HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 November 1992

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) (Fees) Amendment,
Equal Opportunity (Employment of Juniors) Amendment,
Land Tax (Rates) Amendment,
Local Government (City of Adelaide Wards) Amendment,
Pay-roll Tax (Exemptions) Amendment,
Police Superannuation (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Racing (Dividend Adjustment) Amendment,
South Australian Country Arts Trust,
Statutes Amendment (Commercial Licences),
Summary Offences (Road Blocks) Amendment.

SUPERANNUATION (BENEFITS SCHEME) BILL

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

PETITIONS

GOODWOOD TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

A petition signed by 67 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow for transfer of ownership of Goodwood Technical High School until such time as the local residents and the Unley council are satisfied with any proposed usage was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, we still cannot hear the petitions being read.

The SPEAKER: Again, it is because of the background noise. Everybody is talking at the same time.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Again, Mr Speaker, that microphone is not sufficient to get the voice across.

The SPEAKER: I will have it checked.

CRAIGBURN FARM

A petition signed by 4 617 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to preserve Craigburn Farm was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 108, 117, 133, 147, 150, 163, 164, 172 to 178, 180, 182, 183, 185 to 190, 192, 194, 195, 197, 198, 201, 211 and 219.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
- South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs—Report, 1991-92

By the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
- Report, 1991-92 Attorney-General's Department.
- HomeStart—Report, 1991-92.
- Listening Devices Act 1972—Report on the Operation of, 1991-92.
- Parks Community Centre—Report, 1991-92.
- West Beach Trust—Report, 1991-92.
- Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Regulations—Practising Certificate Fees.
- Professional Indemnity Insurance Scheme.

By the Minister of Environment and Land Management (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
- Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1991-92.
- Beverage Container Act 1975—Regulations—500ml Containers.

By the Minister of Education, Employment and Training (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
- Office of Tertiary Education—Report, 1991-92.

By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
- Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1991-92.
- Department of Correctional Services—Report, 1991-92.

STATE BANK

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The salaries paid to executives of the State Bank and other Government institutions have been the subject of much debate in this place and elsewhere. I have already provided the House with various details concerning the salaries of executives in the State Bank. On 7 October 1992, I tabled the State Bank of South Australia annual report and accounts for 1991-92, which showed that the number of executives paid in excess of $100 000 in the State Bank Group had declined from 51 as at 30 June 1991 to 41 as at 30 June 1992.

On 13 October 1992, I informed the House, on the basis of advice provided to me by the bank, that on a fully comparable basis (that is, excluding the incorporation of Ayers Finniss and Beneficial Finance into the bank) the number of executives being paid more than $100 000 in the bank had declined from 24 in 1991 to 23 in 1992.

As members would be well aware, the Economic and Finance Committee is currently undertaking an inquiry into the executive structures and salaries of the State's statutory authorities. Whilst I do not in any way wish to pre-empt the findings of this committee, I believe that, in the light of the information coming to my attention in the course of the committee's inquiries and in view of the material I have already provided to the House on salaries in the State Bank, it would be appropriate that I advise the House of the situation as it now stands.

In the process of compiling information for the Economic and Finance Committee inquiry, the Group Managing Director of the bank has provided me with details of the salaries of all officers in the State Bank Group who earn $100 000 or more. This information is in far greater detail than that contained in the bank's annual accounts, and I am advised it is in far greater detail than the information that other banks and companies provide under corporations law or any other reporting requirement.

As has been highlighted before, the State Bank prepares its financial statements as if it were 'a prescribed corporation' as defined under the corporations law. The State Bank's reporting with regard to remuneration is consistent with the requirements as defined by schedule 5 of the corporations law. Consistent with the requirements of the corporations law, the definition of 'executive officer' used by the State Bank is any officer who meets the following criteria: the Managing Director and his direct reports and their direct reports, who hold managerial roles, not technical roles, and for whom total remuneration cost to the bank (less superannuation) exceeds $100 000 per annum, and who are of chief manager or equivalent status and above in the organisation; or is a director of a controlled entity and has a total remuneration cost (less superannuation) exceeding $100 000 per annum.

The State Bank's accounts have been examined by the bank's external auditors who have confirmed that the bank's reporting on executive remuneration is consistent with the approach taken by other reporting companies, including other banks. I have been advised that the State Bank has strictly abided by the reporting requirements under corporations law with regard to reporting on executive remuneration. Despite complying with the corporations law, officers in the State Bank, as with other corporations, can be earning in excess of $100 000 yet need not be included in the remuneration disclosures in the annual report. This arises where the officer was not classified as an 'executive'—this would be the case for technical officers or officers below chief manager status; officers who worked wholly or mainly during the year outside Australia are also exempt from disclosure in annual reports under the corporations law; and officers who receive superannuation benefits which are not required to be included in remuneration costs, yet these benefits may increase their total remuneration above $100 000.

In compiling the information for the Economic and Finance Committee, the State Bank was asked to provide details on all officers, whether or not executives, with total remuneration of $100 000 or more (including superannuation). The Group Managing Director of the State Bank has advised me that as at 1 July 1992 there were 95 employees of the State Bank Group with remuneration of $100 000 or more. This compares with a total of about 115 at the same time in the previous year. Of these 95 officers, 11 are on relatively short-term contracts with the bank and a further 14 are overseas.

The Group Managing Director has advised me that, as part of the ongoing downsizing of the bank, the number of officers being paid in excess of $100 000 will continue to decrease. As at 1 November 1992, the number of officers with packages of $100 000 or more had fallen to 90, and this number is projected to decrease further in future years. I table a full schedule of this information showing the number of officers in each $10 000 salary band for salaries of $100 000 and above as at 1 July 1991, 1 July 1992 and 1 November 1992.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I also want to advise the House that the State Bank Board has adopted a policy of rewarding various officers in the bank with a performance bonus. These bonuses will not be paid—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—if performance targets are not met. This approach avoids increasing the base salary of employees which would result in increased salary costs in future years. As with many banks, the State Bank operates a bonus scheme for its treasury division to encourage and ensure a high level of performance.

Last financial year, the treasury division exceeded its budgeted profit by approximately 2.5 times, and has recently recorded its thirty-second consecutive month of profitable activity. As a consequence, under the policy adopted by the board, a number of officers in the treasury division of the bank have earned a bonus based on their performance. These bonuses have been included in the total remuneration figures shown in the schedule. The specific details of the total remuneration of all officers, including bonuses and superannuation, have been provided to the Economic and Finance Committee.

While the State Bank complies strictly with the corporations law requirements regarding its disclosure of remuneration in annual reports, the Government believes that the Parliament and the people of South Australia should be provided with more information. The narrow definition of 'executive' used by many corporations means that the remuneration of many senior and highly paid officers is not disclosed in annual reports. In addition, there is no requirement under corporations law to disclose the salary of executives based overseas.

In light of this, the Government has requested the board of the State Bank in future to report in its annual report the salary of any officer whose salary falls within each $10 000 band of income over $100 000 regardless of whether they are classified as executives or otherwise

and regardless of whether they are based in Australia or overseas. It is intended that the SGIC, GAMD and, where appropriate, other statutory authorities will also comply with this new standard.

In addition to statutory authorities adopting this new standard of disclosure, I believe it is important that a similar high standard be adopted by all public companies in Australia. As a consequence, I have asked the Attorney-General to make representations to the Federal Attorney-General to amend schedule 5 of the corporations law to ensure that a more complete disclosure of remuneration is included in the financial reports of Australian companies.

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

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand there will be adequate Question Time for anyone to ask any questions, to make any comment or to explain any question if they desire. When leave is granted for a statement, leave is granted.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier is out of order. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. On 10 September 1992 I advised the House of action that the Government had taken regarding the release of customer information by the State Bank to Data Connection Pty Ltd for the purpose of a telemarketing scheme. At that time, I pointed out that preliminary advice from the Crown Solicitor suggested that the release of names, addresses and telephone numbers to Data Connection Pty Ltd may have been lawful. However, it was not clear that the release of the bankcard numbers was necessary and the Crown Solicitor has considerable doubts, given the sensitivity and confidentiality of these numbers, that they should have been released.

At the time, the State Bank advised that it had independent legal advice which indicated that the provision of customer information by the State Bank was in the 'normal course of business' and, as such, it was not in contravention of section 29a of the State Bank Act. Notwithstanding this advice, in light of the importance of protecting customer confidentiality, I requested the Crown Solicitor to undertake a more detailed investigation into the matter. The Crown Solicitor has now completed a full investigation. I table a summary of the conclusions of that investigation prepared by the Crown Solicitor.

While the investigation has revealed a number of concerns about the practices adopted by the bank, the Crown Solicitor does not recommend prosecution of any officer of the bank for breach of section 29a of the State Bank Act. The Crown Solicitor is of the opinion that direct selling and direct mailing by a bank to its customers can be considered as part of the 'normal business of banking'. The investigation, however, revealed that the bank officers involved were not fully aware of their responsibilities.

The Crown Solicitor concluded that the bank officers seemed to be of the view that, if other banks engaged in direct mailing and if it was commercially advantageous for the bank to do so, it was appropriate to provide the bankcard numbers. The officers did not consider all of the information provided so as to ensure that it was necessary for that information to be provided.

The investigation also found that the explanation offered to bank customers who queried whether the data collection company had their bankcard numbers was inappropriate and that the bank should not have agreed to this form of words which implied that the data collection company did not have access to bankcard numbers. In addition, the protections obtained by the data collection company and telemarketing company to protect the confidentiality of customer information were insufficient.

I am satisfied following this investigation that the officers involved are now fully aware of the full extent of their obligations in this case. As I mentioned in my statement on 10 September, the Group Managing Director immediately stopped the release of customer information on 7 September and cancelled the State Bank's involvement in the telemarketing program at the time when concerns were first raised. In light of this, the Government accepts the advice of the Crown Solicitor and sees no need to take further action on this issue.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister Assisting the Premier on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: On 19 November 1991 I asked the Minister of Multicultural and Ethic Affairs, now the Premier, if he was considering changing the name of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs by deleting the word 'ethnic' and, if so, the reasons for such a change. The Premier responded at that time by indicating that a survey would be conducted and that he would let the survey of groups determine what finally happened in this regard.

The matter was then referred to the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and on 21 February 1992 a letter was written by the Chairman of the Commission to 209 organisations. The letter was accompanied by a statement setting out the cases 'for' and 'against', and a voting paper was included which gave the opportunity for the organisation to add comments. A reply paid envelope was also enclosed.

Of the 96 responses received, 56 (or 58.3 per cent) were in favour of retaining the word 'ethnic' in the title of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs; 39 (or 40.6 per cent) were not in favour; and one respondent did not express a view one way or the other. One of the respondents was Ethnic Broadcasters Inc. (5EBI-FM) which, in the preparation of the reply, had consulted each of its 42 member groups. The result was 60 per cent in favour and 40 per cent not in favour. This reflected the same kind of voting pattern as in the survey itself.

Some of the respondents added additional comments. The view of those voting in favour is expressed in the comment that the word 'multicultural' is inclusive of the

whole community and the term 'ethnic' denotes something of quality and nature that is distinct. The comment was made that there are ethno-specific matters that require ethno-specific attention. Those who voted against suggested that the word 'ethnic' was divisive in Australian multicultural society, that the word 'multicultural' embraces all ethnic groups and that the term 'ethnic' is therefore superfluous. There is clearly a divergence of opinion on the matter. However, in a recent publication of the Centre for Intercultural Studies and Multicultural Education at the University of Adelaide, entitled 'Australian Diversity', Professor Jerzy Smolicz makes these comments on the matter:

The unfortunate connotations built around the word 'ethnic' are partly due to its mistaken application solely to minorities, and often even to the more visible of them. Appreciation that the term is equally applicable to the English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish ethnic groups or, collectively, to the Anglo-Celtic majority would serve to remove any negative implication. As citizens we are certainly all Australians but, in addition, we all have some kind of ethnic background(s). The two concepts are compatible and apply to Australians of Aboriginal, British, Greek, Vietnamese and all the other ethnic ancestries, which together make up the population of this country.

Since the Premier indicated that he would let the survey of groups determine what finally happened in regard to this matter, and since the survey revealed a 60/40 response pattern in favour of retaining the word 'ethnic' in the names of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, it is not intended to take any action to remove the word 'ethnic' from those titles.

QUESTION TIME

WORKCOVER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety refer to the Police Anti-Corruption Branch a written WorkCover Corporation agreement involving building sites, including Remm, which in five specific areas contravenes the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act, and why did he not refer to this agreement in his statement to the House last Friday? A copy of the agreement, which I have in my possession, contravenes the Act in the following respects:

1. It makes compulsory the payment of four weeks interim compensation in all cases pending the determination of liability, while section 106 of the Act leaves it open for such payments to be made.

2. Denies the right under section 53 of the Act for WorkCover to refer injured workers to independent medical opinion and instead agrees to rely solely on medical advice from practitioners of the worker's choosing.

3. Denies the right under section 92 of the Act to have review matters referred to legal practitioners.

4. Denies WorkCover the right under section 28 of the Act to choose rehabilitation counsellors.

5. Specifies that all overtime must be calculated over the proceeding 13 weeks in setting benefit levels, in contravention of section 4 of the Act.

Clearly, last Friday the Minister misled this Parliament.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On previous occasions you have ruled that members cannot make allegations of that nature except by way of substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. The procedure is very clear and I ask the Leader to withdraw the last comment he made.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I withdraw the allegation.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: No written agreement has been entered into between WorkCover and organisations as explained by the Leader. Irrespective of the document he has, if he had listened when I made my statement last week, he would be aware that I made it clear that a practice had grown up within SGIC—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Following the transfer of the claims group from SGIC to WorkCover, the matter was drawn to the attention of the Manager of WorkCover in correspondence from combined management resources. That was referred to the management of WorkCover. Following that reference the matter was investigated and two agreements were finally reached. One was in respect of procedures and the other was on the method of calculating how wages should be sorted out within the building industry because of the vagaries of how time is worked out. That was done on the initiative of Balderstone's.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Premier advise the House of the number of people who attended this year's Grand Prix? The House will recall that last week, in a question to the Minister of Tourism, I explained that a constituent of mine, Ethel Parkinson, had complained to me about the negative attitude of some media commentators over the Grand Prix. Ethel has since contacted me to ascertain whether that negative attitude influenced the numbers of people attending last Sunday's race.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can certainly reassure the honourable member's constituent that attendances at the Grand Prix were in all the circumstances very good indeed. The figure on Sunday was about 100 000, which was only about 6 000 down on the Sunday figure for the race in the previous year. Over the whole four-day event, 295 000 people attended, approximately 45 000 of them being visitors to Adelaide. It is an excellent figure and a good achievement. I know that some people in the community and some organisations seemed to want to talk the occasion down, but it is pleasing to see that those attempts by people to talk it down, which obviously caused concern to the honourable member's constituent, were not successful. Amongst those people who attended the event were 400 international media people. It was a very good turnout indeed. They have taken back with them from Adelaide some great footage, some great

records, of their visit to Adelaide. I can cite two examples—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It seems that we do have some people who want to talk down the Grand Prix, but we will ignore them, as I think the people of Adelaide obviously ignored the same people at the weekend. A German media crew, for example, has compiled a 23-minute segment based upon various shots around the Grand Prix and Adelaide, which will be going to air in Germany. Likewise, a British crew has included a number of shots of Adelaide and its environs along with the Grand Prix in its presentation of the Grand Prix in the United Kingdom.

Those things are added to by many other features that other media crews from around the world do. We can see in that context just how much of a window on Adelaide is presented to the world by the Grand Prix and how very significant this event is; and the money that is made available to that, through the budget process, is very well spent. It is true that the figure made available this year is likely to be exceeded by the requirements as a result of the effects of the recession and of some expectations about what the weather might have been on the day. However, it is still important to note that the Australian Grand Prix held in Adelaide has been of exceptional financial benefit to this State, bringing in more than $20 million a year to the State's economy, which benefits all South Australians. We are talking of net additions to the State's economy, not reshuffled money within South Australia. That has happened over the same period at significantly less cost to the consolidated revenue—about $7 million less—than the two Indy races have cost Queensland. Eight Grand Prix have cost about $7 million less than just two Indy races have cost.

It is worth noting that, on Monday morning, Will Hagen, noted sports commentator and writer, was interviewed by Keith Conlon, and he commented on how much Governments around Australia have put into motor racing events. It is a very large figure indeed. He says that if we take into account Philip Island, Eastern Creek, the money that the New South Wales Government invested, the losses at the World Sports Car Race at Sandown, the Australian Grand Prix, the Indy car race at Surfers, and so on, Australia has probably spent—he is talking about Governments or similar—$150 million on supporting motor sports, and he makes the comment that he thinks that is a bit high. Then he goes on to comment:

> And let me quickly and emphatically divorce Adelaide from that gigantic figure. Adelaide's costs have been extremely well controlled within very tight budgets and small...relatively small losses that have been far exceeded by the business that's been generated by the Grand Prix for Adelaide, for South Australia, and for Australia generally.

That is the key point: the money that has gone in there, which will be higher this year than we would normally expect and want and which will come down as the recession ends and other factors come into play, is still a good investment for this State. I look forward to Adelaide having this event as a permanent feature, and we will certainly be pushing for that to happen.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. How many claims for the payment of four weeks interim compensation were successfully made under the 22 August 1990 agreement with the WorkCover Corporation, the agreement which contravened the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: My advice is that none of the payments contravened the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Has the Minister had the opportunity to consider the impact that the introduction of a goods and services tax would have on young people in South Australia? With the possibility of a Liberal National Coalition pushing such a policy in South Australia, how will that effect secondary and primary school children in particular?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Since taking over this new portfolio I have had the opportunity to look at the effects of the proposed GST on young people. It is no surprise to anyone who has undertaken this research that, like most people on low incomes, youth will be the most disadvantaged in our community, and I should like to explain to the House why. First, we will see an increase of food—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, it is very important. It is very interesting—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already had to speak to the member for Goyder. I have a fairly extensive list of questions here, and let me assure members that, if they think I will leap to my feet in response to interjections on every question that is on this list, they have another think coming. If we are to get through this list, members must behave.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: We are talking about food increases of 8.85 per cent and clothing, about 11 per cent. We have the spectre of sporting activities, which are not even currently taxed at all—

Mr Becker interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —being taxed at 15 per cent under the GST. The cost of recreational pursuits that young people quite rightly enjoy, such as the cinema, video games and other forms of entertainment, will increase. If we look at the buying patterns of young people in our community, we see that their first car in most if not all cases would be a secondhand car, and secondhand car dealers would be required to charge the GST on their sales. As well as this, we will see an increase in activities and goods ranging from the purchase of books (and I have outlined that to the House) to such things as housing and accommodation.

The combination of the wage rates that the Federal Opposition proposes, plus the cuts to Government

services, which have been clearly identified by the Hewson Opposition, and the GST will mean that young people will probably be the hardest hit of any group in our community under this insidious form of taxation. It appears that members of the present Liberal Opposition support the policies, and I have heard them say they support the policies of the Federal—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward will sit down until the Minister resumes her seat. I take it that the member for Hayward has a point of order.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you have consistently ruled against debating the answers to questions, and I ask whether the Minister is not again debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I should be delighted to do that. What has been determined, in looking at the figures presented by the Federal Opposition with respect to this insidious proposal, is that young people will be greatly affected, as I have clearly spelt out. The people of South Australia would like to know the Opposition's policies and whether it supports this form of insidious tax on our youth.

WORKCOVER

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. Other than Remm, which building sites operating under the agreement similar to the one of 22 August 1990 were affected by the requirement to pay interim benefits; how many claims were successfully made; and how many of these were subsequently reversed and payments recovered? It has now been established that the building costs for Remm blew out by more than $200 million and that this blow-out was caused, in part, by secret industrial agreements on the site, including those involving 1 100 workers compensation claims. It has also been established that the State Bank centre costs blew out by nearly $50 million and the ASER development by $180 million—hence my question.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I think members of the Opposition, in particular the member for Kavel, do not quite understand how the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act works.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: It is obvious from their allegations of inappropriate activity that they do not understand. The Act contains provisions that enable WorkCover to do precisely what it has done. I believe that at all times WorkCover has acted in accordance with the Act.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The interjections from members opposite again demonstrate their total lack of knowledge and their ignorance. If they claim they are not ignorant, they do not choose to understand how WorkCover works because it would spoil a very good story. It is very clear that, under the application of the Act, where these payments were made, it was the view of the officer who made those payments that the claim would succeed. It was made quite clear to the people concerned that, in the event of a claim not succeeding, it would be recovered.

As I pointed out in my statement on Friday, there were full recoveries, and money is still being recovered from a number of those people. That is the appropriate way to do it. The Act contains provisions to enable the recovery of money, and that is being done. The Act also contains provisions to enable the board to do what it has done, and I believe it has acted appropriately.

HOMELESS PERSONS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations advise the House what the State Government is doing to address the issue of homelessness?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I preface my remarks by saying that the issues confronting homeless people in our community revolve around not only our finding those people adequate shelter but a number of other issues that need to be addressed. I will restrict my comments today to issues relating to the provision of shelter for those persons. The Government has tried to reach a balance between providing new housing opportunities and housing services to those members of our community who face a housing crisis of one form or another. This year, in excess of 14 000 new housing opportunities will be provided to low income households through Government programs such as HomeStart, public housing, and cooperative and community housing programs. In addition, some 32 000 low income South Australians will be assisted into private rental accommodation through the South Australian Housing Trust's private rental establishment services.

I think it is important to point out that these sorts of programs are provided because the State and Commonwealth Governments commit in excess of $140 million each year to housing—a commitment which clearly would be very much in jeopardy if there were to be a change in Government at the Federal level, particularly with the introduction of a GST. I should also mention the value of South Australia's land banking arrangements, which ensure that land is released onto the market at the cheapest possible price. This has been a very successful program in South Australia.

Many of the 10 000 South Australians who build new houses each year benefit directly from that policy. However, there is also a need to provide crisis and supported accommodation for those members of our community who, for a range of different reasons, require short-term and specialist assistance. In South Australia, the Government and community sectors have combined to establish a network of 265 emergency houses, which provide in excess of 1 000 beds each and every night of the year. In conjunction with these services, a range of helping agencies such as the St Vincent de Paul Society, the Salvation Army, West Care and women's shelters also provide support to help people work through their problems and move back into the mainstream community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: They will get no support if you ever happen to get into government. Last financial year—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: If the honourable member were interested in the answer, he would listen to what I am actually saying. Last financial year the housing portfolio invested some $3.3 million of housing funds into this area to ensure that these services had appropriate accommodation facilities which were both safe and secure. Anyone who has visited the accommodation facilities of some of these organisations will know what I mean when I say that a common attribute of many of these agencies is the dignity with which they treat people who come to them for services, often in distress.

Anyone who has visited some of the large doss houses in cities such as Melbourne or Sydney or has seen documentaries on them will know how impersonal large scale emergency accommodation can become. Not only does South Australia have an excellent range of physical facilities but we also have developed a culture of spirited cooperation between Government and non-Government agencies so that services are designed around providing people with new opportunities in life, not just simply a roof over their head.

