the prospect of easily the largest barley harvest and the greatest quantity of malting barley, will the Minister tell the House what he proposes to do in connection with arrangements for growers to market the crop?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The problem is not with South Australia but with Victoria. There was agreement between the former Victorian Government and the South Australian Government on two issues dealing with the method of selection and appointment to the board and issues involving maltsters. The agreement between the Victorian and South Australian Governments was that upon application a licence would be issued as mandatory after 21 days from the date of application, that is, if one was going into business or was actually in business.

Since the Victorian election there has been a change in Government. I spoke with the Hon. Bill McGrath, who I think is still to be sworn in as Minister. I think he is one of four in respect of whom there has to be an amendment to enable him to become Minister. I have contacted the Victorian Government asking what is its stance.

There is not a problem so far as Victoria is concerned with the selection or appointment to the board but the Hon. Mr McGrath has undertaken to advise me as a matter of urgency about the issuing of the maltsters licences. The Farmers Federation in Victoria and South Australia requires a condition that agreement has to be reached between the board and the maltsters before the licence can be issued.

The legislation has to be complementary in respect of both States. We are in a position, I suppose, to introduce legislation, but it would not be wise to do so until the attitude of the new Victorian Government is known.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: There is not a problem because, in any event, the Victorian Government did not propose to introduce its legislation until early next year. The legislation does need to pass by the middle of next year, and I am sure that it will. It is not our fault here in South Australia, nor is it the industry's fault. I have had a number of discussions and consultations on this matter and I have discussed it with the appropriate local members, the member for Goyder, the member for Flinders and the shadow Minister, the member for Victoria—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member could have asked me and he has now asked me properly in the House. I am simply telling him that the problem with regard to that Bill is not with the Department of Primary Industries, it is not with me as Minister and it is not with South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member has several agendas in relation to this and I think he would be well advised to allow the industry to work things out.

The honourable member knows the difficulty he has with barley growers on Yorke Peninsula and the fine balancing act he has to maintain in this House. I look forward, when the legislation is introduced in this House, to seeing what amendments he will move, which ones he hopes will be defeated by the House and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct his remarks to the Chair and he will come back to the subject in question.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I will summarise, Mr Speaker. It is an urgent matter. I appreciate the question from the honourable member. It is quite critical but I have agreed to the request by the Hon. Bill McGrath in Victoria: he wanted an extra two weeks to consult with industry representatives, that is, the Farmers Federation and the maltsters in Victoria. He has undertaken to communicate as a matter of urgency whether there will be a change in the Victorian Government's attitude and I hope that I will be in a position to introduce legislation in November.

SPEED CAMERAS

The SPEAKER: As to the earlier question asked by the member for Bright, I will allow the question. The question in respect of speed cameras on page 1021 of *Hansard* concerned when the Police Commissioner was first made aware of this matter. The honourable member says that his question is about the actual time and I will allow the question in that regard.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Will the Minister of Emergency Services advise the House of the time that the request was faxed to the Police Commissioner asking that speed cameras be withdrawn from South Australian roads? The Minister has previously advised he sent his request to the Police Commissioner on 22 October.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As to the question, I understand you were ruling in relation to a question asked by the honourable member, but yesterday the Leader asked a question of the Minister—did he discuss with the Police Commissioner the road safety ramifications; had the Commissioner approved before the statement was made? and so on—which I submit relates to the timing of such a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Unless a time was given in the response, and offhand I do not have it in front of me, I will allow the question. The member for Bright.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Minister advised that he sent his request to the Police Commissioner on 22 October 1992. I am reliably informed that the request was faxed to Police Commissioner and, therefore, I ask the time when that occurred.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: What transpired between the Police Commissioner and me will remain between the Commissioner and me, but I can assure the House that a conversation between my office and the Commissioner's office transpired well before the House sat. Therefore, the conversation, agreements and understandings were well and truly logged. What I do and how I discuss these matters with the Police Commissioner will remain my business, and will stay that way.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Treasurer confirm that the major reason why the Adelaide CPI result released today is the worst in the nation is due to the impact of high Government charges and taxes?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, it has taken one hour and 15 minutes into Question Time before we have the issue of the day. Even the most inept Opposition would have seen that the principal question of the day would be on the Adelaide CPI. But the problem is—and everybody here and everybody who observes Parliament knows it—that the Liberal Party has picked a dud, and there is nothing it can do about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will come back to the subject.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Two-thirds of the CPI increase did relate to the increase in tobacco franchise. That is correct: two-thirds of the increase was attributable to the increase in the tobacco franchise. That does not affect at least two-thirds of the people in South Australia. It is purely a voluntary tax. At the most, only one or two people in here would be affected by that particular tax. I also note that the Queensland Government—and this will appear in the following quarter—is increasing its franchise up to the same amount as that applying in South Australia and New South Wales, and Victoria is apparently doing the same. So, the increase is under both Liberal and Labor Governments and, with the exception of possibly one or two members, everyone in this Parliament would agree that the tax is the minimum that we ought to charge. So, I am pleased to have this question.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Had I been the Leader of the Opposition, I would not have asked it at all, because all he has done is draw to the attention of the Parliament, and everyone who observes Parliament, just how inept he is.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): In the many discussions the Premier has had with motor vehicle manufacturers, has the industry been able to justify to the Premier the 39 per cent reduction on the sale price of vehicles for export, and does this wide variation of price mean that the Australian consumer is subsidising the price of Australian built cars for export? I am advised that a Ford Capri car, manufactured in Australia, is available to an Australian consumer for $36 000. The same car, manufactured in Australia and sold in America, is available for $A22 000, notwithstanding that GST applies in America.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is good to see one of the few decent questions coming from the other side today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No, it is a very important question, and the member for Flinders is to be congratulated on raising this point. I am well aware of his own well stated, clear position with respect to tariffs and the automotive industry. I am well aware that he has a clear view on the matter, a philosophical position which he is quite happy to maintain. One could only wish the same clarity of view would apply among the Liberal Party members of this place, who seem to have all sorts of different views as to where they stand with respect to the automotive industry. The Leader of the Opposition will change from day to day.

I am interested to see how his views are forming now, as a result of Ian McLachlan's statements yesterday on the automotive industry. Clearly we will not get an unequivocal view expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. He will continue to hedge his bets. We still have not seen him come out publicly, like he was rumoured to be doing with Jeff Kennett after the Victorian election. We still do not know exactly where the Leader stands on this matter.

Coming to the substance of the question by the member for Flinders, the fact is that the international motor trade sees cars being exported to various parts of the world from various producing countries. I would argue that the situation may well apply in a number of those exporting countries that there is a difference in price regime in the domestic market compared to the international market. The concept of having an export product available at a reduced price has not been an unusual concept. Indeed, it is one of the problems which, when taken to the extreme, results in the very dumping problems we face in other countries. I would be very surprised—in fact, from the figures I have seen, it is not the case—if cars in Japan were sold for the same price by Japanese manufacturers as they are sold in other markets. What may be happening with Australian automotive producers is simply what is happening with many other major automotive manufacturers.

The fact is that, if you increase the productive capacity of the automotive sector in this country, adding in the export sales along with the domestic sales, that makes the whole industry much more viable. One could argue that, without these export sales, cars produced within this country might be dearer still than is presently the case.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No, because you have the situation that the profit coming from export sales helps improve the economic viability of enterprises within this country. I suppose the only way you can guarantee a reduction in the domestic price of cars is simply to do what the Liberal Opposition wants to do, and that is decimate or wipe out the industry by removing tariffs and thus allow cheap imported cars into this country. They would be cheaper than we are paying at the moment. Many members opposite are quite happy to see cheap imported secondhand cars coming into this country. They would see a situation of imported cars, whose secondhand prices are artificially deflated by registration requirements in markets such as Japan, and are thus being dumped on the world market. Sure, the price may be cheaper for the consumer, but at the cost of jobs, investment and the manufacturing sector in this country.

COMMUNITY VENTURES

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training explain to the House why a major metropolitan council refuses to conduct any more joint community ventures with Education Department schools because of the department's action and reliability over previous joint ventures? Recently, the Warradale School Council approached the Corporation of the City of Marion with respect to the possibility of providing funds for a joint community-school venture. The minutes of the appropriate council committee clearly show that the council declined the offer because of the previous unsatisfactory experiences—and, they believe, lack of integrity—of joint ventures in which the council and the Education Department had been involved.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I think the honourable member asked whether I would investigate whether other councils are wishing to adopt this position: could I just have that clarified?

Mr BRINDAL: Can the Minister explain to the House why a major metropolitan council refuses to conduct any more joint community ventures?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will be delighted to get a report for the honourable member regarding this matter.

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Does the Premier agree with the $2 million State Bank interest rate subsidy deal entered into before the 1989 election, and would he enter into a similar deal before the next election? The Constitution provides that the new Premier can go to the people in February next year, and many of my constituents have asked me whether they will get the same interest rate deal from the new Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader might have somehow retrieved his vulnerable position at the end of the first hour of Question Time by his bravado in saying, 'Let's have a second hour of Question Time. We have lots of questions and many things we want to ask.' He might have clawed back a little bit, but then the second hour was delivered to him and he blanched again—he thought he was going to lose the matter. When he got the second hour, the Leader said, 'Things really haven't shaped up at all.' Now the member for Victoria has let him down badly with proof that there were no questions at all; it was sheer bravado, saying that the Opposition wanted to ask a stack of questions. The matter raised by the member for Victoria has been widely canvassed.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Here comes the cavalry again.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I ask you to rule on Standing Order 98 which provides that a reply must refer to the substance of the question and be relevant.

The SPEAKER: I am aware of the Standing Order. The Premier was moving into an explanation, and I am sure that it will be relevant.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This matter has been widely canvassed in evidence before the royal commission and in this place. As members know, we are due to see the report of the royal commission in the next few weeks, and after that report comes down I have no doubt there will be further discussion about these matters.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): What guarantee will the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services give that emergency financial assistance will continue to be available bearing in mind the significant increase in the demand for such assistance outlined in the annual report of the Department for Family and Community Services tabled yesterday? The South Australian Department for Family and Community Services is now receiving applications for emergency financial assistance at the rate of more than 110 per day. The department's annual report tabled yesterday shows that in 1991-92 there were more than 40 000 applications for assistance. Whilst Mr Keating may claim that the recession is over, the South Australian Department for Family and Community Services states in its report:

We expect the demand for emergency financial assistance to continue to be high in 1992-93.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: There were just over 37 000 emergency financial assistance applications for 1991-92. Obviously, this number has fluctuated over the years as economic conditions and other factors change. In 1989-90, the figure was 40 000; in 1990-91, 34 000; and in 1991-92, 37 000. The hard economic times in Australia at the moment have clearly influenced a trend towards increasing the number of people who seek emergency financial assistance from the department. Part of the response to that has been the restructuring of the financial support teams in all 19 district centres of the Department for Family and Community Services. This has had the effect in recent months and during the financial year to which the honourable member refers of making these services more available and accessible to people, and that in itself has had the effect of increasing the number of applicants.

Obviously, the current economic conditions have had that effect, and the voluntary agencies which normally provide support have been hard pressed. That is well understood by the department and by me as Minister. I appreciate the work that those voluntary agencies put in, and I realise that the amount of effort that they and the department can put forward is not unlimited. We will continue to work with those voluntary agencies and to take the appropriate steps in terms of departmental structure to ensure that the work that has gone into making those services more accessible, such as advertising the services throughout the relevant communities, will assist those people directly.

STATE BANK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Given that the Premier was a senior Cabinet Minister at all relevant times and that he received numerous warnings about the performance of Mr Tim Marcus Clark and the State Bank board, does he accept any responsibility for the State Bank's losses?

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this is a variation of a question that has already been asked in this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Points of order are a very important part of the business of this House. The Chair will explain the position. A wide range of questions has been asked about the State Bank's liability and responsibility. To be candid, I cannot remember the nuances of every one of those questions. I am sure that part of the honourable member's question would have been touched on in answers to other questions, but it seems to the Chair that it might be difficult to get a clear answer on that basis, so I disallow the question.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, Mr Speaker, this is also—

The SPEAKER: Order! I disallowed the question. However, if the Premier would like the question asked again, the Chair is quite prepared to allow it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will again call the member for Coles. Obviously, the Premier wishes to answer the question, although I have some doubt about it and I am not positive, as I said—it is such a broad area. If the House is prepared to accept the question, the Premier may respond. The member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Given that the Premier was a senior Cabinet Minister at all relevant times and given that he received repeated warnings between 1988 and 1990 about the performance of the State Bank board and Mr Tim Marcus Clark, does he accept any responsibility for the State Bank's losses?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The matter raised by the honourable member is very stale.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is a very stale matter, and I suggest that many statements I have made on the public record quite clearly indicate my views; most importantly the evidence I gave before the royal commission, which is on the public record. Even if it were not on the public record, members of the Liberal Party, including the Hon. Trevor Griffin in another place, were present at that hearing when I gave evidence, so I know that that information is available to the honourable member. She will find that information in detail in the evidence I gave over half a day. I do not intend to waste time now, because it will take away the Opposition's time to ask questions, and I do not intend to be so unkind. I simply refer the honourable member to the evidence I gave before the royal commission where she will find her question has been answered.

FISHING, NET

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Will the Minister of Primary Industries consider reversing the decision of his predecessor to ban the use of recreational drum nets in the Murray River in South Australia? The previous Minister claimed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: —that there was a need to reduce the effort on the fishery to preserve the fish stocks. However, it has been put to me that the effort is even greater today as a result of illegal wire nets being used in the river. So, I ask the Minister: will he give consideration to allowing the return of recreational drum nets with a fee of $50 per net, as proposed by a prominent fisheries expert, with the funds being dedicated to restocking the river with Murray cod and callop?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: This is certainly scraping the bottom of the drum—and I do not mean any discourtesy to the honourable member. I simply advise the House that a general review of the licensing requirements of the three agencies under my ministerial portfolio (agriculture, fisheries and woods and forests) is being conducted by the deregulation unit, which has been looking at the licensing requirements of each of those three agencies, which licences could be handed back to the industry for self regulation and which licences need to be retained by the Government.

I am in the process of examining the material compiled by the deregulation unit, and I understand that will be released in due course by my colleague. In the light of the information that I am giving the House, I think it would be appropriate for me to await the release of that report and make comments in due course, and I am sure—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am just saying all the licences that are attached to the departments of Fisheries, Woods and Forests and Agriculture are being reviewed by the deregulation unit, and they will be reviewed to determine which licences are necessary, which licences—if any—can be handed back to the industry by way of industry self-regulation, and which licences simply must be retained. As the information from the deregulation unit is being considered by the three agencies, I think it is appropriate for me—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am well aware, but it is a fairly extensive review of licences, and my general philosophic position is that, wherever the industry can self-regulate, wherever it is appropriate to do so, the industry should be given the opportunity, because in many instances the industry can do things far cheaper than can the Government, and that is one way of getting input costs down. Of course, that is not always feasible or proper because, for hygiene reasons or consumer protection, governments must retain licensing controls. However, I would much rather provide the honourable member with the information in the context of the release of the report.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister who is not in his seat.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order. Will the Minister resume his seat. The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety advise the House of the reasons why the WorkCover Corporation set up its special unit to monitor WorkCover claims at the Remm site? In his answer, will the Minister explain all the reasons for the establishment of this very special unit?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The member for Bragg is a well-informed member of this House. Last night he told us that he was here when the WorkCover Bill was debated. If he had listened intently and read the Bill he would know that WorkCover is managed and controlled by a board that consists of six elected employee representatives and six elected employer representatives and two people who are appointed on the basis of their knowledge of industry. The WorkCover organisation is managed under the direction of that board. Its members make the decisions and guide and direct the manager on how things ought to be done in that area. I will ask the manager whether the board is prepared to release that information.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Why will the Premier and his Ministers not answer questions outstanding on the Notice Paper? As the Premier would know, I have several questions—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Sir, question on notice No. 68 states:

> Why has the Premier not answered the member for Hanson's letter to him of 21 February 1989 regarding Mr Doug Grosser's request for an interview?

In his question the member for Hanson asks why the Premier has not answered a question that is on the Notice Paper. I am not sure whether my point of order is relevant, but I think it is.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the question is out of order on the basis that a Minister is not compelled to respond to a question on notice or a question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader has a problem, he should tell me what it is, but my instructions and information are that a Minister is not compelled to answer, exactly the same as when a question is asked in the House during Question Time. There is no compulsion with respect to the content of the response. A Minister may even ignore a question asked in the House. I take the point of order.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I take note of your ruling, but the honourable member's question was, 'Why will the Premier not answer?' I think it is quite legitimate to ask why a person will not answer a question.

The SPEAKER: As I understand it, it was a collective question. Did the member for Hanson ask, 'Why will Ministers not answer?'

Mr BECKER: I asked, 'Why will the Premier and his Ministers not answer my questions—

The SPEAKER: I would possibly accept a question directed to an individual Minister as to why he will not answer, but I repeat: he is not compelled to answer.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward is out of order. I am not sure, when there is no compulsion for a Minister to respond, the Premier can be held responsible.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, perhaps I can assist. All questions on notice go through Cabinet and, as the Premier chairs the proceedings of Cabinet, it is appropriate to direct that question to the Premier, because he would know as the head of Cabinet which questions have not been answered and perhaps why Cabinet has pulled the answers out.

The SPEAKER: That may be so, but Cabinet discussions are not answerable to any Party in this House. My understanding is that knowledge of Cabinet business is not required to be responded to in the House. Does the member for Hanson have some problem with the ruling of the Chair?

Mr BECKER: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: We will suspend while we look at it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel.

INDONESIAN TRADE FAIR

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I address my question to the Premier. Given the recommendation of the Arthur D. Little report for South Australia to access the rapidly growing Indonesian market, what initiatives has the Government taken to participate in and encourage participation from South Australian industry at the Fifth International Manufacturing Machinery, Equipment, Materials and Services Exhibition in Jakarta? Indonesia's industrial sector has been expanding rapidly, growing at over 11 per cent during 1991. Manufacturing contributed over 22 per cent of the gross domestic product in 1991. Opportunities exist in raw materials, intermediate and capital goods, processing technology, consulting and engineering services. The new Jakarta International Exhibition Centre will stage the fifth international convention from 1-5 December. Held annually, it is the largest trade-only display in Indonesia and last year attracted some 22 000 visitors and some 764 companies, and 22 countries participated.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a pity that this question could not make it up into the first grade during the first hour of Question Time, because it has a lot going for it. The question relates to a matter of currency (the Arthur D. Little report and the recommendations of that report) and, as I indicated during the Estimates Committees, for example, we are examining exactly what is the best way to work with South Australian business in Indonesia, including the question of representation. There will be further reports on that in the future.

On the matter of participating in trade fairs, the honourable member would know that many trade fairs are held all over the world and many of them are held in target markets. While this market is identified in the Arthur D. Little report, many other trade fairs are held in Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, the US, Hong Kong, Taiwan and so on. It therefore requires some pretty close scrutiny as to whether or not a particular trade fair is the best way of selling South Australian expertise. I do not know what consideration was given to this particular trade fair (and I will get a report on that matter), but it is possible that it was considered that this was not the most effective way of promoting South Australia's business potential in Indonesia.

I can certainly advise in any event that, if some consideration was given to this matter, it would have only been done in consultation with industry. It is not the habit of the Government to decide that we will participate in a trade fair somewhere and then go out and look for industry support for that. We do it in consultation with industry. I will certainly get a report on that matter with respect to this trade fair but, as I said, there are many trade fairs in the region in the markets that we target and, clearly, we cannot participate in all of them.

STATE BANK

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Premier. Why will he not answer my questions on the Notice Paper concerning the State Bank and related matters? I have been advised by the General Manager of the State Bank that answers to the questions I have on the Notice Paper have been provided to the Premier's Department. The constituents who have requested answers are wondering why I have not received the replies.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will be responding to all questions to me on the Notice Paper. I think that my track record over nearly 10 years in the Cabinet is very good with respect to my answering questions on notice.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Ross Smith is quite correct; those questions should have been directed to the Treasurer, to whom the State Bank Act is committed. Nevertheless, I will not make a big point of that. My office is in the process of pulling together all the necessary information that has to be put into the answers—which is not just from the source mentioned by the honourable member—so that I can then give the honourable member the information he seeks.

SPEED CAMERAS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister of Emergency Services confirm whether the one and only faulty speed detection unit was responsible for photographing a car which was recorded by the unit as travelling at 49 km/h and which allegedly exceeded a 25 km/h road works restriction; how many other cars were photographed on that day and at that location?

A constituent of mine was travelling on the Truro to Blanchetown road on 6 October. As the car approached

the section of road that was being repaired, a flagman stopped the traffic travelling towards Adelaide to allow traffic travelling in the opposite direction to proceed. The car that my constituent was in was behind several other vehicles and, of course, the space between each vehicle, as my constituent states, was only a few metres. While my constituent and his wife were stopped, they both observed a police vehicle on the side of the road and nearby was a speed detection unit. On the other side of the road, a vehicle was stopped and the occupants were speaking to the police officer, so they were quite aware that there was surveillance of the road.

After several minutes the flagman waved traffic to proceed towards Adelaide, and they all moved off, passing the detection unit. It was at this point that the speed unit photographed my constituent's car resulting in a $150 expiation notice.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I intend to report to the House on the whole process of the testing that is being undertaken by the—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am not sure what the honourable member finds amusing about that.

An honourable member: You.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: He ought to see how he looks from this side of the House. If I get that report tomorrow, I will attempt to report to the House tomorrow. The Commissioner is obviously doing a thorough report on this. He will obviously be consulting AWA, the RAA and the National Standards Association in preparing the report. Obviously, it will be a complex and comprehensive report, and I will address the issues that the honourable member has raised in a general sense in that report—or I am sure the Commissioner will.

I will refer the particular incident to the Police Prosecutions Branch for a full investigation. Given the information and the data, I believe I have enough to work on but, if the honourable member has further information in relation to the issue that is relevant, I ask that it be passed on to me and I will convey it to the police.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is addressed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. When can I expect a reply to the question I asked five weeks ago of the former Minister of Recreation and Sport during the Estimates Committee in relation to the losses incurred over the past year in running the TAB? On 24 September, I pointed out to the Minister that TAB turnover—-

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Standing Orders provide that a member may provide such facts as are necessary for an explanation of the question. Since the member is referring to a question he has already asked, that explanation would not seem to be necessary.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Walsh withdrawing leave for the explanation to be given?

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: No.

Mr OSWALD: At the time, I pointed out that TAB turnover had risen and, in its last year of trading, it had a $500 million turnover and incurred a 5 per cent loss. I also asked the Minister to provide an analysis of why TAB turnover, despite having risen over four years, is showing a negative return. I asked the question on 24 September—five weeks ago—and as yet I have not received a reply, hence my question to the Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I understand that there is a question on notice dealing with exactly this matter. I think it was asked by a member other than the member for Morphett. I have asked my departments to give me information as soon as possible on all the outstanding questions. As soon as that is available, the question will be answered.

NURSING SERVICES

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is directed to the Minister of Health. What monitoring of demand for home nursing services has been performed by the South Australian Health Commission to review the need for such services as day surgery increases? The Minister frequently uses increases in day surgery as a justification for the frequent closure of hospital beds. Recommendation 415 of the Hunter report into waiting lists states:

> Demand for home nursing, for example, Royal District Nursing Society, should be monitored as increases in day surgery occur.

As the Hunter report was received by the Government four months ago, the House will be interested to know what progress, if any, has been made in this important matter.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Those members who have listened to my many speeches in this place over the years will know of my very strong personal interest in the area of performance statistics and output measurement. I am sure that many of my now ministerial colleagues would have received questions from me and listened to numerous speeches from me on this subject. Indeed, it is a matter which, I am very pleased to say, is gradually finding its way into Government repertoires and, indeed, many departments now publish such statistics and activity levels as part of their annual report to the Parliament and as part of their Estimates Committee documents.

I believe that the honourable member is quite right to raise the question of the monitoring of these kinds of levels, and I have asked the Health Commission to develop a comprehensive series of output measures and performance indexes by which we can judge the ongoing trends. Obviously, it is not possible to use those in the individual case—just simply to take a snap shot figure—because in those cases they can be quite misleading, and I acknowledge that, despite my support for the concept as a whole.

However, I remind the honourable member that the Royal District Nursing Society saw some 398 800 people in the metropolitan area in the past financial year, and that was a boost of some 12 per cent. I believe that those kinds of activity levels, like the metropolitan domiciliary care, which was up some 11.8 per cent, and a whole number of those kinds of statistics—which I will not go through now because of the time available—do clearly reflect the increasing activity levels in those areas.

However, I will certainly take on board the question of monitoring that area of the Hunter report because, like

the rest of that document, but excluding the areas that relate to Federal management, for which I am not responsible to this House, I will certainly support it.

TILAPIA

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): When does the Minister of Water Resources intend to allocate funds for a contingency plan to combat the potential disaster to the Murray-Darling River system of the introduced fish species tilapia—or, more particularly, *Tilapia Mossambica*?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: Tilapia has already been allowed to escape into fresh water streams in the eastern water shed in Queensland. It has the capacity to destroy the ecosystem of all the wetlands and main channels in a very short time indeed. Tilapia is a native of Mozambique and is far more voracious than European carp, which has done so much damage to the Murray River and its natural environs. I have received a reply to my question asked in the Estimates Committee from the then Minister of Water Resources who conceded that there is no contingency plan to deal with—to use her word not mine—an escapement (I think she means 'escape') of tilapia into the Murray-Darling system.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now starting to debate the issue. He should explain the question.

Mr LEWIS: It is now recognised by the Department of Fisheries, which says that the tilapia threat warrants the same commitment as did the myxomatosis research program in the war which had to be waged against rabbits. It seems—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is taking an inordinately long time to explain the question.

Mr LEWIS: It has been put to me—

The SPEAKER: And he is commenting and debating in the explanation.

Mr LEWIS: It has been put to me by people whom I represent in the Lower Murray—

Mr QUIRKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order from the member for Playford. The member for Murray-Mallee will resume his seat.

Mr QUIRKE: My point of order, Mr Speaker, is whether the honourable member is asking or answering a question.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I call the member for Murray-Mallee, but I ask him to wind up.

Mr LEWIS: The question was about funds for the contingency plan to combat the fish. I was simply explaining the importance of the question as it has been put to me by my constituents. They have made plain to me that they regard the tilapia threat as being the worst confronting the Murray-Darling system ever.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee will resume his seat. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My point of order relates to whether there is anything in the Standing Orders that gives the House approval to give the member for Murray-Mallee an extension of time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. That is the second point of order that I consider to be frivolous and a waste of the time of the House. I ask the member for Murray-Mallee to sum up very quickly; otherwise I will withdraw leave.