WORKCOVER

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Has the Speaker received confirmation from the United Trades and Labor Council that the council is opposed to any changes to the WorkCover legislation? I ask this question in view of your public statement on 30 October that you would withdraw your support for the Government at a time of your choosing if the UTLC informed you that the council did not want you to change the current WorkCover legislation.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Orders of this House are very clear, and think I have explained this six or eight times: no person in this House has any responsibility to explain their actions except in relation to any area of responsibility they have to the House. My connection with the Trades and Labor Council, the Employers Federation, the Liberal Party or the Labor Party which does not impinge upon my duties and responsibilities to this House has no relevance in an answer I must give. I therefore say, 'Mind your own business.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ARNOTTS BISCUIT COMPANY

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Premier, in consultation with other State leaders, convey to the Campbell's Soups company that there is exceptionally strong concern and opposition on the part of the public to the attempts of that American conglomerate to take control of the Arnotts Biscuit Company? The Australian company Arnotts, which is a substantial employer in my electorate, is popularly considered to be a significant part of our Australian heritage.

Last night's ABC *Four Corners* television program presented a persuasive case that the future of the company is at risk from a commercial predator who has been quite devious and untruthful about its aims. The program warned that Arnotts products could easily end up being produced overseas and imported into Australia, with disastrous effects for local employment. Members of the public have expressed concern and have suggested a consumer boycott of Campbell's products until it withdraws its takeover bid.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, I have heard of the report of the program last night, although I myself have not seen it: I look forward to seeing a replay so I can see the allegations made on that program. I can certainly say that, when the South Australian Government is approached, at any stage, by the FIRB to comment on the takeover proposals affecting, as they do, some facilities in South Australia, I will look very closely at what is the best interest of South Australians, of the South Australian economy and of South Australians generally with respect to this takeover bid and I will convey that view accordingly.

I do not see any real value in my doing that in consultation with other State leaders because, while I accept there is a number of State leaders around Australia who would share the same degree of concern that I have for the well-being of the local economies for which they have responsibility, I also know that there are others, given their practice, who really could not care less. I could not see any merit, for example, in offering to join on this matter with Jeff Kennett, who seems quite committed to doing as much as he can to destroy an effective industrial economy in his State. So, there is really no merit in joining with him on this matter. I would be very concerned to see that we do keep the Marleston factory in South Australia as an important part of the Arnotts enterprise, whatever happens to Arnotts as a result of shareholder changes.

This State Government has played an active part with respect to Arnotts over the years. We have worked very closely with them as they have been considering various rationalisation moves over the years. We have frequently put views to them about the best way to help their own interests as well as at the same time helping South Australia's interests. It is fair to say that, at various stages over the years, we have been able to effect decisions that they have made to the benefit of South Australians. Likewise, I believe that is the kind of progress that this Government should continue to achieve.

In any event, it is not certain that the Campbells offer will succeed because, as I understand it, that organisation is offering a price less than the figure at which the share market is currently trading, and Arnotts' directors themselves have rejected the offer on the ground that the price is inadequate. So, it would seem that Campbells have a long way to go before they will be able to succeed; they will have to raise their price at the very least. At the end of the day it will be very important for us in Australia that this company that has a very proud history in this country is able to continue its contribution to our economy and increase that contribution; that it is

able to do so as a result of more jobs, not fewer, for Australian employees; and that it is able to do so by more exports, not fewer, from Australia. They are the kinds of issues that will need to be closely examined and which I, as Leader of this State Government, commit myself to pursuing. As to the allegations made last night, I will have to view the program and seek further comments on those particular allegations.

STATE BANK

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Treasurer. In view of his statement to the House today, how many State Bank officers received a bonus last financial year? In view of the group's loss of $550 million in 1991-92, does the Government consider it was appropriate for any bank officer to receive a bonus and, if not, why did not the Government use its powers under its indemnity with the bank to ensure that bonuses were not paid?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As to the question of those officers who are, I understand, in the Treasury Department of the bank and who receive these bonuses, apparently it is common practice throughout the banking industry that—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Mitcham interjects and says that the bank made a loss. If he had listened, he would have heard me say that this particular group of people exceeded their budget and their target by two and a half times—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham will have plenty of opportunities—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —and that for 32 weeks they have made a profit in their particular area of endeavour. If the practice in the banking industry is to pay bonuses to these people, I cannot see how the State Bank would be able to compete for quality employees without having a similar salary structure. I know from what the member for Mitcham has said previously that he would agree completely with that.

The member for Mitcham agrees that you have to meet the market now. Whether it is appropriate for the bonuses to be so high is something on which I will have further discussions with the bank, because it does seem to me that perhaps the target was too low and that the bonuses cut in too early. So, all those things are a matter of judgment of the bank board and the management of the bank. It seems to me that there is an area there for further discussion.

As to the precise number of people involved who receive bonuses should their area of the bank make a profit, I will certainly get those figures for the member for Hayward. There is no question that I was not particularly happy, despite the bank's reporting in its annual report over and above its statutory obligations and within a few weeks of the annual report being handed down, to then find that more people were on $100 000 than had been reported.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Hayward says they are lying. I do not believe for one minute that they are lying, but I have made it clear in writing and verbally to the management and the Acting Chairman of the bank that it is unacceptable to me not to have the full information. That is why I have asked the board of the bank to 'consider' including in its next annual report everyone who earns over $100 000, whether or not the bank's legislation requires that those people be included, so that the people of South Australia will have full disclosure from at least one bank. I compare that with every other bank in Australia where there is minimum disclosure. I think that is quite wrong and that is why—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Some of them have a guarantee, yes. and that is why I have also asked the Attorney-General to take up with the Federal Attorney-General the question of all public companies, because the public is entitled to know the number of salaries in the State Bank exceeding $100 000—the public will find out—and I believe that every public company should be in the same position, so that when people are making decisions on where to invest—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is good. I think we should probably have a resolution in Parliament—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has obviously answered the question because the Opposition is agreeing with him, and I ask him to conclude his reply.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is an unusual situation, and I would like to argue with them, if they—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart.

PETROL SNIFFING

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs advise what consideration, if any, is being given to eliminating leaded petrol from Aboriginal communities in the north of the State? Concern has been expressed to me about the extent of petrol sniffing in those communities and the damage that leaded petrol can do to the health of those involved.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Stuart for her question, particularly in view of our recent visit to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands, where we had the opportunity to meet with all the communities as we went from the western side of the lands to the annual general meeting of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands at Ernabella, or the headquarters at Umuna. The advantage we had was that now, with my new portfolio responsibilities of police, environment and land management, and Aboriginal affairs, I was able to combine and use the resources of all departments to look at this issue.

Prior to our departure the senior police officer involved in the lands informed me that there was a significant problem with petrol sniffing in the area, and he asked me to address it. We raised this issue with the various leaders of the community as we travelled through the lands, along with other issues including soil conservation and community health needs. We are confronted with a

significant problem, and I spent a considerable amount of time with the senior constable in charge of the police aides on the lands. He expressed to me great concern about the situation on the lands, not only as a police officer but also as a person deeply involved with the community, having enjoyed living in that community for several years. His concern indicates that there is a serious problem with petrol sniffing, particularly with teenagers and people in their early 20s.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I do not need your help; I can manage this quite well without your assistance. In that process we met with the leaders of the community. The point that we put to them was that if they made the decision to ban leaded petrol they would have full Government support in doing that. I have since raised that with my colleague the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services and I plan to raise it when we get a response from the council on this issue.

We attended the annual general meeting last Wednesday morning and I raised it with the full council. I believe that we received affirmative support from all sections of the community. They will now consider that, and I expect in the next month that we will be informed via the council's spokesperson that there is support for the concept of banning leaded petrol. There will be consequences from that, and I think it is worth the time to share with the House the concerns that some of the community members have.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Morphett raises the question of diesel. There are other ways of conveying vehicles. Diesel and unleaded petrol are the other two alternatives. I understand that the community has a franchise for petrol sales on the lands. As a consequence, the whole decision rests with them, but they will need the assistance of the Government to support that decision for a number of reasons; not only the physical sale of the petrol but also support programs—programs for recreation for youth, health support programs, and a very simple one, which is to skill the community to detune a motor from leaded to unleaded petrol. I have talked to my colleague the Minister of Education, Employment and Training about that. We expect that we shall have to send a couple of skilled automotive engineers to assist the community with a program of how to detune their motor vehicles to cope with unleaded petrol.

We have to take a number of steps, but I sincerely hope we can achieve this, because the problem is very serious. Unless we act soon, we shall see very serious consequences. I believe that there will be some continuation of sniffing, but I hope not seriously. I guess that some members of the community who are heavily hooked on this type of substance will probably use unleaded petrol or diesel or some other form, but there will be some consequences to their health. I guess that the use of hydrocarbons in unleaded petrol and diesel will have some impact—respiratory infections, and so on—so there are other health questions that I shall have to address with my colleague the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services. I hope that we can overcome this serious problem and I look forward to working with the community in the lands to achieve that.

PUBLIC SECTOR RESTRUCTURING

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier undertake to supply, as a matter of priority, the current structure of each Government department, including all branches, the number of officers employed in each branch and the names and titles of all officers at or above ASO-8 level? The Premier confirmed last week that departmental annual reports for 1991-92 indicate only the structure of Government during the past financial year. Since his major changes to the Public Service, neither the Parliament nor the public know the current structure or the machinery of Government. If Ministers are to be properly accountable for program expenditures made pursuant to the new appropriation schedule, information on the new structure of the Public Service is essential.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes.

NATIONAL PARKS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I direct my question to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. Has any consideration been given to establishing a core of volunteers to staff remote parts of South Australia on a seasonal basis? I understand that in Western Australia volunteer park rangers provide information for tourists and basic camp ground maintenance in a number of remote parts. Volunteers are provided with mobile homes and radio communication during the tourist season in areas where the National Parks and Wildlife Service does not have enough resources to staff individual camp grounds permanently.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Napier for his question. I do not believe it is widely known that we run such a program in South Australia. In fact, for a number of seasons (for approximately five years), we have been running a similar system to that in Western Australia. In South Australia they are called 'camp ground hosts'. They assist local rangers by staffing parks such as Naracoorte, Witjira, the Flinders Ranges and Deep Creek at the height of the tourist season. Therefore, we already use volunteers in that capacity.

Most of the volunteers are tertiary students. They do not run the parks on their own, but they provide invaluable assistance to the full-time staff of those parks, particularly the rangers. In effect, the voluntary use of these people and the basis by which they provide their services is a very valuable ancillary support to those permanent staff working in the parks areas. Of course, in return for their services, they offer an opportunity for learning more about the park, enjoying the physical environment and sharing with those full-time officers and tourists such things as guided walks, educational talks and, of course, explaining to people what accommodation is available, how it can be accessed and the various opportunities they can enjoy as a consequence of going to those parks. I am delighted to be able to say that we do have that. I hope those services will continue, and it will be something that will grow upon the community. It has not received great publicity, but I hope it will. I hope that people who do use our national parks come to use them a great deal more.

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): What target has the Government set for reducing the size of the public sector during the financial year?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: In a statement on 1 October announcing changes to departmental arrangements, the Premier said they heralded 'a leaner, more efficient public sector'.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am pleased to see that the honourable member pays attention to some comments that I make, but he obviously does not pay attention to all the comments I make. If he had done, he would have noticed that, when I talked about the need to have a Minister of Public Sector Reform, I was talking about creating a more efficient public sector designed to provide the community with more effective services as a result of the challenges of the 1990s, just like all areas of the community have to at all stages examine their own efficiencies and respond as effectively as possible. The private sector acknowledges that it must do that on an ongoing basis. Just because it has changed in years gone by, as the public sector has done, it never accepts that there is a point at which it stops. It knows it must keep on being responsive.

That is precisely the point I am making about the public sector: even if we were not in a recessionary mode at the moment in this country, even if we did have a better budgetary situation, it would still be incumbent upon us to make sure that the public, who, after all, pay for the public sector, are getting the most efficient use of the dollars they make available. If some areas of public sector delivery can be done more efficiently and in a leaner way, that enables you to do other areas in a bigger way than you might have been able before. I made the point publicly at that time that this was not to be confused with a razor-gang kind of approach. This was not to be confused with saying this was tied to a certain figure of cuts in the number of public servants. That would have to be a separate process that would be determined by the funds that the Government had available to it in framing its budget for the next financial year.

I indicated that, in the first quarter of next calendar year, we would be making major statements that would define what we understood our budgetary climate to be—in other words, what cloth we had available to cut to shape Government expenditure patterns for the 1993-94 financial year. That is a separate process that will require targets to be set, and those targets may well require reductions in the number of public servants. On the other hand, they may or may not, depending upon the economic climate of the time. That is a separate process from the process of public sector reform, and I see that public sector reform process as an important challenge for Government not just now as we are tracking out of a recession but next year, the year after and for the rest of the decade and as part of an ongoing process to ensure that we can guarantee to taxpayers in this community, the public of South Australia, that we are making the most efficient use of the dollars they make available to the Government. The head count figures are already published in the budget for the 1992-93 financial year, and I refer the honourable member to those figures.

BEACH EROSION

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. With the winter season more or less at an end, will the Minister indicate to the House the current condition of metropolitan beaches and what sand replenishment, if any, is indicated?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear the question. I ask the honourable member to repeat the question.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Certainly, Sir. My question was: with the winter season more or less at an end, will the Minister indicate to the House the current condition of metropolitan beaches and, in the light of this condition, what sand replenishment, if any, is indicated? It has been put to me that the more energetic seas of the winter period tend to scour the beaches and dump the sand on an off-shore sandbar and that the gentler seas of the summer season largely return it. It is inferred from this that there are two important benchmarks: around about now when the beaches are likely to be in their leanest condition and in April at the end of summer when they are likely to be in their fattest condition—hence my question.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This is a very important issue as we come into summer, although I suppose we have seen a delay in summer occurring at this point in time. There is some need for us to address this matter because, from personal observation and comments from the community and a variety of coastal councils, I believe that, again, there has been some scouring of the beachfront, and we need to address that. Discussions are currently being initiated; in fact, we have already had contact with the Local Government Association, which has indicated its preparedness to enter into discussions with us about a long-term program of sand replenishment along the coastal foreshore.

The figure that has been put before me indicates that over the next 20 years about $30 million will have to be spent to maintain sand replenishment and the coastal profile regarding the way in which most of us have known our immediate coastal foreshore arrangements for the City of Adelaide from the southern to the northern regions. The member for Baudin, having had a long experience in the environment portfolio, knows the importance of this matter, especially from the viewpoint of the tourist dollar and the enjoyment of the South Australian community as a whole, which expects that sort of coastal profile. Discussions with the Local Government Association have been planned. We look forward to resolving this matter so that, as a community which enjoys the benefits, we can address the need for funding to maintain our coastal environment, ensuring that everyone who wants to enjoy and have the pleasure of it can do so.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland.

PUBLIC SECTOR SALARIES

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Premier now reveal the remuneration packages provided to the seven so-called portfolio coordinators and say what increases have been negotiated with those who were transferred from other positions in the State public sector? The Premier refused to provide this information to the House last Friday, but he said he would do so if asked during a normal Question Time. The Premier should recognise that he has just been asked.

The SPEAKER: The Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The officers are as follows: Peter Crawford, Department of the Premier and Cabinet; Mr Payze, Department of Road Transport; Mr Ted Phipps, Engineering and Water Supply Department; Mr Dundon, Department of Primary Industries; Dr McPhail, Education Department; Mr Cossey, Office of Business and Regional Development—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: —and Mr Michael Lennon, Office of Planning and Urban Development.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: In that order, the base salary of those officers is: $111 485, $100 611, $106 048, $94 087, $106 048, $94 087 and $94 087. In respect of allowances—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. As I have said once before today, there is a long list and, if members want to get through it, it is up to them. We can stop the questions at any time. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The allowances that have been negotiated so far are: Mr Crawford, $44 006, and Dr McPhail, $18 952. The other allowances for the other portfolio coordinators are still being determined.

SOUTH PARA DAM

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Public Infrastructure respond to claims which were reportedly made by Mrs Bernice Pfitzner, a Liberal member in another place, on 25 October and which cast doubts on the safety of the South Para dam? The Gawler *Bunyip* of 28 October stated that Mrs Pfitzner conveyed to the meeting at Two Wells that she had been told that the South Para—

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

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, will you direct, if the member for Playford is referring to a member in another place, that he use her correct title; she is 'the Hon. Dr'.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Playford to repeat the question and to use the correct title.

Mr QUIRKE: I am sorry for the omission, Mr Speaker. Can the Minister of Public Infrastructure respond to claims reportedly made by the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner, a Liberal member in another place, on 25 October which cast doubts on the safety of the South Para dam? The Gawler *Bunyip* of 28 October stated:

> The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner conveyed to the meeting at Two Wells that she had been told the South Para reservoir was unsafe because the walls were not strong enough.

The honourable member apparently went on to say that she had been told that the radial gates had not been brought into operation during recent flooding because, if they had been closed, the wall might well have given way.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question and for the opportunity to correct these highly misleading allegations. I am very sorry that, despite the fact that it is now some time since the Hon. Dr Pfitzner allegedly made these comments, she has not seen fit to dissociate herself from the reporting. I therefore assume she believes that she has been correctly reported.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department has ascribed the information conveyed to the meeting allegedly by the Hon. Dr Pfitzner as grossly incorrect. All that these claims are likely to achieve is to cause undue concern and worry to people who live down stream of the South Para dam. One wonders what qualifications or expertise the Hon. Dr Pfitzner has that enable her to make these statements, because I do not believe that her doctorate is in structural engineering of dams or anything of that nature.

I have been advised by the department that the South Para dam wall is in fact extremely sound and, like all major dams, is monitored on a regular basis to ensure it remains so. The spillway capacity of the South Para dam is quite large and, therefore, the dam is very safe from overtopping. The department also advised that closure of the radial gates on the spillway would not threaten the dam wall with collapse. It is pointed out, however, that the radial gates are not and have never been floodgates, as has been claimed by some people, and they are not there for the purpose of controlling floods.

While a 1976 study suggested that they might be able to play a role in flood control, it was finally determined after further study in 1987 with better hydrological data that they could not be used for that purpose. Departmental engineers say that the radial gates were designed to be operated with water levels close to the top but were not designed to overtop. If operated outside the design parameters, the gates could be at risk of failure, but I stress that that refers only to the gates and not to the wall of the dam itself.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

> That Question Time be extended by one hour.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC SECTOR CONTRACTS

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I address my question to the Premier. Were each of the seven so-called portfolio coordinators required to sign a new contract of appointment? If so, what is the duration of each contract?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Not yet, but any requirements that are made with respect to contracts will adhere to normal Government practice.

LOCUSTS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Primary Industries indicate to the House the current position with regard to the locust plague in the northern areas of the State and what is being done to protect property owners in those areas?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: This matter does attract considerable public attention, because everyone appreciates the serious nature of a locust plague in the country areas and, indeed, its arriving in the metropolitan areas. As members know, the State Government has allocated approximately $2 million to fight the locust plague. The Department of Primary Industries handles the plague in the Flinders Ranges and on Eyre Peninsula, but as part of its charter the Australian Plague Locust Commission looks after outbreaks in the Murray-Mallee and scattered areas in the north.

There have been approximately 200 reports of locusts in the metropolitan area, but they have been in very small numbers, scattered from Port Adelaide to Sellicks Beach. Early on Sunday morning, there had been a couple of dozen reports, but as the day wore on, until the present time, I am advised that approximately 200 reports have been made. However, I stress that they are in small numbers, and there is no cause for alarm in the metropolitan area. On Sunday, a swarm of locusts was actually seen landing by a ship in local waters, so it now looks as if they came from areas in the Far North.

It is difficult to say exactly how they originated in the metropolitan area; in view of the numbers involved and the arc extending from Port Adelaide to Sellicks Beach, the fact that they were actually seen landing in a swarm in local waters where inevitably they drowned, and that weather conditions were appropriate for long distance flights—and they can travel many hundreds of kilometres in one night given such weather conditions—it is clear that they were not actually breeding in Adelaide but came from the Far North, from areas under the control of the Australian Plague Locust Commission. I understand that they die off in the metropolitan area because it is not suitable for breeding. Nevertheless, the situation still has to be watched in the metropolitan area, and the public have been particularly good in responding to calls to report locust outbreaks to departmental officers. So, the situation can be assessed; there is no cause for alarm in the metropolitan area—it is quite under control.

Daily briefings are taking place in country areas because it is particularly serious there. I am advised today by the department that there is a major locust swarm activity in the Oodnadatta, Macumba, William Creek, Marree, Strzelecki Track and Broken Hill areas, which the Australian Plague Locust Commission is spraying to prevent southerly and easterly movement. Provided there are no north-easterly winds with warm nights, I am advised there will be no movement south. There is plenty of green feed in the areas to keep the locusts there, but a new generation in December could be of concern. Daily briefings are taking place.

Country people have had to put up with an enormous amount of discomfort and dislocation as a result of the locust plague. There has been tremendous cooperation in country areas between local farmers, associations and departmental officers. The rapport is extremely good and at the present time the plague is under control, but it has to be watched on a daily basis. The department is doing everything it can, and very successfully so. It does attract attention in the metropolitan area, but there is no cause for alarm here, as it is under control. That is not to say that there might not be further outbreaks. I think members can appreciate what country people have had to put up with.

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Does the Minister of Environment and Land Management agree that an advertisement seeking a Chief Executive Officer for his department is seriously inaccurate and reflects the widespread confusion in the public sector about the Premier's new departmental arrangements? This advertisement, which appears in the *Weekend Australian*, states that the Minister's new department:

> . . . includes the previous Lands Department, along with the environment functions of the former Department of Environment and Planning.

However, as the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations admitted in one of the few questions the Government was prepared to answer last Friday, virtually all the environmental functions of the former Department of Environment and Planning have been transferred to the Office of Planning and Urban Development, not the Department of Environment and Land Management.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The simple answer is 'No'.

INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLE

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs considered what role the Government and the Parliament could play in next year's celebration for the International Year for Indigenous People?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for this question, which is particularly important for the Aboriginal community in South Australia, as well as nationally, and for the Torres Strait Islanders. As stated, next year will be an international celebration, something in which not only Governments but the Parliaments of this country should join. I have raised with my colleagues on this side of the House the issues that we ought to consider and I presume that we, as a Parliament, will be looking at what opportunities we have to celebrate this event.

From my point of view as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, it would be important for me to raise with you, Sir, as Speaker, and with the other place the possibility of the Parliament joining together to celebrate and appropriately recognise this international year. The Government will be supporting a number of events for the indigenous celebrations, and we as a Parliament should consider our options in joining with the community in those celebrations. It will be a significant event for the Australian community, as well as internationally, and it is one that the Parliaments of this country, Governments and the community as a whole should join together in recognising and celebrating. The issue will be raised with the Parliament, and I hope I will enjoy the support of members in looking at the options that we have and the opportunities we can take to celebrate the International Year for Indigenous People.

DISABILITY ADVISER'S UNIT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Premier. Why has the Disability Adviser's Unit been transferred back to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and who is now responsible for coordinating the Government services to the disabled? A proclamation on 8 October transferred all positions in the Disability Adviser's Unit of the Premier's Department and the Disability Service Unit of the Health Commission to the Department of Family and Community Services. The Government's new budget schedule did not provide for these changes and was therefore wrong.

A further proclamation last Thursday reversed the transfer of the Disability Adviser's Unit of the Premier's Department but not the Disability Service Unit of the Health Commission which oversees more than $80 million of Government spending. This has added to widespread concern and confusion about the coordination of services to the disabled and the position of the Intellectually Disabled Services Council.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: This is a very important question, and I thank the member for Heysen for raising the issue in the House. As he correctly observes, the proclamation has been reversed so that the *status quo* now prevails in relation to this area of disability service provision.