Mr LEWIS: My constituents are concerned that funds must be found before it is too late and our rivers are infiltrated and devastated by this aggressive intruder.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: As Minister of Public Infrastructure, I am the Minister responsible for water resources and I do not mind answering that question. The fascinating aspect is that I read the answer to the question on notice that my colleague provided, and it is interesting to note that the explanation to the honourable member's question, virtually word for word, was the answer that he got to a question on notice to the Minister of Water Resources.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. My point of order is that the answer to that question was the answer that I gave the Estimates Committee. My question is about funds.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Nonetheless, the question is of considerable importance. There are no contingency plans, as I understand the situation, for preventing the spread of this particularly voracious fish into the Murray-Darling system. Obviously it will need to be taken up, and it will need to be taken up in the first instance by the Murray-Darling Commission.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Does the Premier concede that accepting with too much frivolity a smarty pants question from the member for Napier is the reason for the Government's current in-house embarrassment?

The SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Chair did not understand that question but, if the Premier is prepared to answer it, he will do so.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I understand why you, Mr Speaker, cannot understand the question, because it is a silly one. It is a question without any substance at all. The facts are that the Opposition has tried today to indicate that it has a wellspring of questions on so many issues on which they want to tackle the Government and that, when given the chance in the first hour when the Government decided to let Opposition members ask most of the questions, bar three, they would have all these questions to probe us on. Then, when another hour came, they said that they could fill up another hour too.

We have had a shambles from the Opposition in terms of the quality of the questions that they have come up with. The only question which was on an issue of the day and which should have been asked in the first hour was asked only when finally the Opposition was goaded into it by my interjection across to the member for Kavel, who said, 'Of course, of course; we forgot the most important question that we should have asked.' Then they

gave it to the Leader and the Leader fluffed it up. I do not accept the point made by the member for Light. The reality is that this apparently vast number of questions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria has a point of order.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I might have to check the tape, but I think that some most unseemly language was used by the Premier, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that, if it was used, it was inadvertent. I cannot imagine the Premier using language in this Chamber that would not be appropriate. We will check and, if so, I think perhaps the Premier might take it upon himself to withdraw.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, I thank you for your comments. It has certainly not been my practice to use unseemly language in this place. I think that I would like to hear the tape.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I would like to listen to the tape to hear the terms referred to, because I do not recall just now having used any unseemly language. Therefore, I do not intend to withdraw that which I have not said. However, if the tape indicates that, in the heat of debate, I said something somewhat intemperate, I will, upon listening to the tape, be prepared to come back and withdraw those comments.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sittings of the House for the remainder of the year.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.G. EVANS: At the time that the Deputy Premier responded to the motion for a suspension of Standing Orders to provide for an extra hour of Question Time, he said that I, the Opposition Whip, was running around white faced and in panic.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: He certainly was.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS: I should like to state clearly, as you would know, Mr Speaker, that there were 24 questions on notice at that time and we were down to either 20 or 21 and that immediately the hour was given I had enough to fill the paper for more than that hour. It was a reflection on me as an individual. I was asked by my colleagues what the Government was up to, and I told them that I had been on the receiving and the giving ends of such tactics and it was either one of two things: first, that they had got the message that they should not make ministerial statements in answer to questions; and, secondly, that they might be heading for a position where they want to call an election. That is exactly what I told my colleagues.

The other matter over which I was in panic, if there was a panic, was in trying to organise private members' business on this day, and that is what I was chasing around doing. I feel that the reflection on me by the Deputy Premier is not for the good management of the House. I attempt to be fair and to keep up with the work, and I think I do it as well as the Government Whip.

The SPEAKER: As this is the one day for private members' business, in the interests of the House not losing private members' time, I do not intend today to propose that the House note grievances.

BRIGHTON BEACH

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr McKee:

That by-law No. 1 of the Corporation of Brighton relating to regulating bathing and controlling foreshore, made on 4 June and laid on the table of this House on 6 August 1992, be disallowed.

(Continued from 21 October. Page 960.)

The SPEAKER: I understand that this matter was disallowed in the Legislative Council and it would appear that the best procedure is for the member for Gilles to move that it be discharged.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I move accordingly, Mr Speaker.

Order of the Day discharged.

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

A quorum having been formed:

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

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

Nothing has altered since the time when the then member for Morphett moved that motion. In fact, over the years there have been several motions and speeches in this House reaffirming that the airport remain within its present boundaries and that the curfew also remain in place. The Federal Airports Corporation, which now operates Adelaide Airport, some years ago allowed a BAE146 aircraft to operate during curfew hours. The twin-engine aircraft was operated by National Jet Systems, which was successful in winning the contract to take staff from Adelaide to Santos properties in the northern part of South Australia and in Queensland and which, I understand, carries some mail under contract to Sydney.

The point is that the aircraft was extremely quiet and the six-month period granted for it to operate within the curfew hours was used as a test to ascertain whether the

aircraft movements disturbed local residents. During that period I believe there was only one complaint. Certainly, I received only one complaint and, when I explained what it was all about, that person did not want to pursue the matter any further. Since then the operators of the aircraft have been permitted to operate full time. Now we are starting to receive complaints because the aircraft operates around 4 a.m. I have been receiving complaints from residents in Lockleys, Brooklyn Park and West Richmond.

Residents from those areas complain about aircraft taking off from Adelaide Airport, but it depends on certain weather conditions. The crux of the whole argument about curfew conditions at Adelaide Airport is the use of jet aircraft, and the question has now been raised about the proposed activities of Qantas Australia. To remain competitive and to be a viable airline it now wants to bring aircraft from Singapore into Adelaide Airport at 5.5 a.m. four days a week.

Why the aircraft could not leave Singapore one hour later, or why it could not cruise a little slower, is beyond me. We are told that Sydney airport is now the hub for Qantas and that the aircraft landing in Adelaide at 5.5 a.m. will depart for Sydney just after 6 a.m. We are also told by Qantas that the 767 aircraft will fly into Adelaide International Airport over the sea, which means that residents of Glenelg North could have their sleep disturbed at that hour in the morning. The aircraft will land on the main runway but will not use the reverse thrust of the engines to pull it up. In other words, it will glide in and gradually ease to a halt.

Under all normal weather conditions that sounds good (it involves flights four mornings a week), although there could be adverse weather conditions after the aircraft leaves Port Augusta. Having flown on that leg to destinations overseas and returning from overseas destinations during our lobbying for the Commonwealth Games, I know that 767s are a comfortable aircraft. The flight departs Singapore at about 10 p.m., if I remember rightly. If one is coming from London, depending on the aircraft, there could be a two or three hour stopover at Singapore airport, which is not uncomfortable, as it is one of the most modern and pleasant airports in the world. Certainly, a break of two or three hours after a long flight, especially from London to Singapore, is important.

I know that some people get grumpy and anxious to get home but, in my opinion, those who do a lot of travelling are not all that inconvenienced. You need to have a good break and be able to walk around and exercise your body. I believe that Qantas has not tried all that hard to come up with a timetable to accommodate Adelaide Airport as well as the Sydney airport. I know that it is in Qantas's interests, but I have been told by other international airline carriers that, to be successful in operating an international airline today, you have to fly virtually continuously around the world, and that may be so. Qantas has always been at the end of the line as far as the European connection is concerned, and one can understand why Qantas took a considerable investment in Air New Zealand.

Qantas is now to be privatised, and it would not be unreasonable to assume that Singapore Airlines will accept an offer to take up 20 per cent of Qantas. Again, I would endorse that type of investment, provided that Australians retain a 51 per cent shareholding. I can see huge strides being taken by Qantas in reorganising its airline in the next two or three years, as well as some rationalisation of international aircraft carriers. I believe that Singapore Airlines, Qantas, Air New Zealand and maybe Cathay Pacific will be involved. I believe that British Airways is sufficiently large and strong to compete with all other international aircraft carriers and will remain alone, but I have been reliably informed by astute managers in the air transport industry that, by the year 2020, there may be only four or five large international carriers. Whilst there is prestige in each country having its own airline, the day will come when there will have to be a rationalisation of services.

Demands are being made for bigger, wide-bodied aircraft, much quieter aircraft, and for short landing and take-off aircraft. Every major airport in the world has a similar problem to that of Adelaide Airport, involving the location of an airport close enough to the city that it can be easily serviced by the major international hotels. The problem with the development of airports is the growth of housing around them. I have been very fortunate in the past 18 months—that opportunity being provided by the Government—to travel widely. Don Dunstan always said, 'Get out of this place, go overseas, look around and listen.' I believe that the facilities provided to us today as members of Parliament give us that opportunity. Therefore, I can understand the tourist industry's need and concern to have a good, strong, viable international airport close to the city.

However, there is one other problem: the main runway at Adelaide Airport is not long enough. It cannot cater for the 747 international aircraft nor, I believe, the 767s, to take off fully fuelled and fully laden with cargo and passengers. So, the tragedy is that Adelaide, whilst it likes to boast direct international air links, can provide only a limited service, and that service is truly from Adelaide to Singapore. I do not know why Qantas has insisted on flying its aircraft to Europe via Singapore, because the better option in my opinion would be to go west from Adelaide to Perth, or even from Adelaide direct to Harare, which it could do, and then from Zimbabwe through to London. In my opinion, it would be a much quicker flight and the African connection could provide a very valuable tourist mecca for Australians and Africans. I believe that some time in the next 10 years this will occur.

Our immediate market is the Asian area—Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Hong Kong and Vietnam—and that is where our immediate future business contacts and hopes lie. Those business opportunities provided there will be a boon to Australia. In the long term, looking ahead 25 years or more, it is Africa. We should be starting to concentrate our efforts and energies now into Africa. With very little effort, we could feed the African nations. We could assist the African nations and provide a lot more aid than we are giving those very poor developing countries at the moment. We ought to be ashamed of the contribution we are making federally; we should be doing much more.

It all revolves around Adelaide Airport. The short-term future for our own tourist industry, the most labour intensive industry that we have now in the country, is

tourism. Therefore, we have to provide the opportunity to attract international airline carriers. Unfortunately, I do not believe that the Adelaide International Airport is that location. It may be suitable for some of the types of aircraft that we use at the moment, recognising that Adelaide Airport is not the main destination, although we are somewhere within the Australian connection, be it on the way to Melbourne or Sydney.

The resolution back in 1978 still stands. It certainly stands as far as the local residents are concerned. We are heartened that it is the attitude of the Royal Australian Air Force and the Federal Government, and no doubt the Opposition's attitude will evolve as well, that defence bases must be made viable. When one travels overseas, one will find in most cases that the air force base of a country is also located at the international airport. So, the Edinburgh air field could well be the airport to be developed, with the runway to be lengthened and the facilities upgraded. It will not take a great deal at Edinburgh to turn that facility into a truly international airport that could operate 24 hours a day, with the Adelaide Airport becoming the secondary airport. That situation applies in most capital cities around the world, where they have more than one major airport, including one huge facility as an international airport and another interstate or intrastate airport.

I do not think that Adelaide Airport will ever be closed, cut up and subdivided into housing allotments. It is not possible because of the low water table and the huge amount of infill that had to be brought in to build the main runways, let alone the need to clean up the very swampy area. In looking at extending the Adelaide Airport runway, we were advised today by the Highways Department that it would cost $20 million to put the Tapley's Hill roadway underneath the airport runway. To build a deviation road would cost $8 million. However, to look at spending that sort of money in the name of tourism does not sound feasible to me, when Edinburgh could make a greater impact and provide better facilities. We could establish a very fast O-Bahn or electrified rail system from Edinburgh to the city. Really, to boost our tourism, we need more international hotels, but that is another story. The Philippines was successful in becoming a tourist destination by first of all attracting major hotels which then attracted the tourists. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC SECTOR SALARIES

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to peg all executive salaries and packages of Government department and statutory authority employees exceeding $150 000 per annum.

In moving this motion, I am mindful of the public's perception that, like Federal public servants, our public servants are fat cats who are well paid and enjoy an excellent lifestyle. To some degree that is a myth. There are many well paid public servants just as there are many well paid politicians. We were not happy to see our salaries exposed in the *Sunday Mail* last Sunday. It seems to me that every time the issue of salaries and salary ceilings is raised, someone—and I suspect it is someone from within the Public Service—goes to the *Sunday Mail* and says, 'These are the salaries of all the politicians for everyone to see.'

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

Mr BECKER: That is what I would like to do. It is all very well if they get them correct; however, Mr Deputy Speaker, your salary was not correct, but I will not raise that issue. It annoys me when the media do not disclose the level of their salaries. I mentioned the question of salary levels a year or two ago, and I was pleased then that the Government of the day led by the former Premier, the member for Ross Smith, said, 'Yes, the executive salaries will be disclosed.' An attempt has been made to disclose some salaries of Government trading enterprises in the Auditor-General's Report, but some authorities have not done so and some have treated the issue with contempt. By the beginning of the next financial year, this Parliament must insist that the executive salary range level be printed in the Auditor-General's Report as well as in the annual reports of the various Government statutory authorities.

There is no doubt that this issue was highlighted and raised because of the number of large salaries paid by the State Bank to various executive officers. I am mindful of the fact that many of those salaries were paid to persons employed by Beneficial Finance, a subsidiary of the State Bank, and other subsidiary companies. The salary levels for SGIC were nowhere near as high as those of the State Bank or the executive salaries of some of the staff of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. Apart from Mal Hemmerling's salary, there is only one salary that one could complain about, and that is the $150 000 paid to the marketing manager, which I feel is unreal.

Hemmerling's salary is quite large, but it is based on the salary packages of persons in similar positions overseas and/or within Australia. Dr Hemmerling could argue quite rightly that he had a low base salary and that he was given substantial allowances which boosted his whole package, but his overseas counterparts work for only eight months of the year. I think Dr Hemmerling is doing a pretty good job to spin out his work for 12 months of the year. Of course, we understand why he and his board readily accepted the opportunity to manage the Entertainment Centre.

I am not here to attack Mal Hemmerling, because I am a great supporter of and I believe in the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. I believe the contribution made by that sporting event to tourism is equalled by nothing else in this State. The Adelaide Festival of Arts is highly regarded and accepted throughout the world. It is one of the best arts festivals in the southern hemisphere, if not the world, but I think we tend to underrate it. If we take the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust as a guide, page 213 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1992 shows that the highest paid person employed by the trust is in the salary range $110 001 to $119 999. If we compare the contribution of the Grand Prix with that of the Adelaide Festival of Arts—and a large number of people come from interstate and overseas to attend that festival—we would have to say that the trust's executive officer is underpaid in comparison with Mal Hemmerling. However, we do not appear to have any difficulty

attracting some of the best directors to our Festival Centre—so that proves the story.

I was disappointed with the attitude of some of the statutory authorities in the way in which they reported in the Auditor-General's Report. I refer, for argument's sake, to the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Under the heading 'Remuneration of senior management', section 29 on page 249 of the Auditor-General's Report, the executive salaries are described as follows: remuneration received or receivable by members of senior management—management team (8), $771 000; level three managers (11), $800 000; level two managers (13), $893 000; and level one managers (17), $1 089 000. In other words, there are 49 executives with a total salary bill of $3 553 000.

That is a pretty lousy way in which to report to the Parliament on the remuneration of senior management. I hope the Government will gently remind the Electricity Trust of South Australia that it expects better. I take that as a contemptuous way of reporting the executive level salaries to Parliament. The Government must say to all these senior public servants or employees of statutory authorities—such as Mr Kean, the Chairman of the Board of SGIC—'If you take on the position of chairman or executive of a Government authority, what you do is accountable to Parliament and to the people, and you must be prepared for full disclosure. You come under the magnifying glass of Parliament.' That is pure open Government. That is demanded and practised right around the world. Whether it be the Westminster system, the American system or some other republic, no matter how large or obscure, there is greater demand today for accountability.

There is only one senior executive employed by the Lotteries Commission, and that person draws a salary in the range $120 001 to $130 000 per annum. I could not ascertain whether anyone employed by the Local Government Finance Authority received a salary over $100 000. The South Australian Government Financing Authority and the Local Government Finance Authority have no large executive salaries, yet SAFA has assets in excess of $22 billion. It is the largest of all our financial institutions in that regard. I have yet to complete my search through the Auditor-General's Report in relation to salaries.

On page 290 of the Auditor-General's Report, at paragraph 19, there is further mention of executive salaries in respect of the Pipelines Authority. With respect to remuneration of members, total remuneration received or due and receivable by members of the board, including the salary of the General Manager of the authority, was $142 000. So, there has been no break-up to assist us there, but only one senior manager or the Chief Executive Officer received a substantial salary.

I was very pleased with the way the Engineering and Water Supply Department reported its executive salary structure. That Government department seems to have adopted a very responsible accounting system and disclosure of its operations to Parliament. This year, the Auditor-General has given quite substantial coverage to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. For argument's sake, on page 68 of the Auditor-General's Report under 'Remuneration of executives' there is one person in the salary band $130 001 to $140 000, and four executives of that department are in the next salary band of $100 001 to $110 000. There are eight executives in the salary band $60 001 to $140 000, whereas in the previous financial there were six. So, full marks to the E&WS Department for providing those figures.

I am annoyed by the pressure that has been placed on the Government, statutory authorities and the boards of those authorities as a result of the level of executive salaries paid to people in private enterprise. This is really the crux of the whole issue. I believe that the salaries paid to executive officers, be it in private banks, insurance companies or similar authorities, or private companies, including BHP and News Corporation, are far in excess of what I would call a reasonable salary. BHP, the biggest company in Australia, has 49 000 employees, 248 of whom are in the salary band $100 000 to $1 479 999. It is absolutely ludicrous to think there is an employee in BHP who receives in excess of $1 200 000. Another BHP employee receives $980 000 to $989 999 and yet another $890 000 to $899 999. As I said, 248 executives, compared with 233 in the previous year, are receiving those huge salaries which, in my personal opinion, cannot be justified, and almost 100 executives receive in excess of $150 000 per year.

That is where the pressure is being put on Government trading enterprises and State and Federal Governments. If somehow we could control the executive salaries in private enterprise, we could control the grab and the greed of those who believe that they ought to be paid at the same level. If we go to a meeting of the shareholders of a publicly listed company, we see that if a poor shareholder dares to stand up and ask a question he gets slapped down. It is not like Parliament, which is accountable; very few Australian companies are truly accountable to the shareholders, let alone to the workers. It is about time we did something about that. The pressure that is being put on Government by these private companies is reflected in the huge salaries we are required to pay in the public sector, and then of course the only way we can obtain the revenue to pay these huge salaries is to increase taxes and Government charges. I think the whole thing has got out of hand and is all out of kilter, and we have to tackle executive salary levels.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMUNITY SERVICE AGENCIES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

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

I know he is not required to be in the Chamber at the present time, but I am sorry that the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services is not on the front bench at this stage. I say that because when I raised this matter earlier I noted that quite obviously the Minister shared the concern that I expressed when I referred to

this matter during a grievance debate. I would like to have been able to ask a question of the Minister specifically as to the form of representation that he is making to his Federal colleagues to have this proposal overturned. I have received representation from a number of non-government agencies, who have pointed out to me very clearly that they are already under-resourced for the services they provide, and I am sure that any member of this House who keeps in touch with the community service organisations, whether it be the non-government agencies or the Government agencies in their own electorate, would realise that that is the case. A number of these agencies have made contact with me about this matter.

The Federal Minister has advised (not directly, but through Treasury) that in future payments for the State for supported accommodation projects and for other grants will be paid on a monthly basis instead of quarterly as at present. There is concern that as a result of this the State Government may take the same action, placing an even greater burden and strain on agencies. As I said earlier, the resources of these agencies are already stretched to the limit. This action on the part of the Commonwealth Treasury will exacerbate cash flow problems, particularly if agencies have annual accounts to pay in a given month. We realise that these agencies are not funded for any administrative support and that this will put further pressure on these services to use paid staff time for the additional administrative and clerical duties necessary.

Agencies have informed me that they will not receive any worthwhile interest during such a short period and that currently it is recognised that interest is beneficial, helping operating costs in a budget that would show a deficit if these agencies relied entirely on the funds granted. Further, with the prospect of a new award being introduced, agencies will be under increasing pressure, as no additional funding will be forthcoming to cover the added wage costs. I am informed that modest size agencies have little if any back up support for payment of essentials, such as salaries, should there be either any delay in funding payments or any other unforeseen urgent costs.

I suggest that the State Government should be protesting very loudly and vehemently at the Treasury's announcement. It should be pressing the case for maintaining funding payments on a quarterly basis in the interests of the clients who will suffer under a system of monthly payments. That is why I would like to have had the opportunity to ask the question: what has been done, or what is being done, to resist the Treasury's move? I would hope that the Minister for Health, Family and Community Services will provide details about the specific action that he and his Cabinet colleagues are taking in regard to this matter.

One of the organisations that has written to me is SACOSS—and I realise that it has written to a number of other individuals and a number of organisations, and I know it has made strong representations to the Government. I would like to refer to the letter that it has written. I would hope that, recognising that the Premier of South Australia is the patron of that organisation, the present patron will take its concerns on board. The letter states:

> I am writing to express our strongest concern at the Commonwealth's proposal to move to monthly payments of grants for all programs administered by the Department of Health, Housing and Community Services. Currently, most payments are made on a quarterly basis, usually in advance.
>
> The proposed changes will have very drastic consequences for already under-resourced and stretched services.
>
> The consequences will include:
>
> 1. Loss of income to the States who have traditionally been paid in advance;
>
> 2. Substantial loss of income to service provider agencies who have budgeted to receive interest on grants in advance;
>
> 3. Trebling the administrative cost for the States who will need to move to monthly payments to agencies;
>
> 4. Trebling the administrative load and cost for agencies. (most agencies in the non-government sector have voluntary treasurers who find the existing systems arduous).
>
> 5. Cash flow problems for small under-resourced agencies, coping for example with large quarterly bills...The unilateral decision by the department [the Federal department] to move to monthly payments is a departure from the Commonwealth's stated policy of collaborative planning with the States and cooperative effort with the non-government sector. It in fact represents a reduction in funding for the States and for service providers.

The letter asks for urgent support to prevent this move to monthly payments and the writer has offered to discuss these concerns with any reader. That very clearly spells out the concerns of SACOSS and, when one realises that SACOSS is the umbrella organisation for the community service agencies in this State and recognises the number of those agencies, one perceives just how important this matter is, and it is one that I hope the Government will consider.

Recently, I brought to the attention of this House many of the concerns that are being expressed and many of difficulties being faced by non-government agencies in this State, because many of these community service organisations are finding it increasingly more difficult to continue to provide even the basic needs of the disadvantaged in South Australia. It is interesting to note some of statistics that have come out of the annual report of the Department for Family and Community Services, to which I referred earlier in a question. I will bring these statistics to the attention of House again, because the department is now receiving applications for emergency financial assistance at the rate of more than 110 a day. I point out to the House that that assistance is for basic necessities, such as food.

The department's annual report, which was tabled yesterday, shows that in 1991-92 there were more than 40 000 applicants for assistance, or 18.1 per cent more than in the previous year. I realise that, in answer to a question earlier today, the Minister attempted to indicate that perhaps there was not as much concern as would be suggested by these statistics. I have to disagree with that: there is considerable concern in the community. We realise, as the report says, that the demand for emergency financial assistance is likely to continue to be high for the next 12 months and possibly after that. A considerable number of individuals and families are disadvantaged and are in dire straits in South Australia at present.

It is important that the Minister clearly states what specific action he will take to ensure that these services continue to be provided at a time when they are most needed. Last week I brought to the attention of this House the plight of one such organisation—the Society of St Vincent de Paul. That organisation has informed me that two weeks ago it received 120 calls for assistance in

one day—the largest number of calls ever received by that agency in this State. It has experienced increases of more than 10 per cent each month since July, and this month, up to and including some five or six days ago, 1 003 calls for help have been received. It is not just St Vincent de Paul: other organisations have told me that they are facing extreme financial difficulties because of the huge demands being placed on them.

St Vincent de Paul is now having to purchase 80 mattresses a month just to satisfy urgent basic needs. Purchases of this type have risen from 140 000 in 1989-90 to 163 000 in 1990-91. Last year the total number of calls for assistance received by St Vincent de Paul in Franklin Street was 13 185. The total number of people visited as a result of these calls was 72 773, with over $250 000 being spent on assistance.

I bring St Vincent de Paul to the attention of the House only as an example; if I had the time, I could refer to a large number of other organisations, such as the Adelaide Central Mission, the Salvation Army and many others. It is ironic that in the 1990s the Adelaide Central Mission is having to provide food parcels. In the publication *The Mission Speaks*, the Reverend Ivor Bailey states:

> Asking people to donate cans of food is reminiscent of the War efforts of Depression of the 1930s. Unfortunately that's what it's come to. That's why we've launched the 'Can the Recession' appeal. The perilous state of the economy spells hardship for many ordinary families.
>
> For many years the mission has supported the homeless and the unemployed; now we're seeing the new poor, people who have a home but can't afford to eat. The mission is a large agency—in fact, the largest non-government welfare agency in the State—but in an over bureaucratised society, where welfare is prescribed and costed and caring limited to office hours, it is increasingly necessary to break out of the industrialisation of welfare.

So the article goes on. It is absolutely essential that the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services take into account the matters raised in the motion. I call on the Minister to advise the Parliament about specific representation he is making to his Federal colleagues to have overturned a proposal to change from quarterly to monthly funding for non-government community service agencies in view of the grave concerns. I ask the House to support the motion.

The bells having been rung:

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

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

The SPEAKER: Call on the Orders of the Day: Other Motions.

TRAM BARN

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr Amitage:

That this House expresses its sincere and profound admiration at the dazzling display of political flexibility exhibited by the Minister for Environment and Planning which, with respect to Hackney Tram Barn A, required her to adopt a position on 11 August 1992 totally opposite to her stance of the previous day.

(Continued from 9 September. Page 552.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I note the motion that has been moved by the member for Adelaide. The motion explains how the member for Adelaide feels in relation to this matter and the Minister's change of mind on many occasions on the issue. I support the views expressed by the member for Adelaide, and I am happy for this matter to go to a vote.

Motion negatived.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Quirke:

That this House notes the industrial relations policies of the Liberal Party at the Federal level and, in particular, the policies of the Kennett Government in Victoria and also notes the Opposition in South Australia has promised to support similar anti-worker, anti-union measures aimed at undermining decent standards of living for all South Australian wage and salary earners.

(Continued from 21 October. Page 974.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I note with interest the motions moved by members opposite: they relate to actions taken to reform the industrial estate of this country. We have here a motion of condemnation by the member for Playford. We have here the tired old statements of a Government that has been in power too long, has been corrupted by its own power and has no new ideas. Therefore, the only thing that the Government can concentrate on is the moving of motions as well as the condemnation of new initiatives and of the taking of new steps forward. That is what this Government is all about. We have not seen one new idea flow from it in the past two or three years, but we have certainly seen plenty of damage done by it in that time. The Government is concentrating on damage control. The only way to control the damage is to deflect attention away from its ill-conceived efforts, its poor administration and the massive losses that are being made daily by the Government, including the $3 150 million associated with the State Bank.

This country has nothing of which to be proud in relation to its industrial relations record. Australia is one of the most unproductive of the OECD countries. There is probably only one sector in our economy that can hold its head up high, and that is the rural sector. Despite the vagaries of the seasons, the difficulties that it encounters daily, the difficulties of survival in an astonishingly bad climate, with overseas interests in grain and commodities placing it in jeopardy, it is the only sector of this country that can hold its head up high and say that it is more productive than are its counterparts in the rest of the world.

After we get away from the primary industries, we strike real problems. They are problems that have been set by archaic industrial systems, by commissions and by a framework which is no longer relevant to this country. It is absolutely irrelevant to the future of this country, yet it is sustained by personal interests and because Governments, Federal and State, wish to maintain the power base of the unions. That is what it is all about. It has nothing to do with the future of Australia: it is a matter of maintaining the power base. They know that if they let that go, relinquish it and actually do something for Australia, the donations are not going to roll in. They know that they are sustained by their fellow travellers

from the union movement, and they curry and buy favour in the process. That has been recognised; it is nothing new.

However, the economic circumstances facing this country are certainly new. They have been coming about for the past 20 or 30 years. Looking at the trends, we see that we have been slipping down that slippery slide for 20 to 30 years. If we continue to go along in that way, we shall rate below many of our Asian neighbours who are picking up and running with the ball. There has to be dramatic change. That change will not be brought about by tinkering at the edges or by maintaining the networks and frameworks that have existed in this country since about 1915. That will not help this country: we have to make a break from where we have been.

If the union movement wishes to play a very important role in this process, it cannot rely on Governments, particularly Liberal Governments, to sustain an archaic system. That is the message that has been given clearly by the Federal Liberal Opposition, it is the message that we have sent out to the electorate and made everybody aware of over some time and it is the message that everyone in this House should accept. We cannot change for the better and improve our living standards if we do not change the industrial system under which we operate. This State is bedevilled with some terrible problems. Unless we become a lower cost State, our future will be grimmer than the nation's future because we have certain disadvantages.

I know that productivity levels are difficult to measure across jurisdictions, but some international companies have provided us with comparative figures of output and input per unit in countries where they have branches and manufacturing plants, agencies for tourism, hotels and so on. We have not a composite picture but a very clear picture nonetheless of the situation in Australia relative to nations against which we compete. The comparison is soul destroying. The dramatic change that is needed can in no way be just cast aside. Members opposite can appreciate what happens on our wharves, where all that has changed is that the Federal Government has paid out $300 million to help out its mates, while in terms of turnaround time we are still 50 per cent below where we should be. We should be able to turn a ship around a lot faster with a lot more cargo than we do today. If people want to judge the efficiency of our ports and understand why it is difficult to get a ship in here, they have only to look at our record, which is not too bright.

Our building sites are among the worst in the world. Comparisons have been given to us by international companies. Members opposite might claim that one cannot compare South Australia with Singapore, because it is not relevant. We have heard statements that one should never compare South Australia with nations where low wages are paid. However, Singapore wages are heading towards overtaking ours so, in terms of performance, there is no doubt that we should compare them.

When I was in Singapore I saw people working on building sites until 11 o'clock at night. I am not saying that we should do that in any shape or form, but I simply draw the comparison. When international companies compare us with other countries, they say that Australia is absolutely the worst by far. If we compared Singapore figures with Australia, and particularly South Australia, there is a 50 or 75 per cent disparity in terms of productivity. All members know why, because we heard the reason today: whenever a building site is running out of work the workers go on WorkCover.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: They do: 430 workers went on WorkCover and it happened to coincide with the slowing down of a project. That is no myth—it is fact. Members opposite should not lecture us on the changes that we wish to undertake because those members know that industrial relations in this country have to change dramatically. If it has to be under a Liberal Government because the Labor Government has not the guts to do it, so be it. Members opposite have been aware of our policy for a number of years in South Australia; in fact, I think I wrote one of the contributions and most of it has been endorsed by the Federal program.

I expect a higher level of debate than the rubbish we get from the other side. The member for Playford has put this drivel up expecting the House somehow to agree that we are doing well because, to do otherwise, would reflect on the Government's own performance. Its performance is abysmal, it should be recognised as such and this motion should be overwhelmingly rejected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gilles.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I support the motion. The business community during the 1980s embarked on an orgy of avarice and greed, where it recklessly borrowed money, buying businesses and property with money from a seemingly bottomless pit of credit. There was no planning, no thought, just a 'let's get rich quick' mentality. Then the market—the free market; the market much loved by the Liberal Party—corrected itself in 1987 and wiped out half the value of all Australia companies. That was followed by a classic property boom with grossly inflated property values that could not be sustained. This caused the banks, which thought their loans were secure, to write off approximately $15 billion from the economy. The nurses did not do that; the welder did not cause that to happen, nor did the truck driver or the school teacher: the unconscionable greed of the business community caused it to happen.

Now the Liberal Party has finally posted its true colours to the masthead. At long last it has unveiled its industrial policy. And what an oppressive un-Australian policy it is. They want the ordinary wage and salary earner to bail out their big business mates. The Liberals want the workers in our society to pay the price for their supporters' folly—it is an outright swindle of the economy of this country.

The Liberals' industrial relations policy will directly result in a loss of wages and a loss of jobs. Who will be left to consume and who will be left to spend in the businesses that the Liberals support? To my amazement, the head of the Australian Small Business Association, Mr Boyle—I do not know which branch of the Genghis Khan family he comes from—stated last week that he believes the Liberal industrial relations policy does not go far enough. It is now clear that the Federal Opposition's industrial relations policy is the low wage/low skill approach to Australia's future. The policy allows employers to force their workers out of awards and make

workers accept individual employment contracts which substantially cut pay and reduce conditions of employment.

By reverting to a base minimum hourly award rate the Opposition is attempting to camouflage the impact of its policies on wage and salary earners. This is the 'like it or lump it' approach to workplace bargaining. Under the Opposition's policy there is absolutely nothing to stop an employer offering a worker a simple choice—either they accept reduced pay and conditions or take the sack. Under common law this would not constitute an unfair dismissal. Behind the Opposition's base minimum hourly award rate smokescreen and the few basic leave requirements that constitute the policy's minimum conditions, a wide range of basic employment conditions are up for grabs. Under the Opposition's policy, individual contracts would be legal if they reduced one's pay to the lowest award classification rate. For example, the metal industry award has 14 classifications and a worker who is a skilled fitter and turner can be forced down to the wage of an unskilled process worker, which in itself is a big pay cut straight up.

The Opposition's eliminates overtime, penalty or shift rates, regardless of what hours are worked day or night. For many workers penalty and overtime rates are an important part of their regular income, and to lose them would substantially reduce take-home pay. It requires employees to work a 60-hour week or more and eliminates any rest days or paid public holidays; it removes any limits on daily working hours; it eliminates all rest and meal breaks; it eliminates annual leave loadings with no compensation; it takes away the job security of permanent workers by making them work as casuals; and it removes award superannuation and redundancy entitlements.

And the Liberals have the hide to paint these so-called reforms as 'family friendly'! There is nothing family friendly about a mother being forced to work 12-hour shifts through the weekend for nothing but the base minimum hourly award wage. There is nothing family friendly about shifts being changed at will by an employer so that parents cannot pay planned child-care with any certainty. This will happen under the Coalition's policy. The Coalition will abolish general award wage increases. The inadequate minimum wage that it proposes will steadily lose its value and will result in a lowering of real wages for Australian workers.

Dr Hewson and Mr Howard will not come out and say so, but it is clear that that is the intention behind their proposals. They want to lower real wages and they see the future of Australia as a low-wage country. Unskilled and poorly unionised workers will be the most vulnerable—for example, migrants, many women and young workers. The Opposition's $3 youth wage will mean that many young people will be forced to accept jobs paying little more than the dole, with no guarantee that they will receive any training. There is nothing to stop employers replacing adult workers with young workers on the youth wage. This would inevitably lead to a low wage spiral, with decent employers forced to follow.

Those workers fortunate enough to be allowed by their employers to return to the award system will still be disadvantaged. As with the minimum hourly rates governing workers on contracts, award minimums will steadily lose their value, eroding living standards year by year. The inevitable result of the Opposition's policy is lower wages and reduced living standards for many working Australians.

What is worse, with all employees on individual employment contracts, there will be secret deals—hardly team building stuff. It is a recipe for suspicion and distrust in the workplace. The Coalition's policy will also set workers and their unions against employers as they fight for a fair deal. It would destroy the cooperation and trust between management, workers and unions, which is absolutely essential for long lasting and real productivity gains. Productivity gains cannot be achieved with an uncooperative and resentful work force. It is a return to the conflict-based industrial relations of the Fraser years. The real tragedy of the Opposition's approach is that it is completely unnecessary. Australia does not need it. It is unfair and divisive.

Significant real reform has been made. The quiet revolution in Australian workplaces is occurring. For example, workplace bargaining is creating increasing numbers of quality productivity-based agreements which give companies greater flexibility. Career paths in restructured awards are encouraging workers to train and learn new skills. Industrial disputes are at record lows. Investors and our trading partners increasingly value our reliability. Wages policy through the accord has locked in permanently low inflation. Australian industry is adopting international best practice and is becoming more globally competitive. Business has said that all the flexibility anyone could reasonably want is there already. Mr Howard's new flexibilities are to remove protection, neuter the umpire, remove awards and cut wages.

All the progress made in Australia by replacing confrontation with cooperation is now threatened. The Coalition has held a mirror to its prejudices and perceived a policy. Mr Howard is not proposing to introduce enterprise bargaining; he is trying to put everyone on individual work contracts. Each person would be thrown on the mercy of the market, but with many of the normal supports and protections removed. The employee advocate is a joke. There will be no national wage case in any form. There will be no limits to the number of hours worked per week or the number of hours worked per day. Standard working hours will be abolished. Guarantees of paid public holidays are removed. Redundancy payments can be removed. Permanent employment can be replaced by casual employment. Superannuation, just established as a right for all, will be turned back to being a privilege for the few.

The Australian Industrial Relations Commission, required as an umpire to resolve disputes fairly, will be cut out and given a change of role to become an enforcer of Government economic policy. The protection of properly arbitrated award standards will be removed. Over time the protection that awards offer will be eliminated. Industrial law will be scrapped in favour of expensive and time wasting common law with its archaic nineteenth century standards. Under common law it is not employer and employee but master and servant.

I hope that members opposite learn something from history, because back in 1929, when the Industrial

Arbitration Commission was attacked by the national Bruce Government, the Government was slaughtered at the 1929 election. Interestingly enough, Bruce lost his seat. The other interesting point is that the current holder of that seat is the Deputy Opposition Leader, Mr Peter Reith, who has the responsibility of forcing GST down the throats of the workers in this country.

The $3/$3.50 per hour exploitative youth rate is retained. Training so essential to the future of Australia is missing from the policy. It will be up to the boss if workers get any training, and it could be in the worker's time. Women do not benefit. They will bear the brunt of this low wage approach. The affirmative action agency is abolished. Migrant workers do not benefit; indeed, they are at a particular disadvantage.

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

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I never cease to be amazed by members opposite who rise in here to proclaim their understanding of the Coalition's policies and, in the process, denigrate them, claiming that they would cause widespread unemployment and poverty. Exactly the opposite is the case. Members opposite do not seem to understand what they are talking about when they speak about market forces, where there are assured minimums in law. Even if there were not assured minimums, all that members opposite have to do when addressing the substance of this motion and understanding the stupidity of it is to look at the way the tiger economies of South-East Asia have emerged from abject poverty.

People less than 30 years ago—many of them barely 15 years ago—were living in dwellings and with standards of living and expectations of education which were the poorest in the world, poorer even than Mexico or South America. They were at least as poor as anything people in Africa experienced, except that tribal peoples of Africa at least had their territory and traditional means of winning food from the wild. They had no understanding of disease control, but they were not densely populated, and accepted the attrition rate among their young. The birth and infant mortality rates were very high.

In the tiger economies of South-East Asia, the population densities were high, and there were not the technological skills or the equipment available to treat water and disease, leave alone provide hospitalisation. There were no schools. You only have to look at the history of Hong Kong, or Singapore for that matter, to understand that. More importantly, if they were going to just survive as human beings, what they had to do was import raw material and add value to it at such a rate in the dollar of their investment that they had an excess margin available to provide services for themselves as a community, services which we tend to take for granted, such as education, health and transport, and other essential infrastructure activities, such as getting rid of sewage and delivering potable water to the dwellings and workplaces that they had available to them. They had to capitalise their enterprises to buy the equipment necessary. They had to borrow the raw material which was to be processed by that equipment and by their hands, and had to use their wit in the process of doing so. They had no universities or schools when they set out, and very little else to bless themselves with.

Mr Speaker, you and I both know, and so do all members opposite, that by using this approach, allowing the market forces to determine who gets what, they have made themselves more prosperous per capita than we are, and their standard of living continues to rise in spite of the fact that we have vast natural resources to underpin our standard of living. All we have to do is go and literally rake up the raw materials and resources at our disposal, put them into containers, ship them out and sell them to economies such as those to which I have just referred, the tiger economies of South-East Asia, where the value adding process has been undertaken.

We only have to rake up the wealth from the ground, or alternatively put huge machines in place in the fields and rely on divine providence, as is well known from science, given the variations that exist, to provide us with the rainfall and the sunshine to convert what we have done, by way of seeding the land and fertilising it, into another vast natural resource. That is all we have to do, yet whilst we do that extremely well as export industries and enterprises in those endeavours, we still complain through our traditional trade union movement that more needs to be done for the worker in the service and manufacturing industries, and more needs to be done to protect the capital invested in manufacturing.

No thought is given as to the source of prosperity. No analysis is made of how in the field of human endeavour prosperity is created and real wealth is generated. Someone somewhere has to pay the piper. The export industries have done it to the point now where, after 10 years of Labor, they are working with worn out tools which are behind those of our competitors and which need dramatic rapid updating.

Those worn out tools that I speak of are not only fences falling down on farms and worn out equipment but also the people themselves who are involved in farming enterprises of all kinds and who are ageing almost a year for every year that passes in average age of those engaged in the enterprise. That is not a tautology. The fact is that no young people are entering those enterprises, and that is why the average age of the people participating in those enterprises is increasing almost at the rate at which time passes. That is a danger for us, because the skills which those people have will pass away with them in great number. Yet, they are the skills upon which we depend for the generation of wealth from that sector. Most of the manufacturing industries in this country that are engaged in export derive the raw materials to which they add value from those same producers. So, it does not appear as primary enterprise export but as manufacturing export, yet very little has been done to it.

For instance, hides are not seen as primary products; they are seen as manufactured items. They have been skinned from the animal, so it would seem that some value has been added in that process. Other simple and primitive processes of a manufacturing kind shift the category of the export away from being, for example, grain from the farm gate to some form of processed grain to be sold from the mill that processed it, but it is not sold as, say, biscuits. Another astonishing thing that

worries me when I hear members opposite, such as the member for Gilles, speak is that they claim—

Mr Venning: Read.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, they read a speech. They claim we have a poor training record in the work force. Who is to blame for that? Who has been in Government, State and federally, for more than a decade? Who has been involved in conjuring up mickey mouse training schemes that do not address the problem of providing the skills the economy desperately needs? It has been the ALP, which has been in office for more than 10 years—and members opposite proudly prate about that as part of their record of achievement. What an achievement it is! The level of relevance of the training and skills that we provide to our population is worse now than it was at the end of the 1970s. Our work force is continually out of employment, and the number of unemployed is growing to a far greater extent than the position that existed at the end of the 1970s.

In 1982 we had a drought. In 1983 Hawke and Keating were elected to Government in Canberra, and they claimed that they broke the drought. When the drought broke, a great deal of export income was derived from the productivity that resulted. They claimed that they stimulated the economy to bring in all this money, and then they squandered it. That is why we are in the mess we are in today. Self-serving motions of the kind that has been moved by the member for Playford do nothing at all to help our understanding of that. The public needs to be told honestly that wage costs per unit output are far too high. We are not competitive. We made it so, no-one else. Our standard of living is falling compared with those economies that had to drag themselves up by their boot straps.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support this motion, which I will read again, because it seems that members opposite are not addressing the thrust of it and are not saying what the Liberal Party will do when it gets into power—and I think that is extremely important to know.

Mr Matthew: Are you voting for us, too?

Mrs HUTCHISON: No. In fact, no-one will. I am referring to the year 2010, which is probably when you will get there. The honourable member's motion states:

> That this House notes the industrial relations policies of the Liberal Party at the Federal level—

we assume, but we have not yet been told, that those are the policies of the Liberal Party, but I bet my bottom dollar that they are—

> and, in particular, the policies of the Kennett Government . . .

The Kennett Government in Victoria makes no bones about its industrial relations policy. This Opposition has indicated that it supports that policy. There has been much comment, particularly by the member for Mitcham and the member for Murray-Mallee, about the poor old employers, but they do not remember the human face of employment. The human face of employment is starting to come to the fore in New Zealand. What has happened in New Zealand after assessment of the first 12 months—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HUTCHISON: —of the employment contract legislation? I will provide some details of that human face for members opposite who do not care about it and who have indicated that very clearly.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: The member for Bright laughs. That is how important he finds the social implications of this type of legislation. He does not care for his electors, and I hope his electors read this.

Mr MATTHEW: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The member for Stuart will resume her seat.

Mr MATTHEW: The honourable member is attributing invalid motives to me by saying that I do not care. That is clearly not the point, and I ask her to retract that statement.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Stuart to withdraw if her remark offended the honourable member.

Mrs HUTCHISON: If the honourable member finds my remark offensive, I will withdraw it. Twelve months after implementation of the New Zealand employment contract legislation—and I would like the member for Bright to listen to this—what are the human dimensions of what has happened? Again, I hope the member for Bright is listening to this and that he thinks enough of his electors to do so. I refer to some of the information that has come out of New Zealand, and for the benefit of members opposite all this information can be supported. The following examples speak for themselves. They show the deterioration of income for workers who have been denied union representation—and we have a lot of union bashing from members opposite. Why should South Australian workers be forced to accept similar exploitative measures?

I will deal with some special aspects of the New Zealand economy and jobs in certain sectors. In the private health area, new workers coming into a rest home had no choice but to accept the employer's contract which removed overtime and loadings for working at night, at the weekend and on public holidays; all allowances for meals, shift, shoes and stockings, which were previously provided, were removed and a single hourly rate was promoted. New workers who wanted to 'bargain' were not employed, and 16 workers who refused to sign that contract were threatened with the sack. A licensed rest home similarly had a new lower hourly rate reduced to $8 an hour for a 40 hour week without payment of overtime and with no single duty to exceed 12 hours without payment of overtime.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: The honourable member opposite says, 'That's about right'. One of the drastic things that has happened in New Zealand and which it is only just starting to realise is that, if you give people less take home pay, they have less money to buy goods and services, and the New Zealand domestic economy is going downhill at a fast rate of knots. The New Zealand Government did not think about that when it brought in this employment contract legislation. All it thought about was the export markets. I think the domestic market is more important than the export market, and that is the one you should look at. If you cannot sell goods and services on your domestic market, you are in real trouble.

I turn now to some of the ways the contracts have been drawn up. A contract for a licensed rest home was drawn up by an employer with legal advice, and the terms of that contract were as follows:

The employer/employee representative parties to this collective employment contract declare that—

and this is what the worker had to sign—

neither the contract itself or any part of it was procured by harsh and oppressive behaviour or by undue influence or by duress upon any party; and that neither the contract itself nor any part of it was thought to be harsh and repressive when it was entered into and that any allegation to the contrary and any action for relief or compensation commenced for that purpose must be rejected as contrary to the purpose and intent of the contract.

Workers who were already employed and who did not sign that were immediately dismissed. Again, the contract stipulated hourly rates, with no penalty or overtime rates, and there was another clause as follows:

Except with the knowledge and consent of the employer, employees shall not engage in outside employment or business activity which involved such hours of work or physical effort that it would or could be reasonably expected to substantially affect or reduce the quality or quantity of work of the employee.

We are talking about a part-time employment industry, and this was the contract that those employees were forced to sign. I say, 'forced' advisedly, because they were forced to sign that, otherwise they did not have a job. That is what this Liberal Opposition, the Kennet Government in Victoria and the Federal Liberal Opposition want to bring in here. They want to interfere with the private life of employees. They will invade that privacy to the extent of saying, 'You shall not have another job if you are a part-time employee.' I am quite sure, Mr Speaker, that you would object very strongly to that, as I do, because I find that an absolute and utter disgrace. It is absolutely disgraceful. It is not something that we want to see here in South Australia.

In the licensed hotels industry, for example, there are similar efforts to lower wages and conditions, and this type of industry is very susceptible to that. Again, the major thrust is to force workers to sign contracts that remove all penalty rates and reduce wages. Standard contracts from the Hotels Association of New Zealand show that rates of pay were reduced between $10 and $30 per week. That is $10 to $30 a week that those people do not have available to them to put into their domestic economy. That is $10 to $30 a week that the domestic economy of New Zealand does not have to build it up again, and that is why there are so many people drifting away from New Zealand. That is why we have so many people from New Zealand and in fact from all over the world migrating to Australia—yet members opposite tell us that Labor Party policy is not a good policy.

Mr Meier interjecting:

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

Mrs HUTCHISON: There are other illustrations of young people, working as apprentice chefs for 50 hours a week, being paid $50 a week gross—$1 an hour. These facts can be substantiated for the information of the member for Mitcham, who sits there and nods his head. I simply say to him that he can have these facts verified. This worker complained only when he was dismissed for taking three days of sick leave. Even though a doctors certificate was supplied, he was said to be unreliable. These contracts are open-ended in the employers' favour. One of the things that the New Zealand Government said was that the unions could negotiate for the employees. However, it failed to say that the employer had the right of veto over the union's negotiating on behalf of those employees, so it was a very misleading comment for the New Zealand Government to make.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I am amazed that a member such as the member who has just resumed her seat would not at least admit that the Party to which she belongs has plunged this State and the country into great debt, which has created unemployment such as we have not experienced since the Great Depression, and the honourable member talks about how we should go down the path of her Party's industrial relations policy. On top of that, we can add to the workers who are out of work and who do not have any income to spend except that which is granted to them through the tax system by those who do work and earn an income, all those who are encouraged to stay in high school or go to TAFE or some further education through special Federal and State Government grants. I do not deny them that right, but in many cases they looked for a job and could not get one. They could not get a job, so they took the other path to try to be further educated, to the point that now we are educating people when they come out. We still do not have a job for them, and they expect a higher salary than they would have expected before they had that further education, and quite rightly so.

The Labor Party is content to say, 'We want to go on down that path, because we are the greatest thing since sliced bread.' That is what members opposite are telling us. But, out in the streets of this State there are people who want jobs and cannot get them because the system is against them. I challenge members to go out and employ somebody because, if that employee is unsatisfactory, they will see how difficult it is to replace that person in the current industrial climate. Members would see all the hassles one has to go through, where people are encouraged by the union movement to use every loophole possible to claim unfair dismissal, until in the end we have thousands of small operators who say, 'Don't talk to me about employing anybody; I won't touch them. I would sooner have one of my family do extra hours in the business and eliminate the opportunity for others to work.' That is what is happening. The honourable member spoke about others who had cuts of $10 or $30, and it came from some ALP propaganda magazine she was reading from.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: That is right, from the same sort of philosophy as the honourable member. She spoke about people losing that $10 or $30, which they would not have to spend. Does she realise that many businesses cannot borrow money that really came from this country? Even the State Bank was involved, investing overseas, and the money went out of the country. That is where it went, so some of the bosses have been borrowing money that really does not originate in this country to employ people and to try to survive. Many of them got so far into debt that they lost everything. Whenever another business goes

broke in this State, through the industrial laws of this State, through the conditions that prevail, through the economy or through the lack of economic growth that this Government has sought to achieve, what do we hear from members opposite about those who have lost their jobs?

Is there any bleating or weeping as a result of the errors of the State and Federal Governments? No. Instead, they flaunt the circumstances that destroyed those people's job opportunities—$3 000 million out of one organisation—the State Bank—and the interest debt we have to pay because the Treasury had to put the money in. How many capital works projects could have been completed; and how many jobs would that have created if that money had been available?

There is not a whimper from members opposite. They say that because it happened in some other parts of the world we had to go down the same path. We did not have to go down the same path. Water mains are in ruins, public buildings need painting and we need new facilities—all these things would create jobs—but the money is not there. We have a health industry that is in chaos, but the money is not there. It is wrong for the Government to adhere to a philosophy that it claims is the right one, a philosophy that plunged us into these depths. It says that, because somebody wants to change it and create more jobs, more people are involved in trying to get the economy to run again. But what does it offer? Nothing. It has governed in this State for about 20 of the past 25 years.

We know whose fault it is. Members opposite are not prepared to stand up one at a time and say, 'We have made an error; we will step aside and we will give somebody else a go at it because we are sure we cannot do it ourselves.' That is the truth of it. I ask the House to ignore this motion. I do not believe it has any credibility; it carries hypocrisy with it. I would hope that each and every member on the other side stops and thinks about what he or she has done to this State, through their action or inaction.

[*Sitting suspended from 6.1 p.m. to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr S.G. EVANS: Before the dinner break I was saying what most people in Australia are saying: that the ALP has a lot to answer for in bringing this country to its knees and many people to financial ruin and to a life of despondency, not knowing whether there is a future. I want to refer just briefly to a couple of aspects of the motion moved by the member for Playford. We must note that only recently he was suggesting that people on $100 000 should have their salaries looked at. In that context, I wish to refer to the latter part of his motion:

> . . . and also notes the Opposition in South Australia has promised to support similar anti worker, anti union measures aimed at undermining decent standards of living for all South Australian wage and salary earners.

It is interesting that the honourable member is only talking about those earning wages or salaries. There is not one expression of regret for all those who cannot get a job—those denied the right to have a job, a salary or a wage. There is not a word about that. It is the Labor Party that has created the situation that has put so many people on the scrap heap, so the member for Playford dare not mention those people who have been denied the opportunity to have an income.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It is 12 per cent of the whole State.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, 12 per cent; but it is actually more than that, as I explained earlier for the member for Coles: there are people who have been encouraged to go into other fields of learning in the hope that when they come out there will be jobs. It will get worse under the present Government, both Federal and State, in the next year, because a lot of those people will come out of the education system and be thrown on the job market, but the jobs will not be there. Members opposite know it. I am sure that you, Sir, understand what I am saying. These people who did not have jobs were encouraged to take up education which would be to their benefit, but there was no guarantee of jobs at the end—and particularly not in this State. This Government through its lack of good management and its false approach towards managing the economy has let the people down.

On what basis does the member for Playford suggest that the attitude of the Liberal Opposition in South Australia is one of anti worker and anti union measures? I believe in the union movement; I believe in a responsible union movement; I believe that employees have a right to have someone to represent them. I support the Austrian system, where the primary producers are forced to join their particular body, the manufacturers theirs and the salary and wage earners theirs. They have to go to the negotiating table and sit around and work on a problem until they come up with a solution. They have had very few strikes and very little trouble there since their constitution was formed in 1948.