An honourable member: What is the *status quo*?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The *status quo* is the existing situation. The explanation of that is relatively straight forward.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I think the member for Heysen clearly goes beyond the terms of his own question by indicating that it changes daily when, in fact, the one change that has occurred has been to return to the *status quo* provision. Upon becoming Minister of Health I perceived that there was clearly an important area that required coordination and, indeed, the Government has set about that task in the past few weeks of consulting with all of the relevant groups within the community to determine what is the best structure that can be produced in this area.

While I am not in a position to make a final announcement about that, I certainly will be prior to the House's rising before Christmas. The criterion in determining what an appropriate structure might be is to ensure that this vital area of policy is brought together in one coordinating office that can administer those sections of the Government that are responsible for policy in this area. Those Health Commission incorporated units can then continue to operate in the most administratively efficient manner possible and their advice can be coordinated by an administrative unit associated with a client advisory group so that, in fact, clients are able to bring their viewpoint forward on the advice that goes through that centralised office.

It is also vital that central office have a direct line to the Minister, the Premier and the Government so that the policy advice that they give can be fed in directly to the Cabinet system, that the Minister is immediately available to that structure and that the clients and the director of the office can give policy and planning advice to the Minister. I will be bringing forward a proposal to the Government and to the House that will show to the community the best possible mechanism for coordinating that advice and ensuring that direct access by those client groups in the disability area is available.

At the same time it is necessary to coordinate with the Commonwealth Government the funding proposals that are available through the Commonwealth Government tier of office, and legislation will have to be drafted and brought to this House at the earliest opportunity to ensure that funding continues to be available. Also, it is vital that the disabilities directions project, which I think brought together many of the thoughts and policy proposals in this area, is examined closely by the Government and the final stages released.

Mr Speaker, I take your advice that replies to questions should be kept to a minimum but I understood that, since we had so much additional time, members wanted to hear these fuller replies. If that is not the case, I can certainly give you an assurance that I will be bringing forward policy considerations in this area and ensuring that the best possible coordination of service takes place.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety advise the House whether this Government proposes to adopt the industrial relations policy of the Victorian Liberal Government?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: We have no intention of following the disastrous industrial relations policy of the Kennett Government, nor do we intend going down the path of the disasters upon which they are embarking.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Heysen interjects that we do not have the guts to do it. I put to the House that, by going down the track advocated by the Opposition and as now being implemented by the Liberal Party in Victoria, would be to deny award protection to over 80 per cent of the work force in South Australia. I point out that 62 per cent of those people are covered by State awards and most of those people work in the

service industry and are female, young and unskilled, or are elderly. All those people would be at a disadvantage.

One has only to look at the example of the United Kingdom, a country which used to be an international manufacturing giant, which led the world in innovation and which has followed the disastrous path of the Liberal Party, both nationally and at State level. The member for Heysen can laugh about that: perhaps he wants to see manufacturing industry disappear and see people impoverished. Perhaps he wants to see people no longer able to service their mortgages. Does he want to see that happen? I suspect he does. Does he think people should be exploited and does he want to see our own manufacturing industry turned into a wasteland?

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is again debating the answer and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will come back to the response.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Mr Speaker, as I was pointing out to the House, these disastrous policies have led to the industrial demise of the United Kingdom. I have been advised that, at a recent conference in Europe considering the advantages of the industrial relations system in Australia, advice from European countries is to continue with what we have. European countries point out that uncontrolled enterprise bargaining like they have seen, and as advocated by the Leader of the Opposition, will bring a disastrous increase in inflation. They no longer have control of inflation and then they see the demise of their manufacturing industry.

That is what the Leader of the Opposition wants. He wants to see our manufacturing industry driven into the ground because he has some obscure belief in a philosophy that is now out of date. He ought to appreciate that those companies making a go of it in America today are those embracing employee consultation and the trade union movement. They are the ones that are bringing back the off-shore industries so that they can manufacture the perfect article in their own country and beat their competition.

I would suggest that all the things we want to see happening today in industry in Australia and South Australia are those that can happen within the industrial framework provided by the Industrial Relations Act as we are going to amend it shortly in this place. The trade union movement, in conjunction with the Government, has introduced a significant number of changes, many of which have been resisted by the employers. The employers never thought of award restructuring and participated in it only because of the initiative of the metal unions, whose representatives studied overseas. The metal unions, which published *Australia Reconstructed*, took that initiative, and that is what is going to save Australia. We are not going to save it if we divide Australians against Australians and pit the haves against the have nots. We will not do it by driving the men, women and children of our State into poverty, but that is precisely what will happen if the Liberal Party has its way.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Those members interjecting are the members who want to pay so much below the award rate without being prosecuted. We have the Federal shadow Minister saying, 'It will be all right, the awards will stay.' Members know as well as I do that if we do nothing to the awards over eight or 10 years, as the Federal shadow Minister is suggesting, the relativity will stay the same and inflation will take care of wage rates. We will find that those base rates will be very low.

What the Opposition does not understand is that, if we look at an award like the metal industry award and consider the base rate, we see that it is the lowest rate paid for a person such as an electrical fitter with electronics 1 or 2, and the skilled tradesman or toolmaker could end up on that rate. That award coverage will be lost and award protection will be taken away from those people. The Opposition seeks to throw away something that has worked extremely well for this country. It has brought about a significant increase in jobs in the manufacturing area and it has brought about wage restraint. It has meant that our country has been able to handle inflation and deliver many other things in Australia. All the Opposition wants to do is take that away.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Adelaide interjects about unemployment. All he has to do is see the unemployment in England—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to draw his response to a close. If he wishes to extend further, he can seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Mr Speaker, I thank you for your advice.

PRISONER, DRUGS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): What action will the Minister of Correctional Services take to eliminate trading and the use of drugs in our prisons? The 1992 annual report of the Department of Correctional Services, tabled today, reveals that incidents involving drugs in South Australian prisons increased by 34 per cent in 12 months. Of the 422 drug incidents 189 were at Yatala compared to 67 at Yatala 12 months previously. In another place earlier today the Hon. Ian Gilfillan revealed allegations of a heroin drug ring operating in Yatala Prison. It has been alleged that the drug ring, which nets thousands of dollars per week, is supplied by a Correctional Services officer and that two prisoners supply the drugs to approximately 100 inmates.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Bright for his question. It is true that increased drug use has been detected within the prison system, and I would think that is a tribute to the diligence of the staff who work for the department in detecting these increases. The allegation made by the member for Bright, that a heroin drug ring is operating in Yatala and that it is being supplied by a prison officer in connection with two inmates, has been investigated. My advice is that at this stage no charges are being laid. I would assume that that advice indicates that people have not been able to get evidence to prove it.

Members opposite make the most wild allegations in the world as though they are actual fact. They do not

believe that you should have to prove what you say. Members on this side of the House believe in the due process of the law. You just cannot go around bad mouthing somebody and expect them to be convicted. If they are going to be arrested, charged and convicted, let it be done on the basis of proper evidence. My advice is that they have not been able to find that.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Newland interjects. I understand from what she is saying that she wants to see people prosecuted just on her say so. She does not believe in the due process of the law; she does not want the appropriate processes to apply. We have the position in this State (and I believe it is upheld in this Parliament) that people are innocent until proven guilty. The mob on the other side says that people are guilty until proven innocent.

As I said earlier, there has been increased diligence, skill and training of prison officers, and I would expect from that that there would be increased detection. We have a problem with people visiting the prison and with the exchange of illegal substances and whatnot between visitors and prisoners. I remind the House that it was not so long ago that a prison officer asked a visitor at the Northfield Prison Complex to open their mouth and, when they did so, a small parcel of drugs fell out. That person was removed from the prison. The police were advised and it is now a police matter. The prison officers are diligent in this work and they are detecting more of these instances. I can heap no more praise on them than the highest.

SLUDGE PIPE

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. Will the sludge pipe connecting the West Beach E&WS treatment works to the Bolivar sewage treatment works be completed on time and on budget and will its completion assist the regrowth of seagrasses in the vicinity of West Beach, Henley Beach and Grange Beach?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. As members would know, both the Glenelg and Port Adelaide sewage treatment works currently discharge digested sewage sludge into the gulf, and there is no doubt that there has been some degradation of seagrasses in the vicinity of the outfalls.

Due to the initiative of the now Minister of Education, Employment and Training in putting an environmental levy on sewage rates some time ago, the money has become available for a number of amelioration processes, of which this is one. The sludge will be pumped to the Bolivar sewage treatment works, where it will be treated by air drying and on-land disposal at a cost of some $14 million. I recall a former Leader of the Opposition diving into the middle of this stuff for a stunt. However, to answer the honourable member's question, construction started in September last year and it is due for completion by the end of 1993.

PUBLIC SECTOR CONTRACTS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Does the Premier agree that Parliament is entitled to know the details and conditions of employment of Chief Executive Officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act and, if so, will he table all such contracts of employment by the end of this week?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The answer certainly is 'Yes' in respect of the broad principle of the question that the honourable member asks. On the question of the tabling of contracts by the end of this week, I cannot indicate whether we can fulfil that at this stage.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If things are still under negotiation, as they might be in some circumstances, one would have to wait for those negotiations to finish. At the end of that process, I would certainly be happy for that information to be made publicly available for all members.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Can the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations investigate as a matter of policy the Housing Trust's procedure of increasing rent if a tenant receives further income in the course of undertaking further education? A constituent, a Housing Trust tenant, enrolled for a TAFE course which cost $600. She then applied for Austudy, which was granted. The Austudy amount received covered only the cost of the TAFE course. However, she did the right thing and declared it, which resulted in her Housing Trust rent being increased by $34.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. Clearly the person who has sought the honourable member's assistance in this matter is in receipt of income other than that provided through the Austudy program. I would need to obtain further information from the honourable member's constituent so that I can have the matter investigated and see what impact the receipt of that income has had on her rental payments to the South Australian Housing Trust.

The Housing Trust has a sophisticated rental structure with respect to concessions. I am sure that all members would be interested to know that at 30 June this year 74.2 per cent of Housing Trust tenants were benefiting from reduced rental in one form or another. Obviously the Housing Trust provides a substantial financial support structure for many individuals and families in our community with respect to the impact that rental payments have upon the household income.

Members might be interested to know that full rents were increased on 4 July this year by an average of 2.9 per cent, bringing the full rent for a five-room semi-detached house to $84 per week in metropolitan Adelaide and $81.50 per week in country locations. A five-room single brick house of 102 square metres, for example, increased to $120.50 per week in the metropolitan area and $115 in the country. Members can see that the structure of Housing Trust rentals is fair and, indeed, reasonable, given the substantial subsidies that are provided to the overwhelming majority of Housing Trust tenants.

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I direct my question again to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. How many officers are now located in the Department of Environment and Land Management?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Obviously the honourable member did not understand my answer to an earlier question in regard to the position of CEOs. I make it clear that the functions of the department are being conducted as normal, and the Acting CEO is undertaking those responsibilities along with those officers. The functions are being conducted as they were, and they will continue to be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Any opportunity that the Opposition is endeavouring to take to create misunderstanding or scuttlebutt in the community will not succeed, because the officers are conducting their normal duties as they have been and will continue to do.

TEACHER REGISTRATION

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training inform the House whether agreement has been reached between South Australia and Queensland on providing full recognition of teachers who are registered in either State?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in this area. It will now be much easier for teachers to move their skills into classrooms across State borders following an agreement—indeed, it is the first agreement of its kind in this country—to recognise registered teachers in both Queensland and South Australia. The agreement is a significant step in national moves to improve the portability of teachers' skills, their status and, indeed, their recognition across Australian education systems.

It would be quite appropriate to have on the public record the fact that I feel it is important that the contributions which qualified teachers of good standing can make in educating young Australians are not hampered by geographic boundaries. The agreement means that teachers who hold either full or provisional unrestricted registration in South Australia will be granted the same level of registration in Queensland without any limitations. Teachers will simply present their certificate of registration to gain this dual acceptance across the two States. Indeed, teachers coming from Queensland to South Australia will be afforded the same kind of honour in terms of being recognised. It is important that we clearly acknowledge that this is the first, I hope, of many such agreements so that eventually we have teachers who are trained and registered and who can work in any State in the country and pass on their skills, competence and professional expertise to young Australians.

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

Mr Oswald (Morphett): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. How many positions have been transferred—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. As I understand it, Standing Orders—

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for Hanson wish to take the Chair?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:—require all members to refer to members by their electorate or the position they hold under the Crown.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to repeat the question.

Mr OSWALD: I think it is an attempt to stop me asking the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will repeat his question—and that is a direction from the Chair, not the honourable member.

Mr OSWALD: I direct my question to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. How many positions have been transferred from the former Department of Environment and Planning to the Office of Planning and Urban Development?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I understand that a few moments ago the Leader asked the Premier to provide a full list of details of positions above a certain level in administrative units within the Public Service, and the Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:—undertook to provide that information. I do not have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:—any problems about providing the honourable member with that information. I will be quite pleased to obtain that information for him. I will do it in conjunction—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Morphett had more than adequate time to ask his question—in fact, he asked his question twice. If he wishes to ask further questions, he should notify the Chair and he can do so. In the meantime, he will not interject.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will be pleased to obtain that information and provide it in conjunction with the information that was sought by the honourable member's Leader a few moments ago. I do not know to whom the honourable member has been talking, what gossip he has received or what innuendo he was making about the administration of the two new departments that have been created as a result of the division of environment and planning functions, but that work is proceeding smoothly and responsibly. It is a complex issue, as was mentioned in debate in Parliament last week. It does involve some complex and legal issues. They need to be resolved properly and not as a result of haste, and that work is continuing in our respective agencies.

There is no diminution or change to the programs or the impact of services in our community. This division is designed to enhance our ability to provide services to the community, and in my portfolio area it will most certainly enhance our ability as a Government to assist in major development projects in this State in particular, but in the planning process generally, which has been the subject of criticism over the years since the 1982 development Bill, which has been a great disappointment to the people of South Australia and particularly to the development community in this State. They have sought—and that has now been provided through the planning review—a new set of laws through which we can provide greater certainty and stability in our planning process. That is the brief that has been given to me and to the Office of Planning and Urban Development, and the appropriate structures are being put in place.

GHAN RAILWAY

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Tourism provide a comparison of facilities available on the Ghan compared with other great trains such as the Blue Train and the Orient Express? The Ghan is often described as one of the great train journeys in the world.

Mr S.J. Baker: At least the Orient Express runs on time.

Mr HERON: However, I heard recently of an overseas visitor who was disappointed with many aspects of the journey. This person considered the toilets, showers and sleeping berths to be too small, the provision of information inadequate and was disgruntled at having to share lounges with holiday-class passengers.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I was interested to hear the former Deputy Leader of the Opposition saying, 'Well, at least the Orient Express ran on time'. So, it is clear that a few Ghan knockers are left in the Opposition. I guess that explains its stand on tourism in recent days with trying to undermine the Grand Prix and the tourism industry and espousing the GST for tourism. The fact is that the Ghan is succeeding. First class business on the Ghan has more than doubled in four recession years, which is a better performance than most airlines, hotels and cruise ships.

On the Orient Express, the price of a first class ticket is in excess of $A1 800 for a journey that is more or less equivalent to that of the Ghan. Of course, the Ghan price is $425. In other words, the Orient Express price is over four times what we are charging for a first class trip on the Ghan. I know that there was this criticism of the Ghan, which has received some currency from one traveller, about the toilets on the Ghan. The Orient Express has nine double berths per sleeping car with no toilet or shower facilities provided in each cabin.

Each car has one toilet and shower to be shared between the 18 passengers on that car. Both male and female passengers have to use the same toilet and showers. It is very hard to get a seat on the Orient Express. The Ghan sleeper cars are fully air-conditioned, with a separate air-conditioning system for the en suite toilets and showers. So, that is quite a difference. We consider the price charged on the Ghan is extremely good value compared to the equivalent facilities on the Blue Train, which has two superior but very expensive cabin types available and a class equivalent to first class on the Ghan at almost double the price.

On board information was mentioned in this criticism. From a position four years ago where no announcements were made on train, passengers now have three line section audiotapes played during the trip. These tapes last about 30 minutes each and cover such topics as: railway etiquette, which would be very important for members opposite if they travelled on the Ghan; the history of the area, going through the history of the Ghan and the areas through which it travels; the unique flora and fauna; the tremendously exciting geology along the Ghan line; the agriculture—and I know that in reply to a subsequent question the Minister of Primary Industries could expound on this subject—the changing diorama of agriculture and industry along the way; the unique and historical heritage towns; the very special Aboriginal culture; and other points of interest.

A video which has been produced covering the section between Adelaide and Port Augusta is also shown on the Ghan, and the production of further tourist videos will be completed by the end of this year covering the sections from Port Augusta to Tarcoola and Tarcoola to Alice Springs. I encourage members during the break to encourage visitors from other States to use the Ghan as a form of entry into South Australia, perhaps even next year, if members opposite get behind the Grand Prix for a change, as a way into the State to celebrate that exciting carnival.

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. Does the new Government department which was referred to in an advertisement in the *Weekend Australian*—according to that advertisement, it includes the previous Lands Department along with the environmental functions of the former Department of Environment and Planning and comprises 1 400 staff with an annual budget of $100 million—reflect the widespread confusion in the public sector about the reorganisation, and are those figures accurate?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member finished?

Mr OSWALD: The honourable member is finished.

The SPEAKER: The Minister of Environment and Land Management.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It appears that the only confusion is on the part of the honourable member. Quite obviously, it does reflect what the department is going to do and the functions it will perform. However, I will enlighten members opposite so that they will have a picture of the functions that will be performed by the Department of Environment and Land Management. The functions of the agency will be: nature conservation, which is a very important aspect; management of wildlife on public and private properties, including pastoral and coastal areas, and particularly control and clearance of native vegetation; cultural conservation, including dedication of sites of historic interest; response to

community values, which will include animal welfare, a function that carries on from the former portfolio of my colleague the Minister of Education when she was Minister for Environment and Planning; public enjoyment and education; protection of the physical environment, which will include the EPA; response to matters of major community concern; sea level rises and issues of that sort; destruction of the ozone layer; implementation of policies relating to ecologically sustainable development; participation and strategies to maintain the nation's biodiversity; rehabilitation of the Murray River and other waterways—those aspects will come under the major community concern which will be part of the Department of Environment and Land Management; management of land titles; management of land information—the mapping section; and, of course, valuation of land. They are the functions that will be part of the Department of Environment and Land Management. The honourable member referred to the advertisement and, from the information I have been given, that is the accurate figure.

MAIN NORTH ROAD

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport Development. Will the Minister seek information on what developments are in store for Main North Road and, in particular, will he report on redevelopment proposals for the intersections of Main North Road with Maxwell Road, Research Road, Kesters Road and McIntyre Road? Constituents have constantly raised concerns about safety and, in particular, traffic flow at these points and on the Main North Road in general.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Main North Road is of great interest to both the honourable member who asked the question and the Minister answering it on behalf of the Minister in another place, because it runs through the middle of my electorate. On many thousands of occasions, I have travelled that route on the way to and from work, and I am aware of the problems relating to those intersections. So, I would be pleased, as someone living in the area along with the member for Playford, to obtain a detailed report for him.

MEDICARE LEVY

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Does the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services support the .15 per cent increase in the Medicare levy from 1 July 1993, and does he believe that the small increase in Federal hospital funding will be sufficient to overcome budgetary problems in the State's hospital system?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The Medicare levy is quite properly a matter for the Federal Government, which makes the decision relating to any increase or decrease. It is a Federal budget decision, which is now with the Federal Parliament. The question of negotiations with the Commonwealth Government over Medicare funding is very much an issue. I had personal contact with Deputy Prime Minister Howe yesterday and again today to discuss the ongoing bilateral negotiations between this State and the Commonwealth. That will be completed as soon as is practicably possible both to ensure a significant increase in the State's funding for the booking list area, which is a first priority, and to ensure the maximum possible increase in the State's overall level of funding for our hospital system and related health areas.

I assure the member for Adelaide that increasing that to the maximum possible extent is our highest priority. Anyone would know that negotiating with the Commonwealth Government is an interesting area in terms of extracting the maximum amount of money, and I know my ministerial colleagues share that view. I will do the best I can to obtain the maximum deal for South Australia.

GAWLER RIVER

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Is the Premier now in a position to give the House an update on the question asked by the member for Light on 28 October regarding the consultation that was promised to the people directly affected by the flooding of the Gawler River?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can give some further advice on this matter, and I know that the member for Light would be aware of some of that further advice as a result of a request that I received that he be considered as part of the task force process—and I was happy for that to be the case. I appreciate his willingness to serve in that capacity.

On the last occasion on which I spoke about this matter in this House, I said that I looked forward to meetings taking place in the very near future. The joint task group convened a member of stakeholders—as they are referred to—on 3 November to identify the issues and to determine a course of action. The member for Light attended that meeting. The meeting resolved to form a working party to develop a Gawler River catchment flood management plan. This will be developed after the investigation of a range of measures including flood plain mapping, flood warning arrangements, emergency service response plans and engineering flood mitigation works.

The Gawler River flood mitigation working party will consist of 10 members, including the member for Light and single representatives from the District Council of Mallala, the Gawler council, the District Council of Munno Para, the Engineering and Water Supply Department,, the Bureau of Meteorology, the State Emergency Service, the District Council of Angaston, the Department of Road Transport and the Northern Adelaide Plains Water Resources Committee. The Chief Executive of the District Council of Mallala, Mr Colin Dunlop, will activate the working party and chair meetings. State Government funds will be provided for the engagement of consultants if this is considered necessary.

One of the first tasks of the working party will be to determine suitable terms of reference in consultation with catchment local councils. The local community will be given the opportunity to participate in the preparation of the catchment flood management plan. The working party will then report to the joint task group and, from time to time, a reference group of stakeholders will be consulted. In addition, a wide range of interested parties will be invited to be part of the reference group. I can also say

that tomorrow morning I will meet with a deputation from residents in the Two Wells/Virginia area who are coming to meet me and the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services on the matter of financial arrangements that were available for those affected by the recent floods.

PRIMARY INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Minister of Primary Industries. How many research and development staff from the Department of Agriculture were not transferred to the Department of Primary Industries?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The allocation of $2.5 million for the South Australian Research and Development Institute is—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member might wait for me to finish. It is a nominal allocation which will largely be spent on salaries as people are transferred out. Those matters are actually being worked out and attended to at the present time. It is a nominal amount.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Members can laugh and make fun of these things. The creation of the Department of Primary Industries is a very positive step, a step in the right economic direction. These things do not happen overnight. There are many others questions one could answer. However, in due course I will find out the exact number for the honourable member and let him know. But, the $2.5 million allocation for the duration of the year is a nominal amount to cater for salaries, such as that of Dr Radcliff and Mr Lewis and other staff members who will be associated with that change.

BUSINESS REGULATION REVIEW OFFICE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister of Business and Regional Development. Will the report of the Business Regulation Review Office be made public and will it include details of those licences proposed for elimination? It has been reported in the media that the Business Regulation Review Office has compiled a report known as 'The Small Business Inquiry and Statutory Licence Review' based on the opinions of the small business community. Small business constituents in my electorate have informed me that they support deregulation and are impressed by the number of licences proposed for extinction, according to this report. They believe that this will make it much easier for small business to operate in South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, the report will be made public. Indeed, I intend to table it in this Parliament. It is true that the State Government plans to abolish almost 50 State business licences. Obviously, that will take some legislation but it will make it easier for small businesses to operate in South Australia. Those licences which are believed to be irrelevant or inefficient or which duplicate other regulations cover a variety of Government agencies. The Government is also considering abolishing other licences and introducing a pilot scheme for a master licence system to enable businesses to apply for one licence to replace all others.