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

Mr HERON (Peake): When I first received my copy of the Hewson industrial relations policy, I thought that I would sit down with it and use my highlighter to mark the sentences that I thought would be detrimental to the workers of Australia. It did not take me long to realise, after the first two pages of that 33-page document, that I had marked every sentence.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HERON: No, I did not carry on with my highlighter because I could see the trend of that policy. It was just slam into workers and take away their just rights. It was also to smash the trade union movement. That policy is about getting rid of the trade union movement. Many people have short memories. There is only one reason why we have the trade union movement in Australia: because unscrupulous employers in the late 1890s were putting the boot into workers, and it started with the shearers' dispute. That flowed on to many other industries. All that workers were asking for was a just wage and reasonable working conditions. That has continued since and now we have a very strong trade union movement that is looking after workers' rights because we know the employers will not do that. I suggest that that has to continue, but the policy put out by Hewson and Howard is intended to turn back the clock, as the Prime Minister said, to slave labour. That is what would eventually happen under a Liberal Government—and hopefully it will never get power—in the Federal arena.

Workers belong to their appropriate trade unions which deal with their problems, but let us not forget that

employers have their trade unions. When an employer wants to get negotiations going or wants to see what he can do, he joins the Employers Federation or the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, which are the employers' trade unions. When a worker has a problem, he can take it to the Industrial Commission, and so can an employer. The judge then decides who is right and who is wrong. That is why we have that very important word 'conciliation'. If there is a dispute, the Industrial Commission can conciliate and see whether an agreement can be reached so that there is no dispute.

It was interesting to hear the member for Mitcham say that all that the Labor Party was pushing for was to maintain its power base with the trade union movement. That is correct: the trade union movement uses the Labor Party, and *vice versa.* That is because it is the only political Party that will look after workers' rights. There is no-one else to whom workers can go, so the Labor Party looks after them as best it can. The member for Mitcham also said that there has to be drastic change. What that document recommends will be drastic change all right. Workers will not have a chance if the Liberals ever get power.

The member for Mitcham said that he was not suggesting that we should work like people in Singapore because they work until midnight on building sites. That is exactly what that document will allow employers to do: get workers to work until midnight and not have their specific breaks. What will happen with regard to the safety of those workers when that comes along? The honourable member also said that we do not have the guts to alter our industrial relations policy. We do not want to alter our industrial relations policy. It is only the Opposition that wants to alter the policy. The policy is working for workers so that they can maintain a good lifestyle, and I hope they will continue to go on forever in that way.

Opposition members also argued about industrial disputes. In the past 10 years the number of industrial disputes has been nearly halved in terms of time lost. That was because agreement was reached with the ACTU and the Trades and Labor Councils around Australia to sit down with employers and work out what we call the wages accord. That wages accord has worked, although not to everybody's satisfaction. Many of the union members are not happy with that wages accord, but in real terms workers took wage cuts to assist employers. Workers also said they would look at work practices and work sites to assist employers. That is what I am saying: workers are doing their bit to help the economic situation in Australia today.

Then the member for Stuart mentioned the horrendous contract situation in New Zealand. That document is saying exactly the same thing: 'If your boss doesn't like your face, tick off out the door; I'll get someone whose face I do like.' When this face comes in all nice, pretty and rosey, the employer will say, 'I'll give you $3 an hour.' What about that? $3 an hour. If this policy ever gets up and an employer decides that they might have to buy, say, a new forklift, they will not go and buy a new forklift: they can employ people on manual labour for $3 an hour. They will bring them in by the hundreds. So, they will think, 'We will not have to spend money on equipment; we'll just get people for $3 an hour.' Then, when they have finished loading whatever they are loading, the employer will again say, 'Thank you very much, see you later.' That is what will happen if that policy gets in.

Last night we debated the workers compensation legislation. What do you think the Liberal Government will do with that Bill if it is elected (and hopefully it will not get in nationally and in this State)? What do you think it will do with the Occupational Health and Safety Act, which we have and which is working very well? Those things will be thrown out the door. The employer will not be worried about having a monthly meeting with his employees to see whether they can improve safety, because one thing will be on their agenda—productivity. That is all it will be: there will be no sitting down and talking to the workers to see whether they can overcome problems; it will all be one-sided.

I hope that the workers never run into this document, because it will not be Hewson's Fightback: it will be the union's fight the sack, because they will all be threatened with the sack. I hope the Liberals do not get in but, if they do, I hope the workers take on the Opposition as hard as they possibly can.

The Opposition loses sight of the fact that workers have fought for many years to get their conditions now. If we ever try to take that away from workers, they will fight twice or three times as hard for something they have fought for nearly 100 years to get, and we will see industrial disputation in this country like we have never seen before. And rightly so, because they did not waste all their time and energy and lose a lot of money to get the just rights and conditions, only to have them taken away. I will be the first one at the front of the line to carry the banner for them if that ever takes place. That is what we all should do.

We must understand that we have never yet heard the Opposition come out and ask, 'What about the workers?' It is all, 'Look after the employer.' There are two sides to making a business: the employer runs it and the worker works it. And both those sides can work together to get their just means. It is about time that the Opposition came out and said, 'Okay, let's mention the workers and what their rights will be.' I have not heard it yet, and I do not expect it.

The member for Playford said, 'We will finish up with slave labour.' That policy is opening the door for employers to do what they want with workers. They will have no-one to turn to. There will be no industrial commissioner. If someone gets sacked unjustly or something goes wrong in the workplace, there will be no-one to go to, because they will try to smash the trade union movement. Let me give the Opposition a tip: you have a bigger fight on your hands than you think if you are going to try to smash the trade union movement in this country, because they will treble their fighting power if an attempt is made to take away their rights from them. I fully support the motion moved by the member for Playford and I hope that it is carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): It gives me great pleasure to support the motion, although, from what the previous speakers on this side of the House have said, I am concerned, if by chance those members opposite eventually sit on the Treasury benches, about the dire

consequences to the workers of this State. Sufficient has already been said about the change in Victoria's industrial relations policy as well as the position at Federal level, but what worries me is this blind following of that line by the Liberal Party in this State. Listening to the member for Davenport, the member for Murray-Mallee or anyone on that side, one would think that anything concocted by Dr Hewson or Mr Kennett was okay by them.

They might not be aware of it but, since the launch of Jobsback, already Federal Liberal backbenchers are growing uneasy about the backlash from the electorate. I do not have to remind the House of the disastrous launch of the Liberal Party's youth policy when about 90 per cent of Australia's adult population protested that they did not want to go back to the days of slave labour.

What happened to their youth policy? It died a natural death. Neither you, Mr Speaker, nor I have heard anything more about it, and it will be the same with Jobsback. With a Federal election due in March or April next year, the Federal Liberal Party will be going into an election with no industrial relations policy, because I predict that Jobsback will quietly fade into the background, just as the youth wages policy did. It has already gone into the background, so the Federal Liberal Opposition will be facing a March or April election next year with no policy direction whatsoever. However, what have we got from members opposite? As I said, we have this parroting that anything that Dr Hewson or Mr Kennett says is okay.

At the moment I am reading a book about the social history of the United Kingdom. The part I am reading now relates to the era starting with the Industrial Revolution and finishing with the infamous Masters and Servants Act in Britain in the nineteenth century. The Jobsback program is identical to that: it is dressed up in some rhetoric; it is said that there will be some independent public servant who will be the arbitrator; everyone will play the game right; and no-one will be any worse off. Mr Speaker, I know that you are only a boy from the Port and, like myself, you have had no tertiary education. We have been—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier should not make presumptions.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I would hate to make presumptions about you, but I recall that at one time you were trying to outdo me when I was trying to place on record my humble beginnings and lack of formal education. You, Sir, were going down the line that anything I could do you could do better.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It seems to me that the member for Napier is casting aspersions not only on you as Speaker but also on every resident of Port Adelaide in describing you as 'only a boy from the Port', as if that were some lesser mortal and not a person to be respected as others are.

The SPEAKER: I understand the point of order that the member for Coles has made. However, I wear the badge—'only a boy from the Port'—with honour and pride, because I do not feel affronted. However, I caution the member for Napier to be careful with his terminology with respect to other members. They may not be as thick-skinned as I am.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I find it interesting that support for the position of Speaker in this House sometimes comes from the most unusual quarters. As for the suggestion that I was reflecting on all the population of Port Adelaide, I point out to the House, as you would be well aware, Sir, that my daughter lives in Port Adelaide and she is the last person upon whom I would reflect.

Returning to the subject of Jobsback, I suggest that it relates to this fig leaf of basic freedom. Jobsback is based on the freedom to choose a job. Under the Liberal policy, an employer gives a prospective employee the terms and conditions, and it is a case of take it or leave it. Taking New Zealand as an example, we know that the conditions are usually so bad that most self-respecting workers leave it, but we also know the pangs of hunger and the problems of providing food and succour for the family. A large proportion of the population is eventually forced to take it, and they do so at a very reduced rate. I refer to a comment in the *Age* of 22 October:

> The moral fig leaf on which Jobsback is based, namely, freedom to choose, is only one of the four basic freedoms, and probably not the most important to workers. As H.R. Tawney said, 'Freedom for the carp is death for the minnow.'

One of the problems with the trade union movement before the Industrial Commission was set up was that strong unions managed to get the best conditions for their workers. Smaller unions fell by the wayside. One of the greatest achievements of the Whitlam Government was to take away that power from the strong unions, which, in effect, were doing enterprise bargaining and getting the best deal for their workers. There was a catch-up period where everything was frozen for those at the top and the workers at the bottom were allowed to catch up so there was wage parity. That has been one of the strengths of the Industrial Commission. I was a toolmaker, and toolmakers were considered to be the elite of the metal trades. However, we earnt less than transport workers because they had more political and trade union muscle. Whitlam changed that; the Industrial Commission changed that.

The Liberal Party will throw that out the window and let the law of the jungle prevail. They always say that they are the champions of the small business person. What will happen to the young lad who works in a deli? What power will he have? The deli owner will just say, 'If you don't accept $2.50 an hour, you don't work.' That is what they want. It is a disaster and, the quicker they realise it, the better for all of us.

Mr VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE BANK

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

That this House views with concern—

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

(b) the composition of the GAMD Board; and

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

and therefore calls on the Treasurer to—

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

management of businesses in receivership; and

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

(Continued from 21 October. Page 978.)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): I would like to address the comments made by the member for Mitcham in support of this motion; one can see the shallowness with which the motion has been conceived and the sort of agenda the Opposition has tried to run around this whole matter of the State Bank. The motion purports to deal with the Group Asset Management Division of the bank. It refers, quite sensibly, to the measures that need to be put into place to ensure that the so-called bad bank, the impaired assets of the bank, are properly dealt with. That is, as the honourable member said in moving his motion, a very important thing as far as the State is concerned, because the success of the Group Asset Management Division, the extent to which it can recoup anticipated losses will, of course, affect the overall use of the indemnity that the State has provided. And while it would be unreasonable to expect the GAMD to make a profit—indeed by its very nature it is structured not to make a profit, in that we have separated the profitable activities of the bank from the unprofitable liabilities that it has—nonetheless, the way in which that division operates is absolutely crucial to overall financial performance.

In moving his motion, the honourable member focused on a couple of aspects of the Group Asset Management Division. First, he wanted to criticise the way in which the bank has been operating up to now in terms of attempting to recoup, as much as possible, the losses to ensure that the impaired assets are worked out in the most favourable way. In criticising that, he chose a number of specific examples, and I think the words he used were that 'the bank was acting as some sort of bully boy; that it was taking a very hard line; that there were people who would come to the bank with reasonable work-out propositions and they were being told by the bank, "We are not interested in that; we are going to sell you up tomorrow, or put you into receivership, or do anything else to get the maximum return we can".' The point the honourable member was making was that in some cases, by taking that hard line, it might be incurring a greater loss or a lesser recovery than if it were a little more amenable.

When we look at the range and complexity of the issues the bank is dealing with, while I think it is true that some care has to be taken in that area, we cannot really have it both ways, because the very member who is taking these individual cases and saying, 'Look at the hard line the bank is taking; look at how rigorously it is pursuing its financial return' is exactly the member who, in a broader or more general context, is attacking the bank for its lack of rigour, for its lack of attention to these things. It seems to me to be an extraordinary criticism. It is a totally inconsistent line to take. Either we want the bank to be making a maximum recovery—and, if it does, that obviously benefits the taxpayers of South Australia, who own the bank and who are providing the couple of billion dollars indemnity to the bank—and, in so doing, to ensure that it gets the highest return possible, or we want it to be some sort of beneficial organisation that is very sensitive to the plight that individuals find themselves in and takes a very easy and reasonable line. But we cannot have it both ways.

I believe that one of the essential points that the honourable member has to answer in his summing up of this debate will be: where does he stand on this issue? It is outrageous to castigate the bank on the one hand, and bring up these individual issues, for its lack of rigour and, equally on the other hand, to say that it should be much more reasonable and soft in particular cases.

For my part, and I suggest from the Government's point of view as well, I would like to see some sort of balance. Yes, we do want a business-like and rigorous approach to be taken, but equally we would expect the bank necessarily to have regard for the personal plight of its clients and to try to come out with the best possible solution. Just to produce isolated examples over the whole range of cases with which the bank is dealing is not good enough, as far as I am concerned. One can always emotionally present a particular case and have everyone say, 'Yes, that sounds right. The bank is being very tough in this matter.' The honourable member calls them bully boys, and that might be right, but we never have the full case put before us. I know, because I have actually investigated a number of these cases.

I have heard the facts as presented to me either by a member of the public directly or by the Opposition. I have pursued it with the bank and discovered that there is another side to the story. The person who seems to have been given a very hard time by the bank has a long history and record of ignoring notices, failing to make payments or whatever. I am not saying that this is so in all cases, and I am not saying that there are not genuine cases that need to be put up, but time and again that has been the experience. So, the honourable member does himself a gross disservice in beginning his argument around this case by using those specific examples in the way he does, because he does not present both sides of the story. I do not intend to compound the error by presenting another side of the story, although in at least one of those cases I know for a fact that he has not produced a balanced picture at all.

The question is then asked, 'What should be done?' I say that there are really two stages that should be gone through. If the member for Mitcham, who moved this motion, any of his colleagues or any other members of Parliament have particular examples of cases of hardship or of someone who has come to them and said, 'We are being hassled by the bank; we are being given a hard time and we would like this looked at,' the first step—and most importantly the first step—should be to take up that matter with the bank or the Treasurer individually. The bank firstly, because the bank has said time and again, 'We are prepared to receive submissions from members of Parliament. We are prepared to brief the Opposition.'

The member for Mitcham knows full well that he got a number of fairly detailed and intensive briefings over the years. They were used very selectively indeed. When it suited members of the Opposition to have a sensational case that they thought might be spoiled by knowing the facts, they rejected any briefing. Members opposite got up in this place and, under the full glare of the television

lights and with the protection of parliamentary privilege, they put one side of the case on the record. They got their pound of flesh and publicity out of it but, when the case was more closely examined, it was discovered that it was not as black and white or as cut and dried as they had suggested.

Did they back down, apologise or retract? No, they simply ignored it and went on to the next one, but the damage had been done in that case. My challenge to the honourable member and his colleagues if they come across one of these cases is, first, to take it up in the right channels and in the right way, to take it up with the bank, which would be only too pleased to examine the case and give its side of the story or, if they do not feel that is satisfactory, to take it up with the Treasurer. It is only after having done that and having explored it fully in that way that I believe they have a legitimate right to raise the matter under parliamentary privilege in this place. If they are genuine, if they are not trying to use this issue as a general attack on the bank or the Government but, in fact, to assist the people who have come to them, that is the only reasonable way in which to do it: by private treaty before it is given public exposure.

Time and again members opposite have demonstrated that they have no interest whatsoever in that aspect. They want publicity and headlines—it does not matter at what expense—and therefore the problem is not resolved because, as we know, the response of the bank which has made the decision is to take a defensive posture and to make it much harder for settlement or agreement to be reached. So, let us have no hypocrisy on this. The honourable member should be fair dinkum. If these are genuine hard cases he should have first gone through the proper channels and tried to solve them, and only if he felt at the end of the day that he could not get anywhere should he have raised them publicly. Time and again we have fixed those issues. There are many examples of issues that have been fixed in that way, and very few examples of their having been fixed by the aggressive confrontation tactics of the member for Mitcham and his colleagues.

I turn now to the second aspect of the honourable member's argument: that the persons who constitute the board of the Government Asset Management Division are insufficiently qualified and need greater expertise. I think that is a bit rough. Certainly, they have very high responsibility and need a high level of expertise, but the way in which the honourable member simply brushes aside the experience and background of these individuals indicates that he is not acting in the best of faith. He deliberately, it seems, refuses to accept that the actual hands-on working through of these accounts, the dealings with the customers, the working through of impaired assets needs to be done but not by the board. The board is there to supervise overall policies and direction, not to engage face to face with the clients. That must be done by those who are employed for that purpose in the division.

The honourable member does not in any way attempt to analyse their qualifications and expertise; and in doing so he short-changes the GAMD quite considerably. He says that three members of the board are not enough. As I think the Treasurer said at the time, the board can be supplemented. The honourable member then goes on to analyse the three members. He says that the board is comprised of 'a Mr Ruse, who will be Chairman'. The honourable member knows very well, because he has dealt with this individual, that he is not 'a Mr Ruse', whom one dismisses in that way. Contrary to what the honourable member says, Mr Ruse has a very good track record with the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust. Its investment performance and return to members is in the top bracket of funds throughout Australia. That has been explained and put—

Mr Brindal: That is not what the *Advertiser* says.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member interjects: 'That is not what the *Advertiser* says.' He is underlining what I am saying. The very fact that the *Advertiser* does not say it, indicates that he must be in the top bracket, and that is what the record shows. Mr Ruse has had an extremely long association with public financing as General Manager of SAFA and as General Manager of the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust he has shown that he can perform. So, that is 'a Mr Ruse'.

Another member of the board is the Deputy Crown Solicitor, Mr Robert Martin. This is how the honourable member treats him: 'I am told that Mr Martin is quite competent.' Who by and under what circumstances? What an extraordinary thing: he has been told that he is competent. Is not that sort of patronising analysis encouraging to Mr Martin.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Indeed. The honourable member goes on to ask what the Deputy Crown Solicitor is doing there. He is there because he has expertise in this field. If he were not there, the honourable member would be asking why. Finally, he picks on the third member. He says, 'There is a person by the name of Glidden,' who is actually the well-known former General Manager of the South Australian Brewing Corporation, who was very successful and left only after the takeovers and rationalisation. This is a person who has been on the bank board attending to these very problems in a hands-on way and who has received broad praise in industry for so doing; a person very well qualified to be on the board. And to be dismissed in this arrogant and affected way by the honourable member is quite outrageous. I suggest that this motion is very badly conceived, and the arguments surrounding it are quite outrageous. They are aimed at making political capital and at making the GAMD task harder, not aimed at assisting the essential process. By all means let the Auditor-General be involved, but that is as far as it goes.

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

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FARMERS FEDERATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House notes the change of name of the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia to the South Australian Farmers Federation and wishes that organisation every success in the future.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 683.)

Mr VENNING (Custance): I wish to thank briefly those who participated in this debate. There is no point in continuing the debate, as I would like a quick decision, and I am confident that the House will agree. I was concerned that the contribution of the member for Napier was a little negative. In commenting on the name change, he asked what benefit there would be to the members of the federation. It is very much a pedantic argument, but the whole reason for changing the name was to bring about national conformity and to save the confusion of members, since there is a national affiliate, the National Farmers Federation, and it was commonsense that the name of the old UF&S should change to become the South Australian Farmers Federation.

It fits obviously and correctly with the National Farmers Federation. I thought it rather strange and very nitpicking for the member for Napier to take the line that he did, and I was surprised. I know that the member for Napier classes himself as the biggest landholder on that side of the House, and I thought that he would have been more constructive and helpful to the argument. However, I was not particularly enamoured of what he had to say. It is of great benefit to all members who choose to belong to the South Australian organisation to realise that there is a Federal affiliate.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr VENNING: As the member for Gilles interjects, no doubt most trade unions have Federal affiliation, and the name change fits in quite naturally with that. The member for Napier also stated that members in this State were being swallowed up by the national organisation. I thought that that was quite a ridiculous point of view because, as I said, members are State members and the nationally affiliated body is only the body that represents them, and the members who make up the National Farmers Federation are part and parcel of the States. I thought that that was quite a ridiculous argument to take on.

The member for Napier is a landholder, and I thought that he would have been more constructive. I know the member for Napier's point of view on scabs, and as a landholder I thought that he ought to be a member. I challenge him in this place to become a member of the South Australian Farmers Federation. I have already invited him to do so privately and now in this House I invite him to put his money where his mouth is and become a member. I commend this motion to the House.

Motion carried.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD

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

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

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

(Continued from 21 October. Page 983.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): When I moved my amendment to this motion last Wednesday I indicated the steps the Government had taken to develop a traffic diversion strategy in the event of a blockage on the Mount Barker Road following a semitrailer accident. At that time I also gave some statistics which indicated the scale of the actual problem along the Mount Barker Road. Those statistics clearly indicated that the problem with semitrailer accidents indeed far less than one would gather from the member for Heysen's speech. Tonight I want to continue by outlining the work the Government has undertaken during the past five years to improve the Mount Barker Road, because about $7.7 million has been spent on improving the section of the Mount Barker Road between the tollgate and Eagle on the Hill. I would like to put on the record exactly what work has been undertaken by the Government in this regard.

The Department of Road Transport has improved vehicle road holding and stability, and a number of measures have been undertaken. First, there was the regrading and reshaping of the Devil's Elbow to prevent laden trucks overturning; that is the most significant problem spot with semitrailer accidents. There has also been resurfacing with an open graded friction course and the installation of additional drains to prevent aquaplaning and to improve drainage on the Mount Barker Road. I should point out that the open graded friction course has had the added benefit of greatly improving the visibility of traffic lane markings in wet weather, which is a problem with this stretch of road.

The work undertaken in the past five years also includes the improvement of roadway delineation and sight distance, and there have been a number of measures in this regard. Road lighting has been installed along the length of the road and that has certainly been a great improvement, particularly during fog, which often occurs on that section of road. There has been the installation of additional warning signs along the road, vegetation obstructing drivers' view of the road has been removed, access to abutting private properties has been upgraded and additional raised pavement markers have been installed along sections of the road.

Work has also been undertaken to reduce the opportunity of vehicles to collide, for example, by reducing the number of median openings along that section of Mount Barker Road and by the installation of sheltered turn lanes, as well as safe pause areas for vehicles making U-turns. There has also been work to reduce the consequences of vehicles losing control.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: We will come to the koalas in a moment. First, we had the installation of barriers, and I believe that the New Jersey concrete median barriers that have been installed along the Mount Barker Road represent the first case where such barriers have been installed in Australia. These were installed because of the tight curvature of the road, the high vehicle speeds and the large commercial vehicle content of the traffic on this road.

If one drives down the road and sees the tyre marks all over those barriers, one can see just how successful they have been in preventing vehicles from drifting across the

road, thereby presenting the opportunity for head-on collisions, so they have been a very successful measure. Allied to that has been the shielding of the ends of these new barriers with crash cushions which have been especially imported from the United States. The crash cushions have now been hit several times and already these have saved motorists' lives.

A further measure is the upgrading of the shoulder guard fence to current standards and the installation of additional guard fence where appropriate. There has also been the reshaping of concrete side drains so that vehicles encroaching into them do not overturn, as was often the case previously. There has also been the widening and sealing of road shoulders along this stretch of road. I should point out that installation of concrete median barriers along the entire length of the Mount Barker Road was not possible, because sections of the roadway were too narrow and because of the costs and impracticality of widening the roadway.

There was also the need to preserve median openings in the vicinity of Eagle on the Hill because of the commercial enterprises along that stretch of road. The other measure that has been taken by the Government in the past five years to improve the Mount Barker Road is the improvement of access to emergency services and minimising delays to traffic in the event of an accident or breakdown. Several measures have been taken to achieve this. First, there is the installation of additional emergency telephones, and the department has ensured that these telephones are the latest vandal-proof design. In fact, Department of Road Transport staff assisted Telecom in developing this design.

There has also been the provision of openings in the new concrete median barrier to enable police to divert traffic to the opposing carriageway to bypass an accident. Of course, that also enables emergency services to gain easier and quicker access to the accident site. The other measure that the Government has taken is to reduce the likelihood of accidents involving large commercial vehicles by, for example, upgrading the safety ramp—the one just west of the Mount Osmond Road—to increase its effectiveness for large vehicles. There has also been the installation of truck parking bays along the freeway to permit drivers to rest before starting the descent to Adelaide.

They are the measures that the Government has undertaken during the past five years. As I said, about $7.7 million has been spent to improve this stretch of road. There is also further work to be undertaken within the next few months in the vicinity of Concrete Corner. A concrete median barrier and associated crash cushions will be installed to prevent head-on accidents. That will be continued on the lower section of the road.

There will also be the installation of a wire rope safety fence on the roadside to redirect vehicles losing control on this particular curve. The proponents of this safety barrier claim that it is easier and less costly to repair than the normal guard fence used by the department. However, the generally tight curvature of this road means that there are very few locations where the wire rope safety fence would be appropriate. A prototype section of this safety barrier has already been installed in a less demanding location alongside the Main North Road at Smithfield. That work will be undertaken within the next few months.

Finally, I indicate that some other measures are under investigation by the Department of Road Transport for Mount Barker Road. An in-depth study is being undertaken of the accidents on this road before and after the recent major upgrading to determine whether any other change or upgrading is required to the existing road. In addition, the department will be looking to see whether any traffic control or policing measures would be helpful in reducing the accident rate and the severity of accidents on the road. Also being examined is the possibility of installing a new type of high containment wire rope safety barrier in the vicinity of the Kavel lookout and other selected locations to improve the safety of large commercial vehicles.

Further, overseas research regarding the overturning of large commercial vehicles is being examined to determine whether the findings are appropriate to this road and, if so, whether reshaping of sections of the road would be beneficial. I have outlined a number of measures that the Government has undertaken along this stretch of road.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: The member for Heysen may well care to trivialise what has been done. But, I would like to read to him an article in the Wednesday 14 October Mount Barker *Courier*—his local newspaper—and some of the comments made by residents of that area about what they think of him and the road project. The article, headed, 'It's not the road—it's the speed', states:

> Truck drivers who travel on Mount Barker Road believe the problems are not caused by the road . . . but by speed.
>
> . . . 'I don't think it's the road, there's nothing wrong with it,' said one. 'There's mad blokes driving . . . both cars and trucks. In such a hurry they won't wait for anyone. I'm driving a 20 to 24 tonne truck down that road almost every day and you just can't afford to drive fast. It's a two lane road, what more do they want?'

Another driver states:

> Most drivers will say the same thing . . . there's too many people driving too fast . . . The road is fine.

What did the editorial of the Mount Barker *Courier* say about the suggestion put forward by the member for Heysen? It states:

> Several million dollars have been spent on upgrading the worst sections, widening Devil's Elbow, putting in the New Jersey-style median barriers, lighting, emergency phones, etc.

It also states:

> It would seem obvious that if the overall amount of traffic were reduced at peak times by removing heavy vehicles, then the remaining traffic would flow more smoothly and safely. But the consequences before and after peak times could well be worse, with drivers either speeding to beat the curfew, or with large numbers travelling together afterwards. And to restrict times when trucks could use the road could have a serious impact on industry.

So much for the views of the member for Heysen. The conclusion of this editorial reads:

> Sure, a new road would be wonderful . . . but many things are more urgent. In the meantime, we could all drive a little more slowly and get there just the same—remember the hare and the tortoise!

It would seem that the exercise indulged in by the member for Heysen is simply to generate a bit of publicity in his area, but unfortunately it has back-fired. Even his colleague, the member for Davenport, was not exactly complimentary to his views last week when he

seconded this motion. It seems to me that the member for Heysen has obviously gone off half-cocked on this particular measure. In fact, a lot of money has been spent by this Government on improving the road. The statistics in relation to road safety speak for themselves.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Ferguson:

That this House—

(a) supports the motor car industry in South Australia;

(b) views with concern the statement by the Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors that Mitsubishi would walk away from a $100 million engine plant in South Australia if a Coalition Government imposed its zero tariff policy;

(c) agrees that a zero tariff policy will destroy incentive to invest in the industry;

(d) calls upon all members to support a call to the Coalition leaders to drop this anti-development policy and to support the retention of jobs in the industry; and

(e) calls upon the Leader of the Opposition to jointly sign a letter of protest with the Premier.

(Continued from 14 October. Page 841.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): When I was last speaking I was cut off in my prime in the analysis of this motion. I had outlined some of the great problems that faced Australia and the contribution that Federal and State Governments have made to the health and well-being of the motor vehicle industry. It should be put on the record, in the few minutes that I have left, that if we looked at what has happened in South Australia we could have no confidence that there would be any motor vehicle industry left by the end of this century anyway. In the past two years, under the stewardship of the member for Ross Smith and now Premier Arnold, this State has lost 38 000 jobs. Of those, about 21 400 have been in manufacturing. We do not have a proud record on which to fall back. We have not had a period of excellence and success that we could say has put the motor vehicle industry at the forefront of achievement in this country and that it will go on and on without change.

We have already heard that Nissan is pulling out of Australia. We know that the motor vehicle industry is going through very difficult times, as are most parts of the manufacturing industries of this country. In respect of the defensive motion before us, moved by the member for Henley Beach, we can only ask: of what assistance has the Government been to the motor vehicle industry? The record speaks for itself. The Federal Government has been tearing down the tariff barriers without putting in the reforms that will allow them to be competitive internationally. They are not even competitive on the local front. We pay an extraordinary price for cars in this country because of the protection that has been proliferated, originally for some very good reasons. As an economic student during the 1960s one of my studies was on the motor vehicle industry. It was quite clear at that stage, and Professor Hancock—

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): Order! The honourable member will have an early minute if he keeps up that behaviour.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Professor Hancock was one of my excellent tutors on the subject of labour and industrial development. He made the point very strongly that, if Australia depended on its tariff barriers, our standard of living would decline, because you cannot increase the productivity of an industry when it is protected behind walls. But if you tear down those walls, you must institute reforms to allow the process of change to take place. What we have seen in this country—and every member on the other side understands it—is a Federal Government tearing down the tariff barriers but providing no protection whatsoever for our manufacturing industry.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Manufacturing is going through its worst time since the Second World War. Manufacturing is not increasing its capacity to compete on open markets because of the way this Government is running the country; and it is being done with the full support of the new Arnold Government here in South Australia. When members put motions before this House, they should at least make sure that they are sensible, and they should look at their implications. It is no good for the Premier to go bleating to Canberra saying, 'Look, you are doing the wrong thing: you should be protecting our motor vehicle industry.' Has he put out a strategic plan to protect our motor vehicle industry? Has he proposed changes to the industrial relations system to assist car makers? Of course he has not. He goes over there and says, 'Look Paul, seriously, it could cause problems if you keep tearing down tariff barriers as you are doing at the moment.' Not one constructive contribution has been made to improve this country's industry. We know that we will improve with the right Government.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): In some of the motions that have been debated today and in some of the debates that are occurring in the community we have seen, on different fronts, the whole area of Fightback under attack. With regard to the goods and services tax, Fightback has come under severe attack by all the major churches, by the tourism industry and generally by the business industry itself. Jobsback was launched only within the past week and already, apart from tacit approval by the employers in the early days after the hype at the $100-a-plate dinner, doubts are coming in from that area and also from the trade union movement.

Tariff policy, with which this motion deals, has been under severe attack by all the major car manufacturers, yet what reaction have we had from Dr Hewson and his cohorts who make up the Federal Liberal Party in Canberra? Everyone, regardless of their credentials, has had to suffer a sniping attack from Hewson and his mates who say, 'How dare they criticise Fightback, Jobsback, and our tariff policy.' The Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors in effect said that, if the Hewson Liberal Party got in and introduced its zero tariff policy, Mitsubishi would walk away from a $100 million engine plant in South Australia. Not a word was said about that; in fact, the Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors suffered a scathing attack on his credibility by Hewson. Every other major car manufacturer who has had the temerity—as far as Hewson is concerned—to question the zero tariff policy of the Hewson coalition has suffered the same treatment as the Managing Director of Mitsubishi

Motors. The Federal Liberal Party even tried to cloud the issue by saying there is no difference between the current Federal Labor Government's policy on tariffs and its own.

Not once, and I have watched the news broadcasts and read the newspapers, have we had any criticism, of the Federal Labor Government's tariff policy, because the car manufactures know that they can work within that tariff policy. We have heard nothing new from the member for Mitcham. The only new thing I have learnt is that once he was a student of economics. If the member for Mitcham was a student of economics, then I am glad I did not get passed fifth grade because, if he is a product of what the universities were turning out in the 60s, the Liberal Party deserves what it has got. I know that you, Mr Acting Speaker, are a farmer and wish the best for your children, and I once recall that you and I were talking and found that we had similar backgrounds. I came from a place 12 000 miles away, off to lunch with the Queen, while you did not have that pleasure, but basically we come from the same backgrounds.

If the member for Mitcham is representative of the economic thinking of not only the State Liberal Party but also the Federal Liberal Party, no wonder they are now under attack from every major organisation that would be affected by the tariff policy. Always we get from members opposite, whether in regard to this or any other motion, that the Labor Party created mass unemployment, so how dare we attack a policy that will make our present level of unemployment seem minor.

It seems to me that, despite having all the major world newspapers available in the Library, the thinking of the State Liberal Party seems to end at Ceduna in the west and at Bordertown in the east. The Liberal Party does not even know that the rest of Australia exists let alone in the rest of the world. The Liberal Party does not seem to realise that there is a recession throughout the western world and in fact throughout the whole world. Because we have a recession and are a victim, along with all the other States and countries and because we have unemployment—which is far too high and no-one has any argument against that—the Liberal Party believes it is entitled to argue, and I might say in a very shallow manner, for its tariff policy.

I predict that before we go to a Federal election in March or April the Liberal Party in Canberra will do a backflip on its tariff policy, on its goods and service tax and on Jobsback, and that it will officially do a backflip on its youth wage policy because, as I said earlier tonight, we have heard nothing more from the Liberal Party about its youth policy. When that happens I look forward to the honours student in economics having the decency to stand up and say, 'What I said on 28 October was all wrong.

There has been a change in policy and my guru is telling me that what I said on 28 October is all wrong and we now have a different policy.' Members opposite might find what I, a member of the Labor Party, am about to say rather strange. There is every good chance, given the way the people feel about the Federal Labor Party, that the Keating Government will lose the next election. However, as a result of this dogmatic refusal to do anything about it—

Mr Quirke: Arrogance.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Playford, because arrogance is the right word. By refusing to listen to the pleas of the churches, the tourism industry, Mitsubishi, Ford Australia and General Motors-Holden's, the Coalition will find that it will be taken away from them. It deserves to have it taken away because all the policies under Fightback favour one class—the elitist, wealthy class. Make no mistake. The poor, the disadvantaged, and all the people who represent them, whether they be in Government agencies or non-Government agencies, will go by the board. The Liberal Party has always been a Party of the elite, a Party that promotes selfishness and greed. Its tariff policy is part of that overall philosophy. It is unfortunate that you, Sir, being a Liberal, have to listen to that because I do not classify you in the way that I classify the others. If they go along with this zero tariff policy, the motor car industry in this State is stuffed.

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

TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Holloway:

That this House calls for a moratorium on tariff reductions, particularly for the motor vehicle and textile, clothing and footwear industries, until the national economy has recovered and it can be demonstrated that those industries are in a position to withstand any such reductions.

(Continued from 14 October. Page 852.)

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): This motion is not dissimilar to one to which the member for Napier just spoke, although selectively, as Labor members do. The simple fact is that there are more than tariffs to the Fightback question. What the Labor Party conveniently overlooks is the abolition of some six taxes. For example, wholesale sales tax, which is levied at varying rates up to 30 per cent, is to be abolished. It is the hidden tax that every one of us pays every time we go to the supermarket and when we buy a range of goods and services. That tax is already built into the price of those commodities. We are paying the tax; it is Labor's invisible tax.

Prime Minister Keating was rolled by Bob Hawke in a motel room during the tax summit when he wanted to introduce a broad-based consumption tax. Keating got it right in 1983, because Australia needed such a tax to re-establish incentive in the workplace. He wanted to change the taxation system in Australia. That is what he sought to do but Bob Hawke did not let him get away with it. With his ACTU mates, Hawke rolled Paul Keating, so he had to retreat from a broad-based consumption tax and, since then, he has broadened the net of the wholesale sales tax system. Keating has increased the income from wholesale sales tax by three- or four-fold over that time. He has increased the hidden, invisible tax on Australians, soaking up the taxation structure.

Mr Blacker: There is 20 per cent on toilet paper.

Mr OLSEN: One could hardly describe that as a luxury. It is a basic commodity in most households, irrespective of how wealthy you are, and it makes a nonsense of what the honourable member for Napier was

saying about the taxation thrust and approach of the coalition Parties. We will abolish wholesale sales tax; that hidden tax, that invisible tax will go. In addition to that, we will abolish the fuel excise. It has been well demonstrated in Adelaide today that every time the average family fills up the tank of their car they will be saving some $11 per fill. For the average family car, that represents a reduction of 19c a litre. If you are a business operator or a business person you will have a tax credit on that, and it will be a saving of 26c a litre. It is a simple fact that the cost of fuel wends its way into all the goods and services we buy. It is a part of the transport system, it is part of the cost of production, part of the cost of distribution of those goods and services and that wends its way into the price we pay for the end product.

Payroll tax will be abolished. I can remember the member for Ross Smith when he was Premier standing up and saying, 'We have got to get rid of payroll tax. I will lead the charge to Canberra. I will get Bob Hawke and Paul Keating to ensure that we get rid of payroll tax, the great disincentive to job opportunities in Australia.' What did the Premier achieve, apart from all the words? There was no action, no result. The coalition policies will abolish payroll tax and make a commensurate payment to the States to ensure that they are not out of pocket in relation to the abolition of payroll tax. I hope the member for Ross Smith contributes to this debate, because it will be interesting to see how he is going to retreat from the position of wanting the abolition of payroll tax and then supporting the Keating thrust of maintaining payroll tax, the great disincentive to jobs in this country.

Lump sum superannuation tax will be abolished. The training guarantee levy will be abolished. Custom duties will be abolished. Coal export duty will be abolished. They are the seven taxes that go on 1 October 1994 with a coalition Government. In line with that, for 95 per cent of Australians there will be a reduction in personal income tax so that they are paying less than 30c in the dollar. What the coalition is attempting to achieve is this: of the money people earn they keep more in their pocket and pay the broad-based goods and services tax at 15 per cent. Yes, they pay it as they spend it. So, the decision is yours as to the level of tax you pay. The decision is not made by some Parliament in Canberra, taking the tax away and not giving you the opportunity to make that determination yourself. So, 95 per cent of Australians will have a greater take-home pay. Let us look at this GST and the 15 per cent that the Labor Party keeps talking about. The simple fact is that by the time you abolish—

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Because it is part of the Fightback package. Members opposite selectively pick one component from the Fightback package and do not look at the offsetting components of it: the benefits to business, the offsetting microeconomic reforms or the reduction in business costs for those business operators. They want to ignore that because it is a good news story for business, it is a good news story for job opportunities in those business operations in Australia—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Yes, coupled with industrial relations, which is another component of the total package. The simple fact is that the reduction in the taxation system is putting back the incentive for people to work longer and harder, to achieve greater productivity, more take-home pay and a higher level of retained earnings. That is the principle behind the thrust of the Fightback package that the coalition is putting forward. There is a range of other benefits, and let me mention this point in relation to the 15 per cent that is talked about.

Even the Federal Treasury has indicated that, by the time we abolish the six or seven taxes that are currently in the system, that are currently on the goods that we are buying in the supermarket, the net increase in the cost of goods for the average Australian will be 4.4 per cent—not 15 per cent. That is the Federal Treasury figure and you cannot argue with it. That 4.4 per cent is more than compensated for by the greater take-home pay and retained earnings as a result of the reduction in the tax scale. One might say, 'Well, what about the pensioners? What about the superannuants? How will they be affected by the Fightback package and this broad-based consumption tax?

The simple fact is that any pensioner or superannuant will have a one-off 8 per cent increase in their pension cheque, and other people on social security benefits will have a one-off 6 per cent increase in their entitlement, more than offsetting the 4.4 per cent nominated by the Treasury as the additional cost as a result of the Fightback package proposed by John Hewson and the Coalition team. Coupled with that, not only are those benefits within the community where there is a greater cash flow and greater disposable income, we come to the situation of motor vehicles, where we have the most aged population of motor vehicles of any Western country and democracy.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We are well used to the furphies of the member for Ross Smith who, for 10 years, has led South Australia down the path of the State with the highest debt in this country, and has bankrupted this State. It is with an absolute hide that he can come into this Chamber and make interjections such as that. The member for Ross Smith used $2 million of taxpayers' funds to buy the last State election, which he got with 47 per cent, when members on this side got 52.4 per cent. I am amazed that he has the absolute hide to come into this Chamber—

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My point of order, Sir, is that—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My point of order is that the 1989 State election result has nothing to do with these tariff policies.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The member for Ross Smith.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, and I am delighted to follow the former Senator who, unlike a number of his colleagues sitting beside him, at least is consistent in the approach that he has taken and has argued his policies firmly. He has not done the flip-flops and jumps around as those who wish to prefer themselves up the front bench have

done. He had the unfortunate experience of being dudded by his colleagues on his triumphant return to this Chamber. Be that as it may, I regret to see him sitting there. I think he would be far more effective back in the Senate in Canberra, because he obviously has the fire and zeal for the Federal Opposition's Fightback package. An important element of that is to have no regard whatever for the interests of South Australia, so perhaps the Senate is not the appropriate place. Canberra certainly is, but whether it is the Senate is another matter.

This motion is about tariffs—in particular, the impact of the current plans on textile clothing and footwear and the motor vehicle industry. We have covered this topic in various ways and from various directions. The former Senator, the member for Kavel, decided to deal with it on the basis of the Fightback package, and well he might, because the only justification for the outrageously anti-South Australian attitude being taken by some members opposite must be that the Fightback package, which sees this zero tariff option adopted, will deliver all sorts of marvellous benefits that somehow will outweigh or create the jobs that will be displaced by the tariff policies of the Federal Opposition.

If one analyses the structure of the South Australian economy and sees the impact of that, understanding that whatever else may happen in other parts of Australia—and it will be fairly devastating there—will happen to an even greater extent in South Australia, it makes it irresponsible but, as I say, at least the member for Kavel is consistent in his support.

Let me just deal quickly with his way into this tariff issue, which is to justify the Fightback package. Of course, he refers to Prime Minister Keating's adoption of the broad-based consumption tax (BBCT) at the tax summit in the mid-80s. Yes, that is very true, and it is there on the record, but let me put the record straight, because I was there and I was involved in those discussions. I did not support the BBCT then; nor indeed did the unions, as the honourable member highlights, and nor did large elements of the business community in this country. The Business Council of Australia representatives at that tax summit threw their weight against the broad-based consumption tax. They did not accept it.

Some of their members no doubt are prepared to endorse the elements that have been put together in the Fightback package, but we know that many of them are not. A lot of the big movers and shakers in industry in this country will not accept it. That was a crucial factor in its rejection at that tax summit—not backroom deals or Hawke sitting on Keating or whatever. The fact is that the broad-based consumption tax did not have broad-base support, and it did not have that support from industry, either.

Fightback does not have that support, and nor should it, because in the intervening years since that proposal was put forward much has happened. This is the tragedy of the Liberal Party. It is locked out of Government and it is returning to the remedies of the 1970s to try to cobble a program together. It is a tragedy for Australia. It is presenting a vision that is locked in time in some previous era that has long since gone.

For instance, the tax regimen of the mid 1980s was filled with loopholes, evasion and the industry of tax avoidance, which was a scandal in this country. Progressively, those loopholes have been closed. The fringe benefits tax was abolished, and the Opposition would not accept that. The capital gains tax was introduced, and the Opposition carried on about that. The scene has changed drastically. We have a fairer and more efficient tax system than we had then, and consequently the need for the broad-based consumption tax envisaged at that stage has, I would suggest, disappeared. The Opposition is still locked back in that era—revisiting the past.

Mention was made of the Opposition's industrial relations policy. If ever there was a policy that could be seen as being based on industry attitudes and a perception of what happened in the workplace of the 1970s, it is that. Members opposite have ignored union amalgamations, restructuring and workplace bargaining; they are back somewhere in an era of the 1970s when John Howard and others had some sort of direct experience on which they are trading, and they are presenting that as a remedy for the 1990s. It is totally destructive, not just to the tourist industry and a number of other key job creators but to our basic manufacturing industry, and that is surely what we should be talking about in this debate.

One should remember that the GST will raise more than half of what income tax raises at the moment. It is a big fat slug. To talk about those various other taxes that will be abolished as some sort of balance is an absolute fraud. Indeed, wholesale sales tax will be reduced in some cases, but do we want to bring down the price of Ferraris in order to raise the price of food? That is what the GST does. Do we want to place on restaurants a major imposition on their costs (because they are not affected by wholesale sales tax)? Of course not! But that is what the GST does. Petrol tax is a good one: it will not bring down the cost of air transport in Australia, because Dr Hewson made the mistake of thinking that aviation users of fuel actually paid a fuel franchise as well. They do not; indeed, that is a direct impost on air transport in this country, and that will result in air fares rising by 8 per cent to 10 per cent under the GST.

As far as the ordinary person at the petrol pump is concerned, the fact is that the Opposition proposes road user charges under Fightback. Do we know what they are? Do we know what they mean? They will impose generally the direct cost on road users of all the road works in this country, irrespective of where those costs lie, how recovery occurs and the efficiencies of the various systems.

South Australia and the Northern Territory are the two most efficient States and Territories in the country. Those costs will be imposed generally, and that will more than cancel out any reduction in fuel costs. Increased road user charges will be the biggest shock to the system we have ever seen; so, do not fall for that. Payroll tax should be abolished, but 85 per cent of businesses in this country do not pay a cent of payroll tax. What benefit is it to small and medium businesses of which the member for Kavel and others claim to be the champion? They will get nil, zero, nothing at all.

We could go through all those areas, but let us get to the nub of this argument: the destruction of our manufacturing industry if we run riot on this tariff question. As the member for Mitchell said in moving the motion, we want tariff reform and reduction, but is this the time to do it in this wholesale way? The answer is 'No'. The plans for the car industry and the textile, clothing and footwear industries and the general tariff area in Australia were devised at a time when recovery was being promised.

We thought that we would see major growth in the economy nationally and internationally, but that has not occurred. When, in the March 1991 industry statement Prime Minister Hawke made certain pronouncements on tariffs, he expected there to be by September 1991 a major recovery in the economy. We are now in the September 1992 quarter, the results are coming out and it has not occurred. There are some signs of stirring but, unfortunately, we have not seen the recovery that could have supported even the tariff structure that was proposed.

And that is the point: the reduction, as Bill Hamel said very eloquently to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry dinner the other night—and I believe that the member for Kavel was there—we could cop 25 per cent down to 15 per cent on the basis of the growth figures that were taking place, but the Opposition is assuming that that growth has occurred and is taking it down to zero. That is intolerable. Zero policy is unacceptable.

We do not have an international level playing field at all: let us not pretend that we have. That is a myth. We have not been able to succeed with agricultural tariffs in GATT, so we still have our commodities being discriminated against, and we want to disadvantage ourselves further in the manufacturing industry.

That is a formula for total failure and for the winding up of manufacturing industry. No successful economy succeeds purely on the raw materials it produces unless it is Nauru producing guano or the Middle East potentates producing oil. It must have a broad based manufacturing industry, and the Opposition's policies would simply wipe that out. The Federal policies need to be modified in the current climate. We have said that constantly, and we say it again.

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

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House, while recognising the important role select committees have had and will continue to have in investigating matters of relevance to the House, is of the view that the recently established standing committees provide a unique opportunity for investigations to be undertaken on an ongoing basis without unnecessarily placing strains on members' time and staff and other resources; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting this resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 9 September. Page 553.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I should like to congratulate the member for Napier for raising this issue through his motion. As I understand it, he is saying that we should be putting more emphasis on using standing committees to investigate matters rather than select committees. That is a point of view with which I have some sympathy. Unfortunately, the motion as moved is ambiguous. Nevertheless, it is important that we in this Chamber debate the direction in which committee should go.

To some extent, we could say that it is already happening—that the standing committees of this Parliament are being used more and more to investigate matters that, in the past, might have been referred to select committees. Of course, the powers of the four new committees of the Parliament are much wider than those of the previous committees, and those four new committees have the ability to examine in great detail any matters referred to them. In recent weeks, the Economic and Finance Committee, of which I am a member, had a reference from this Parliament concerning parliamentary salaries. That is an example where the standing committees of the Parliament can be used to examine matters and a select committee need not be established.

The speech made by the member for Napier was extremely well researched, and he presented statistics about the membership of both select and standing committees. He indicated that the workload of some members is particularly high. Over the past few years, there has been a large number of select committees of this House, and I have had the privilege to be a member of both select and standing committees. Select committees serve a useful purpose; they are also a great deal of work and, if members are on both select and standing committees, there is a considerable workload.

The member for Napier in his well researched speech also indicated some of the problems we encounter if there are too many select committees running alongside standing committees, and he mentioned the problems of staffing those committees and achieving quorums. I know that at times it has been hard to organise select committee meetings simply because members were involved in so many other committees; to get a sufficient number of members for a quorum on the one day at the one time is not always easy to do.

The member for Napier reached the conclusion that it is necessary to 'sit down and . . . sort out our committee system so that it can work for the benefit of this Parliament and the people of South Australia'. That is what this matter is all about: we really need to consider the best use of committees—select committees versus standing committees—so we can achieve the best result for the people of this State. That is why I have some sympathy with the thrust of the motion while at the same time I think it would be wrong to suggest—and I do not say that he does suggest—that we ought not have any select committees at all. It is just a matter of getting the balance right; perhaps, it is still fairly early in the piece to make a judgment. I certainly believe that the member for Napier has done a service to the Parliament in bringing the matter forward and having a discussion on it, because there have been cases in the past where the workload of the Parliament has been exceeded and where matters could have been handled more suitably by the standing committees. As I said earlier, fortunately that has been happening anyway in recent times, and I

certainly hope that the trend continues. If it does continue, a motion to bring that about would not be essential. Again, I congratulate the member for Napier on bringing up this matter so we can discuss an important issue.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I am a realist and, despite those very kind words that the member for Mitchell has said in regard to this motion—and he is spot on in saying that this motion is an attempt to achieve a balance between select committees and the four permanent standing committees of the Parliament—unfortunately there are some people here who seem to see this as some radical plot to deny members the right to sit on select committees. That is not the case but, as I say, I am a realist, and I realise from a quick count (and to be a successful member of the Labor Caucus one has to be able to count) that in the final analysis my motion will be defeated.

Let me say that that does not really cause me any particular problem: in fact, I think that already the emphasis is going off select committees, due in large part to the fact that we now have a coalition. I say that in no derogatory way in relation to the member for Hartley and the member for Elizabeth because, if anything, the member for Elizabeth should be congratulated on actually setting up the whole idea of the four permanent standing committees, and the member for Hartley should be congratulated on the correct use of one of the standing committees and what it can achieve. I pay that tribute to those two members of this Parliament.

As I say, the one thing that does disappoint me is that, in the existing system (and I hope that the number of select committees will reduce), no matter which way we go, unless we get further resources, more and more strain will be placed on those people who service those committees. In that I include all the table staff, the clerical staff, and my very good friends the *Hansard* staff. In not one speech that has been made in relation to this motion has the lack of resources been referred to. In my opening comments when I moved this motion, I said this was not a plea or a grab for additional resources. I know that, as one of the Presiding Officers of this Parliament, you, Sir, do your best to battle for the resources that we receive within Parliament, but many times, along with the President, you, Sir, have given us the message that we have to live within the budget.

This motion, if adopted, would not have destroyed the select committees, would not have increased the power of Standing Committees, but would have given the Parliament an ability to work better. I think that very shortly, perhaps within the next budget, Cabinet will come to realise that this was not a radical Maoist plot put forward by me. There is a lot of merit in it. Unfortunately, like all good motions, it will have to stand the test of time before being accepted by the proletariat out in the community and here in the Parliament. I urge members, if they are under a two-line Party whip, to abandon the instructions and support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins, G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, D.M. Ferguson, R.J. Gregory, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings (teller), V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (24)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, M.J. Evans, S.G. Evans (teller), T.R. Groom, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

WATER RATING POLICY

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

That this House calls on the Minister of Water Resources to ensure that the current review of the Government water rating policy results in the introduction of a fair and equitable user pays water rating system.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 285.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): With the consent of the member concerned, I move:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

NATIONAL RAIL CORPORATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That this House calls on the Government to resist signing away running rights to the National Rail Corporation until the future of Australian National and the rail industry in this State is guaranteed; calls on the Federal Government to re-examine 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 and in particular the Rail Workshops at Port Augusta and Islington and, further, calls on the Federal Government to immediately commence work on the Darwin-Alice Springs rail link and release the $17.5 million for the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific.

(Continued from 26 August. Page 413.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move the following amendment to the motion:

(a) Leave out the words 'calls on the Government to resist signing away running rights to the National Rail Corporation until the future of Australian National and the rail industry in this State is guaranteed;

(b) Leave out the words 're-examine the NRC concept and';

(c) Leave out all words after 'link'.

The motion would then read:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to ensure that the NRC does not interfere in the continued operation and survival of AN and the rail industry in this State and in particular the Rail Workshops at Port Augusta and Islington and further calls on the Federal Government to immediately commence work on the Darwin-Alice Springs rail link.