Some small businesses need up to 20 licences to operate in this State, and that is a nonsense, considering the amount of time and money involved. This situation is, of course, replicated in other States. The abolition of these licences is the first step towards reducing the cost to the community and Government agencies and towards removing much of the red tape. Hopefully, unlike with previous efforts at deregulation in this Parliament, there will be support from the Opposition, which mouths the rhetoric but, when it comes down to the line, seems to back away from any deregulation.

The master licence system takes this even further, and the Government is considering a pilot scheme to assess its feasibility. The Government will also establish a one-stop shop business licensing information centre, which will provide information on regulations required for small businesses as well as the necessary licence application forms. This centre will be run by the South Australian Small Business Corporation and is expected to be operating by April next year. At the moment, people have to go to several different Government agencies to find out what licences they need to set up a business and to get the application forms. This one-stop shop will put an end to this, as all information and applications will be available at the one location in the Small Business Corporation, although obviously they will still have to lodge the forms with the various agencies. However, the centre will save business people enormous amounts of time as well as reducing administrative costs to the Government.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I direct my question to the Minister of Primary Industries. Which former Department of Agriculture programs have been cut to fund the establishment of the South Australian Research and Development Institute; where is that institute to be located; and what is the cost of establishing the institute? This institute is to be funded by the reallocation of funds originally allocated to the Department of Agriculture. However, the Government has not so far indicated which departmental programs will be affected by this reorganisation and the extent of cuts in funding of those programs.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: As I said in answer to an earlier question, a nominal amount of $2.5 million was allocated to the Research and Development Institute. In terms of research activities, I am told—and I give this figure as an approximation, as I have not had it verified—there are about 500 different research projects which should become the responsibility of the institute.

As the honourable member knows, the former Department of Agriculture is under review, and the organisational development review should be released towards the middle of next week. I should receive its findings very shortly. I will be in a better position to answer the honourable member's question in detail when that review is released as, obviously, that will affect some of the activities that will be transferred.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: At the present time, the Research and Development Institute is at the Waite campus. That will obviously be the headquarters. I have told the House the appropriateness of the administration buildings of the former Department of Agriculture being located at the Waite campus is being reviewed. I will be able to make that information known next week.

The question is of considerable importance, because the honourable member is reflecting a line of inquiry that I have had put to me frequently over the past couple of weeks. The best answer I can give at the present time is that research activities will be transferred. In relation to the nature and the full extent of those, I will make those decisions after the ODR review is handed to me, and I will inform the House accordingly.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. What is the purpose of the South Australian Government's spending $11 million dollars on mineral exploration?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What an extraordinary interjection. What has that to do with it—apples and pears?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: An extraordinary interjection. However, I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. I believe that this is indeed my maiden question as Minister of Mineral Resources. It has been a long time coming, but it was certainly worth waiting for.

An honourable member: The way things are going, it will be your last.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He is devastating today. He is very animated today. The $11 million as announced by the then Premier and Treasurer in the recent budget was an initiative that is probably long over due. There has been some concern in the mining industry that Australia as a whole has perhaps been living off exploration that was done some years ago. I do not think there is any doubt that over the past decade it has become more and more difficult for miners to explore and, therefore, eventually to mine, should there be any significant finds.

I think there is a number of reasons for this, and I will not go through them all. One of principal reasons is that the 1980s was a decade which no doubt brought to the fore environmental questions that, again, were long overdue. Solutions to many of our environmental problems have been found, and a large number of procedures have been put in place to ensure that we do not repeat the mistakes of the past. I know that most people in the House would agree that that was a necessary decade of action in those areas. However, I believe, and the Government believes, that, without in any way derogating from those standards, we are able from now on to encourage development, and much more than I believe has been encouraged in the past.

I am very pleased that this particular initiative, this $11 million South Australian exploration initiative, was able to be made despite the very difficult economic circumstances in which we find ourselves. It is a very significant amount of money and will supply a great deal of base data to the industry. I know that the industry is looking forward to very early results as a result of this very detailed data that we will be providing.

I believe it is the job of Governments to intervene in this area and spend taxpayers' money for the benefit of the whole community. I strongly believe that. I do not believe that these areas should be left to the market place. I am a very strong believer in Government intervention to assist the private sector rather than the simplistic nonsense that is spoken about opposite. I might say that the miners agree with me. They welcome this Government intervention and what we could call this touch of socialism that has been injected into the budget. I have heard only praise, and no objection, for the fact that taxpayers' funds are being used in this way. I know that the purists opposite will object to the use of taxpayers' funds in this way, but I have no difficulty in defending it. I know that the mining industry has no difficulty in accepting the benefit of it. To be a little more specific—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, I bring your attention to the length of the reply.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to bring his response to a close.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will leave it at that. I am sure that the member for Henley Beach will ask me later on about the specifics of this initiative.

SAGASCO

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Does the Government still intend selling its remaining shares in SAGASCO to Santos, and how will it fill the massive hole in the budget if the shares are not sold for approximately $300 million this financial year?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Mitcham for his question, which is actually a very important one, even though it does show a basic misunderstanding of the Government's budget position. Leaving that aside, the member for Mitcham would remember that the offer for the shares was conditional, and it was made very clear in the press statement that accompanied the then Premier's announcement about our offer of 57 per cent of SAGASCO that certain conditions would apply. I can recommend that the member for Mitcham re-read that press release, because every word of it is still valid.

What has been happening since? I suppose those who are interested have followed in the press that Santos has indicated it wishes to make an offer of approximately $2.70 a share. However, certain action by the Trade Practices Commission and, I believe, by SAGASCO itself has caused some delay in the ability of Santos to follow through with its intention. If and when that offer arrives on the Government's desk, obviously the Government will consider it along with any other offers that come the Government's way.

Until such time as any offers are considered, I cannot give a definite answer to the member for Mitcham, other than to say that our offer on the 57 per cent of SAGASCO shares is conditional. Any organisation that wishes to make a bid for the offer is free to do so, bearing in mind the conditions attached to the offer. In summary, I can only recommend that the member for Mitcham re-read the Hon. John Bannon's press release when the announcement was made.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations inform the House of steps the Government is taking to promote home ownership for public housing tenants?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Housing Trust is very committed to encouraging home ownership through promoting sales of its housing stock to its tenants. It does so for the following reasons: a greater financial security and self-esteem for those tenants who wish to become home owners; a more stable residential base, with a better social mix of home owners and renters, which has always been a predominant value of the Housing Trust in this State; and, thirdly, capital resources for reinvestment in replacement stock, which is also crucial at this time given the slowish nature of our economy and the important role that the building industry plays as a stimulus in our local economy.

In March 1988 the Housing Trust appointed real estate agents to act on its behalf in dealing with tenants interested in purchasing the homes in which they were living. Since then, the trust has conducted direct marketing campaigns to encourage its tenants to purchase their homes. The Housing Trust is currently developing a further direct marketing campaign which will be launched early in the new year. These campaigns have proven extremely successful with over 3 500 sales achieved over the past four years.

The Housing Trust also makes its progressive purchase scheme (PPS) available to tenants wishing to buy shares in their accommodation. In addition, the Government provides financial packages to assist all home buyers through HomeStart Finance Limited. Capital indexed loans are available to all prospective purchasers, including public housing tenants who wish to buy their rental properties.

In the most recent four years, ending with the financial year 1991-92, 931 sales were achieved, 94 of which were under the PPS; in 1990-91, 1 028 sales were achieved, 173 of which were under the PPS; in 1989-90, 858 sales were achieved, 147 of which were under the PPS; and in 1988-89, there were 1 012 sales to tenants, 56 of which were under the PPS.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): This afternoon the Liberal Party has put before the House more evidence of WorkCover rorts—of illegal agreements between union officials and WorkCover. This evidence also raises the most serious questions about the involvement of the Government: when did the Government first become aware of these rorts? Did it condone them? Is the Government now involved in a cover-up? We demand a full investigation. We want to know why WorkCover cooperated in breaches of its own Act. Was it directed to do so by the Government? Did the Government do this because it was pressured by union officials controlling work on the Remm project and other major Government building sites where taxpayers' money was involved, including the ASER project?

The Minister of Labour Relations chaired a committee that dealt with industrial relations disputes on the Myer-Remm site. Was this committee told about these illegal agreements? The constraints of confidentiality orders imposed by the State Bank Royal Commission prevent me from revealing all that is known about the Government's involvement and the cause and cost of these disputes. Let me repeat that, by December 1990, the Government was made well aware of WorkCover abuses and other outrageous union behaviour on this site which has cost taxpayers many millions of dollars. All the Premier has to do is search the files in his own office, if they have not been cleared out by his predecessor, and he will find startling information about the cost of industrial disputes on the Myer-Remm site.

All claims from that site, when finally settled, are expected to cost at least $8 million. More than 1 100 claims are involved. I turn now to the detail of the agreement I have given to the Minister this afternoon seeking a further investigation independent of the Government. This document is dated 22 August 1990. At this time, according to the Minister's statement to the House last Friday, there was only one written agreement between the union, the former BLF, and WorkCover. However, this document refers to various agreements in operation at this time. It records the provisions of those agreements and each provision represents a breach of the WorkCover Act. The first provision forces WorkCover to pay four weeks interim compensation in all cases, pending determination of liability. This is clearly a breach of section 106 of the WorkCover Act, which gives WorkCover a wide discretion in this matter.

The second provision prevents review matters being referred to legal practitioners. This breaches section 92 of the Act. The third provision prevents WorkCover seeking independent medical advice on an injured worker. This breaches section 53(2) of the Act. The fourth provision denies WorkCover the right to choose rehabilitation counsellors. This section breaches section 28 of the Act. The fifth and final provision specifies how weekly payments to injured workers are to be determined. This clearly breaches section 4 of the Act.

This document records agreements between the union—the BLF, the very people out on the steps of Parliament House this afternoon, telling this Parliament that it should not amend the WorkCover legislation—and WorkCover people themselves. It has been reported that the WorkCover board did not know about this agreement.

Then who did? Who authorised it? Someone in WorkCover has willingly been involved in breaches of WorkCover's own Act.

These are questions the Minister ignored last Friday when he made his ministerial statement to this House. He has not even attempted to have these questions investigated, as he promised to do earlier in the week. Last Friday the Minister said WorkCover's written agreements with this building industry union did not contravene WorkCover's legislation and that there was no evidence that union members had been paid benefits to which they were not entitled. The Minister's statement was totally inadequate and completely irresponsible in the circumstances.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Conflict between neighbours is a problem that every member of Parliament comes across from time to time. When that conflict occurs between people in private residences, between private dwelling occupants and South Australian Housing Trust occupants or between trust tenants on either side, it becomes the bane of existence of many members of Parliament. I am no different from most members in this place who take an interest in these problems.

Ever since I have been in this place I have been aware of the conflict between neighbours. Most people in the community want to live in peace and make allowances for their neighbours; they make allowances for noisy parties and celebrations, but there comes a time when people have had enough of certain behaviour, and that is the time when conflicts spill over into unsavoury events.

Since 1990 I have raised in Parliament the problems of conflicts between neighbours and the need for the Government to have amending legislation so that the police have the power to act without a complaint from the public. The reason why most members of the public will not complain about a neighbour or neighbours is their fear of recrimination. That is a fact and every member of this House would be aware of it.

Why do I raise this matter again? Because I am aware that the matter has been before a number of Ministers since 1990. I am aware that the Minister responsible for the police has given documentation to responsible Ministers to act on this problem. There is a crying need in the community for the appropriate Acts to be amended so that neighbours can live in peace and can have action taken when they lodge complaints with police.

The current situation in respect of a Housing Trust tenant in Seaton is that he and his wife have been subjected to a great amount of harassment, involving drinking parties, abuse in the back and front yards and music being turned up loud at all hours of the day and night and, when the police are called and sighted, the music is then turned down. My constituent was not aware that he and his wife could seek a restraining order. How many people in the community are aware of that procedure to try to address such problems?

As members would know, in 1991 I requested, both within the Party forums and in this House, that the Act be amended appropriately so that the police can act of their own volition without having a complaint from members of the community. Not one caring person in the community would not agree on that issue. Members of the Police Department, including senior members, have said that they would support such a proposition. We need such a provision and I hope that the EPA Bill, which I understand will incorporate all matters pertaining to noise control, will be introduced in this Parliament before Christmas.

There is a crying need for action, because people have for long enough put up with yahoos who carry on and seem to have no care for their neighbours. My Seaton constituent has indicated to me that time and time again he has had to put up with noise, and many people have put up with such problems over many months and sometimes years rather than complain and be seen to be an unhelpful neighbour. The time has come for this legislation to be introduced in the Parliament and I hope to see such amending legislation and the EPA Bill introduced in the House before Christmas.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I want to place on record my congratulations to everyone who contributed to the splendid effort to get the paddle-steamer *Marion* refloated at Mannum last Sunday week in a ceremony conducted by Dame Roma Mitchell, who was invited to officiate and, of course, did so in an admirable fashion on behalf of everyone in South Australia.

The people who participated in the project of getting the *Marion* restored to the point where it could be refloated in the dock at Mannum deserve high praise from the rest of us in South Australia and, indeed, the whole of Australia. It is a very historic paddle-steamer, and this is what we can achieve if we set our minds to it. It was an almost totally voluntary effort and it was also an outstanding example of cooperation between citizens with skills, equipment and materials and a well led community organisation such as we have, including Rob Bowering, chairman, and local government, the Mannum District Council. Everyone deserves to be commended.

What did the State Government do? It did absolutely nothing. I know that I did whatever I could do in the circumstances. The State Government not only sat on its hands and did nothing but failed to identify and recognise a problem which its own actions have created. The thing that the State Government did not do and has not done is fix the unholy mess in the regulations that affect all our river-boats, particularly our heritage wooden hull boats, such as the *Marion*.

Not many people realise that, because of these silly regulations, in recent years we have lost to the eastern States a number of our heritage vessels, associated projects and facilities. We have lost the paddle-steamer *Coonawarra*, the motor vessel *Loyalty* to Wentworth and the paddle-steamer *Enterprise* to Canberra, all because our regulations here have prevented fare-paying tourists from taking a cruise on them. Yet that is not the case in the Eastern States. Those vessels would have remained here and the projects associated with and the development of facilities relevant to their operations would have been part of the capital investment and infrastructure in South Australia's tourism development along the river if only the Government had responded to the reasonable and

sensible requests that have been made to it over the years.

If it is safe to use the *Marion*, or any other vessel for that matter, for people who make a donation to its restoration and if it is safe for people who wish to use it as a restaurant, for instance, why is it not safe for people who want to pay a fare for a journey of one, two, three, four, five or however many days? People used to take cruises on the *Marion*.

Mr D.S. Baker: I had one myself.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Victoria points out that this has been going on until very recent times. It has been going on for over 100 years. There is no reason why these vessels could not have been resurveyed. If the Government is fair dinkum about tourism development, decentralisation and deregulation, it must act swiftly to fix the regulations which are irrelevant to river boats but which threaten yet another viable project for South Australia. We cannot afford to allow the *Marion* project to languish, yet it desperately needs funds. There are still a few river boats left which could be restored and operated in South Australia if only the Government will get out of the way. These regulations may be relevant to coastal waters, but they are certainly not relevant to the inland river waters of this State, and that is a real problem for us.

We have another problem in tourism development to which I will draw attention later, and that is the problem created by land locking divisions caused when the Swanport bridge was put across the river. Those subdivisions made by the acquisition of land are now landlocked and the people who own them cannot get access to them to develop them to provide tourism infrastructure in the fashion in which they ought to be able to do so. I shall be speaking to the Minister about that in conjunction with a delegation from the landowners in question, as well as the landowner who may be affected, and the Murray Bridge District Council, all of whom have been very patient in trying to find a fair solution to the problem.

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

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I wish to use this time to draw attention to a problem faced by a constituent, Mr Peter McGovern, of Mitchell Park. Many matters come before members of Parliament involving incompetence or other administrative deficiencies by Government departments which members of Parliament can resolve or, if they cannot, they have recourse to the Ombudsman to deal with them. The problem that we face is when there are problems of incompetence with the courts system, and that is the matter that I wish to address because there appear to be no effective means of resolving such problems.

The case involving my constituent was a civil dispute over some earth moving services provided by my constituent, for which he claimed $8 000 from the party for whom he performed the services and was refused payment. The matter went before the local court in 1987. The matter went before a magistrate, and after three days my constituent lost the case. I cannot comment on that case, but my constituent then wished to exercise his right to appeal, and that is when his problems began. It transpired that the court had lost two days of transcripts from the three days of the case. It took some time for all this to be discovered and for various searches to be made to see whether the records could be found. It was not until April this year that my constituent was finally able to have his appeal heard before Mr Justice Bollen.

What was used as the basis of the appeal were the hand-written notes from the magistrate and the one day of transcript that was not missing. What made the matter even more difficult was that the magistrate had left for Darwin in the meantime. I believe that the judge's associate contacted the magistrate in Darwin and, four or five years later, received some comments from the magistrate. That was the basis on which my constituent's appeal was heard. Of course, when my constituent got to the appeal hearing, he discovered not only that two of the three days of transcripts had been lost but that the five exhibits, which were obviously vital in this case, were missing. He discovered that only during the appeal process. He was not aware before that that they were lost.

While the judge did comment on the missing records, my constituent was not successful in his appeal. I should like to refer to some of the comments made in the judgment on that appeal. The judge said:

> It is a principle of law that an appeal court cannot go behind the findings of primary fact of a magistrate, except in the most exceptional circumstances. There are no such exceptional circumstances here. The magistrate was entitled to find as he did. Of course, the absence of the transcript causes some concern.

I interpose that it certainly causes me great concern. The judge continued:

> However, I feel that that which remains and the report from [the magistrate] enables me to conclude this matter. Today Mr McGovern has vigorously asked for an investigation. Certainly I have power to adjourn these proceedings while an investigation takes place, but I have no power to order any investigation. I see no ground for any investigation. The magistrate was entitled to decide as he did.

One can imagine that my constituent feels less than satisfied with the outcome of this case. Whether he would have won the appeal had the transcripts and the exhibits been available, who can say? However, I can certainly understand why my constituent feels aggrieved by the fact that his appeal was heard and he lost it because the transcripts, which included the original judgment given by the magistrate, were missing. No wonder my constituent feels dissatisfied with the outcome. I believe it is a most unsatisfactory situation.

It appears that my constituent is caught in a vicious circle. Wherever he turns, there is no way that he can get justice in this matter. If I had time I would quote from the comments made by the Court Services Department in 1990 when it originally discovered that the information was not available. Unfortunately, I will not have time to do that.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Mr Speaker, I wish to raise two matters. One concerns the fire regulations in relation to burning in the Mitcham council area and the other relates to the Craigburn Farm. The Craigburn Farm is a very valuable property in money and environmental terms. I appreciate that we now have a new Minister and that a new Premier is in charge of the Government. I have written, on my behalf and that of the member for

Fisher, and more particularly on behalf of the community, to ask whether the Premier will receive a deputation to discuss the Craigburn Farm. That was only within the last week. I did not expect a reply until now, but I know that the Premier or his staff will consider talking to the Minister and making an arrangement for us to meet and discuss that property.

I presented a petition today containing more than 4 500 signatures and the member for Fisher has presented a petition containing several hundred, so more than 5 000 people have signed petitions saying that they believe this valuable property should remain as open space, its future use to be decided, whether for public use in total or perhaps semi-private, part of it being a golf club. The trees are magnificent in the undulating areas; they are a mixture of gums. If any member has not inspected the property, I invite them to do so. I know that one or two members have done that, but I believe it is so important that every member should take the opportunity of visiting the property and making a decision.

Over 100 years ago the Belair Recreation Park was saved because the paper of the day, the *Advertiser*, and people in prominent positions decided to fight to have it declared as a national park. I just wish that the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* and the electronic media and those in high places outside the Government had the same drive today to make representations to the Government to show that there is public support broader than a community of 30 000 or 40 000 who may surround it in the different suburbs.

The money required to save the first 62 hectares from being put to subdivision is between $6 million and $8 million. That sounds like quite a lot now, but in the long term it is not much money. The previous Minister virtually admitted that, if she were still in Government in 1999—God forbid if she were—she would be prepared to buy the 80-odd hectares that is also available for subdivision under the supplementary development plan that is being considered.

The size of allotments being looked at are down to 200 square metres; that is less than half the size of a standard netball court. That is ridiculous, and we all know that. I make the plea to the Parliament, in the short time that I have to speak on this subject, to go and have a look at it. Do not cast it aside; stop and think how much the Belair park is used; stop and think how valuable it would be to the south and to the tourist industry. I ask members to go and have a look. I am known to lean towards development and I am a developer by nature, but I draw the line on this property because, as much as it could be available for housing for many people, it should not go in that direction; it is too valuable for that.

The Mitcham council fire regulations prevent the burning of dry material on one's property at any time. It is not even possible to obtain a permit to do it through the CFS or the council unless it is a vacant land. So, if you have a house with 15 acres of quite flammable material, you cannot get a permit to burn the material even if you rake it up in a heap. But if that property is vacant with no home on it, you can rake up the material and burn it. I know the Government is looking at changes in the regulations. On behalf of those many people in the Mitcham hills who are fearful of the next fire, I ask that something be done quickly so that they will be able to make the necessary plans to clean up their properties, to reduce the fire hazard to themselves, their families and their neighbours.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): During the five minutes allotted to me today, I should like to continue from the Minister's response to a question I asked today about the elimination of leaded petrol from the Pitjantjatjara and Anangu lands in the north-west of the State. The elimination of leaded petrol is specifically to try to stop the petrol sniffing which is occurring with young Aboriginal youths in those areas.It is a very important issue, and one which has very horrific health implications for the young people who sniff leaded petrol. The damage that is done to these young people mentally and to their health generally has to be seen to be believed: it is something that we need to address fairly quickly. The discussions that occurred between the Minister and the people who were with the Minister up in the Aboriginal lands, particularly the Pitjantjatjara Council at Umawa, indicated that the communities are prepared to deal with this problem. Of course, we must do more than just eliminate leaded petrol from the lands, which would mean they would have only unleaded petrol and diesel.

Some good results have been achieved in the Northern Territory by eliminating unleaded petrol. It still does not mean that the young people who are currently sniffing petrol will not continue to do so with unleaded petrol. The health implications associated with unleaded petrol are not nearly as bad as those associated with leaded petrol, but they are still something we need to think about quite seriously. The people who seem to be most at risk are in the 13 to 30 year old age group. The 30 year old sniffer whom I saw was very close to death. Nobody understands how this person has lasted to 30 years of age; the expected life span is usually shorter. However, the person concerned was certainly not in full possession of his faculties; he was a very sick person.

One of the reasons that these young people are sniffing is that they are not occupied; no jobs are available for them; they do not seem to have a life that gives them enjoyment. We should have a very good look at the community health problems generally in those communities in the north-west. One of the real problems is that there is a need for a community education program with regard to personal hygiene—just the simple things, the basic things of life. For example, water containers are put on the ground and the dogs, which are an integral part of Aboriginal communities, share them with the children. The risk of germs and of those children catching a disease is very real and is a risk which we need to address—and I would suggest very soon. The communities themselves are prepared to take some responsibility for this. There is also a willingness by the Aboriginal health workers who work in those areas also to take some responsibility for that community health education.