The reason for the amendment is that the Government has now signed the National Rail Corporation agreement and also $12 million of the $17.5 million for the refurbishment has been organised.

In speaking to the motion, there are some points that I should like to raise. The following is really an update, I suspect, on AN's restructuring and in particular the matters raised which were contentious before the signing

of the agreement. The Government has now signed the NRC agreement and that will allow the NRC to operate on this State-owned track for which an appropriate charge will be raised.

The major points of concern to the State Government, which had hitherto delayed the signing of this agreement, were, first, the resolution of AN's future role. For South Australia that is a vital point. We need to be assured of the continued viability of AN's future in South Australia. The second point was the upgrading of the Islington and Port Augusta workshops to allow them to compete with some confidence for National Rail Corporation work. The third part of that was the funding of the Indian Pacific upgrade, which has now been obtained from the Federal Government.

There was also a commitment to adhere to the terms of the 1975 rail transfer agreement. Lastly, there were certain superannuation and land transfer matters associated with that agreement. There was correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Premier on 9 August to advise that this matter had been resolved successfully. In that letter it was indicated that AN will undertake a business plan on its proposed structure for the first three years of the NRC and that South Australia would be consulted on matters affecting this State. I totally support the undertaking of that three-year business plan. I believe that AN is currently working very steadily on that. Part of it will be the upgrading of the workshops at Port Augusta and Islington to a national standard so that they may receive accreditation from the National Standards Association. That will be a critical point for these workshops in being able to tender successfully for work with the National Rail Corporation. I understand that the main criteria for the tendering of work with the National Rail Corporation, as it has stated, will be quality work as opposed to work which is done quickly. One of the problems that the State Government had was that there was some suggestion—

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for this debate has expired.

Debate adjourned.

DAIRY INDUSTRY BILL

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate the dairy industry; to establish the Dairy Authority of South Australia; to repeal the Dairy Industry Act 1928 and the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: 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

There are currently two State Acts covering the dairy industry in South Australia. These are the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946 which covers the area from Meningie to Gawler and the Dairy Industry Act 1928 which covers the rest of the State. There is also Commonwealth legislation that levies all milk to support the lower returns received on export markets.

There is an increasingly national focus on returns from dairying and the legislation to achieve this. There is also a move in all States to reduce legislation in the dairy industry by giving more responsibility to the industry for its own pricing mechanisms and quality control.

The Dairy Industry Bill 1992 follows this national perspective and is in line with national requirements and pricing, particularly at the farm gate. The Bill repeals the Dairy Industry Act 1928 and the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946 and allows the industry to take increased responsibility in quality control especially at the farm level.

Some of the provisions of the Bill are as follows:

The Dairy Authority of South Australia is established consisting of three members appointed by the Governor. There will be an orderly transition from the current Metropolitan Milk Board to the new authority which will allow for industry to reorganise its staff requirements as they become more involved with responsibilities of quality and safety control through specific codes of practice.

Provision is made to set prices. However, as has been outlined in the white paper, it is anticipated that these prices will be progressively removed so that from 1 January 1995, the only price control will be at the farm gate. However, in line with Commonwealth legislation, this farm gate price control may cease by the year 2000.

Provision is made to ensure that milk for market milk, no matter from where sourced or sold, is paid for at the declared farm gate price. This provision is to ensure national discipline as agreed to by all States.

Provision is made to allow for two (1c) increases in the wholesale price of milk to be paid into a trust fund to be distributed to dairy farmers outside the current Metropolitan Milk Board area and so increase their farm gate price to the same as that received by dairy farmers in the Metropolitan Milk Board area. This provision will allow for a Statewide farm gate price and not put at risk country milk processing plants.

Provision is made for the Minister of Primary Industries to have reserve powers in the event of a breakdown in an industry equalisation agreement.

Provision is made for unpasteurised milk to be sold which will need to meet satisfactory safety and labelling standards.

Provision is made for codes of practice to be administered by the various industry segments.

Provision is made for the milk testing equipment (currently the responsibility of the Metropolitan Milk Board) to be transferred to the dairy industry, as determined by the Minister. The benefits from herd recording cover all dairy farmers and provision is made for the industry to fund the replacement and operational costs of this equipment.

Staff currently employed by the Metropolitan Milk Board will be transferred to the authority. I commend the Bill to members.

Part 1 of the Bill (clauses 1 to 3) contains preliminary matters.

Clause 1: Short title. This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement. This clause provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation. This clause contains definitions of words and phrases used in the Bill.

Part 2 of the Bill (clauses 4 to 11) deals with the Dairy Authority of South Australia.

Clause 4: Establishment of the authority. This clause provides that the authority is established as a body corporate and an instrumentality of the Crown.

Clause 5: Ministerial control. This clause provides that the authority is subject to control and direction by the Minister.

Clause 6: Composition of the authority. This clause provides that the authority consists of three members appointed by the Governor of whom at least one must be a person with wide experience in the dairy industry.

Clause 7: Conditions of membership. This clause provides that a member of the authority is appointed for a term not exceeding three years and is eligible for reappointment. The terms for removal from office are set out as are the reasons why such an office may become vacant.

Clause 8: Remuneration. This clause provides that a member of the authority is entitled to such remuneration, allowances and expenses as may be determined by the Governor.

Clause 9: Disclosure of interest. This clause provides that a member who has a direct or indirect private interest in a matter under consideration by the authority must disclose the nature of

the interest to the authority and must not take part in any deliberations or decision of the authority in relation to that matter. Failure to comply with proposed subsection (1) carries a penalty of a fine of $8 000 or imprisonment for two years. Proposed subsection (2) provides that it is a defence to a charge of an offence against proposed subsection (1) to prove that the defendant was not, at the time of the alleged offence, aware of his or her interest in the matter.

If a member discloses an interest in a contract or proposed contract under this proposed section and takes no part in any deliberations or decision of the authority on the contract, the contract is not liable to be avoided by the authority and the member is not liable to account for profits derived from the contract.

Clause 10 Members' duties of honesty, care and diligence. This clause provides that a member of the authority must at all times act honestly in the performance of his or her official functions. The penalty for an offence is divided as follows:

- if an intention to deceive or defraud is proved—the penalty is a $15 000 fine or imprisonment for four years or both;
- in any other case—the penalty is a $4 000 fine.

Subclause (2) provides that a member of the authority must at all times exercise a reasonable degree of care and diligence in the performance of his or her official functions. A fine of $4 000 may be imposed for failure to comply with this duty.

Subclauses (3) and (4) provide for penalties of a $15 000 fine or imprisonment for four years or both where—

- a member of the authority makes improper use of his or her official position to gain a personal advantage for himself, herself or another or to cause detriment to the authority; or
- a member or former member of the authority makes improper use of information acquired through his or her official position to gain directly or indirectly a personal advantage for himself, herself or another, or to cause detriment to the authority.

Clause 11: Proceedings. This clause sets out the procedures of business conducted by the authority, including the quorum necessary (two members) and voting rights (one vote per member and the presiding member has a casting vote if necessary). A decision carried by a majority of the votes cast by members at a meeting is a decision of the authority. The authority may conduct a meeting via a telephone or video conference. The authority must cause accurate minutes to be kept of its proceedings.

Part 3 of the Bill (clauses 12 to 16) deal with the functions and powers of the Dairy Authority of South Australia.

Clause 12: Functions of the authority. This clause provides that the authority's functions are—

- to recommend the imposition, variation or removal of price control in respect of dairy produce under this Act;
- to determine the conditions and the fees for licences to be issued under this Act;
- to approve, provide, or arrange for the provision of, training programs for implementing appropriate standards and codes of practice for the dairy industry;
- to grant, or arrange for the granting of, certificates to persons who successfully complete training programs approved by the authority;
- to monitor the extent of compliance by the dairy industry with appropriate standards and codes of practice; and
- to carry out any other functions assigned to the authority by or under this Act or by the Minister.

Clause 13: Powers of the authority. This clause provides that the authority has the powers necessary or incidental to the performance of its functions and may, for example—

- enter into any form of contract or arrangement;
- employ staff or make use of the services of staff employed in the public or private sector;
- engage consultants or other contractors;
- delegate any of its powers to any person or body of persons.

Subject to the transitional provisions, an employee of the authority is not a member of the Public Service, but the terms and conditions of employment of any such employee must be as approved by the Minister.

Clause 14: The Dairy Authority Administration Fund. This clause provides that there is to be a fund called the Dairy Authority Administration Fund which consist of all fees and charges recovered under this Act, all penalties recovered for offences against this Act and any other money appropriated by Parliament for the purposes of the fund. The fund is to be applied towards the costs of administering this Act.

Clause 15: Accounts and audit. This clause provides that the authority must keep proper accounting records of its receipts and expenditures, and must, at the conclusion of each financial year, prepare accounts for that financial year. The Auditor-General may audit the accounts of the authority at any time and must audit the accounts for each financial year.

Clause 16: Annual Report. This clause provides that the authority must, on or before 31 October in every year, forward to the Minister a report on the administration of this Act during the year that ended on the preceding 30 June. The report must include the audited accounts of the authority for the relevant financial year and must be laid before Parliament within 12 sitting days after receipt by the Minister.

Part 4 of the Bill (clauses 17 to 27) deals with the regulation of the dairy industry.

Clause 17: Licences. This clause provides for licences of the following classes:

- dairy farmer's licence;
- processor's licence; and
- vendor's licence.

It is an offence for a person to carry on business as a dairy farmer, processor or vendor unless that person holds an appropriate licence. The penalty for such an offence is a fine of $8 000.

Clause 18: Issue of licences. This clause provides that the authority may, on receiving an application for a licence, issue the licence.

Clause 19: Licence fee. This clause provides that a person who holds a licence must pay periodic licence fees in accordance with the regulations and if a periodic fee payable by the holder of the licence is in arrears for more than three months, the authority may, by written notice given to the holder of the licence, cancel the licence.

Clause 20: Conditions of licence. This clause provides that a licence may be issued on such conditions as the authority thinks fit and that the authority may, by written notice to the holder of a licence, add to the conditions of the licence or vary or revoke a condition of the licence. A person who holds a licence who contravenes or fails to comply with a condition of a licence is liable to a fine of $8 000.

Clause 21: Transfer of licence. This clause provides that a licence may be transferred with the consent of the authority.

Clause 22: Revocation of licence. This clause provides that the authority may revoke a licence if the holder of the licence ceases to carry on the business in respect of which the licence was issued or the holder of the licence contravenes or fails to comply with a condition of the licence.

Clause 23: Price control. This clause provides that the Minister may, on the recommendation of the authority, publish an order fixing a price for the sale of dairy produce of a specified class. An order under this section—

- may apply generally throughout the State or be limited, in its application, to a particular part of the State;
- may apply generally to the sale of dairy produce of the relevant class or may be limited to sale by retail or by wholesale or to sale by licensees of a particular class or by reference to any other factor;
- may be subject to a condition, stated in the order, that a specified proportion of the price paid for dairy produce to which the order applies be paid into a trust fund established by the Minister to be applied as directed by the Minister towards equalising the return to dairy farmers throughout the State for dairy produce produced by them;
- may, by further order, be varied or revoked.

This clause further provides that any amount payable under a condition imposed under proposed subsection (2) *(c)* may be recovered from a person who has paid, or is liable to pay, the price for the dairy produce fixed in the order as a debt.

Clause 24: Non-compliance with price-fixing order. This clause provides that a person who carries on a business involving the sale of dairy produce must not sell dairy produce to which the order applies for a price that differs from the price fixed in the order. A fine of $8 000 is fixed for non-compliance with this provision. For the purposes of determining the price for which dairy produce is sold, any contractual arrangement which provides in effect for a remission of price or a premium on the price, will be taken into consideration.

Clause 25: Guarantee of adequate farm gate price. This clause provides that a person must not process milk in the State for the purpose of manufacturing market milk unless the raw milk was purchased from a dairy farmer (either within or outside the State) at a price determined by the Minister on the recommendation of the authority as the farm gate price for milk. A fine of $60 000 is the penalty for non-compliance with this provision.

It is further provided that a person must not sell market milk unless the market milk was produced from raw milk purchased from a dairy farmer (either within or outside the State) at a price determined by the Minister on the recommendation of the authority as the farm gate price for milk. (Penalty: $60 000.)

The Minister may, on the recommendation of the authority, by notice in the *Gazette*—

- determine a farm gate price for milk; or
- vary or revoke a previous determination under this proposed subsection.

If there is a general consensus throughout Australia on what an appropriate farm gate price for milk should be, the authority's recommended farm gate price should reflect that consensus.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that this section does not apply in relation to raw milk sold under a contract that was in existence at the commencement of this Act.

Clause 26: Equalisation schemes. This clause provides that the Minister may, on the recommendation of the authority, establish a price equalisation scheme that is binding on dairy farmers and wholesale purchasers of dairy produce of a class stated in the scheme. Such a price equalisation scheme may impose a surcharge on licence fees on licensees who are bound by the scheme. The terms of any such scheme are to be published in the *Gazette* and the Minister may, on the recommendation of the authority, by further notice, amend or revoke the scheme.

Any scheme under this proposed section, or an amendment to such a scheme, must be laid before both Houses of Parliament and is subject to disallowance in the same way as a regulation.

This clause further provides that a price equalisation scheme cannot be established if a voluntary price equalisation scheme is currently operating between the proposed members of the scheme or a substantial majority of them.

Clause 27: Non-compliance with scheme. This clause provides that a person who sells or purchases dairy produce contrary to the terms of a price equalisation scheme that is binding on that person is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of $8 000.

Part 5 of the Bill (clauses 28 to 33) contains miscellaneous provisions.

Clause 28: Advisory and consultative committees. This clause provides that the Minister may establish committee(s) of representatives of the dairy industry to obtain advice and facilitate consultation as to any matters relating to the industry or the administration of this Act.

Clause 29: Powers of inspectors. This clause provides that an inspector may enter and inspect any dairy farm or other premises in which dairy produce is produced, processed, stored or kept for sale in order to determine whether appropriate standards and codes of practice are being observed and may take samples of any such dairy produce in order to determine whether the dairy produce complies with standards in force under this Act.

Clause 30: Hindering inspectors. This clause provides that a person must not hinder or obstruct an inspector in the exercise of powers conferred by this Act. The penalty for an offence against this clause is a fine of $8 000.

Clause 31: Protection of staff. This clause provides that an inspector or other person engaged in functions related to the administration or enforcement of this Act incurs no civil liability for an act or omission in the course of the performance or purported performance of those functions.

Clause 32: Review of Act. This clause provides that the Minister must at the end of three years from the commencement of this Act review the operation of this Act the report of which review must be prepared and laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 33: Regulations. This clause provides that the Governor may make regulations for the purposes of this Act.

The schedule of the Bill contains repeal and transitional provisions.

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

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (SUSPENSION OF VEHICLE REGISTRATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): 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 make further amendment to the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 to allow for the suspension of registration of motor vehicles registered in the name of a company where the company is in default of payment of a pecuniary sum imposed on the company in relation to an offence arising out of the use of a motor vehicle of which it was, at the time of the offence, the registered owner. The offences to which the scheme will relate are, of course, those traffic offences where the owner of the vehicle, as well as the driver, is guilty of an offence, for example, parking offences, speeding offences and 'red light camera' offences, but where the driver has not been named by the registered owner of the vehicle.

The Statutes Amendment (Criminal Law Sentencing) Act 1991 ('the Act') passed through Parliament during the last session. Section 21 of that Act provides that a person may be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence until such time as an outstanding pecuniary sum, imposed for an offence arising from the use of a motor vehicle, has been fully satisfied.

This Bill puts in place the second half of a scheme which operates successfully already in New South Wales and Victoria. In both States, disqualification of a driver's licence is the centre-piece of the scheme. Suspension of registration only applies to vehicles registered in the name of a company, as the company cannot hold or obtain a driver's licence, and of course will not arise in some instances if the company gave the name and address of the offending driver to the prosecuting authority. Suspension of registration does not apply to cars registered in the name of an individual because this would prevent the use of all vehicles registered in that person's name by any other family members for essential purposes. Secondly, an individual would suffer two penalties, that is, licence disqualification and suspension of registration while a company would only suffer the latter penalty.

The provisions to allow for suspension of registration were not included in the earlier amendments as detailed consultation was necessary with SGIC, Motor Registration Section and the Courts Services Department.

The scheme as proposed will work as follows:

- where a company is in default of payment of a pecuniary sum imposed for an offence arising out of the use of a motor vehicle registered in its name, the court may suspend the registration of all motor vehicles registered in the company's name until such time as the sum is fully satisfied;
- the compulsory third party insurance will also be automatically suspended until such time as the sum is fully satisfied and therefore a claim will be able to be made against the nominal defendant under the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 in the event of the uninsured vehicle causing injury to a third party;
- the company will be advised by the court of the consequences of non-payment of the fine at the time of imposition of the fine;
- the order for suspension will take effect if the fine is still unpaid 28 days after the company is given notice of the suspension order;
- the Registrar of Motor Vehicles will not be empowered to register any vehicles in the name of the company until such time as the outstanding sum is fully paid;
- the Registrar of Motor Vehicles will still have the power to transfer the registration of any vehicle to which the

suspension order relates to a new owner. This provision will protect a *bona fide* purchaser;

- the court may revoke the order for suspension if satisfied that the sum in default has been reduced and that continued suspension would result in hardship;
- consequential amendments are made to the Motor Vehicles Act to provide a defence for a person who drives a vehicle to which a suspension order relates where that person genuinely did not know of the existence of the order.

I commend this Bill to honourable members as it is anticipated that the driver's licence disqualification and registration suspension schemes will together see a significant increase in payment of outstanding fines.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement by proclamation.

Clause 3 inserts new section 61b, which provides the courts with the power to order that the registration of all motor vehicles registered in the name of a company be suspended if the company has been fined for an offence arising out of the use of one of its vehicles, and has been in default of paying that fine for a month or more. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles must notify the defendant company of the court order, which will take effect if the fine is still unpaid at the end of one month from the giving of that notification. While an order for suspension is in force, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles cannot register any vehicle in the name of the company and cannot renew any registration. The Registrar can, however, record a transfer of any vehicle to which the suspension order relates. The court has the power to wholly or partly revoke a suspension order if the company reduces the sum in default and would suffer hardship if the suspension were to continue. The court is not prevented from taking other enforcement proceedings (that is, sale of goods or land) while a suspension order is in force. When the amount outstanding is paid in full, or the order is revoked, the court must notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

Clause 4 amends the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. A defence is provided in the two sections that create the offences of driving an unregistered motor vehicle (section 9) and driving an uninsured vehicle (section 102). If the driver of a company-owned vehicle did not know and could not have known that a suspension order was in force in relation to the vehicle, and was driving the vehicle with the express or implied authority of the company, the driver will not be guilty of an offence.

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

FINANCIAL TRANSACTION REPORTS (STATE PROVISIONS) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): 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

A major development in the fight against organised crime has been the establishment of the Cash Transaction Reports Agency under the Commonwealth Cash Transaction Reports Act. That Act requires financial institutions and cash dealers to provide the Cash Transactions Report Agency with reports of transactions which may be relevant to the investigation of breaches of taxation and other Commonwealth laws.

The Cash Transaction Reports Agency can pass that information on to law enforcement agencies including State Police Forces.

The legislation has, from the State's point of view, two shortcomings:

First, although the agency is empowered to distribute information received from cash dealers to State Police Forces, the Act does not provide any protection to cash dealers who provide further information in response to follow-up requests from State police.

Secondly, there is no obligation placed on cash dealers to provide information about suspected offences against State criminal law or information which may be relevant to actions under the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act.

Section 16 of the Cash Transaction Reports Act (Commonwealth) requires a cash dealer who is a party to a transaction and who has reasonable cause to suspect that information he or she has concerning the transaction may be relevant to the investigation of an evasion of tax law or to the investigation of an offence against the law of the Commonwealth, to prepare a report of the transaction and communicate to the Director of the Cash Transaction Reports Agency. The cash dealer must also if requested to do so by the Director give such further information as is specified in the request to the extent to which the cash dealer has that information.

It is not an express object of the Act to require the Director to collect information for the purposes of helping State authorities to enforce State laws but information is made available to State authorities which has already been collected for the purpose of facilitating the administration and enforcement of Federal laws.

Once information is passed on to State police the need invariably arises for a law enforcement officer to seek further information and/or documentation from the cash dealer. While there is nothing in the Act to prevent a cash dealer from voluntarily supplying the information where it is requested by a State agency, there is no compulsion upon the cash dealer to do so, whereas when a Federal agency requests such information it must be provided as a right and the cash dealer is covered by the indemnity in subsection 16 (5) of the Commonwealth Act. In the absence of compulsion and the provision of statutory protection the cash dealer who supplies such information may be in breach of an implied duty of confidentiality owed to the customer.

The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has considered the matter and model State legislation has been prepared which requires:

(a) cash dealers to provide further information to State police regarding offences against State law; and

(b) cash dealers to report to the Director of the Cash Transaction Reports Agency on transactions which may be relevant to the investigation of offences against the law of the State or may be of assistance in the enforcement of the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act.

The legislation also protects cash dealers against legal action in relation to the provision of that information. The reasons for preventing the bringing of proceedings against cash dealers who provide information as required by the amendments are as follows:

(a) without such protection cash dealers who comply with the reporting obligations imposed by the section will be exposed to the risk of civil suit for breach of obligations such as confidentiality to customer account holders;

(b) if cash dealers are not given such protection the objective of the legislation of ensuring the flow of reliable information to law enforcement authorities will be defeated;

and

(c) the section complements the existing Commonwealth legislation in that the proposed section 7 is in terms similar to the corresponding Commonwealth provision.

This Bill conforms to the model agreed to by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. It is considered that this legislation will increase the effectiveness of the Cash Transaction Reports Agency as a law enforcement tool by enabling the State to make full use of CTR information which is currently provided to the police by the CTR agency and to enable the State to access further information as may be necessary.

The Commonwealth is in agreement with and supports the form of the legislation.

Legislation of this nature has already been passed in Victoria and it is hoped that sufficient States will have passed the legislation by December 1992 to allow for a common

commencement date, as has been requested by the Australian Bankers Association.

It should also be noted that the Commonwealth legislation has been renamed the Financial Transactions Reports Act and the Cash Transaction Reports Agency has been renamed the Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre but the amendments effecting these changes have yet to be proclaimed.

I commend this Bill to honourable members.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

PART 1
PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title. This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement. This clause provides for the commencement of this measure on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation. This clause defines the terms 'Commonwealth Act', 'court' and 'protected information' and provides that expressions used in this measure have the same meaning that they have in the Commonwealth Act.

Provision is made for the interpretation of references to the Commonwealth Act prior to the commencement of the Cash Transaction Reports Amendment Act 1991 of the Commonwealth. That Act changes the name of the Cash Transaction Reports Act (the Act that currently deals with this matter at the Commonwealth level) to the Financial Transaction Reports Act.

Clause 4: Act binds Crown. This clause provides that this measure binds the Crown as far as the legislative power of the State permits.

PART 2
REPORTS, ENFORCEMENT AND SECRECY

Clause 5: Further reports of suspect transactions. This clause provides that where a cash dealer has reported a suspect transaction to the Director of the Commonwealth Cash Transaction Reports Agency the dealer must, if a request is made by the Commissioner of Police or a relevant member of the Police Force, supply information that is relevant to the investigation or prosecution of a person under a law of the State or to the enforcement of the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1986.

Failure to comply with such a request renders a cash dealer that is a body corporate liable to a division 3 fine ($30 000) or, where the dealer is a natural person, a division 5 fine ($8 000), division 5 imprisonment (two years) or both.

Clause 6: Reports of suspect transactions not reported under Commonwealth Act. This clause provides that where a cash dealer has reasonable grounds to suspect that information held by the cash dealer concerning a transaction undertaken by the dealer would be relevant to the investigation or prosecution of a person under a State law or to the enforcement of the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1986, the dealer must communicate the information to the Director of the Commonwealth Cash Transaction Reports Agency.

Failure to make such a report will render a cash dealer that is a body corporate liable to a division 3 fine ($30 000) or, where the dealer is a natural person, a division 5 fine ($8 000), division 5 imprisonment (two years) or both.

A report is required whether or not the cash dealer is also required to report the transaction as a significant cash transaction under Division 1 of Part II of the Commonwealth Act, but is not required if the dealer is required to report the transaction as a suspect transaction under Division 2 of Part II of the Commonwealth Act.

Just as South Australian police may require a cash dealer to supply further information in relation to a transaction reported under section 16 of the Commonwealth Act, they may also seek further details following a report made under this clause. The penalty on non-compliance with such a requirement is the same as the penalty for failure to make the original report under this clause.

Clause 7: Protection of cash dealers, etc. This clause protects cash dealers and their agents or employees from legal liability in relation to any action required of them under this measure or undertaken in the mistaken belief that the action was required of them under this measure.

The clause further provides that compliance with section 16 of the Commonwealth Act or clause 5 or 6 of this measure in relation to a transaction provides a cash dealer with a defence against a charge of money laundering under section 10b of the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1986 arising out of the circumstances of the transaction.

Clause 8: False or misleading statements. This clause penalises the making of false or misleading statements under this measure.

The penalty for the making of such a statement is a division 2 fine ($40 000) or, where the dealer is a natural person, a division 4 fine ($15 000), division 4 imprisonment (four years) or both.

Clause 9: Secrecy. This clause prohibits police who have received information under this measure from making a record of that information or from divulging that information except in the performance of a duty relating to the enforcement of a law of the State, the Commonwealth, another State or a Territory.

The penalty for making such a record or divulging such information is a division 5 fine ($8 000) or division 5 imprisonment (two years) or both.

A person is not required to divulge or communicate protected information to a court unless it is necessary to do so for the enforcement of a law of the State, the Commonwealth, another State or a Territory.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question—

That the vote on the third reading of the Bill be rescinded.

(Continued from 22 October. Page 1030.)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer): When I last spoke to the Bill I gave the House a brief indication of the reason and necessity to bring the Bill back before the Assembly. Without going through the whole debate again I will recap to refresh the memories of members. As everyone knows, significant changes made in Ministries and administrative units have meant that the schedule which accompanied the Bill when it was introduced allocated funds, for example, to departments and administrative units that no longer exist. Of course, those funds have been transferred to where the program has been moved. This is a sensible and simple procedure that should not have created any great excitement. However, it appears to have done so, although it created no excitement in the Upper House.

I think the procedure we have adopted is a good procedure; it is the preferred procedure, although other procedures were suggested. I think it gives due recognition and courtesy to this House and, for those reasons, I commend the motion to the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! As this motion requires an absolute majority, the Chair is required to count the House. There being an absolute majority present, I put the question. There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins, G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, D.M. Ferguson, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (21)— M.H. Armitage, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker (teller), H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis,

W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: Order! Because there is a lack of an absolute majority, the motion lapses. The House finds itself in a very unusual situation with this Bill. It is my intention to send the Bill back to the Legislative Council in its original form.