It is something that should be raised with both the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs—and I know that the Minister of Aboriginal affairs is aware of this problem and is quite prepared (and I applaud him for this) to work on it. We all should look at it as a problem with which we need to deal, because a whole segment of the

Aboriginal community will not live long, and that is a whole segment that will not be able to look to the future and be able to teach children younger than themselves to be able to carry on their culture in the Aboriginal lands.

It a serious issue, and I applaud the Minister for his willingness to work within the community. I applaud those members of the Aboriginal communities who are also prepared to take this problem by the throat and to try to do something about it. It has been a problem in the past and it continues to be a problem. Let us not allow it to be a problem in the future. It is something we really do need to address.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for—

(a) completion of the following Bills:

Dangerous Substances (Equipment and Permits) Amendment,
The Standard Time (Eastern Standard Time) Amendment,
Industrial Relations (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment,
Government Management and Employment (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Acts Interpretation (Australia Acts) Amendment,
Superannuation (Benefit Scheme),
Superannuation (Scheme Revision) Amendment,
Dairy Industry,
Criminal Law (Sentencing) (Suspension of Vehicle Registration) Amendment,
Financial Transaction Reports (State Provisions) and

(b) consideration of the Legislative Council's amendments to the Fruit and Plant Protection Bill and the Statutes Amendment (Public Actuary) Bill—

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RIGHT OF REPLY) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

At common law, the accused (or his or her counsel) does not have the right to address the jury (the right of reply) after the prosecution has finally addressed the jury unless the accused has called no evidence other than evidence of character. Section 20 of the Evidence Act provides that the defence also does not lose the right of reply where the accused is called as a witness. In all other cases, the prosecution addresses the jury last. A number of lawyers believe that giving the right of reply to the defence is a right as important and fundamental to the defence as the presumption of innocence and the privilege against self-incrimination, and have been unhappy with the state of the law in South Australia for a number of years. The Mitchell Committee recommended that the accused should have the right of reply whether or not he or she called evidence. But expert opinions were divided on the merits of this recommendation—not only on what the law should be but why the law existed in the first place.

The issue arose again in the process of consultation on a part of the courts package that passed through Parliament in late 1991. The Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society took the view that it was possible that the reforms proposed in relation to committals might have flow on effects on right of reply. The Government undertook to make sure that there was no disadvantage suffered, but, given the controversy that had surrounded the issue in the past, took the view that it would prefer to deal with the matter separately. This Bill is the result of that undertaking. After a great deal of consultation with the legal profession and the Director of Public Prosecutions, it has been decided that the best course is the simplest—that is, to provide that the accused always has the right of reply. In the course of consultation, this view was reinforced by the recommendation made by the judges of the Supreme Court in their last annual report to the same effect.

The Bill also makes one other change to the law. It relates to the right of the prosecution to address the court. Traditionally, where the accused is unrepresented, the prosecution does not address the jury at all at the end of the evidence. The reason for this is essentially awareness of a general disparity between the forensic abilities of a professional prosecutor and the general run of accused persons. This rule will, if breached, lead to a mistrial. The rule has, nevertheless, been the subject of criticism. For example, why should it apply where the accused happens to be, for example, an experienced lawyer, or where the accused attempts to manipulate the system by discharging his or her lawyer at the last moment only to rehire once found guilty? For that reason, the Mitchell Committee recommended that 'where the accused, although unrepresented, indicates that he intends to address the jury, the Crown should address the jury at the close of any evidence for the defence'. The Bill provides that the prosecution has the right to address, and leaves the precise circumstances in which that will be appropriate to the court in the individual case. I commend the Bill to the House.

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 is formal.

PART 2

AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT 1935

Clause 4 replaces section 288 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 with three sections. Proposed section 288 provides that any person charged with an offence may be represented by counsel. Proposed section 288a provides that a person charged with an offence may give evidence after the presentation of the prosecution case. Before giving such evidence the defendant may make an opening address.

In cases where there are two or more defendants, the opening address of each defendant will be made immediately before his or her evidence or, where the court so directs, the addresses of each defendant may be given together prior to the giving of evidence on behalf of any defendant. Proposed section 288b provides that, regardless of the conduct of the trial, the prosecution has the right to make a closing address and the defendant has the right of reply.

PART 3

AMENDMENT OF EVIDENCE ACT 1929

Clause 5 repeals sections 19 and 20 of the Evidence Act, consequential on the amendments made in clause 4.

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

FIREARMS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Emergency Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Firearms Act 1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The violent and tragic use of firearms in August 1991 in New South Wales and in 1987 in Victoria focused public scrutiny on firearms legislation throughout Australia.

Here in South Australia, the Minister for the administration of the Firearms Act, undertook to review the effectiveness of controls. The Minister took into consideration the resolutions of the Australian Police Ministers' Council and the Premiers, Conference, submissions from the Commissioner of Police and other interested parties, such as the promoters of paintball activities.

This Bill seeks to bring into effect the resolutions of the Police Ministers' Council and Premiers' Conference together with the recommendations of the Commissioner of Police, paintball operators, and other interested parties, which are not yet embodied in this State's firearms controls. Honourable members should clearly understand that the changes are not an emotional response or knee jerk reaction to the multiple murders which occurred last year.

The objective of this legislation and the Firearms Act Amendment Act 1988 is to prevent, so far as is possible, death and injury as a result of firearms misuse. Honourable members and the community generally should not suffer under the illusion that this legislation will eliminate firearms misuse. The Government makes no exaggerated claims for this legislation and does not regard it as a panacea. No firearms or criminal legislation can of itself eliminate crime. Nevertheless, it is imperative that appropriate controls, together with firearm education programmes, exist to promote the safe and responsible possession and use of firearms. This Bill embodies such controls.

In October and November 1991 the Australian Police Ministers' Council met to discuss the adoption of national uniform minimum standards for firearms controls and agreed to a number of resolutions. At the November 1991 Premiers' Conference, the Premiers and Chief Ministers concurred with the resolutions of the Police Ministers' Council and recommended that all necessary administrative and legislative changes should be implemented in all jurisdictions by 1 July 1992.

Of the 19 resolutions agreed to be adopted, some will require multiple legislative changes, others can be more appropriately implemented by regulation and the rest will require no legislative or regulatory change. Amendments have been included embodying the following resolutions:

- confirmation of the existing prohibition on the possession of fully automatic firearms;
- to prohibit, subject to carefully defined exemptions, the sale of military style self-loading centre-fire rifles, and all self-loading centre-fire rifles and self-loading shotguns which have a detachable magazine capable of holding more than five rounds;
- confirmation of the existing restriction on the possession of hand-guns;
- consistent minimum licensing procedures which include issue only to residents of proven identity who have the appropriate qualification, training and genuine reason;
- all firearms be registered in the licence holder's jurisdiction of residence;
- to limit the sale of ammunition to appropriate licence holders and collectors;
- to ban, other than in the case of government or government authorized users, the possession and use of detachable magazines of more than five rounds capacity for self-loading centre-fire rifles and self-loading shotguns;
- to impose an obligation on sellers and purchasers of firearms to ensure purchasers are appropriately licensed;
- to require the suspension of relevant firearms licences, prohibit the issue or renewal of licences, and require the seizure of firearms in the possession or control of a violent offender or a person against whom a protection order is in effect, and grant police a discretion to seize firearms temporarily where such action is warranted.

While the Government is prepared to limit access to self-loading firearms, we will not make such controls retrospective. Persons who have legally purchased firearms in good faith will not be deprived of their rights to possess and use those particular firearms. Transitional provisions in this Bill, and the Firearms Act Amendment Act 1988, will ensure that those rights are preserved.

The legislation will prohibit the possession of a detachable magazine of more than five rounds capacity for a self-loading centre-fire rifle or a self-loading shotgun unless the person has possession of that magazine for use on the grounds of a recognized firearms club, as part of a collection or in accordance with the transitional provisions.

For a number of years, promoters of paintball activities have made representations to the government requesting that participants in paintball activities on properly controlled grounds should be exempted from the requirement of holding a firearms licence for the possession of a firearm, in the same manner as a person on the grounds of a recognized firearms club. The government believes that properly controlled activities should be permitted in South Australia as they have a popular following in many other countries. The legislation will facilitate the application for recognition and the approval of grounds by paintball operators. Once recognized, paintball operators will benefit from the legislation in respect to persons participating in paintball activities on approved grounds and the sale of paintball ammunition in much the same way as the recognized firearms clubs. The paintball operators support these amendments.

Under the Firearms Act Amendment Act 1988, an application for a firearms licence cannot be validly made by a person under the age of 18. To enable younger persons to possess firearms for appropriate shooting activities, this Bill will allow an application for a licence to possess an air rifle or air gun to be made by a person of or above the age of 16.

The amendments provide for a police officer to seize a firearm if he or she suspects on reasonable grounds that continued possession of the firearm would be likely to result in undue danger to life or property or if a person has failed to comply with an order under section 99 of the Summary Procedure Act in relation to the firearm. The legislation will give the Registrar the power to temporarily suspend the licence of a person who is not a fit and proper person to hold the licence pending the consideration of cancellation of the licence by the Firearms Consultative Committee. A police officer will be empowered to seize a licence if the licence has been suspended or cancelled, if a person has possession of the licence contrary to an order under section 99 of the Summary Procedure Act or if a firearm possessed under the licence has been seized.

To ensure the Registrar can give proper consideration to the granting, refusal, temporary suspension and cancellation of licences under this Act, medical practitioners will have a duty to report to the Registrar any case where they have reasonable cause to believe it is or would be unsafe for a patient to possess firearms. The amendment protects the practitioner from civil or criminal liability where such report is made.

The Bill enables a licence holder and the Registrar to vary classes, purposes of use and conditions on a licence, setting out the required procedures. In addition, requirements are placed on the Registrar and the licence holder in relation to licences and approval to purchase firearm permits. If a person is aggrieved by a decision of the Registrar, in relation to a licence, permit or grounds of a recognized firearms club or recognized paintball operator, he may appeal that decision to a Magistrate in chambers.

The Bill includes an amendment which provides that the Crown is not bound by the Act. This amendment arises from a decision of the High Court which raised doubts as to when the Crown is bound by an Act.

The Bill amends the Firearms Act 1977 and the Firearms Act Amendment Act 1988 and it is proposed that it will come into operation on the day on which the Firearms Act Amendment Act 1988 comes into operation.

The Government has taken into consideration the rights of ordinary citizens and shooters, and believes that this Bill will not unduly affect the interests of the legitimate firearms user. The community expects the Government to ensure that only fit and proper persons own firearms, that those persons be held accountable for the use of their firearms, and that there are proper controls over the proliferation of firearms in this State. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Bill amends the Firearms Act 1977 as if the Firearms Act Amendment Act 1988 was in operation.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 amends the interpretation provision.

Definitions of "paint-ball firearm" "paint-ball operator" and "recognized paint-ball operator" are inserted for the purposes of new provisions relating to paint-ball activities.

A definition of "restricted firearm" is inserted for the purposes of a new provision limiting the availability of such firearms. The definition allows the regulations to specify the types of firearms that are to be restricted.

The definition of "silencer" is amended to ensure that it includes devices that comprise part of the firearm as well as devices designed to be attached to a firearm.

The definition of "special firearms permit" is deleted although the concept of a firearms licence being specially endorsed so as to authorize the possession of a dangerous firearm is retained.

Subsection (5) of the current interpretation provision (as amended in 1988) provides that a person who purchases or sells more than 50 000 rounds of ammunition per year will be taken to be carrying on the business of dealing in ammunition. The amendment provides that this does not apply in relation to a recognized paint-ball operator. This is similar to the exclusion of recognized firearms clubs.

The amendment also inserts provisions to explain what is meant in the Act by references to grounds of a recognized firearms club or recognized paint-ball operator. Any grounds provided or arranged to be provided by the club or operator are to be considered to be grounds of the club or operator.

Clause 4 inserts a new section 5a which provides that the Crown is not bound by the Act.

Clause 5 is an amendment relating to paint-ball activities. Section 11 is amended by providing that a person who uses a paint-ball firearm as part of an organized activity on the grounds of a recognized paint-ball operator is not required to hold a firearms licence.

Clause 6 amends section 12. It requires the Registrar to be satisfied as to the identity, age and address of an applicant for a firearms licence before granting the licence. It enables the Registrar to refuse to grant a firearms licence to a person who is not usually resident in the State.

It also removes the ability of the Registrar to grant a firearms licence authorizing possession of a "dangerous firearm" on the grounds that the firearm is of historical, archaeological or cultural value but the ability of the Registrar to grant such a licence on the grounds that the firearm is required for the purposes of a theatrical production or for some other purpose authorized by the regulations is retained.

Clause 7 amends the administrative processes relating to conditions of firearms licences set out in section 13.

The requirement of reporting to the consultative committee any licence conditions imposed by the Registrar with the agreement of the licence holder is removed.

The Registrar is empowered on his or her own initiative to vary or revoke licence conditions, extend or restrict the classes of firearms to which the licence relates or vary or revoke endorsements on the licence. The current provision (as amended in 1988) only allows this on application by the licensee.

Clause 8 amends section 14 which requires various permits to be obtained in relation to the purchase or sale of firearms. The current provision (as inserted by the 1988 amendment) provides that in the case of an auction of firearms a purchaser does not need a permit although the auctioneer is required to ascertain that the purchaser holds an appropriate firearms licence or is a licensed dealer. The amendment requires the purchaser to seek a permit approving the purchase retrospectively. If that permit is refused, the amendment provides that the licence will be taken not to authorize the possession of the firearm. New section 31a sets out the steps that must then be taken in relation to the firearm.

The amendment also provides that restricted firearms may only be sold pursuant to permit. The amendment in clause 9 to section 15 provides that such a permit will only be granted if the Registrar is satisfied that special circumstances exist justifying the granting of the permit.

Clause 9 contains amendments to the administrative processes related to permits set out in section 15 and is consequential to the amendments to section 14 contained in clause 8.

Clause 10 alters the conditions to which a dealer's licence is subject, as set out in section 17. The amendment makes it a condition of licence that the dealer must not deal in dangerous firearms and enables the Registrar to impose conditions on the licence with the agreement of the licensee.

Section 17 is further altered to bring the legislation relating to conditions of dealers' licences into line with that relating to conditions of firearms licences.

Clause 11 amends the cancellation of licence process set out in section 20 and introduces a process for suspending a licence.

The current provision (as inserted by the 1988 amendment) provides that one of the grounds for cancellation is if the licensee has committed some act that shows that he or she is not a fit and proper person to hold the licence. The amendment removes the need to point a specific act to establish lack of fitness.

The suspension process is such that the Registrar may suspend a licence pending an investigation as to whether the licence should be cancelled for a period of up to 3 months or such longer period as the consultative committee allows. The Registrar is also specifically empowered to revoke a suspension.

Clause 12 inserts a new section 20a obliging medical practitioners to report to the Registrar cases where they believe it is or would be unsafe for a patient to have possession of a firearm. The section protects the practitioner from civil or criminal liability where such a report is made.

Clause 13 inserts a new section 21ab. The section requires a person whose licence has been suspended or cancelled to return the licence to the Registrar. It also enables the Registrar to require a licence to be returned so that further endorsements can be made on it.

Clause 14 is an amendment relating to paint-ball activities. Section 21b (as inserted by the 1988 amendment) requires permits for the purchase of ammunition in certain circumstances. The amendment provides that a permit is not required for the acquisition of ammunition by a recognized paint-ball operator for distribution to participants in paint-ball activities. The exemption is similar to that given to recognized firearms clubs.

Clause 15 amends section 21d (as inserted by the 1988 amendment) by adding to the decisions of the Registrar against which an appeal may be taken the following: refusal of an application for a permit authorizing the purchase of a firearm at auction, variation of licence conditions, suspension of a licence, refusal to approve the grounds of a recognized firearms club or paint-ball operator and the imposition or variation of conditions imposed on such an approval.

Clause 16 amends section 22 by removing a reference to a special firearms permit and referring instead to a firearms licence that authorizes possession of a dangerous firearm.

Clause 17 is an amendment mainly relating to paint-ball activities. Two new sections are inserted. New section 26b provides for the recognition by the Minister of paint-ball operators. The exemptions given in relation to paint-ball activities only apply in relation to operators to whom such recognition has being given. The provision is similar to that relating to recognition of firearms clubs.

Section 26c institutes a system for the approval of the grounds of a recognized club or operator by the Registrar.

Clause 18 amends section 29. This section currently makes it an offence to possess a silencer. The amendment creates an additional offence of possessing a detachable magazine of more than 5 rounds capacity for a centre-fire self-loading rifle or self-

loading shotgun. Paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* set out exceptions to the general rule.

Clause 19 substitutes section 31a (inserted by the 1988 amendment). The current provision allows retention of a firearm for a specified period after cancellation of a licence or registration of a firearm or refusal to renew a licence in order for the firearm to be disposed of. The amendment extends the provision to cover suspension of a licence, refusal to grant a licence (in the case of applications by residents new to the State who have brought firearms with them) and refusal to grant a permit authorizing purchase of a firearm at auction. The period for which the firearm may be retained is reduced from 2 months to 1 month.

In addition, if a licence is simply suspended provision is made for the former licensee to retain the power of disposition over the firearm if the firearm is stored by a dealer or other authorized person.

Clause 20 amends section 32. The amendment makes it clear that a police officer may seize a firearm if he or she suspects on reasonable grounds that continued possession of the firearm by the person would be likely to result in undue danger to life or property or if the person has failed to comply with a restraining order under section 99 of the Summary Procedure Act 1921.

The amendment also introduces a power for the police to seize a licence in certain circumstances—where the firearm is seized, the licence is suspended or cancelled, the person possesses the licence for an improper purpose or the police officer suspects on reasonable grounds that the holder is not a fit and proper person to have possession of the licence.

Clause 21 inserts a new section 34aa which governs return of a licence seized under section 32. If the licence is not suspended or cancelled and the associated firearm has not been seized, the licence must be returned within 14 days. If the firearm has been seized, the licence must be returned when the firearm is returned.

Clause 22 amends section 34a which gives the court power to order forfeiture of firearms. The amendment requires the court to make an order under the section if a person is convicted of an offence involving a firearm or if the court forms a view that a party to proceedings is not a fit and proper person to have possession of a firearm. The orders that can be made are expanded to include imposition of licence conditions, suspension of licence and disqualification from holding a licence.

Clause 23 amends the evidentiary provision consequential to the amendments contained in the measure.

Clause 24 amends the regulation making power set out in section 39.

The amendment makes it clear that the regulations may provide, or empower the Registrar to determine, requirements for the safe keeping of ammunition.

The amendment also enables the regulations to require recognized paint-ball operators to keep records and furnish information to the Registrar (similarly to recognized firearms clubs).

Clause 25 amends the transitional provision. An unnecessary reference to a special firearms permit is deleted. The second amendment relates to the possession of large detachable magazines for self-loading firearms. New section 29(2) outlaws possession of certain magazines. The transitional provision allows persons in possession of such magazines as at the introduction of the measure to retain possession if they inform the Registrar of that possession together with certain details.

The schedule contains amendments of a statute law revision nature.

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

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Education, Employment and Training) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a fund to be used to improve the quality of training in the building and construction industry; to establish the Construction Industry Training Board to administer the fund and to coordinate appropriate training; to provide for the imposition and collection of a levy for the purposes of the fund; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: 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

INTRODUCTION

This is a Bill for an Act to establish a mandatory training levy of 0.25 per cent on the value of building and construction work undertaken in South Australia, which in turn will provide a fund for expenditure on training provision across the building and construction industry in this State.

BACKGROUND

The levy, and its associated fund have been proposed by the employers and unions in the building and construction industry, with the aim of improving the level of skills of new and existing employees in the industry, with a resultant increase in productive efficiency within the industry.

Employer and union bodies in the industry recognize that building and construction activity is cyclical in nature over time, and have expressed concern at the impact this has on the stock of skilled labour available in periods of industry buoyancy, with resultant loss of possible new contracts to the industry in this state.

In addition, the process of Award Restructuring, already well underway in the building and construction industry will bring much greater pressure to bear on the currently limited training resources of the industry. Award restructuring will link remuneration and career progression to levels of skill acquisition, and will broaden the scope of many occupations within the industry, for which additional training will be required.

It is critical for members to note that the drive for the establishment of the levy and associated fund has come from employer and union bodies within the industry. This is not a government-driven initiative. This is a case where the industry has recognized a problem and taken steps to rectify it. The government is consequently responding to a direct approach from the industry for assistance.

CONSULTATION

The Construction Industry Training Council, which this Bill seeks to replace with a new Construction Industry Training Board, has coordinated an extensive consultation with industry members on the proposal. These have included all unions, employer organizations, peak industry bodies, government and statutory authorities with a direct involvement or association with the industry.

It is particularly encouraging that such a large and diverse industry sector has been able to come together to address this important issue, not only for the future benefit of the industry, but the State as a whole.

As the initiative for the levy has come from industry itself, it has been important that the industry partners were directly involved in the drafting of the legislation, to ensure that the individual and broad concerns of industry members are addressed.

THE LEVY

The legislation provides for a levy on all building and construction work valued at over $5,000 conducted by private sector companies. Government building and construction activity will be exempt from the levy, in recognition of the already high level of training effort by government, and the requirement for the government to remain bound by the provisions of the Training Guarantee Act. With the successful passage of the Bill, the Commonwealth will exempt the private sector building and construction industry from the Training Guarantee Act.

However, all work which is undertaken on behalf of the government by private contractors will attract the levy.

The rate of the levy will be 0.25%, with a capacity for the levy rate to be varied by Regulation up to a maximum of 0.5%. It is anticipated that in a full year, the levy will raise approximately $6.5 million, although this will be dependent upon

the actual level of activity in the building and construction industry.

The levy will be payable prior to the commencement of work, at the stage of building approval (where required), but will not apply to works in progress at the time of proclamation.

The levy will be paid by the "Project Owner" which in most cases will be the holder of a Builder's Licence, or the principal contractor for engineering construction work. Since the principal contractor will be contributing directly to the fund, it is reasonable to assume that subcontractors will also be meeting a proportion of the levy cost. However, it is important to note that the levy will in any case only be paid once on any given project.

Detailed definitions of work which will attract the levy are given in the Schedules to the Act. It is intended however, that repair and maintenance work which is minor in nature and which is carried out by an employee whose employer is not primarily engaged in building or construction work will not attract the levy.

Collection of the levy will be managed by the Construction Industry Training Board, and payment will be able to be made to any agents, such as the existing Industry Indemnity Schemes or a bank, which may be appointed by the Board. A receipt of payment, properly endorsed, will constitute proof of payment for the purpose of gaining a Building Approval from the local council.

THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING BOARD

As noted earlier, the Construction Industry Training Council will be reconstituted as the Construction Industry Training Board, and in addition to administering the levy and training fund, the Board will continue the existing functions of the Council with respect to training coordination and advice to the industry and government.

The Board will have the following membership:

5 employer representatives
3 union representatives
2 nominees of the State Minister
1 independent presiding officer, nominated by the State Minister

Furthermore, one nominee of the Commonwealth Minister will have observer status on the Board.

This makeup of membership has been proposed by the industry as the most efficient and workable of a number of options which were considered.

Membership of the Board by employer and union groups will be determined by the industry from the lists in Schedules 2 and 3.

In addition to this central structure, the Board will appoint at least three standing committees, to give advice to the Board on training matters and allocation of funds relevant to each particular sector of the industry. It is anticipated that each committee will comprise such people as the Board sees fit to represent the interests of that sector. In addition, working parties may be formed to address issues that cross all three sectors, such as in the case of specialist services.

The activities of the Board will be formally reviewed after three years, and a report will be tabled in Parliament. In the event of any improper behaviour by Board members, the Governor will have the power to remove and replace any member, or may in an extreme circumstance, cause an administrator to be appointed. Whilst these public safeguards have been put in place, I most certainly think it unlikely that they will have to be enacted, given the commitment of the industry to making the levy a successful and integral component of a modern and vital industry in South Australia.

The Board will have vested in it a number of limited powers of recovery of any due but unpaid levy, and penalties have been set for non-compliance with the provisions of the Act in respect of non-payment of the levy.

EXPENDITURE OF LEVY FUNDS

The Board will be required to prepare an annual training plan, setting out the priorities for employment related training to be funded from the fund. Training will cover the full range of occupations in the industry, and will be directed to both entry level employees, and existing employees within the industry requiring skills upgrading.

Money from the fund will be allocated to the sectors contributing to the fund in approximately the same proportions as the resources of the fund have been contributed by that sector, for the purpose of providing training relevant to that sector. It is not intended that the Board become a training agent in itself. Rather, the Board will purchase training in accord with the requirements of the training plan from a range of training providers as appropriate. These may include government as well as non-government training providers, or a mix of both.

CONCLUSION

The government is of the firm belief that this initiative will serve to significantly improve the level and quality of training within the building and construction industry in South Australia. It will assist in the provision of training to a much broader cross section of the industry than is presently the case, and it will help to alleviate the skill shortages which in times of economic growth and recovery are major impediments to the industry, and the whole economy.

A highly skilled workforce is essential for the attraction of investors to our State, and for the task we face in making South Australia truly a leading competitor in the world markets.

The government wishes finally to congratulate the industry on bringing this important initiative to this point, and considers that it sets a fine example to other industry sectors of how they may go about improving the skill profile of their workforce, and gain the unequivocal support of both government and opposition members in rebuilding our State's economy.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 sets out various definitions that are required for the purposes of the measure. In particular, "building or construction work" will be taken to include building or construction work set out in schedule 1, subject to any alteration by regulation, and "project owner" will be taken to be the person or body engaged to carry out the relevant building or construction work or, if there is no such person, the person or body for whose direct benefit building or construction work exists upon its completion. In addition, subclause (2) provides for the constitution of various sectors of the building and construction industry, as defined by regulation.

Clause 4 provides for the reconstitution of the Construction Industry Training Council (S.A.) Incorporated as the Construction Industry Training Board. The Board will not form part of the Crown, nor constitute an agency or instrumentality of the Crown.

Clause 5 provides for the composition of the Board, one being an "independent" chair, two persons nominated by the Minister on the basis of their experience in vocational education or training, five persons nominated in accordance with the regulations by specified employer associations, and three persons nominated in accordance with the regulations by specified employee associations.

Clause 6 provides that a member of the Board incurs no personal liability for honest acts undertaken with reasonable care and diligence. A liability that would otherwise attach to the member will attach instead to the Board.

Clause 7 relates to the procedures of the Board. Six members will constitute a quorum of the Board. Subclause (3) will require that any decision of the Board will need to be supported by members of each group appointed under clause 5. A person appointed by the Commonwealth Minister for Employment, Education and Training will be entitled to attend Board meetings and to participate in Board proceedings, but will not have a right to vote.

Clause 8 will require a member to disclose any direct or indirect private interest in a matter before the Board. The member will not be permitted to take part in any deliberations or decisions of the Board in relation to the matter.

Clause 9 sets out various duties that a member of the Board must observe in relation to the performance of his or her functions.

Clause 10 provides that a member of the Board is entitled to receive allowances and expenses not exceeding amounts determined by the Minister after consultation with the Commissioner for Public Employment.

Clause 11 sets out the functions of the Board.

Clause 12 provides that subject to the provisions of the Act, the Board has all the powers of a natural person.

Clause 13 empowers the Board to establish committees to assist the Board in the performance of its functions. In addition, the Board will be required to establish a committee in relation to each sector of the building and construction industry to represent

the interests of that sector in the management of the Fund, to advise the Board on appropriate allocations from the Fund, and otherwise to act in relation to its particular sector.

Clause 14 will allow the Board to delegate any function or power to a committee of the Board, or to an individual. A delegation may be made subject to conditions and will be revocable at will. The Board will be required to include a list of delegations made during each financial year in its annual report.

Clause 15 relates to the execution of documents by the Board. The common seal of the Board will only be used to give effect to a decision of the Board and any affixation of the seal will need to be attested by the signatures of two members of the Board.

Clause 16 will require the Board to keep proper accounts and to carry out an annual audit.

Clause 17 will require the Board to prepare an annual report, a copy of which will be sent to the Minister and then laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 18 provides that the staff of the Board are not public service employees.

Clause 19 provides for the appointment of collection agencies by the Board. A collection agency will be entitled to receive a fee agreed between the Board and the agency for carrying out its functions under the Act.

Clause 20 provides that a levy is imposed in respect of the value of building or construction work which commences after the commencement of the legislation. However, the levy will not be payable in respect of work approved before the commencement of the Act, or for which written offers or tenders have been made before that commencement.

Clause 21 provides that the rate of levy will be 0.25 per cent of the estimated value of the work. A regulation may, on the recommendation of the Board, alter the rate, but the rate will not be able to exceed 0.5 per cent in any event.

Clause 22 provides that the estimated value of work will be calculated in a manner determined by the regulations.

Clause 23 provides that the levy is not payable in respect of work where the estimated value does not exceed $5 000. Work carried out by a government authority will also be exempt.

Clause 24 provides that the project owner is liable to pay the levy. The levy will be payable before building approval is obtained or, if no such approval is required, before the work commences.

Clause 25 imposed various penalties if a levy is not paid in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

Clause 26 will require the project owner to notify the Board if the actual value of the work exceeds by $25 000 (or such other amount as may be prescribed) the estimated value of the work.

Clause 27 provides for an adjustment of the levy if the actual value of the work on completion exceeds $25 000 (or such other amount as may be prescribed).

Clause 28 provides for a refund of levy if any work is not carried out after the levy is paid.

Clause 29 empowers the Board to recover amounts due to the Board in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Clause 30 makes it an offence for a project owner to provide false or misleading information regarding work or its cost.

Clause 31 provides for the creation of the Fund and empowers the Board to invest money not immediately required for its purposes.

Clause 32 requires the Board to prepare a training plan on an annual basis for the purpose of improving the quality of training, and skill levels, in the building and construction industry. A plan must set out priorities for funding. A plan must be prepared on the basis that money will be allocated to training for each sector in approximately the same proportions as the resources of the Fund have been contributed by the particular sector. The plan must be submitted to the Minister for his or her approval. The Board will be required to ensure that funds are only allocated to properly organized training programmes relevant to the building and construction industry in the State.

Clause 33 relates to the appointment of authorized officers.

Clause 34 sets out the powers of authorized officers.

Clause 35 will render void, as against the Board, any agreement or arrangement to defeat, evade or avoid the payment of levy under the Act.

Clause 36 relates to proceedings for offences against the Act.

Clause 37 relates to the regulations that can be made under the Act.

Clause 38 provides that the Minister must, as soon as practicable after the third anniversary of the commencement of the Act, appoint an independent person to carry out a review of the legislation and provide a report to the Minister, to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Schedule 1 sets out various activities that are to constitute building or construction work for the purposes of the Act. Routine maintenance or repair work of a minor nature will not be relevant if carried out by an employee for an employer who is not primarily involved in the building or construction industry.

Schedule 2 sets out the employer associations that are recognized by the Act for the purposes of clause 5.

Schedule 3 sets out the employee associations that are recognized by the Act for the purposes of clause 5.

Schedule 4 sets out various provisions that will empower the Minister to take action if the Board fails to comply with the Act or fails to implement a training plan. The Governor will be empowered, in a case of serious default, to appoint an administrator of the Board for a period not exceeding one year.

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

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 6, line 12 (clause 11)—Leave out 'Division 6 fine' and insert 'Division 4 fine'.

No. 2. Page 8, (clause 14)—After line 6 insert the following subclause—

'(3) A person who contravenes or fails to comply with a notice under this section is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Division 4 fine.'

No. 3. Page 9, line 26 (clause 18)—Leave out 'Division 7 fine' and insert 'Division 4 fine'.

No. 4. Page 10, line 2 (clause 20)—Leave out 'Division 7 fine' and insert 'Division 4 fine'.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The four amendments of the Legislative Council simply increase penalties. Amendment No. 1 deals with reporting fruit or plants affected by a disease and increases the division 6 penalty of one year imprisonment or $4 000 maximum fine to a division 4 penalty of four years or $15 000 maximum fine. Amendment No. 2 is designed simply to avoid any suggestion of ambiguity. Clause 17 should actually apply, but there appears to be some doubt about whether 'a notice' and 'an order' are the same thing, so I readily agree to the insertion of a division 4 fine (page 8, clause 14, after line 6) to ensure that there is no confusion that an offence has been committed.

Amendment No. 3 is designed also to increase a division 7 penalty of six months imprisonment or $2 000 maximum fine to a division 4 penalty of four years or $15 000 maximum fine. I have no difficulty with that amendment, because people could put cartons of diseased materials in with an accredited endorsement, and that would seriously damage our industry. So, I have no difficulty with increasing the penalty in that regard. Similarly, amendment No. 4 deals with the prohibition on sale of fruit or plants affected by a disease. I have no difficulty with increasing the division 7 penalty of six months or a $2 000 fine to a division 4 penalty of four years or $15 000 in recognition of the seriousness of breaches of this legislation.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Opposition agrees. It is fitting that stiff penalties be imposed for bringing animal

material into Australia from overseas; we recognize the damage it can do. Anyone who brings plant material into this State or into Australia should also face an appropriate fine, and the Opposition supports the increase from a division 7 to a division 4 penalty.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC ACTUARY) BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 8, line 11 (clause 32)—Leave out '1992' and substitute '1995'.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The amendment involves a change of date. The member for Mitcham pointed out when the Bill was being debated in the House that there could have been some confusion about the date and that perhaps the date contained in the Bill was not the appropriate one. I have checked that matter, and the member for Mitcham is absolutely correct. In the other place, the Government moved the amendment that is before the Committee. I thank the member for Mitcham for his keen eye and, clearly, I am happy to move that the amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES (EQUIPMENT AND PERMITS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 October. Page 868.)

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the amendments contained in this Bill. We recognise that the use of dangerous substances is a very important area. Whether it is relative to equipment or the use of the substances themselves, it is very important that people who have the facilities and the use of these substances are careful to ensure that they implement the appropriate safety requirements for the use of these products. The major concern with this Bill relates to the conversion of cars to run on liquid petroleum gas. As the Minister would be aware, many questions have been asked in the House about this issue. The member for Hanson asked a long series of questions about a particular operator in the western suburbs.

I think the Government should be supported in its recognition that the public needs to be assured that workshops insist upon these sorts of safety standards. We recognize that not only a gas fitter should be responsible for the work he does but also the owner of the company that is installing the petroleum gas cylinder into the vehicle should be responsible, and we strongly support the direction being taken by the Government.

I hope that in reply to the second reading stage or in Committee, the Minister will explain the general application of this Bill because, whilst the second reading explanation was specific in relation to the installation of the cylinders in vehicles, the general definition appears to give the measure wide application. It provides that the standards are to apply across quite a number of other applications or instruments. We would like to understand where the Minister sees this measure applying.

There is also reference to a period of three years after the installation of equipment in a motor vehicle. We would like the Minister to advise the reasons for the three year warranty, in essence—the three year period in which the fitter is responsible for the work carried out. The other question relates to the use of the Industrial Court. We wonder why in this instance the Industrial Court and not the District Court or something similar is involved. With those three broad queries, in principle we support the Bill.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): One of the reasons we are using the Industrial Court is that the Industrial Court is very skilled and knowledgeable in dealing with matters that are brought before it. The member for Bragg would know that over a long period of time it has been the intention of this Government—indeed its actions—to ensure that penalties under any Acts referred to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety are determined by the Industrial Court. We find there is a consistency of decision making; the magistrates and judges of that court have a close and wide knowledge of the penalties in that area and also of the Acts that are peculiar to them.

This Bill was drafted in response to a number of instances that were reported to me as Minister. The first instance was reported to me by telephone by a person who told of his experience with liquid petroleum gas in the cabin of his motor car and the effects that that had on him. A week later I received a letter, which reminded me of the telephone conversation I had had the week previously. I had referred the person who rang me to the Director of the department, at that time Mr Hedley Bachmann. I went to see him and told him that the person whom I had referred to him had written me a letter. He said, 'No, this is a different person.'

The natural gas distribution system had been fitted inappropriately to the motor vehicle and there was a leak in the pipe, which allowed the interior of the car to fill up with gas. On both occasions, the occupants of car were non-smokers and stopped the vehicle before they had an accident. It was about that time, when watching a news broadcast, that I saw the aftermath of a similar situation. One unfortunate person in Victoria, who was a smoker, lit his cigarette; there was a minor explosion in the motor vehicle and he was burnt.

We found, in tracking down the wrongdoers, that the owner of the business who employed the fitter could not be penalised at all. Indeed, some proprietors were placing undue pressure upon the fitter to speed up the job, because there were plenty of orders and the more work done, as one could imagine, the more jobs could be completed and the more money they could make. On one occasion when inspectors went to an establishment to ascertain the facts, they had to retreat to get the assistance of police officers, because the owner of business had become violent.

I have a very simple attitude to this. I do not believe we can compromise on safety. Where we have people

who behave in such a way that they place other people's lives at risk, we as a Parliament need to ensure that those people can be punished, and punished severely. This Bill is primarily aimed at ensuring that we can lay the blame at the appropriate door. If it is shown to be the manager or owner of a business who is at fault, well and good. If it is a worker in that business, perhaps the blame ought to be laid there. You know as well as I do, Mr Speaker, that all employers and owners of a business carry absolute responsibility. It is their responsibility to ensure that their workers do the work correctly. They have the ultimate responsibility.

As for the wide cast of the Bill, we are dealing with more than autogas. Ordinary town gas is now used in motor vehicles. If one has town gas connected to one's home, one can arrange with the South Australian Gas Company to have a pump installed beside the carport or garage. Cars can be converted and at night they can be connected to the pump to be filled. It is an entirely different method of putting gas into a motor vehicle than that used with compressed natural gas. If my memory serves me correctly, liquid petroleum gas is stored at a much lower pressure than pressed natural gas, which can be stored at up to the equivalent of 900psi, or something like that. It is enormous pressure.

We have also found that the Australian standard is the best standard to adopt in this. Whilst that might change from time to time, I think it is appropriate for this State to adopt Australian standards. I do not believe it is appropriate for us to have standards that are different from those in other States. We should be aiming as a State to ensure that the things we do conform with the Australian standard. The Government is very firm on that and that is why we have a Bill like this to overcome that problem. I appreciate the support of the Opposition.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

THE STANDARD TIME (EASTERN STANDARD TIME) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 October. Page 1168.)

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Liberal Party is opposed to the change to Eastern Standard Time. We believe that, given today's modern era of communications and travel, and generally in terms of South Australia's place in Australia, there is no reason whatsoever for the change to Eastern Standard Time. In researching the case for and against the change to Eastern Standard Time, I have noted some interesting historical developments. In 1898 South Australia moved away from Central Standard Time, as it was then—a time that a considerable number of people are now arguing perhaps ought to be reconsidered.

In 1898, principally the same group, the Chamber of Commerce, pushed hard for the State to move from the then Central Standard Time to the existing situation of being half an hour behind Eastern Standard Time. In Peat Marwick's paper that contributed to the A.D. Little report on development in South Australia, it is stated:

> The chamber's current effort to shift South Australia half an hour ahead follows a similar campaign of nearly a century ago. Originally, South Australia operated nine hours ahead of Greenwich Mean Time. However, following a concerted campaign by Adelaide's merchants on the need to obviate the one hour advantage held by the Eastern States in the sending of cablegrams, Central Standard Time was advanced half an hour in 1899.

It is interesting to note that there are 253 standard times in the world, with South Australia being only one of 14 on a half hour differential. Four of the 14 are small isolated islands, whilst another is the Northern Territory, which is a fairly obvious case. Only 11 countries in the world operate more than one time zone, with Australia and Canada (Newfoundland) being the only countries to operate a zone with a differential of half an hour. Despite the information contained in the Peat Marwick paper, my understanding from further research I have undertaken indicates that four other countries—India, Iran, Afghanistan and Myanmar (previously Burma)—have time zones with a half an hour differential.

One of the issues we need to decide when considering whether we move to Eastern Standard Time is whether we accept where we are placed in the world in terms of our meridian, or whether we decide to take advantage of some spurious economic advantage by coming into line with the Eastern States. If we followed world practice, we would base our time in South Australia on the meridian 135 degrees east, running down the centre of South Australia through Coffin Bay, Kingoonya and Oodnadatta. This would put us one hour behind the Eastern States.

In looking at the case for Eastern Standard Time, the Premier announced that it was the Government's intention to introduce legislation in response to the release of the interim report from the Arthur D. Little study. One interesting comment about that study is that it has not recommended a move to Eastern Standard Time. One of the consultancies, the Peat Marwick consultancy on South Australian business climate study of May 1992, reported the following:

> Despite the expressed advantages of shifting to Eastern Standard Time, support for the move is weak. In a 1986 survey conducted by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce amongst its members, 3 200 at the time, to gauge support for EST, only 256 responses were received (that is, an 8 per cent response rate). Of those who responded, only half were in favour of the shift to EST. Again in 1988 the chamber tried to engender support for the issue by surveying 150 of the biggest member companies in South Australia. It was thought that these companies would be those most adversely affected by the time difference and therefore most in favour of Eastern Standard Time. Yet out of 150 companies, only half responded to the survey, and of those only half were in favour of the move.

That quote from the A.D. Little report clearly shows that the statement the Government has made through the Premier is in fact quite wrong and that there is no recommendation in the A.D. Little report that we should move to Eastern Standard Time. The A.D. Little report states that there is only a very weak interest in moving to Eastern Standard Time. It would have been much better had the Government come out and said clearly that it believed we should be moving to Eastern Standard Time and that this was in the best interests of South Australia—commercially, economically or whatever—but instead it has used the A.D. Little report as the basis for its argument, and that is quite wrong.

In consultations with business leaders as part of this A.D. Little study, no-one saw the time difference with the Eastern States as an issue. Therefore, in this admittedly

small sample, the apparent communication disadvantages were not perceived to be of any significance. However, there is no question that the Chamber of Commerce, particularly some of its senior members, is in fact strongly committed to the move to Eastern Standard Time. The chamber's argument is one of economic advantage to South Australia—a perceived advantage more than anything—that it is in the best interests of South Australia to be seen as part of the Eastern States bloc. The argument put forward very strongly and very lucidly by the chamber is that this perception is the most important issue in terms of where South Australia places itself with respect to future trade.

It is interesting to note that approximately 10 to 15 per cent of our trade is with Asia and, if we look straight up the meridian, it makes a lot of sense to go back half an hour and have the same time zone as the people with whom we wish to trade and export to in the future. So, we must weigh up in this argument whether our future growth will be in the export business to Asia or through trade with our Eastern States neighbours.

There is no doubt that a significant amount of our current trade exists with the Eastern States. Over the past 100 years, the fact of being half an hour behind has not shown itself to involve any major disadvantage in terms of our trade arrangements with our interstate partners. No doubt five years ago the argument that our communications were difficult was far more valid than it is today. If one looks at our current general communication methods, we find that almost every businessman of note carries a portable telephone, has a fax machine in his office and possibly travels with a portable computer.

There is no doubt that the communications argument as one of the principal reasons for changing from half an hour behind Eastern Standard Time to Eastern Standard Time is not as valid today as it was five years ago. The argument of whether our city's senior businessmen are unable to communicate with senior businessmen interstate is a nonsense. What is a big issue with the business community in this State is the ability to communicate with our public servants. If we talk about Public Service time, the effectiveness of public servants and the inflexibility we have with that system because of some crazy scheme introduced by the Hon. Clyde Cameron some years ago—if we argue the advantages of getting our Public Service system and timing organised and efficient—we would have a solution to the problem confronting our State.

To argue strongly today in favour of going to Eastern Standard Time, other than as a matter of perception, is really a nonsense argument. A couple of groups have lobbied me quite strongly in favour of Eastern Standard Time and I should put their arguments on the record. First, I refer principally to television stations, whose argument is legitimate in claiming that they now have to pre-record programs and hold them for half an hour. That is a significant cost to South Australian television stations.

This is also a significant problem in Western Australia, which is a further hour and a half behind. If we adopted Eastern Standard Time, whilst we might remove a difficulty for television stations in regard to pre-recording material from the Eastern States, there will still be a problem involving Western Australia and the pre-recording of material. Any time the Minister wants to watch his favourite cricket team playing in Perth against Western Australia or, more importantly, when he wants to watch any Crows game against the Eagles in Perth, there will be the same difficulties involving time differentials and the cost of pre-recording.

The argument involving the commercial television stations is a legitimate commercial argument, but it has existed ever since television stations have operated in South Australia. I accept that there has been some change in terms of nationalising programs but any ongoing problem in South Australia involving the cost of advertising or programming will be worse than traditionally has been the case.

The second pro-business position argued can be summarised in a report of the former State Development Council 'South Australia, A Strategy for the Future', commissioned by the Tonkin Government and published in September 1982. It states:

> The half-hour time difference between South Australia and the Eastern States places South Australia at a considerable disadvantage in their business and trading relations. When different lunch breaks are taken into account, daily communication time is cut by up to 90 minutes. This presents problems for local businesses with Eastern States markets and is a difficulty which has to be considered by firms intending to locate or have sections of their operations based in Adelaide. There seem to be considerable advantages in a switch to Eastern Standard Time for South Australia. The council realises this would present some problems for centres in the Far West of South Australia and feels that they should have an option to remain on Central Standard Time.

That report in favour of a pro-business stance was put out in 1982. The argument of going to Eastern Standard Time has been around for a long time. The argument against going to Eastern Standard Time involves a far larger number of people in our community. It is estimated from the letters that we have received in the Leader's office and from all constituents that general voting would be about 20 per cent in favour of moving to Eastern Standard Time and 80 per cent opposed to it. Views range from those of business people through to general citizens throughout our State.

Generally, there is a widespread community feeling against change but it is important that people's case against change, as well as the strong argument by a few business people in support of the move to Eastern Standard Time, be recognised. First, the Government itself cannot claim a mandate for the change in respect of this measure. As I said earlier, the argument using the A.D. Little report is clearly wrong, because that report said that the only support for this motion was very weak. The change would mean that at midday in South Australia the sun would be over the meridian 150 degrees east, in a line which runs north and south between Canberra and Sydney and which is about 1 000 kilometres east of Adelaide. This situation is compounded when the Eastern States go to daylight saving.

With daylight saving based on Eastern Standard Time it would be midday in Adelaide when the sun passes through the meridian 165 degrees east, a line passing through the Pacific Ocean about 300 kilometres east of Lord Howe Island and not far from New Zealand's South Island. Eastern Standard Time in South Australia would mean that there would be 58 consecutive days during winter when the sun would not rise until after a quarter

to eight in Adelaide. This would be even later in western country centres. There would be 158 separate days on which the sun would not rise until after 7 a.m. The problems are obvious for schoolchildren in the metropolitan area having to travel across town to school, as well as for those students in country regions west of Adelaide where they must travel long distances.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Even for industry any benefit from the switch does not apply across the board. For example, the building and construction industry would have difficulties during the winter months with its traditional 7 a.m. start for workers on high-rise developments.