WATERWORKS (RESIDENTIAL RATING) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 October. Page 1100.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Prior to last evening's adjournment, I took the opportunity to point out the delight on the part of the Opposition in the Government's having come to its senses on the matter of water rates for residential purposes. As I pointed out last night, 18 months ago the then Minister of Water Resources introduced the water rating system which brought considerable hardship to people of all ages and in differing circumstances in the metropolitan area.

It is regrettable that, even with the requests that were made by the community generally and the representation that was made by the Liberal Party, it has taken 18 months for the Government to withdraw that system and introduce a new system. The then Minister spoke loud and long against suggestions that the previous system was a wealth tax. She warned that a user-pays system would be inequitable, more expensive for everyone and would cost more overall to deliver, and yet I am pleased to say that now we do have what can generally be recognised as a user-pays system.

As I said last evening in this debate, it would be the intention of the Opposition to allow this new system to run its course before we can be absolutely certain that we are satisfied with the procedures that have been adopted; but from what we see now it would seem that the Bill is acceptable. Last evening I also referred to the two distinct rates that apply under this legislation. The first is the basic rate relating to the water supply fee, and at this stage that would be $120 to cover the first 136 kilolitres. The second rate is the consumption rate, an additional charge of 88c per kilolitre above the 136 kilolitres based on consumption. Then, we move into the third stage which provides for a further 20c per kilolitre to be paid for consumption over 700 kilolitres, and this provision is to apply from January 1994.

As far as the Opposition is concerned we see this as being acceptable. I have received some representation on this matter because it would seem at this stage that, over the 700 kilolitre water consumption level, the user-pays system would cease to exist. But for the reasons of conserving water, which is of significant importance particularly in this State, it is appropriate that this additional payment should be made. I believe the majority of people, certainly in the metropolitan area, would agree with that.

Mrs Hutchison: And the country.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: And the country, as my colleague on the other side of the House points out. The only other part of the Bill that I want to refer to is in regard to vacant allotments. We are told that residential customers who share a meter—for example, strata title flats—will not be subject to the step price from 1994-95, and that residential properties include houses and strata units. However, residential customers who share a meter, as I said before, will not be subject to that step process. In the previous Act vacant land was excluded from the residential rating system as, *prima facie* a vacant block is not a residence. There are, of course, as is pointed out in the second reading explanation, many situations where a vacant block is purchased with the sole intent of building a residence on it.

The Minister's second reading explanation refers to situations where a vacant block is purchased with the sole intent of building a residence on it. The Government believes that it is appropriate that such land be regarded as residential for the purpose of rating, and this Bill provides the power to do that. When I was first made aware of the Bill I had some concerns that this may be something of a trap as far as broad acres are concerned.

I have checked this out with the Urban Development Institute, which I understand has in turn taken it up with the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and we are assured that that is not the case. In fact, there will be an improved situation as a result of this legislation as it relates to individual blocks. In turn, it will be significantly cheaper, particularly for blocks of land valued at over $62 000, which I believe is the cut-off point. I cannot cite a particular concern that has been pointed out to me, so on behalf of the Opposition I am prepared to accept the Bill in its present form. However, if at a later stage we find that there are disadvantages to the development industry or to individuals as a result of this provision, we will take further action to attempt to amend the legislation.

The situation in respect of how a vacant block is regarded for rating purposes is made quite clear in the Bill. Section 65a is amended by striking out the definition of 'threshold value', and new subsection (3) provides:

> The Minister may, on the Minister's own initiative or on application in writing and on the basis of such evidence as the Minister may require, determine that vacant land is residential land if satisfied—
>
> *(a)* that the land is situated in a predominantly residential locality and—
>
> (i) is 0.1 ha or less in area; or
>
> (ii) is similar in area to other allotments of residential land in the locality; or
>
> *(b)* that—
>
> (i) a person is in the process of constructing, or planning the construction of, a residential building on the land;
>
> (ii) the land will be used primarily for residential purposes; and
>
> (iii) the land will not, before being used for residential purposes, be subject to division under . . . the Real Property Act 1886.

That is perfectly clear. I have no problems with that. The Opposition accepts that that should be the case and, with its being spelt out, we have no concerns in respect of that matter.

Finally, now that this revised system has been brought down, it is regrettable that it has taken 18 months to do so. I am very much aware of the many people who expressed concern through their local member about the additional water rates that they paid as a result of the

system. Under this new legislation that will no longer be the case. Certainly I have received an enormous amount of representation in the 18 months since that system was introduced. I believe that the former Minister lost an enormous amount of credibility as a result of the Bill that introduced this new system, and the fact that she refused to accept that she made a mistake. It is disappointing that that Minister, although she no longer has responsibility for this Bill, has refused to accept the fact that she, and consequently the Government, made a mistake.

It is only as a result of considerable pressure from the community and only as a result of considerable representation from this side of the House that the change has been made. I would commend the persistence on the part of all those people who have continued to make representation and who have continued to indicate that the system introduced 18 months ago was wrong and was not equitable for the people of this State. The Opposition supports the legislation.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I rise to support the Waterworks (Residential Rating) Amendment Bill, because I think it is important that we recognise that for the first time in 136 years we are removing the property component from water charges, and I think that deserves some attention. The property charge on water was introduced by way of an Act in 1855. The Act actually pre-dates this House of Assembly. In fact, it was introduced by the Governor-in-Chief with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council. That Act, No. 28 of 1856, just 19 years after the State was founded, introduced the system of water rating that existed virtually until this day. I would like to refer to the original rates, because I think it is important to make some observations about the sort of system we had and why. The 1855 Act provided:

> It shall be lawful for the said Commissioners to make an annual rate, not exceeding two shillings in the pound, on all lands within the said city, including a city assessment according to the value at which such land shall be assessed therein, as a 'construction rate', and also to make an annual rate, not exceeding sixpence in the pound, on all such lands according to the value of the aforesaid, to be called the 'supply water rate' . . . The supply water rate shall be paid by and be recoverable from the person requiring, receiving or using the supply of water.

So, in 1855 long before the foundation of the Labor Party and certainly before the time of the former Minister of Water Resources we had the introduction of water rates purely as a property charge. That situation existed within the Act with various modifications right through until fairly recent times. It was only when the former Minister of Water Resources first altered the system 18 months ago that we moved towards a user-pays system, and that was the first time, as I said, in over 130 years. We have now reached the stage where the property component has been removed after 136 years, and we have entirely a user-pays system which is appropriate to the current situation. I mention that historical fact to refute the sort of rubbish we have heard from the member for Heysen about this system being a wealth tax.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Of course it was a wealth tax, and you know it.

Mr HOLLOWAY: The whole point is that if it was a wealth tax it was introduced by the Legislative Council in 1855, and it was far more of a wealth tax then than it ever could be now. As I said, the original rate was two shillings in the pound on property plus a water rate of sixpence in the pound, and there was no user-pays component at all. That situation existed for over a century. The point is that whatever members opposite might say, the only satisfaction they can feel is because they may have succeeded in distorting the debate. They certainly have not done anything whatsoever in terms of making a useful contribution.

Members opposite did not ever have the courage to address this matter. They were in office plenty of times during that 136 year period, and they never saw the need to introduce a user-pays system. I would like to remind the member for Heysen of what he did some 12 months ago when the Minister first changed the system, when he introduced into this House a motion to repeal the present Bill. So, he was suggesting we should go back to the old property system. The member for Heysen did not have the courage—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

Mr HOLLOWAY: —to say exactly what he meant by a user-pays system. When he first spoke against the Bill, he had the opportunity to put up or shut up, but he did not. In fact, all he did was suggest that we should go back to the previous scheme. Even last night in his contribution on this Bill he was still having two bob each way by saying it was a bit of an improvement but not exactly what the Liberals would do. But of course the member for Heysen would not tell us what it was that the Liberals would do.

Whilst it is important that we make this point and recognise that there has been a quite significant change after a very long period of time in the way in which water is charged, it is also rather ironic that, on the very day this Bill is being debated, the Victorian Government has not only increased water rates by 10 per cent but also is imposing a property tax, a modified poll tax, if you like, of $100 on property. How ironic that in this State, when we should be turning to a user-pays system and removing the last property vestige, over in Victoria a modified poll tax is being introduced by the Kennett Government. That is something that we should not forget. As I said, not only have water rates gone up by 10 per cent in Victoria but we should also take note that, if a GST is introduced into this country, water rates will go up by a further 15 per cent.

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Members opposite may interject but, nevertheless, the fact is that there will be a 15 per cent increase in water rates if a Hewson Government is elected. No matter how much members opposite might be embarrassed by that, nonetheless, it is a fact. The member for Heysen also talked about embarrassment over this system. Not only should the Opposition be embarrassed by the matters to which I have referred already, but they should be embarrassed by the other shenanigans we saw during this debate by some of their colleagues, such as the member in the other place, the Hon. Mr Stefani, who was the infamous user of six tonnes of water a day.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, our Standing Orders preclude us from reflecting on honourable members in the other place and from alluding to debate in the other place. I clarify the point I am making by pointing out that the member for Mitchell clearly said that the Hon. Mr

Stefani in another place—and he was about to quote him in debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): If that is the case, I would ask the member to refrain from mentioning the honourable member in the other place.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I certainly was not going to quote the Hon. Mr Stefani. All I was pointing out is that it is a historical fact that the Hon. Mr Stefani was one of a number of people who challenged the water rates scheme, and it transpired subsequently that he was the user of six tonnes of water a day. That is a simple fact. Whether members find it embarrassing—as, indeed, they ought to—I do not think that it is in any way unparliamentary, stating a simple fact.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Members will cease interjecting across the House.

Mr HOLLOWAY: The important thing to recognise here is that we have made a major change in the water rating system after many years, and it was this Government that had the courage to do it.

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: The Deputy Leader may laugh but, as I said, after 130 years it was not his Party that tried to introduce a user-pays system.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable member for Mitchell please be seated. The member for Bragg will get his opportunity in a moment, that is, provided that the member for Bragg ceases interjecting. The member for Mitchell.

Mr HOLLOWAY: Members opposite appear rather touchy on this matter. The simple fact is that although they had the opportunity over many years they did not change the water system in this State. Of course, they are particularly embarrassed by some of the revelations that have come out during this debate. Nevertheless, the important thing is that this Government did have the courage to change the water system. It has moved one step towards a user-pays system, and it has now completed that step. It is important that we should do so for the conservation of our most precious resource.

As a result of those changes, of course, the message is now going out to the community that we need to conserve our water, and the financial incentive to ensure that this is the case is now built into the water rating system. While we have removed the property component, which was the equity element that was in the existing scheme, at least the change preserves a higher rate for those large users of water, so that those people who do use amounts of water well above the average and well in excess of normal needs—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Yes, by six times a day—will now be paying a higher rate of water once they use over the 700 kilolitres. So, it is important that at least in this new user pays system there is a disincentive for wasting water. In such a dry State (although it has not been so dry this year, certainly in normal years we are the driest State in the driest continent), it is important that we have a water rating system that encourages conservation.

I would like to conclude on one note in relation to the user pays system, because we have heard a lot from members opposite about this. I pointed out some of the hypocrisy on their talking about a user pays system, because they have not really put up what they want. However, there is another element to user pays, and that is that within the water rating system of this country there is a very considerable cross subsidy of country water schemes. I have the Auditor-General's Report here only for 1990, so I do not have current figures. However, I am sure it is not much different. In 1990 the Auditor-General pointed out that the loss on country waterworks was $29.6 million, compared with a profit of $28.4 million for metropolitan waterworks, so what we have is a cross subsidy from city areas to country areas.

If members opposite are really genuine about user pays, perhaps when we do hear what their proposals are we can look forward to their ending this cross subsidy and deciding that country people should follow this user pays principle of which they claim they have been the champions for so long. So, as I have said, we have heard a lot from members opposite, and a great deal about user pays. Here is the chance, and I hope that the Deputy Leader or one of the members opposite will tell us whether they believe that user pays should extend to country areas. I am sure they will say that it should not, so perhaps they could describe to us exactly what they do mean by user pays. I would like to conclude by saying that I support this legislation, because—

Mr MATTHEW: On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, during the course of this debate the member for Mitchell has been leaning over the pillar, and I ask whether he contravenes Standing Order 68 which provides in part that a member should not detract from the decorum of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not uphold that point of order. I have noticed a number of members in this House doing the same thing.

Mr HOLLOWAY: One could say that perhaps we are keeping this House afloat. I would like to conclude by saying—

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham will please be seated. The member for Walsh.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, in relation to the decorum of the House, I draw your attention to the fact that the member for Bright is visibly masticating.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have to inform the member for Bright that chewing is out of order. I was not aware that he was chewing but if he was I must advise him that it is out of order.

Mr MATTHEW: Swallowing a glass of water is hardly chewing. I am not able to chew water.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am merely advising the member for Bright that it is out of order.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I conclude my remarks by pointing out that Opposition members have been extremely hypocritical throughout the entire development of the water rating system, and I think we need to hear from

them on a number of points. We certainly need to hear from them exactly what they do mean by a user pays system, as they interpret it.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Members on the other side are making too much noise.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I am pleased that members opposite note the great contribution that the Minister of Education, Employment and Training, who is the former Minister of Water Resources, has made in the development of this—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. The honourable member has been misrepresenting members on this side of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I suggest that frivolous points of order will not be accepted in future and advise members that they should ensure that points of order are valid. I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I wish to congratulate the former Minister of Water Resources for the effort she has put into taking a courageous decision, after 136 years of having a property-based system, finally to convert our system to a user-pays system. She has done so in a form that preserves some equity and some of the tax principles of ability to pay. It certainly is an achievement of which I believe she can be proud. Members opposite really have nothing at all for which they can congratulate themselves over their behaviour throughout this entire water debate. Members opposite have been very vocal on a whole range of matters. But, the fact is that the record will show that some of their supporters have been the most profligate users of water in this State—

An honourable member: And they have paid for it.

Mr HOLLOWAY: —and they have not made the contribution that they should have. It is most important that we should have a water system that reflects the objectives of conservation. The former Minister for Water Resources and the Minister at the table have now brought in an Act that does just that, and I congratulate them for doing so.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I naturally support the measure. I want the House to understand that the Opposition has no difficulty with this; it is, after all, the nub of the argument that we have been pursuing for sometime. However, the member for Mitchell is in gross error on at least one count. I would welcome a system which was truly user pays. When he says that the country users of water are subsidised by the metropolitan area, he should have been a little more judicious and explicit, because, as you would know, Sir, the people who get the benefit of that subsidy are principally—and I am talking about a huge margin—the constituents of the member for Stuart, the Treasurer—the former Minister for Finance and therefore the member for Whyalla. That is where the bulk of the subsidy goes. I would happily accept the user-pays principle for my constituents in residential areas—very happily indeed.

For the price that we have been paying and will continue to pay under this amended system, we would be able to obtain what I believe should have been our just deserts in the first instance, that is filtration, because our supply of water comes directly from the Murray. It requires very little pumping and it is more often than not accompanied by a great quantity per unit volume of solids, the likes of which are not provided in company with the water to any other residential user of water anywhere in this country, not just this State. The water comes straight out of the river.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It is more like a meal.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, it is more like a meal. It would be great for frogs, and I know that it will suit the tilapia if this Government goes on with its policy of doing nothing in the face of that threat. It goes straight into our mains. The risk of trihalomethanes in our water supply is not just a few times higher or ten times higher, but hundreds of times higher because of the additional quantities of chlorine that must be put into our water.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: The only good thing is that we can't see them.

Mr LEWIS: That is not a good thing; that is a bad thing. It is many times more dangerous than the lead that comes from combusted or partly combusted automobile fuel, commonly called petrol, to the people who live near intersections or the children who play in playgrounds at schools near intersections. It is a hell of a lot more detrimental to the prospective health of the population at large to have to use that much chlorine. More than that, not only does that water necessitate our using much higher volumes per unit volume of chlorine to try to make it safe but it also requires that we suffer a deterioration rate of our consumer mains system, apart from the losses sustained by the department.

The number of times that we have to replace components such as tap washers, copper pipes and the like is well in excess of the number of occasions upon which it is necessary to do that in the metropolitan area or in any other part of South Australia, and that incidence has been substantially decreased in recent times because the water reticulated to metropolitan homes and to homes in the Iron Triangle has been filtered so the foreign material in it has gone. It does not mask the effect of the chlorine; there is no buffer to absorb the chlorine and reduce its impact on the otherwise high levels of bacteria that live in conjunction with the high levels of solids, whether they are colloidal inorganic material or colloidal organic material. It is particularly the organic material that soaks up the chlorine and buffers its effect and provides a base on which the bacteria can thrive. We do not have that.

We also suffer the consequences in our hot water heating services, for instance, of more frequent replacement of the elements, because the moment the water is heated it is like heating egg white. The natural fibre in the colloidal organic matter is flocculated. In consequence, it brings down with it on flocculating the colloidal clay, and that forms a layer of sludge in the bottom of the hot water service tank which rapidly covers the heating element and causes it to be insulated from the thermostat which determines whether it is switched on or off, so it continues to function in the hot mud. There is boiling mud around the copper tubing in which the heating element is placed and it simply corrodes the outer jacket of the heating element, which breaks through, water pours all over the ceilings of our homes, and we have to not only replace the heating element but carry out repairs to our ceilings. We pay the same rates as everyone else—

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker—

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

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have been enjoying the discourse by the honourable member immensely, because I enjoy the particular line of argument that he has been putting forward, but it is hardly related to the Bill. Would you ask him to come back to the Bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I accept the point made by the Minister. I ask the member for Murray-Mallee to return to the Bill. I must say that I was enjoying it, too.

Mr LEWIS: I note the remarks that were made by the member for Mitchell in connection with the so-called cross-subsidisation; he claimed that country consumers were cross-subsidised by metropolitan consumers of water. In responding to that, I simply had to point out that it was not true—not in the general case. Of course, it was true of the constituents of the member for Stuart; they get their water about four or five times cheaper than the real cost, and the same goes for the member for Whyalla.

More particularly, if the user did pay, as the member for Mitchell claimed was the case under this legislation, my constituents would not have to pay anywhere near as much; in fact, we could filter our water for less than the charges that will be levied on us as water users in our homes, and we do not have filtered water. The Government has always denied, until the Minister gave an assurance in the Estimates Committee of which you, Mr Deputy Speaker, were a part, that that water, the charges for which are affected by this legislation, will be filtered. But she would not say when; she gave no commitment in time. I intend to keep her and now more particularly this and any subsequent Minister to that undertaking. It is only fair, because we have to suffer.

We pay the same amount but we do not get the same service, and no attempt is made to give us a just and fair service—the kinds of things this Government prates about all the time, such as social justice, equal opportunity and equity. There is none of that in any of this as it affects my constituents. It was the member for Mitchell who introduced this into this debate, not I, and it does not behove the Minister at all to sit there and grin smugly.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: That is unkind.

Mr LEWIS: It is quite appropriate and accurate, though, taking spurious points of order. The Government came Johnny come lately screaming to this legislation in the face of demands from the public. Had it not been for the Opposition's determination to obtain a much fairer, more conservation conscious policy, we would not have this. I will continue to campaign on behalf of my constituents for a much fairer deal. It is not fair to charge them for muck by the kilolitre.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support this Bill, because it is an excellent Bill which introduces a very good user-pays system. It is a Bill which my colleague the member for Heysen has strongly supported, and in his presentation he has covered all the major issues. In the seven years that I have been a member of Parliament, this single issue has been the most important—

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

Mr INGERSON: It might be eight years—that has ever developed. As the member for Heysen would be aware, about 500 people attended a public meeting in the Burnside Council Chambers because they believed that the old system was unfair as it was principally a wealth tax, although it did incorporate a user-pays component. Their argument was principally that all other major commodities—electricity and gas—be delivered to the front door on a user-pays basis, plus a component charge for service delivery, but there was a cost difference for water charges depending on the location, the size of the block of land, and whether that property was in the eastern, western, northern or southern suburbs of the city. Their argument was that it was unfair that they should be paying this wealth tax.

As I pointed out to them on many occasions, a move to a user-pays system will not necessarily significantly reduce the amount paid for water in the eastern suburbs, in particular in my electorate, because most of the people who live in my electorate, particularly in Toorak Gardens and Burnside, have large blocks and they chose to have extensive gardens. Consequently, their use of water will be high. So, under a user-pays system, many people will have to pay a considerable charge, but it is a payment of choice. They make the decision to use that water, whether it be on their garden or for personal use, and they recognise that they must pay accordingly.

A court case on this issue was initiated by the Burnside Water Rates Residents Committee and, as the Minister would be aware, the case created some havoc for the Government because the decision to send out notices and the dating of them proved to be incorrect and created a minor hiccup that brought another Bill back into the House. It is unfortunate that it has taken nearly 15 months for the Government to recognise that the arrangements introduced by the then Minister of Water Resources, Hon. Ms Lenehan, and supported by the Hudson review was a disaster.

The fact that the Government has done a 100 per cent backflip on this issue suggests that politically it has proved to be an important issue too, because Governments do not make such backflips unless their constituency is markedly affected. As we have said many times, the wealth tax concept was not only a predominantly eastern suburbs issue but it was also an issue in marginal seats. More importantly, I think it was an issue in some of the safer seats that might be at risk at the next election.

I suspect that the significant backflip is important in respect of the seats held by the members for Todd, Albert Park and Playford and other safe seats held by members opposite. It is important for the community that the Minister in his reply admits that it has been a political exercise. We congratulate the Minister on recognising that pragmatism in politics is still alive and well in the Labor Party and that it has recognised this important concept has important political ramifications for members holding safe seats. I know that the member for Albert Park would like to endorse those comments, although I know he will be here when this Government is replaced.

One of the most important issues not covered by the Bill relates to sewers and the charging for sewers. I hope that the Government is examining the matter, because I

know that we are. I hope it is looking at some method (although this is far more difficult to implement) of recognising the user-pays system. It has been pointed out to me by many people that there are anomalies in this area and I hope the Government will look at it.

I note with interest the comments made by the member for Mitchell. I have been fascinated over the past two or three months to note how the Government spends little time supporting motions and Bills that it brings before this House but spends considerable time being concerned with what is happening in Victoria and what is happening with the GST promotion. It fascinates me that a Party in power should be so concerned about the success of the Liberal Party in Victoria and the success of the excellent Fightback promotion campaign undertaken by our Federal colleagues.

I am amazed how sincere and concerned members opposite are about that when they should be more interested in the Bills that the Government brings before the House. I support this very important change in the water rating system. It will be a major issue in the electorate of Bragg and I am glad that the Government has done a political back flip and supported the argument pursued by the Liberal Party for some time.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): It is a tragedy that we have to debate this legislation now because we could have completed the debate last night, and it reminds me of the anonymous contribution that is presently being distributed in the lobbies of the Parliament. It goes like this:

Oh dear, what a calamity
Late last night I was caught in the lavatory
Just when there was an important division
Today we decided to revenge that decision
To try to embarrass the Opposition
By not asking any questions we were derailed
And once again my Labor Government has failed
My silver tail has been tarnished
And my Ministers served up as garnish

It is headed, 'Hamilton's lament'. No doubt it refers to the member for Albert Park. Had he not missed the division, the legislation would have passed this House by 1 a.m.

I support the Bill very reluctantly because I believe there is a sting in the tail. I have never been happy with the system of property valuations for taxation purposes, whether it be delivery of services such as water and sewerage or council rates. The system is wrong. In 1979, the then member for Davenport (now Leader of the Opposition) and I conducted a very successful campaign in the metropolitan area against the property valuation system. Following a number of meetings that the honourable member held on his side of the city, we had a meeting in the Henley Beach Town Hall which was attended by over 500 ratepayers and residents. It was a very successful meeting because, a few weeks later, Des Corcoran's Government called an election, and we won the seat of Henley Beach. Water rates have always been and will always be a very contentious issue. This morning's *Advertiser* (page 9) carried an article headed, 'Financial first for E&WS'. It reads:

The Engineering and Water Supply Department broke even for the first time in its history in the past financial year. Its annual report says the department achieved a 'zero impact' on the State budget in 1991-92. This represented a $24.1 million improvement on the previous year. E&WS Chief Executive Mr Ted Phipps says in the report that two years ago the department drew $43 million from the Consolidated Revenue but in the latest year it broke even. Mr Phipps says in 1992-93 the department would further lower its costs by reducing its work force by 800 people.

I remember that a Public Accounts Committee report was very critical of some of the practices of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The member for Chaffey, who was the responsible Minister in the Tonkin Government, very proudly boasted of reducing the staff by 800 people. So, the E&WS has been savaged in terms of its work force. Along with the railway workshops, its workshops were among the best in the State. We are gradually losing all those skills and apprenticeship opportunities in the E&WS, and I regret that.

I regret that the priorities of the Government in handling the State finances are such that we are downgrading and downsizing the skilled workshops of some of our Government instrumentalities. I think that is a tragedy. I appeal to Ted Phipps, the Government and the Minister at the table tonight to seriously consider what they are doing in regard to the skilled work force because the Minister knows, as well as I do, that during his term as Chairman of the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, we were concerned about the lack of provision of sufficient capital to replace the wasting assets in large Government instrumentalities, particularly the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Mention has already been made of the huge cost of supplying water to country areas.

We will never recoup the cost of providing water to the decentralised population in the State. It is a cost we must bear, but at the same time we must look at replacing the assets—the pipelines—that carry that service and so there will always be financial pressure on the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Rather than creaming off $18.9 million to go into general revenue.

Mr BECKER: Yes, that is a good point, but the point I want to make now is that I think Ted Phipps was a little bit wrong in reporting the results of the department to the media. Let us go back over the past three years. The contribution from consolidated revenue to the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been some $56 million and it goes like this: for the financial year ending 30 June 1990, on page 73 of the Auditor-General's Report, under 'Funding', the report states:

The department meets its recurrent costs of business and community service undertakings from funds generated through operations which are controlled through a special deposit account at Treasury. The State's contribution from consolidated account of $20.6 million ($19.6 million) essentially represents a residual amount which the department is unable to recover, reflecting the cost of community service undertakings and deficits incurred by undertakings developed on other than an economic basis. Refer note 3 to the accounts.

The report explains further at page 76:

SA Government Contribution:
Under funding arrangements with the SA Treasury Department, the department is required to finance its business activities from revenue earned and with an agreed contribution from the consolidated account to support community service undertakings.

For the financial year ending 30 June 1991, at page 73 the Auditor-General's Report states:

The department meets its recurrent costs of business and community service undertakings from funds generated . . . The

State's contribution from consolidated account of $15.8 million . . .

Note 4 at page 77 once again explains the system. It states:

Under funding arrangements with the SA Treasury Department, the department is required to finance its business activities from revenue earned and with an agreed contribution from the consolidated account to support community service undertakings. During the year, the amount of the contribution was revised downwards resulting in an unfunded loss of $4.5 million, comprising a loss on irrigation and drainage of $9 million partly offset by a profit on other business undertakings (that is, community service operations) of $4.5 million (Note 14 refers).