I think I have explained the arguments for and against Eastern Standard Time. In the end, all members have to decide whether some of the extreme views expressed by both sides are fair and reasonable. It is my view and that of my Party that there is insufficient argument to suggest that there should be any change to Eastern Standard Time.

The member for Napier laughed about people having to start work in the dark and, in particular, children having to leave home in the dark to go to school. I accept that one way to fix this issue is to change the starting time of schools and to change many standard activities that we undertake in our society. There is nothing wrong in accepting that, if we make this change, we should consider other changes, but any major changes in the community must be accompanied by appropriate reasons for the community to go along with such changes.

The argument in respect of the value of communication in terms of trade with our interstate colleagues is a spurious argument. If one talks to businessmen involved in interstate trade, they say that this argument is a lot of nonsense. Having been involved with interstate trade through our pharmacy group over a long period, I repeat what I said earlier, namely, that the only disadvantage we ever had was the disadvantage in dealing with public servants in Canberra, Melbourne and Adelaide because we could never get them. With business people there is no problem at all if one organises the times when they should be available. If there is a problem and they are out to lunch, today one can simply send a fax 'Please contact us as soon as you get back', and back comes the reply immediately. The argument about communication, whilst I will accept it was there five years ago, is no longer relevant. The Opposition opposes the move to Eastern Standard Time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): That was a lacklustre and appallingly unconvincing performance on the part of the Deputy Leader. I have some sympathy for his position because, as was said by such an eminent person, amongst others, as former President Richard Nixon, in his heart he knows that this measure is right. Yet he cannot come out and support it, because he is fettered by a Party room decision driven by a few rural branches of the Liberal Party which feel so strongly and react so violently to this proposition that it has made it impossible for the Liberal Party to do what it knows should be done in South Australia. That is most unfortunate.

The honourable member said that he was putting both sides of the case; he was going to be fair to the pros and cons. He put neither side of the case convincingly. He certainly did not properly adduce the arguments in favour of this measure and I suggest he did not produce reasonable or unequivocal arguments against this measure. The fact is that the Liberal Party is caught very badly in the middle of something that would be of enormous benefit to the State, not just to the urban business operators of Adelaide, not just to that enormously productive area in the south-east, the operations of those in the area that adjoins the Victorian border, but for those further west who are loudest in their complaints. They rightly point to the effect of the meridian and the impact that the time on the clock would have on whether it is light or dark around them. But that is not an adequate argument in this day and age; there are ways of overcoming it.

I say in this day and age, but it is not a new argument. The point was made in 1898 in the *Advertiser* of the day. It thundered editorially against those arguments, making the simple point that one can change the starting times of the schools, or whatever, without causing major dislocation or disruption, and commercial operations would go on. While I agree that one should address the problems in the western part of this State, and on other occasions on which this measure has been presented to this House we have attempted to address them, those problems are not insuperable if there is good will. For the vast majority of those operating in South Australia in the metropolitan area and all areas east, most particularly those areas east whose growth and development are based on locking them more firmly into those larger markets, the argument has been fully put before us. Those who would be disadvantaged can be accommodated if there is a will to do so.

The Liberal Party has neither one stand nor the other on this matter. If the Deputy Leader rejects the concept of a universal time zone in this part of Australia, the logic is to move to the hour's difference that he mentioned. One can certainly raise arguments about the lining up of the clocks with our northern trading partners, and so on. There are two positions that could be taken and argued, but the Liberal Party is sticking with this long-term compromise, which has existed for 94 years now, and in its conservatism and its inability to understand the changes that are happening in our society, in communication, trade and other activities, it is simply standing flat footed on this issue. Opposition members will not budge, not because many of them know that this is not the right course—they know that very well indeed—but because they are being dictated to by a very small group in their Party who will not tolerate change. They have bowed down to them, but they are badly letting down South Australia, not least those in business whom they profess to support.

In relation to the history of this matter, we have been in this anomalous situation before. I suggest that the half hour time difference can only be described as an anomaly; it is neither one thing nor the other; it is neither a scientific nor a convenient time difference. We have been in this position for 94 years. During the period in which we moved to federation, the various colonies of Australia that came together as the Commonwealth attempted to resolve this issue. One of the leading lights in that activity was our Surveyor-General, Sir Charles

Todd, one of the great men of Australian history, the man who, with the backing of the then South Australian Government, seized the initiative and brought the overland telegraph from the rest of the world through Darwin, down into Adelaide and then across to the Eastern States. By that bold and brilliant action he ensured that Adelaide was the marshalling point for the communications of this country and that they did not centre, as those in Queensland had argued, on the eastern coast.

I mention Sir Charles Todd's name because it is relevant in this debate. He and the Government and those supporting the overland telegraph were trying to focus attention on South Australia's links and connections with the rest of the world or its centrality in terms of Australia; not that it is somewhere out on the western fringes of where all the action is perceived to be now, but its centrality to Australia. It was in that context that the colonial conferences of Postmasters-General and Surveyors looked at the question of time zones. At that stage the time was movable. Each capital had its own time zone. I think there was a 26-minute difference between Melbourne and Adelaide at that point and there was another 20 minutes or so difference between Sydney and Melbourne. There were numerous time zones. There were three in Queensland. They were not really zones; one had to adjust one's clock as one went along. In Broken Hill there were four possible times that could be used at any one time. It was a total shambles, and as the country came together an attempt was made to resolve that shambles.

Todd's first proposition was to pick up a central meridian and have a uniform time zone for South Australia, the Northern Territory, Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria and New South Wales. What this measure seeks to do is what Todd wanted and that is what he was able successfully to urge on his colleagues at the 1893 conference of Postmasters-General and Surveyors in Brisbane—a uniform time zone. We have been looking at this issue for more than 100 years, and it is 100 years since we had the solution to it as far as South Australia is concerned—the issue of centrality. That came apart because the colonies on the east coast were not prepared to compromise on where the meridian fell and at a subsequent conference they decided to establish a zone system. The 1894 Act brought in a zone which had an hour's difference between South Australia and the east coast and another hour to the west—the three zone system. I guess it was logical in its operation, but it defeated the object of centrality and connections that this measure is aimed to achieve and that Sir Charles Todd's original proposition of the uniform time zone was meant to achieve.

That was brought in without a great deal of fuss in South Australia in 1894, but within four years the measure was back in the House because it had proved to be absolutely hopeless. The one hour's time difference had been a major and substantial barrier to business, commerce, trade and intercourse between the States and colonies. The fact that we had that overland telegraph line coming through from the rest of the world did not mean very much because our offices were not operating while the messages were being sent east and the merchants in the east were taking full advantage of them. So, there was much agitation about the hour difference, and something needed to be done about it.

Of course, it should be remembered that it had replaced a 26 minute difference between Melbourne and Adelaide before, and briefly the question of uniform time was on the agenda but it had gone off. So, by the time the House debated this issue again in 1898—the very legislation that we have before us, unamended since that time—the one hour time difference had proved to be a major problem. Petitions were drawn up and submissions were made.

Certainly, there was no consensus in terms of our moving to the half hour differential that the Bill and the current Act enshrines or uniformity. In fact, a number of speakers supporting the half hour differential had urged that we go to uniform time. They believed that that was the agreement and that that was what should have been done. They were told it was impractical. They were told at the time, like the Liberal Party today, 'Well, you can only have a part of it; we know the logic of what you are saying, but it is too difficult, so how about taking half an hour?' They said, 'All right, if that is best that can be done, we'll take half an hour.' That is the position we have had since 1898, and it is about time that it changed.

We have attempted on previous occasions to change it, and the logic of that argument has been accepted. It got very close to adoption: indeed, the Liberal Party at the time supported it. I mentioned earlier how unconvincing the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was—and, of course, he was, because on previous occasions he has been part of the other side of the case that strongly supports a uniform time zone. He has only now been forced into taking this position through sheer expediency, and that is all it is, and that lets down South Australia and its development very badly indeed. We are not arguing the science, and I am pleased the debate has not gone into that, about where the time lines are drawn and where the sun is at a particular time of day—that is a nonsense. What we are looking at is the uniformity of practice. We are looking at convenience, not science—convenience which can be adjusted wherever and whenever people need to do business. But, most importantly, on what the Deputy Leader called the spurious economic advantage is the psychological aspect of this.

I believe in the past when we were arguing things such as ease of contact with Eastern State offices—and there is no question that we lose a couple of hours a day under the present system—all sorts of things could overcome that, and those issues were put. Certainly, that is true for those who operate from here and who deal with the Eastern States. What I am very concerned about in the current climate is that the continuing move to consolidate under the banner of economic rationalism and to concentrate all activity in this country on the eastern coast and to argue for the eradication of fiscal equalisation under our Federal compact ignores regional needs and development. With all these major assaults taking place, South Australia has to be demonstrably part of that great complex which is the crescent which runs from the west of South Australia up to the north of Queensland. We must be seen to be part of it. It is not those within this State necessarily who need to be convinced of that but those outside it. Because time and again those interested in investing here, those interested

in dealing with South Australia, those we attempt to entice over here, are under the impression that South Australia is somewhere out there on the western fringe—it is a long way away.

They believe it is a long way away because they have to change their watch or clock when they come here. They can understand that with the west—they have seen the map, and they know that Western Australia, like California, is right on the other fringe of the continent. But to them the centrality and the convenience of South Australia, the fact that it is less than an hour's flight from Melbourne, an hour and a half from Sydney, the fact that we are the distribution and transport hub of this nation—all these arguments that we are putting to these people—break down in part due to the psychological barrier of the time difference. They say, 'If you are so close and so convenient, why do we have to change our watches by half an hour? You must be a long way away to make such an inconvenient time adjustment.' We know that that is not true, and this measure seeks to demonstrate that clearly once and for all. Because, unless we can lock ourselves into the eastern complex, unless we can define ourselves in international and national terms as part of that, we will wither as a regional economy, and those attacks I mentioned at the Federal level which are being wreaked upon us will be intensified.

It is in the interests of all who are concerned about our development, those, for instance, in the Riverland, which is part of a great river system that is as close to Victoria and New South Wales and that section of economic activity as it is to anywhere. But at the moment there is a half hour barrier. I know that any member representing that area would want that eliminated because that is one of those barriers of distance. They are saying, 'The product must be a long way away if it is in South Australia.' For those in the South-East or the Murray-Mallee and all that productive area, again we must lock ourselves in, and this is a great way to demonstrate it—and indeed it would have benefits there.

Those in the west should concede that they have a problem. We should not be driven just by that: let us try to make arrangements to accommodate their particular issues. That can be done, and there has been a willingness shown in the past to do it but, for goodness sake, I urge all members to support a measure that we really need in this State and at this time to try to break that psychological block, to go back to the original principle that Todd and others talked about—the uniform time zone in Australia.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): We have listened to an interesting dissertation from the former Premier. He accused the Opposition of being unconvincing: I put it to the House and to the member for Ross Smith that it was not one of his most convincing addresses to this Chamber, because this is only a diversionary tactic to try to divert the attention of the people in this State away from the appalling mess into which he has led the people of this State. A change to Eastern Standard Time will do absolutely nothing to resolve those difficulties. To have the effrontery and the gall to come into this Chamber and blame the Liberal Party for opposing this charade that we have had to put up with is in itself hard to believe. Even if I were the only member in this Chamber, there is no way I would support the adoption of Eastern Standard Time, because my people are disadvantaged enough now without having this sort of nonsense inflicted upon them.

The honourable member went to great lengths in his support for a uniform time zone. If we went to the hour, that would suit me; there would be no argument from me and there would be no argument for most people in rural South Australia. Tremendous advantages would be gained for the people of this State who want to trade with Asia. We have talked about trading with eastern Australia but nothing has been said about trading with the people who have the growing economies.

Mr S.G. Evans: Thousands of millions.

Mr GUNN: Yes. If we want to do something we should be put on the same time zone as those economies which are developing, in whose Governments we are investing to develop new industries, who want the raw materials we have in this country. Let us not have this charade of nonsense. Much has been said by the member for Ross Smith about the great benefits of this measure to industry and commerce. It is true that one or two people in the Chamber of Commerce and Industry have misgivings about this measure, but the person who is charge of the most successful industry and new development in this State, the Olympic Dam project, Mr Ian Duncan, has virtually said to the Government, 'What you propose is a nonsense.' I hope that the Minister who is in charge of the Bill has read Mr Duncan's comments in relation to this matter. I do not know whether he would like me to read them into *Hansard*, and I am tempted to—

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Let's hear it.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member has never had a headache in his life, so it is nothing new. But he may learn something if he reads what Mr Duncan has to say.

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

Mr GUNN: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was very briefly discussing this matter, as I believe that if the only problem we had to solve, with the economic difficulties facing this State, was to change from Central Standard Time to Eastern Standard Time, then we would have done it years ago. You, Sir, I and the rest of the community know that this will not make any difference whatsoever, although it will certainly have an effect on people in the rural parts of the State who neither desire nor need this change. I challenge the Government and all members of this House: if they want to take a course of action that will be sensible and in the long-term interests of this State, then use meridian 135° to set our time, and we will do away with the half hour difference, which will be doing something constructive for the future. I refer members to the excellent paper by Mr Duncan, General Manager of Western Mining Corporation in this State, who clearly supports that line. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table that gives some comparisons based on *Keith Martyn's Almanac*, which clearly indicates that not only is this not desirable but it is really a nonsense.

The SPEAKER: Is the table purely statistical?

Mr GUNN: Yes, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

A general comparison of times, evolved from tables in Keith Martyn's Almanac. These comparative times are appropriate for Adelaide.

	Current CST plus DST	EST plus DST	NCST plus DST
Mid January:			
Sunrise	0617	0647	0547
Local Noon	1325	1355	1255
Sunset	2032	2102	2002
	CST	EST	NCST
Mid July:			
Sunrise	0721	0751	0651
Local Noon	1221	1251	1151
Sunset	1722	1752	1652

Mr GUNN: In my time in this place I have been through many debates on daylight saving and Eastern Standard Time, and the only times I have been on the winning side recently have been in my opposition to Eastern Standard Time. I look forward to being on the winning side again in this debate, because I believe that the current arrangements are quite satisfactory, particularly with fax machines, modern communications and other electronic devices that are there to assist business and commerce. If the Government and the Parliament want to make a sensible decision they will change the time meridian to 135°, which will save a great deal of unnecessary hassle and will do something constructive. I oppose the Bill.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise briefly to oppose this Bill. From the outset, as a rural member of this Parliament, I am opposed to the Bill because the alteration to the time always affects rural South Australians the most, especially those people living in the far west of the State. I support the member for Eyre in all that he said. I know that not many people live in the far west, but I am sure that they deserve every consideration. We in South Australia need those people living out there: they are the backbone of our State. Like many of my colleagues, I have been very heavily lobbied, particularly by letter, by members of industry in South Australia, and I appreciate the letters and the points of views they contain. But my concern is my constituents. I have some sympathy for the point of view of members of industry in South Australia wishing to lock into the same time slot as our most important business colleagues in the eastern States.

I have no argument with that point of view, and I will endeavour to assist, but I have to consider the downside effects of EST on South Australia—and there are many. If we had EST in South Australia, there would be 58 consecutive days during winter when the sun would not rise in Adelaide until after 7.45 a.m.—that is not Ceduna but Adelaide. The time would be even later in western country areas where there would be 159 separate days on which the sun would not rise until after 7 a.m. So, Sir, I ask you to consider the people of Ceduna, Penong and those areas. The children would be up and off for school an hour before the sun came up. I think that argument must be considered at all times. The argument regarding television stations having a delay of half an hour is almost some sort of a guarantee that South Australia will retain a local flavour. If we are completely locked in with the Eastern States, all we will get is relayed programs from the eastern States and we will have no local content. So, that half an hour guarantees that in some way we will keep our local State content.

I am the first to admit that some industries have problems with their interstate dealings, but surely with the modern technology that we have today—in particular, the fax machine—these can be minimised: messages can be left after hours by using a fax machine. When this argument first arose 10 or 15 years ago, this was not an option, but it well and truly is today. The way to go is to bring us all onto common time. That would be a more equitable proposition if it were based on the meridian of 135°. One only has to look at the map to see that the common meridian straight through the middle of Australia is 135°. Why can we not all come onto this common meridian. It would give Australia a better base on which to be timed to the actual sun. As my colleagues have said, it would also bring us onto the same line as Japan and Korea and much closer to most of our trading partners in Asia, Thailand, China and those countries. So, that argument has merit.

I ask the Government in future to think along the lines of South Australia going back half an hour to Central Standard Time, and then one day the eastern States might see the merit of that. I think it is commonsense that we go onto the common meridian which runs straight through the middle of Australia. Our future trade lies not quite so much with the eastern States, although they are very important, but with Asian countries. We all know that and we have heard it *ad nauseam* in this Chamber. I wish the Government would get its act together and complete the Alice Springs-Darwin railway line, because we would be on a good wicket: South Australia would come to the fore, because our position would be an advantage. I hope that will happen during my time in this Parliament. We will see it happen when we are all on a common time slot.

Many of my country constituents have contacted me and, by far, the majority are very much opposed to this measure. There is the occasional constituent who is in favour, but most will not wear the half an hour on top of the one hour of daylight saving that already exists, because it would put things too far out of kilter. In actual fact, as we all know, the meridian we use now does not pass through South Australia; it passes to the east of South Australia. So, that is already out of kilter. We must always consider the people who live west of Adelaide. It is all very well to lock in with the eastern States, but what about considering the people of Western Australia? At the moment, South Australia lies basically in between Western Australia and the eastern States, but we would then move to 1½ hours in front of Western Australia.

Why is the Government making this change now? We first heard about it in the budget speech, and I thought that the Government was blaming some of the demise of this State on EST. I thought that was ridiculous, because it has nothing to do with Eastern Standard Time. The Government blames EST for the poor business record in South Australia and thinks that this move will solve the problem. In the politest words possible, I think that that is absolute garbage.

The Government is grasping at straws. This is a diversionary tactic to somehow give us hope, to convince us that this is the way to go to solve our problem. The

Government grabs at anything that might serve as window-dressing to South Australian manufacturers and businesses.

I thought that the speech of the member for Ross Smith was incredible. I know that the honourable member as the past premier has had many visits to the Far West and has been well received, and he has appeared to be sympathetic. However, I thought that his speech was quite deplorable. It was most unsympathetic—

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I am not: watch my eyes. The member for Ross Smith basically said that the people out there would have advantages and that they should agree to the change. He should tell that to Education Department teachers in schools throughout the length and breadth of South Australia. We cannot expect the schools to start at 10 a.m. What sort of chaos would there be in the education system? It does not work that way. That would work if we were able to move the clock back an hour, but it would cause chaos within the State, whereas at present we have this so-called 'chaos' between States. If that occurred, the education system and everything else would be in total chaos.

Maybe members opposite do not realise the upheaval resulting from such a change in time. Children would wake up, prepare for and go to school in the dark: they would come home and be put to bed in daylight. Members might say that that is nothing, but to parents in rural areas it means a lot, because tired and niggling children are very hard to handle. That gets to the core of people who have enough stress without this being added to it.

Messing with the clocks always messes up life on the farms. Most grain silos, particularly at this time of the year, close at around 6 p.m. Many stay open longer, but at a huge cost to the bulk handling authority—penalty rules as a result of moving the clock forward. After the silos shut, farmers can often get five more hours of reaping done before it is time to knock off—often it is six or seven hours—but then they have to store their grain somewhere, and that is at extra cost. These things are not taken into consideration at all, because we have to lock into the industries in the Eastern States. But our biggest industries are the grain and sheep industries, and they are not considered.

Do members opposite realise that shearers want to start shearing sheep at 7 a.m.? It is dark then, but how many shearing sheds are equipped with lights? If we want to muster the first lot of sheep at first smoko, we cannot do that, because the grass is still wet from the dew and we would bring them in with wet bellies. Members opposite do not think about these little things that mean a lot to rural people. There are all these little things they do not know about, because they have not been out there in the real world.

These are the issues for me as a rural member of Parliament and these are the issues that consume my constituents who ring me up, write me letters and arrange to see me. I hope that members opposite appreciate my point of view and my position as a member of Parliament. My stand is very predictable, but is this not what Parliament is all about? I represent a country electorate, and in this place it is my job to represent their point of view.

If we listen to the member for Ross Smith, we think that that is bad—that country people either do not matter or have not got it right. The member for Ross Smith, as the disgraced former Premier, has expressed this sentiment before. He preaches social justice, equality and opportunity and then continually penalises country people. I will not go further. I hope that the Parliament is successful once again in defeating this measure, and I urge all members opposite to oppose it.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): On 12 August, during the Address in Reply, having noted in the Her Excellency's opening address to Parliament that the Government would introduce a Bill to move South Australia to Eastern Standard Time, I made the following comment:

> We are already 30 minutes out of kilter with our true meridian time. When the Government introduces the Bill, I will consider seriously, if I believe I have the support, moving an amendment to return South Australia to its true meridian time of one hour behind the Eastern States. If we are so inept that we cannot cope when operating on our true time, there is little hope for us in this State.

I still stand by the comments I made on that occasion. The member for Ross Smith said that a move to Eastern Standard Time will be of enormous benefit to industry and commerce in South Australia. Of course, I do not believe there is any real validity in that whatsoever. Not only am I a country member but my family has had interests in the metropolitan area for a long period. If I believed that a change would have any real benefit for South Australia, I would be willing to consider it seriously. However, when we consider that during daylight saving our true time would be based on an area slightly west of New Zealand, it is absurd. We have heard the former Premier speak at length in support of our moving to Eastern Standard Time.

It is interesting to note the comments made by Ian Duncan, to which other members have referred. An article in the *Murray Pioneer* clearly sets out what I was trying to get across to the House at that time. It defines the true position that South Australia would be in, particularly during the summer months of daylight saving, and the effects that it would have on South Australia generally. Mr Ian Duncan is the General Manager of the Olympic Dam project. That is the project to which the former Premier often referred as a 'mirage in the desert' but which has come to be of significant financial value not only to South Australia but to the Government in terms of the revenue it is now collecting in royalties. Ian Duncan wrote to me on 31 August and said:

> I was delighted to see your article in the *Murray Pioneer*. I fully concur and enclose a copy of my notes on the subject which come to the same conclusions.

In the notes that he has sent me, he refers to various places around the world and states:

> Quoting from the *World Book Encyclopedia*: "The local time at the meridian (line of longitude) which runs through the centre of the zone is used by all places within the zone."

Thus, time throughout the zone is the same. The document continues:

> This statement from the *World Book* confirms the oddity of South Australia's time, for here we currently take our time from the meridian which does not pass through the zone.

In other words, the meridian on which we are operating at the moment actually passes through the Eastern States. The document continues:

The normal world practice leads us to the conclusion that South Australia should change its time to be consistent with a meridian that runs through its own territory. This would put South Australia on the international standard of being a one-hour (not a half-hour) zone and put us one hour different from the Eastern States.