This year the Auditor-General's Report, under 'Funding', at page 60 states:

During 1991-92 a change in accounting practices by the Treasury Department resulted in a reduction in the funds available to the department. These funds, which had previously been provided from the consolidated account, were no longer available:

An operating contribution to meet the cost of community service undertakings and deficits incurred by undertakings developed on other than an economic basis. The net cost of these undertakings during 1991-92 amounted to $26.6 million; contributions to offset the cost of various capital expenditures, with respect to undertakings which were previously treated as non-departmental undertakings.

The expenditures relating to these undertakings have been included in the department's business undertakings for the first time during 1991-92. As a consequence of this, an abnormal expenditure has been recognised to reflect the impact of this change upon the operating result for the 1991-92 financial year. (Refer notes 1.2 *(b)* and 4.)

The real trick in all this, and not spelt out by the *Advertiser* in the E&WS Department report statements, is that the department had an operating loss of $1 million. There was the 'less abnormal' item of $22.6 million, and then there was an operating loss of $23.615 million. The retained profits from the previous financial year totalled $22.129 million. Overall, as at 30 June, there is now a loss of $1.486 million. In the wash-up, it means that, whilst the Engineering and Water Supply Department was forced to carry the cost for the first time in its history, the department and the Government used all the retained profits to wipe off this expenditure. So, commencing on 1 July this financial year, in effect the department is $1.4 million in the red. It is starting behind the eight-ball. Unfortunately, therefore, 800 people will be forced to lose their jobs so that the department can operate on an equitable basis.

I wish that the Government and the public servants charged with these responsibilities would spell out exactly what happens, because the people of South Australia are a little tired of being the pawns in an economic game. The Engineering and Water Supply Department must increase its revenue and its efficiency. The way to increase its revenue has been the concoction of a new, increased rating system based on the 'user pays' principle, which I do not like. There are traps in it, and I believe that the residents and taxpayers of this State will rue the day.

I am all for conserving water, but the Engineering and Water Supply Department has never encouraged the use of rainwater tanks for the storage of rainwater. Every time I have asked the question of the Government of the day, even when my own Party was in power, there was never a positive statement from the Engineering and Water Supply Department in relation to storing water on private properties, even if it were only for our gardens. Where I live, I doubt that we could safely store rainwater collected from the roofs of our properties to be used for drinking purposes. I accept that, but to use it, for example, on the garden or in the laundry would not be a waste of water. I do not think the department has really done its job in that area of water conservation.

To force people to cut down on the amount of water used on their gardens is unfair, because people have the right to a large or small garden, a native garden or whatever. There have been some wonderful experiments with native gardens, particularly in Leigh Creek. What the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Electricity Trust of South Australia achieved there was absolutely superb.

Roxby Downs is another example, and we should be educated in that regard. But I do not like the system and I am not happy with what has been presented by way of this legislation. We have been told that in the 1994-95 financial year a step price of 1.08c a kilolitre for consumption of water over and above 700 kilolitres in a financial year will be introduced. So, it will not take us very long to get to a $1 per kilolitre for the price of water irrespective of how much water is used. I acknowledge that not too many houses will use more than 700 kilolitres. Julian Stefani probably will, but he can afford it, so I would not worry about him. The average ratepayer would probably use about 350 kilolitres per year. It will not be long before pressure is placed on those people.

We do all we can to encourage elderly people to remain on their property—I bet Hugh Hudson realised that when he came up with the current formula—and South Australia is heading Australia in this regard: health authorities encourage people to remain on their own property. The aged will worry about the price of water. They worry now about the price of electricity and heating, and soon they will be faced with a further worry: the cost of water. It will be expensive in today's terms for those who are dependent on a fixed income or pension to maintain the average residential property. I think it is unfair to force people to live in home units or smaller properties. Over the years, I have had many complaints about home units, and I would never encourage anyone to buy one. It is very difficult to get three or five people to live in harmony on a normal residential block.

There is a sting in this legislation, and that refers to the assessment of vacant blocks of land. There are many vacant blocks of land in my electorate, and there are many in the new electorate of Peake where market gardens have been subdivided and a few blocks have been retained by the former owners.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I hope so, and then we will have a look at Barton Terrace for the member for Adelaide. The market gardens have been subdivided and the original owners have retained two or three blocks of land to use as a hobby garden or in future planning for families. They will be hit pretty severely. Councils in those areas do not encourage people to hold vacant blocks of land for their families. They rate those properties so severely that some owners are being forced to sell their blocks of land because the rates are too expensive.

So, with pressure from councils and now from the water rating system, people will no longer be encouraged or able to fulfil their dream of providing a block of land for members of their family, and their relatives will no longer be able to reside alongside them. People who own these properties have close family ties and would prefer to live alongside their ageing parents so they can assist them and so their parents will not be a burden on the State. All that initiative and encouragement is being chipped away bit by bit by this type of legislation that does not encourage incentives. When you take away incentives from people you lead the Government and the economy into all sorts of poor and negative situations.

I am not happy at all. I believe that the base rate is far too low. I understand that the department missed out on several million dollars; that the cash flow to the department was put in jeopardy under the previous rating system that this replaces, because of the low base of the water rate charge. It should be far higher, and it should not be in the Government's interest to be able to collect excessive water rates on a half yearly basis because people have excess water consumption. It would be better to have four equal payments close to the average at a much higher rate and, therefore, give the department a stronger cash flow to meet its obligations rather than to reduce that cash flow to a six monthly basis. The department needs to look at its financial income raising situation more closely.

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): It is my pleasure to be able to stand this evening and support the passage of this Bill through the House. It is appropriate at this time to reflect on the title of the Bill and to comment that, perhaps, rather than being called the Waterworks (Residential Rating) Amendment Bill it should have been called the State Government Backflip Bill or, perhaps, the Many Changes Then Backflip Bill, because we have seen this legislation undergo amazing changes over the past few months. During that debacle, my colleague the member for Heysen was continually berated by the previous Minister of Water Resources for consistently insisting that the previous Bill was wrong, unjust and unfair. However, at the end of the day, the current Bill is before the Parliament through the efforts of my colleague the member for Heysen and the Liberal Party in general. This Bill replaces the amendment Bill that was introduced in 1991, which provided for the iniquitous property or wealth tax without any connection to the amount of water consumed.

Rather than calling the tax that was inflicted by the original 1991 Bill a wealth tax, I prefer to call it a family home tax for, indeed, that is exactly what it was. When the Bill was first touted, we looked at all homes with a value of $100 000 or more being subjected to this tax. That was then moved to $111 000 and then, again, to a slightly greater figure before being moved to $140 000 through an agreement reached in the other place between the Australian Democrats and the Liberal Party. The 1991 legislation was continually changed by the Government until the Opposition in this State finally succeeded in bringing the Government to its senses and making it realise that this impost on South Australians was totally unacceptable.

It is pleasing for us on this side of the Chamber to see members of the Government having to stand and eat humble pie over this Bill, because that is what they are having to do: one massive backflip, because this is not the Bill they would have liked to see pass this Parliament. This is a Bill that has been put forward reluctantly because the Government messed up—and messed up badly—but, after today's events, that is becoming a commonplace activity of this Government. The Government did not get too much right at all during today's parliamentary proceedings.

Dr Armitage: Hear, hear! Three out of three.

Mr MATTHEW: Three out of three indeed, as my colleague the member for Adelaide quite rightly points out. The new system provides that there will be two distinct rates for residential properties: a supply charge for water supply availability, and the water rate based on consumption is retained. The system will provide independent changes to the supply charge water allowance and prices per kilolitre. Unfortunately, the level of charges proposed for the 1993-94 financial year represents no change from those applying to 1992-93, except that the residential property component has been abolished.

In the 1994-95 financial year it is proposed that a step price of 1.08 kilolitres for consumption above 700 kilolitres will be introduced. It is unfortunate that this Bill was not implemented at an earlier date in order that all South Australians could commence to pay a fair water rate effective immediately, but the Opposition is at least pleased that the 1991 Bill is so unceremoniously dumped in its ultimate intent on this occasion. During my contribution to this debate, the member for Mitchell insists on having his say again, after having already spoken to the House—

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: —and he continues to interject. I think it is important to back up the statements I have already made about the original 1991 Bill being nothing more than a tax on the family home; a tax on the home of families in the electorates of the member for Mitchell and the member for Playford; and a tax on people who, during the economic climate that has been created by this irresponsible Government, forcing people into unemployment, can ill afford it. The Liberal Party has been proud to stand up for those people in this Parliament. By way of example, I point to the suburb of South Brighton in my own electorate. When the figure of $100 000 was first floated by this Government as the initial family home tax figure, I took the liberty of doing some computer checks of housing values right through my electorate and I found that as at 30 June 1990 in South Brighton 49.5 per cent of properties were worth $100 000 or more; and it is fair to say that a similar percentage, with increases in the real estate property market, would probably apply to those at $140 000 and above, or certainly within a very short time frame.

Suburbs such as Brighton and South Brighton have been occupied for quite some considerable time, and when those suburbs were developed they were regarded by many people in Adelaide as being part of the outer metropolitan area. For that reason, much of the land,

particularly in South Brighton on the eastern side of Brighton Road, was settled by ex-servicemen, in many cases, in war service homes. They did not pay a lot for their land and through no fault of their own their family home has increased in value because their suburb has been developed in a most pleasant way and, rather than being regarded as part of the outer metropolitan area, it is now regarded as part of inner metropolitan Adelaide. It was quite wrong for those people at the time of their retirement to be inflicted with this family home tax that was proposed by this Government.

Indeed, other suburbs in my electorate would have been affected in much the same way. For example, 82.7 per cent of houses in the suburb of Marino as at 30 June 1990 were valued at $110 000 or more. In nearby Kingston Park, 79 per cent had a similar valuation, and in the new and growing suburb of Hallett Cove, 51.3 per cent fell into that category. In many respects the suburb of Hallett Cove is probably much like the suburb of North Haven; it has been carefully developed over the years and people have maintained their properties with pride, and there are many new homebuyers. Those people have had to struggle with mortgage rates at a time of high interest rates and indeed they should not have been subjected to this impost either.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: And now the seatless member for Gilles starts to interject, too. We are talking about a family home tax.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: If the member for Gilles keeps this up, I doubt whether he would find a seat at all that would be prepared to take him, because no member of this Parliament could stand up and defend any sort of tax on the family home in this State. That is what it was—a tax on the family home. Members can protest as much as they like, but in reality that is what it was, and that is why the backflip has occurred, because members of the Liberal Party were inundated with letters from concerned constituents and concerned members of the public.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: And so were members opposite.

Mr MATTHEW: As my colleague, the member for Heysen, who has battled for this legislation for so long, quite rightly points out, so were members of the Government. However, they ignored their constituents. The reason the member for Heysen is aware of this is that, on receiving the appalling responses from their Labor Party representatives, the constituents of members opposite wrote to Liberal Party members and said, 'These are the responses we have received; this is the response from our so-called Labor Party representative. They want to tax our family home. We implore you, Liberal Party, to please help us do something about it.'

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Yes, we did.

Mr MATTHEW: As the member for Heysen said, we did, through the actions of the member for Heysen fighting continually and debating with the former Minister of Water Resources on the radio, on television, through the newspapers, day in, day out. The member for Heysen wanted—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: She still hasn't apologised.

Mr MATTHEW: As the member for Heysen says, the former Minister still has not apologised to the Parliament. Indeed, it is pertinent also to reflect that the former Minister—the member for Mawson and the current Labor Party candidate for Reynell—seeks to represent after the next election people who live in suburbs such as Reynella, Sheidow Park and Trott Park, which are very similar types of suburbs to Hallett Cove and North Haven, where people have homes that would have fallen into the family home tax category, where people would have been subjected to this family home tax through the very Minister who seeks to represent them. I am sure that those people will reflect on that point come the day of deliverance at the next State poll—a date all members on this side of House look forward to with much eagerness indeed.

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

Mr MATTHEW: I realise I am not supposed to the respond to interjections and I certainly would not do so but the Minister suggested that I should keep a straight face when talking. This is a very serious topic and would I hope that the new Minister of Public Infrastructure, with the very important responsibility for the water resources portfolio, would be concerned. I hope that the new Minister will be ensuring that this family home tax is never again placed upon the people of our State, because that is simply not an appropriate way for a Government to act. Despite the fact that Government has lost $3.15 billion through the State Bank, to try to recover some of those moneys through taxing the family home is indeed getting about a low as any Government can go.

Fortunately, we now have the Bill before us and it will not be entertaining that. But, to ensure that the new Minister is aware of the concerns of people who so actively fought the impost when it was first announced, I would like to quote quickly in the little time remaining from two letters. The first letter quite rightly points out that this property tax, or family home tax impost, was a victory to the socialist left of Labor Party. It was actually printed in *Advertiser* of 25 January 1991. It was written by a Mr Anthony Tagni of Cherry Gardens, who stated:

> The State Government's new method of calculating water rates is yet another example of socialist mentality. To impose punitive measures upon the diligent, prudent and enterprising members of our community cuts across the fabric upon which the once great country was established.
>
> It is high time our socialist custodians realised that weakening the strong does nothing to strengthen the weak.
>
> If the message was not made entirely clear to Mr Bannon and company at the last State election, I'm certain he will get the picture at the next.

I remind the Minister of those last words again: 'I'm certain he will get the picture at the next.' Another letter that was printed in the *Advertiser* was written by one of my own constituents, a Mr Delaney of Brighton, and he stated, in part:

> What a pity it is that the 'brains' who designed the new E&WS water rating system (and those who authorised it) did not have the guts to base water rates solely upon the amount of water used. What could be fairer?
>
> Far from being fair, the minority Government of this State has now set precedent.
>
> Other Government charges could well be based upon similar charging schedules using this E&WS 'wealth tax' idea.
>
> This is Fabianism in action! Imagine ETSA charging for electricity at one rate for a property valued at $111 000 and another rate for those over that amount!
>
> The mind boggles.

Indeed, one could go further and ask whether in fact Telecom would consider basing its charges on the value

of the family home. Certainly, it was not appropriate then; it is not appropriate now. I am pleased this Bill is finally before the House to enable us to once and for all reject this tax on the family home. Therefore, with much pleasure, I support this Bill.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Before I get on to the more serious aspect of this Bill and following the precedent set by the member for Hanson, I would like to read a little ditty. It is entitled 'A Cod Piece: Tribute to Murray':

There was a young cod called Murray, dispatched to the show in a hurry. He gave pleasure to those who gathered to marvel and generated affection never seen before at Wayville. But sadly Murray has now gone to the big river in the sky because of a stuff up in fisheries that cut off his water and left him to die. I know you will agree it is a sad and sorry tale, although we can all be comforted by the tearful compassion shown by our sensitive new age man—Dale.

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the member for Fisher should not give up his day job. I also suggest that he bring his remarks back to the Bill before the House.

Mr SUCH: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your words of wisdom. I do not think that I will take up fishing, either. Getting to the more serious aspects of the Bill, I should like to draw the attention of members to the fact that on 23 August 1990 I raised the matter of the property tax during Question Time in this House. For the benefit of all members and the community at large, I should like to repeat what was recorded in *Hansard* at the time. Under the heading 'Property Tax', I said:

My question is directed to the Minister of Water Resources. How much revenue does the Government expect to generate on an annual basis as a result of its recently detailed property tax based on an acceptance of the recommendation of the Hudson water pricing review . . .

The Minister, responding, said:

I thank the honourable member for his question. I would like to correct the honourable member in terms of his assertion that we are talking about a property tax.

The Minister went on with other points and then, in respect of what Mr Hudson decided and what he was asked to consider, said:

First, he was asked to look at a fundamental user-pays system which at the same time preserved a social equity or social justice component and also incorporated into that water rating system a conservation ethic and philosophy. I believe that Mr Hudson has come up with what, on any sensible analysis, could be seen as a true user-pays system. I am happy to go through this time and time again. He has also managed to pick up the whole concept of conservation and has looked at the question of social justice and social equity.

I believe that the scheme that will come into being at the end of June 1991 will be much simpler, more easily understood by the community and fairer; it will be a scheme under which the vast majority of South Australians will not pay any more for their water.

What ironical words were provided on that day by the Minister who sought to take issue with me as the first person to raise the notion of a property tax. As has been confirmed time and again, largely as a result of the work of the member for Heysen, that property tax or wealth tax has been seen for what it is.

I welcome this Bill. I acknowledge that it is not a true user-pays system, but it is a significant step towards a user-pays system and to a large extent follows the developments that have taken place in New South Wales in regard to the policies initiated by the Hunter District Water Board. I welcome the move towards a user-pays system, acknowledging that it is not a pure user-pays system. My constituents raised many concerns about the old system. They will be pleased that the Government has seen fit to revise and adopt a new system. The old system had many anomalies in it, and many of the suburbs in my electorate were disadvantaged because of the wealth tax or property tax element.

It is often said that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent. The reality is that we are not short of water; we are short of quality water. On the wider global scene, good quality water is the scarcest resource in the world and we should not forget that. Any scheme such as this which encourages people not to waste water is to be encouraged, applauded and welcomed.

To that end, I welcome this Bill. I believe it is a move in the right direction. It gets rid of the obnoxious and inequitable property tax element, about which the Opposition has expressed concern for a long time and which was totally rejected by the community as being unfair and unreasonable. I look forward to supporting the passage of this Bill with some questioning during the Committee stage. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): If it is true that success has many parents and that failure is an orphan, then this piece legislation has been incredibly successful. In fact, while a number of people here were all claiming authorship of the Bill, I had a mental image of this Bill being a bride going to the alter to be married to the Act and in the train of this Bill an awful lot of people all vehemently arguing that they were the parent. The image of all these people in the bride's train vehemently claiming paternity was something that tickled my fancy, so I thought I would share it with the House.

I do not think that, despite the fact that a number of people who spoke in this debate went back into part of the history of the Bill, there is much point in my doing that. The process has been debated in this House on a number of occasions, through Question Time and through other methods. There seems to be very little point in my entering the arena where many people are carrying emotional baggage.

However, a thread of irony runs through this process that I want to tease out. The point made by the member for Mitchell is quite accurate. The original pre-1990 system had existed on a property-based system for many years. That was so during the Playford, Hall and Tonkin Government years. In none of those years was any attempt made to change the system.

We need to remember that it is only in recent years that people have been agitating in any way for a major change. It is in recent years only that the present Minister of Education, Employment and Training, the former Minister of Water Resources, had the courage to tackle this system and to try to make some changes. She has been very strongly criticised for the first of the two Bills that made the changes, the second one of which we are debating at the moment.

I will read to the House some facts that need to be taken into consideration before one takes too much note of that criticism, that is, that the fixed rate component in 1990-91—that is prior to the changes—was $77 million. In 1991-92, after the first change, that fixed rate

component income to the E&WS Department was approximately $60 million. So, there was a reduction of $17 million in the fixed rate component. It is remarkable that a number of people claim that the reduction in the take of $17 million in this fixed rate component is somehow or other a socialist Left increase in wealth tax. It is the first negative wealth tax of which I have heard that is being criticised. So, there is an oddity.

One ought also to put that in perspective in terms of what this second change is bringing about. The 'wealth tax component' of the fixed rate that was raised in 1991-92 was $4.9 million. So, there had been a reduction of $17 million, and a total of $4.9 million was still being collected. In 1992-93, it is expected to be $3.6 million and, of course, that will be abolished by this Bill in years thereafter. So, we have here a situation where the member for Mawson is being criticised quite unfairly for having taken the courage to bring the first Bill before the House, and I make no claim to being the father, author or whatever of this second Bill. That is certainly also something that the member for Mawson, in her capacity as Minister of Water Resources, brought to this stage, and I am merely introducing it because I currently happen to carry the portfolio of water resources within my aegis.

However, the final result is that there will be a user-pays system, and that will be an encouragement to use less water due to the fact that there is stepped price situation. Certainly, the claims that the member for Mawson made at various stages that this was a way of encouraging people to save water in respect of both Bills has turned out to be true. It is always difficult to separate water usage from factors such as weather, but a couple of years ago water usage was about 230 gigalitres. The anticipated amount this year was 200 gigalitres, and it is more likely that the amount will be 190 gigalitres.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: As the honourable member says, and as I said before he interjected, it is impossible to separate the seasonal factors out of all this, but a reduction from 230 gigalitres a couple of years ago to about 190 gigalitres this year is a significant shift in water usage, and I suspect that at least part of it was due to the fact that there was a great deal more consciousness that changes to the Act were taking place.

I note that some members made a more spirited contribution to the debate than others, that some made a more relevant contribution to the debate than others and that some were more accurate than others and that some supported the Bill more than others. However, I understand that the Bill has universal approval in this Chamber and I therefore thank members for their contribution.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What specific measures are being taken by the Government to ensure that the current price of water is maintained or reduced?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thought that that was part of the second reading speech: that there will be no increase in the price of water for the coming year, so that there will in fact be a reduction in real terms, assuming that there is a positive inflation rate. After that one assumes that the efficiencies of the department will have some bearing on the matter, but I am not willing to promise more than one year ahead at this stage.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand what the Minister is saying, but I thought that there might have been specific measures that the department and the Government were looking at to ensure that the price of water was kept as low as possible. There is an expectation in the community that that should be the case, and I would have anticipated that special processes and measures would be considered by the E&WS Department to ensure that that was the case.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his implied assumption that this Government is going to be around for more than one year, and I share his belief. Certainly, there are a number of factors that always come into play in these matters. I have already referred to one in the closure of the second reading debate, that is, that less water is being used.

I do not believe that all of that is due to seasonal factors. Therefore, that affects the income of the department, and one would be working flat out with efficiency matters just to offset that reduction in income because, as the honourable member would be aware, if one's income goes down, one has to reduce expenditure as well. I am conscious of the fact that it would be useful, sensible and desirable to keep the water price as low as possible, and this Government will certainly work towards that. As I have indicated, there will be a real reduction next year because the price of water will not increase. However, it would be foolish to try to predict trends beyond that year, and I do not intend to do so.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will take that matter further on another occasion. I accept that we now have what can be generally recognised as a user-pays system for water supply in the metropolitan area. What steps are being taken to introduce a similar user-pays system for sewage disposal? I ask that recognising that the costs of sewage disposal are based purely on property valuations.

The CHAIRMAN: That question does not have much to do with the Bill, but I will invite the Minister to respond.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I agree that it is very difficult to talk about sewage in a Bill of this nature, so I will give only a very brief response. There are major difficulties in trying to deal with sewage on a user-pays basis and, having said that, that is probably sufficient indication of the difficulties. I understand that there are very few places in the world where this is even attempted and that there are some major difficulties in those places. Most of them end up being a variation of a charge on the household, the number of people who live in a house or things of that nature. In terms of where we are heading, they tend to be almost regressive, because they are not so much user-pays as based on house value, number of people living in a house or various permutations of those factors. It is a difficult area and I do not intend to pursue it in the immediate future.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Rates on residential land.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: During debate on the previous clause, the Minister gave a disappointing response to a question I asked about the introduction of a

user-pays system for sewage disposal. While I am delighted that there have been negotiations between the E&WS and the Hunter Valley Water Board which have enabled us to move closer to a user-pays system for water supply, the Minister might be interested to know, if he does not realise it already, that the Hunter Valley has almost totally moved to a user-pays system for sewage disposal. I encourage the Minister to seek further negotiations with the Hunter Valley Water Board and to follow some of the steps taken by that authority in regard to bringing in a similar system for sewage disposal.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have to disabuse the honourable member of the notion that the Hunter Valley has a user-pays sewage disposal system or a charge for it on that basis. The board charges a percentage of the water used, and I have said that that is one of the variations. We can talk in terms of the number of toilets in the house, the number of people in a house, the value of a house or the amount of water that is charged.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: That was probably an unkind comment, and I should not refer to what would happen to people who use six tonnes of water a day if their sewer charge was based on a percentage of that water. It does point out the difficulties of and the illusion that is created by our saying that we can have a value based system of some kind when it is actually based on another variable rather than on the amount of sewage that is disposed from that household.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What percentage of consumers will fall into the over 700 kilolitre bracket? Two figures were quoted originally when the previous Minister announced that the new system would be introduced. She referred to it as being 1 per cent of consumers: I believe that in more recent times it has been stated that it is closer to 2.5 per cent. Regarding the desirability of a separate system, we have already said that the Opposition supports the added cost as part of a conservation measure. If we are talking about 1 per cent or even 2.5 per cent of all consumers, I question the need to look at changing the system in any way to pull into the net so few people.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My advice still is that the figure is about 1 per cent, and the comment that the honourable member makes is probably reasonably valid, but I think this stepped price is being used to do two things: to penalise, if you like, or to cause an extra charge to be paid by those people who do in fact have a very high water usage rate; and also, in a sense, to give a message to everyone else because, if people are aware that there is some point in their water usage at which they will have to pay an extra amount per kilolitre, they are likely to be more careful in the use of water even if they never get up to that magical 700 kilolitre figure. The sending of the message is at least as important as actually dealing with a percentage of people, whatever that percentage happens to be.

Mr LEWIS: Under the provisions of this clause, does the Minister see that the revenue obtained by government is obtained in return for the provision of a service which is provided for profit? Is it a public service in the philosophical, economic and accounting sense that is simply provided on a cost recovery basis not only for the water involved but also to provide some funds for the restoration and repair of infrastructure, and replacement of it for that matter, or does the Government set out to make a profit on the sale of the water, in effect, to the ratepayer?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: First, I draw attention to the fact that this has absolutely nothing to do with this clause, but you, Mr Chairman, have been fairly lax in that regard so far.

The CHAIRMAN: I am trying to please everybody; it does not alway work.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am happy to try to answer the honourable member's question, if indeed I understand it correctly. Is the honourable member asking me whether the extra 20c per kilolitre over 700 will be put to a special use? I have misunderstood the question. I ask the honourable member to repeat it.

Mr LEWIS: It is important only in the context of whether the Government regards the provision of this service as a means by which it can make profit from its enterprise; that is what I was asking.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for clarifying that. The situation of profit would arise only after one had paid for the infrastructure replacement and various other things of that nature, and after one had a return on the money invested. The money invested in the Engineering and Water Supply Department—in its pipes, dams and so on—is about $10 billion, so the return would have to be quite phenomenal before it breached a normal rate of return figure. It is unlikely to be a matter that will concern us for a number of years yet.

Mr LEWIS: I am very grateful to the Minister for that information, because it reflects the view of the Opposition regarding the service. It is not provided for profit, and accordingly is not taxable under the Coalition's goods and services tax provision. The member for Mitchell is quite mistaken in saying that earlier in the debate. The Fightback package document clearly specifies that no Government service which is provided as a Government service, where it is provided not for profit but for service, is taxable, and that was the reason for my seeking from the Minister the Government's view as to whether or not the service was intended to generate profits for the Government. We do not think it is, nor do we believe that it should be. Accordingly, it will never be subject to a GST.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member has not specifically asked me a question, but I guess I am entitled to a right of reply. Since the honourable member raised the issue of the GST, and as other members have raised the spectre of this reduction of $17 million actually being some kind of wealth tax on the family home, perhaps I can point out that it is my understanding that there is a 15 per cent GST on mortgage payments.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 29 October at 10.30 a.m.