The member for Ross Smith said that, if we were not going to Eastern Standard Time, it might be a good idea if we returned to our true meridian time of 135 degrees east. I could not agree with him more, but it is necessary for that to be considered fully by the people of South Australia. At this stage the debate has only revolved around considering whether we stay on our artificial time or whether we go to what is Eastern Standard Time, which is, as I say, artificial in itself because it is not even true Eastern Standard Time for the Eastern States, which makes it even worse for South Australia to move to that time zone. The article goes on to state:

The Northern Territory needs to be invited into the discussion because they may wish to stay aligned with SA, although it is clearly their decision. The astronomical facts supporting a realignment of NT time to go to the one hour standard are, however, the same as for South Australia. The correct meridian for SA and NT is 135 degrees east, which runs through the centre of South Australia from approximately Coffin Bay in the south, through Kingoonya, Oodnadatta to the north.

He goes on to say:

The company I run—

and he is referring to Olympic Dam—

sells to the Eastern States ($30 million worth each year) but also sells to Japan, USA, Korea, Germany, Belgium, UK, Sweden and Finland. I can assure you that South Australia not being on EST is no obstacle to us.

If we listen to the member for Ross Smith and the Premier, why is everyone else in South Australia so inept that they cannot manage to cope with operating on our true time? If we are talking about real markets and the longer term, let us look at South Australia operating on its true meridian time, which is in line with Tokyo and with Korea, a very quickly developing country.

There is no doubt that Western Australia, Perth in particular, has benefited by the fact that its time zone is more in kilter with Singapore and Jakarta than it is with the Eastern States. If Western Australia can survive for the 150 years that it has, operating two hours behind the eastern seaboard, why must South Australia move to Eastern Standard Time to survive? The answer has been given on a number of occasions here in the House this afternoon and tonight. The Government is looking for a reason to blame other than its own mismanagement of the State's affairs. Every country, other than some four or five countries that can be identified around the world, operate on their true meridian time.

The United States operates on five time zones across the country. There are major industrial cities right across the United States, and they operate within their true time zone. I have not heard that California, San Francisco or Los Angeles are in any great conflict with Washington or New York on the opposite seaboard, yet for some reason this will be the miracle cure for South Australia, getting us out of the economic mess that we are in. As the member for Custance said, that is 'absolute garbage'. I fully agree with him: it is absolute garbage.

I have received numerous letters from across South Australia supporting the call to go back to our true time. As I said, it is a debate that should take place. The people of South Australia should give it serious consideration, and I venture to say that within the next five years we will see a concerted move by the people of this State to revert to South Australia's true time. Then we will have seen South Australia come of age. Instead of trying to attach itself to the skirts of the Eastern States for survival, it will at long last stand on its own two feet and deal internationally where it ought to be dealing—in its own time zone with places such as Tokyo and Korea.

Not all wisdom resides in the metropolitan area. I know that is the attitude of the Government, and I have said on numerous occasions in this place that it is high time some consideration was given to the other points of view outside the greater metropolitan area. I have said many times that 50 per cent of the economy is generated in country areas, and that fact is highlighted in an article written some 12 or 18 months ago by Malcolm Newell. In that article he clearly identified that only 27 per cent of the population lives in the country areas, but they generate 50 per cent of the State's economy. Also, he analysed just how much this present Government was returning to the country areas. From that 50 per cent generated in the country areas, only 15 to 20 per cent is returned. The other 80 to 85 per cent of the resources available to Government is spent within the greater metropolitan area. That is an absolutely absurd situation. If part of a business is generating 50 per cent of the economy, and it is starved of resources, no wonder the State is in the mess that it is in.

The country areas of South Australia have the potential to generate even more for the benefit of all South Australians if those areas were not starved of resources. Malcolm Newell went on to say that, if it was not for the infrastructure costs that the Government put into Roxby Downs, which it did everything in its power to defeat, the resources going into country areas would be even less than the 15 to 20 per cent to which I refer as a major Government expenditure. So, as far as I am concerned, it is quite clear that moving to Eastern Standard Time is a smoke screen that is being put up by the Government. It is trying to fudge the real issue and to cover up the real reason for the economic disaster with which South Australia is confronted.

As I said, if it is so critical to go to Eastern Standard Time, how has Western Australia survived all these years? South Australia has survived very well for the past 100 years. It is only the past 10 years that has seen South Australia in a financial mess, and we all know the reasons for it. It is no good blaming Eastern Standard Time or the fact that we are half an hour behind the Eastern States. It would make no difference whatsoever. In fact, in the long term, if we went back to our true time, we would be far better off ion relation to trading with our trading partners to the north in the South-East Asian countries.

I strongly oppose any move to Eastern Standard Time. It is a sham. It is a move by the Government to try to deflect the real issues away from the public spotlight. For the reasons I have given, there is no way I will support a move to Eastern Standard Time. I hope that it is not too far into the future that we will see commonsense prevail, with South Australia moving to its true meridian time of true Central Time. Central time in Australia is not true central time and, until we determine 135 degrees east to be the true meridian for South Australia, we will not have our true time or be operating sensibly compared with the

rest of the world. No reason exists for us to move to Eastern Standard Time and I trust that within the next five years or so common sense will prevail as a result of a sound and sensible public debate on the matter and we will move to our true meridian time of 135 degrees east.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): We had the half lame lead speaker defending the Opposition's attitude on this amending Bill. The member for Ross Smith covered adequately the half-hearted attempts by the Deputy Leader to justify the obvious party coup by the rural rump in the Liberal Party and it was not long before that rural rump started to emerge. I have not as yet heard the usual excuses that we get from those members of the Liberal Party who represent rural constituencies—excuses such as the milk will go bad in the cow's udder, the curtains will fade, the cocks will not crow or the hens will not lay—but I expect that kind of excuse will come out later.

The member for Custance did make the comment (and I do not want to upset him as he is very good to me and gives me a lot of valuable advice about running my own rural holdings) that messing with the clock interferes with the running of the farm. That struck a chord, so I rushed out to the Parliamentary Library to get a copy of the debate that took place on 9 August 1896. There an honourable gentleman by the name of the Hon. G. McGregor said, among other things, that although he had not the least objection to the Government or the Parliament interfering with the laws of the country it was time for them to stop when they began to interfere with the rising of the sun and the moon. That was 94 years ago. McGregor said it then and the member for Custance echoes it tonight. That is how the rural constituency of the Liberal Party is set in its ways. It honestly believes that if we change standard time or daylight saving it will interfere with the running of the animals, that the cocks will not crow and the curtains will fade. They genuinely believe it.

The member for Victoria is likely to follow me in this debate and he is a very successful businessman: I give him credit. However, he obviously must believe that the curtains fade with daylight saving; he must believe that, by altering the time so that we coincide with the Eastern States, his flowers may not grow as well as they did or that his vineyards may not produce the same amount of grapes they produce now. I find that rather frightening. I do not want to single out the member for Victoria, but he is the only person sitting on the Opposition benches at the moment who is an extremely successful businessman.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am talking about the rural constituency. The member for Custance protests; we always said that he was a wealthy man, but he says that, because of the regulations the Government has imposed, it has taken his wealth away. He cannot have it both ways: either he is wealthy or he is poor. At last count the Deputy Leader was worth over $4 million. He made his money (well, his father made his money for him) in the city, and that is why I exclude the Deputy Leader.

One can go right through the 1898 debate and see what was said, but I confess that the Liberals spoke as much rubbish then as their modern-day counterparts are speaking today. The argument was put forward, even though they eventually had to have a compromise, that the business sector would suffer because there was a delay between the operations of their counterparts in the Eastern States and what was happening in Adelaide.

The Deputy Leader dismisses that and says that with the introduction of fax machines that problem can be easily overcome. To a certain extent, that is true. However, the Deputy Leader then destroyed his own argument and said that in the private sector if they arrange for businessman A in Adelaide to talk to businessman B in Melbourne or Sydney they can do this by telephone, that everyone does it and it is all okay.

He blamed public servants who have the benefit of flexi time, claiming that one can never contact them. The Deputy Leader gave examples where the only problems he had in dealing with the Eastern States was when he had to telephone Canberra about some matter. That is the first time I have ever heard of a local chemist having to telephone Canberra about the running of a business. The Deputy Leader did not put forward a convincing case, but that has already been dealt with. The whole theme running through the 1898 debate was the fact that South Australian businessmen were being disadvantaged.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Victoria interjects, 'Do I believe it?' I have been brought up to believe everything I read in *Hansard*, and they were wise men who put those arguments. Before the Standard Time Act came in people were complaining that they were being disadvantaged. Even with the Bill that eventually came out of the Parliament, there was still the half hour disadvantage and it has continued since then.

No-one claims that if we agree to these amendments it will overcome all the problems we have in South Australia. That was the argument advanced by the Deputy Leader and the members for Custance and Chaffey. In his second reading speech the Minister said that, because 80 per cent of the market of which South Australia can take advantage is in the Eastern States, it is one good reason why we should move in that direction.

Members opposite always quote the A.D. Little report when it suits them, and that report identified that that was one of the factors we should address. I congratulate the Minister because, when you, Sir, eventually get away from that exalted Chair and come around here at about a quarter to 12, you will be saying similar things to what I am saying.

The Minister said that some of the advantages of the proposed time changes are: an improvement in the competitive position that South Australia would have in the Australian market (approximately 80 per cent of the nation's population lives in the eastern States, making it the main market for consumer goods industries); improved communications for firms with interstate branch offices; and time or cost disadvantages which Adelaide money market operators and the stock exchange suffer would be removed. In itself that would be sufficient for us sensibly to take the argument away from wondering whether the member for Custance's wheat would get the best advantage under the old system, whether the member for Custance's cock crows early in the morning or whether the member for Victoria's dried flowers grow better before we cut and dry them, because that is really all we have heard so far. From the Deputy Leader we had

another classic case of his authority being undermined by the Party. All I can do is sympathise with that.

With regard to the 1898 debate (and I will leave it on your desk, Sir, in case you want to use it on some later date) one fellow was like a light on the hill, and that person was Mr Hutchison. I will ask the member for Stuart whether she is related to that person in any way.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: By marriage, of course.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: By marriage. Mr Hutchison said:

> Too much stress had been laid on the scientific aspect of the question.

That is in relation to the sun and the moon and whether the cocks crow and the hens lay. Mr Hutchison said:

> The alteration sought was a matter of convenience, and our commercial mess should not be put in a worse position than those of Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr Hutchison said that in 1898. There was also someone else who was in the same vein as the member for Custance. That was the Hon. W. Russell, whose sole contribution to the debate was that he had heard that early to bed, early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy and wise, that sometimes on the farm it is hard to make an early start and that those employed did not get up very early. The member for Custance would have been very proud of Mr W. Russell. It makes interesting reading.

There is one final quote I would like to make, which makes very interesting reading, where one person said that only two or three businessmen had actually put pressure on the Government of the day to have this change, and he said that in future years there would be more enlightened businessmen around who would prove to the Government the error of its ways. The exact opposite has happened; the pressure has been mounting over the years. The member for Chaffey said we have had this problem only in the past 10 years or so. Let me remind members that for a very long time this State was ruled by the Liberal Party. It was not ruled by the Liberal Party in this House; it was ruled by the Liberal Party in the geriatrics' place up at the other end there. There was no chance—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, it is against Standing Orders to reflect on members in another place, and I ask you to rule accordingly and ask the honourable member to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not accept that as a point of order. I do not think the honourable member was referring specifically to anybody in the other place.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. In fact, I always thought it was a complimentary term to call someone geriatric. There was no chance for any form of rationalisation of the situation into which this State had got itself in 1898. It was a copout in 1898 to satisfy the rural rump. The frightening thing is that in 1992 the Liberal Party pre-selection system can still produce throwbacks to those who existed in 1898. The member for Custance could cheerfully have sat alongside Mr Russell. In fact, if Mr Russell were resurrected, I very much doubt whether the member for Custance could beat him in a pre-selection battle.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

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

Mr BRINDAL: I would ask you to rule on the relevance of this to the debate that is before the House.

The SPEAKER: As the member for Hayward will be aware, I have just resumed the Chair and I have not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I suggest that it is late in the day for you people to be taking on the Chair. However, I have not heard the contribution. I will listen to the contribution and if the member for Napier strays from the path I shall draw him back to it. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. Whilst I accept your wise ruling, I would remind the member for Hayward and members opposite that the reference to Mr Russell of 1898 is relevant to this Bill because what Mr Russell was saying in 1898 is a mirror image of what the member for Custance was saying and most likely what the member for Victoria will be saying. If I know the member for Hayward, with his usual puppy dog attitude, he will be echoing his rural master's words when he makes his contribution. That is the relevance, Sir, and I am sure that you will feel comfortable that you ruled in the way that you did.

As I said, the positives far outweigh the negatives. It is about time that members opposite, who purport to represent metropolitan electorates—there are not many of them, but there are a few—started to have their say in the decision making within the Liberal Party room.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Baudin says, 'Let them be heard.' We all know that within the Liberal Party if one comes from a rural constituency and one has a couple of million dollars in one's back pocket that person will decide what the Liberal Party will say. That is a disappointment. We are a bit more democratic. I sincerely hope that the House will support this overdue amendment. It should have been moved 94 years ago. It will be to the benefit of businesses in South Australia, and I am sure that when it has been passed the cocks will continue to crow and the hens will continue to lay.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I was going to treat the member for Napier's contribution as irrelevant, just as he is treated around this place, but I thought that I would take up two points that he made when saying that we have to get smarter. Therefore, we have to change our clocks and, I presume, go over to Eastern Standard Time, he reckons, to get as smart as Victoria. I should have thought that if South Australia wanted to get really smart, we would go on to Western Australian time, because, after all, they won the AFL, and if we want to get into that big league we should go over there and that would follow his contention. If we want to get smarter still, perhaps we should bring in an amendment to go to New Zealand time so that we are well in front of the rest. That is the irrelevance of the contribution that was made by the member for Napier. We have not yet heard a contribution from the geriatric member for Henley Beach, but that will probably come a little later.

I want to take up what was said by the member for Ross Smith. When he started to speak, I thought, 'I will listen to this. Now that he has the shackles of the union movement from around his neck, he may make a statesmanlike contribution to this debate.' He started off

quite correctly in getting into the history of what happens to our time zones in Australia, and he quite rightly said that South Australia was established by the astronomer, Sir Charles Todd. But what he did not add was that it was an international conference in 1884 that decided that the time zones around the world should be set in one hourly intervals every 15 degrees. That was a world-wide agreement. Sir Charles Todd and other Postmasters-General from Australia attended that meeting. The Australian States then met, starting in Brisbane, and decided that they would fit in with the rest of the world. So, in 1894, the first Bill came in which related to standard time for South Australia and, of course, as many other speakers have said, that time was set as nine hours in front of Greenwich Mean Time, and that was set on the meridian 135 degrees east, which is factually correct.

The former Premier then started to talk about the benefits for South Australia of moving to Eastern Standard Time. That is totally illusionary. That is the nonsense that I have been hearing from members opposite; it is nothing to do with that. If that is an argument, why do we have five time zones in Canada? Why can Canada operate as a major world and trading power? There are five time zones in America. The television stations, as we have heard, can all get on in America. People can do business throughout America. It is one of the world powers; perhaps if we want to be a world power we should split up into five zones, if we are talking about benefits to countries. There are eight time zones in Russia at present. That is another major power. Of course, in Australia, we should have three time zones and each of those should be set, as the world agreement in 1884 said, one hour apart.

This Government has talked much political rubbish. I have been in this place since 1986, and twice it has brought forward this Bill as a political smokescreen to try to take the heat off its ineptitude. If it is fair dinkum, if it wants to take a broader vision in Australia and a broader vision with our trading partners, as has been said by many of my colleagues on this side of the House, and look at what has happened with our trading partners, the majority of whom are still fitting in with the world agreement of 1894, it should put our time back half an hour. It does not matter what we do to our clocks, there will always be 47½ minutes difference between Renmark or Naracoorte and Eucla. It does not matter what political nonsense and mayhem goes on and what you try to do, that will always be the case.

It is factual that South Australia and the Northern Territory are totally within the correct degrees of 135 east and, in fact, if you take 7½ degrees either side of that, South Australia and the Northern Territory are within that. In fact, our time at present is set slightly in Victoria. But that is not the argument: the argument is whether we want to become an established world trading State, and it is to be hoped that one day we will emerge from the State Bank debacle and get those debts paid off. Hopefully the Northern Territory will help us get this country up and running and we will not have to put up with the nonsense that went on in 1898, when the Chamber of Commerce and Industry managed to convince the Government of the day that it would be difficult for its cables to get through if they did not go closer to Victoria.

That cannot be substantiated, because every citizen in this nation or anywhere else in the world, for that matter, can set his clock to whatever time he wants. That is the wonderful thing about enterprise bargaining that will come in under the Fightback package. People can then decide how to run their business. If they want to trade with New Zealand, they can set their business to New Zealand time, if they want to. The member for Baudin laughs. In running shearing operations throughout the spring season in the South-East, all the Victorian shearing contractors who work in South Australia operate on Eastern Standard Time. They change their clocks.

Will the Minister outlaw that so that it is an offence? People should be able to do whatever fits their business operation, but to change the meridians from 142.5 to 150 is out of kilter with the rest of the world. Only seven countries in the world are on the half hour and, therefore, out of kilter in their hour meridians. I think that the Deputy Leader mentioned some of these. They include Burma, India, Afghanistan, Iran and, in fact, Newfoundland. All other countries manage to work their time zones to fit in with that world agreement. It is rather interesting that a very well compiled letter was written to the member for Baudin. It is addressed to him, and the gentleman has given me a copy. It is from a Mr Hughes, who also wrote to the Minister about this, and the Minister, who had also read it (and I think a little bit sank in), responded as follows:

> Dear Don,
>
> The comprehensive submission by Mr Hughes on this sensitive topic appears well researched and accurate. In fact, the merit of the suggestion was such that the submission was included as an option for Cabinet consideration for the adoption of Eastern Standard Time.

The letter is signed 'yours sincerely, R.J. Gregory.' Mr Hughes very succinctly and correctly puts the argument as to why this State should go back half an hour and fit in with the world agreement of 1894, by going back to 135 degrees east. If this Minister in his last days as a Minister wants to do something with a little vision for South Australia, he should start negotiating with the Northern Territory, start some sensible discussion as to how we can fit in and be part of the big wide world. He should not carry on with this nonsense, which is merely a smokescreen to try to placate a few people who do not have the ability to reach down to their watch and change the hands.

That is what this is all about. It is just ridiculous. As the Deputy Leader said, anyone can put out a delayed fax. Many people on this side of the House and the majority of business people in South Australia do business internationally. What happens when you do business internationally? What benefit will there be if we go to Eastern Standard Time? All it will do is put us further out of kilter with the rest of the world. My plea is that this Minister in his final days—

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I think that someone else wants to go next and I want to hear the Minister, because I cannot see how any Minister can put up with some of the contributions from that side of the House and not understand what a smokescreen this is. All I say to him is: for goodness sake, try to be a statesman and try to do something in your final days to bring South Australia out of the 1890s and into the twentieth century, and start

negotiations to get our time zone where it should be—at 135 degrees east.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose this Bill. Never have I seen or heard of legislation whereby a Government of the day has been prepared to take on nature in this way. That is what it is trying to do: it is trying to be the Almighty and take on the sun. It wants to disadvantage other sections of the community in much the same way. This evening, I listened to the member for Ross Smith and the member for Napier defend the Government's attitude to this Bill. I have never heard anything more pathetic than those arguments presented tonight. At least, we could have been given some examples of industry for which in their opinion there might be some advantage, but we just had sweeping comments. There was no mention at all of the other areas of the State which will be so seriously disadvantaged.

Shortly, I will refer to areas where school children will be seriously disadvantaged. I heard a quip from the member for Ross Smith to the effect that we should change school times. If we changed school times, working parents would not be able to look after their children up to the time when they have to start work. In other words, they would have to start work at a different time, and their kiddies would have to look after themselves for another hour and prepare themselves for school. It just would not work.

We all know that when the daylight saving legislation was first considered the then Premier, the member for Ross Smith said, 'You can start school an hour later.' There were attempts by some schools to do that, but of course the unions got into the act and said, 'No, you can't do that, school bus drivers have to work to union rules.' Because one driver said that he would not work later hours, the whole school was disadvantaged. So, the comments made this evening by the former Premier and by the member for Napier simply do not add up. They are quite oblivious to the way in which this legislation would affect the community—to what the real world is all about—and I believe they are quite oblivious to what the reaction will be.

I base that comment on the fact that only a few days ago I asked the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety whether any assessment had been made of the way in which our trading nations would be disadvantaged by a change in standard time. He completely avoided the question. I gave him a golden opportunity to explain in Parliament to the people of South Australia what the impact would be. I was referring specifically to those people in my electorate who deal with live fish and fresh frozen fish: in other words, the fresh fish market. Obviously, there is no country in the world that deals with Australia on the fresh fish market as an exporter on time the same as Eastern Standard Time—none whatsover. We are dealing with a vast ocean. Who wants to trade internationally with no-one? We would all like to think that the opportunities that are available to us through Japan and South East Asia will be brought more into line with how we should be trading and what our natural time tells us.

One only has to look at our time maps and atlases—it is all set out there for us to see. But not this Government; this Government sets out to do things somewhat differently, in its own way. I think the member for Ross Smith ought to try to put a 3½ year old kindergarten child onto a school bus before the sun comes up so that that kiddie can take advantage of kindergarten classes. It is just not on. Any Government that tries to force that upon any kiddie is lacking in heart. In many cases, it is the only way in which parents can provide access to kindergarten for their children. Fairness has gone out of the window with this Government. It really does not know what it is on about. For example, on Saturday 22 August I was required to travel from Streaky Bay to Port Lincoln. As I went past Port Kenny, the sun rose at three minutes past seven. Obviously, on 23 June the sun would have risen later. If we add half an hour onto that time, that would mean that many of our school children would have to be put onto a school bus before the sun rose, before it was light.

It is not right for any parent or Government to demand that of their students or school children. I do not think any of us can stand in this House and say that. The Minister is looking somewhat amazed. He was unable to answer the question about the trading expertise and the trading relationship in relation to live fish. He cannot answer it, because it is a fact, it is reality. We cannot take on nature. We are in a world which is divided into equal time zones. It can work, and we can come up with arrangements to make sure it works.

In his contribution the member for Napier referred many times to a debate that took place in 1898. Mr Speaker, my great grandfather was here in this House at that very time, but more to the point, my grandmother was operating a telegraph station at Cape Willoughby on Kangaroo Island. At that time the only means of communication was telegraph and the only means of prime knowledge of shipping coming into Adelaide was by a sighting off Cape Willoughby. My grandmother, then as a young child, and her family were at that telegraph station.

The relevance of the debate that took place at that time has no consequence when we are talking about today's telecommunications. The Government pooh-poohed that idea and said that it was irrelevant. However, is the Government genuine? I would accept its argument if it said that it will do away with flexitime, that everyone will start work at the same time, have lunch at the same time and knock off at the same time. But we all know for a fact that the unions have it sewn up and the Government has it sewn up to ensure that there is flexitime and that there are RDOs (rostered days off)—all of those factors which almost guarantees that our chances of getting our trading colleagues in another State or overseas, or within the same State, will not be there.

If we were all disciplined enough to start at 8 o'clock or 9 o'clock and to all have a lunch hour at the same time and knock off at the same time, so that we would know that when we picked up the phone to call our trading partner within the State, or wherever, they would be there, one could understand the logic of the measure. But this Government has not done that. It has set out to go in a completely different way.

The former Premier, the member for Ross Smith, stood in this House and referred to the members who represent people in the eastern part of the State—the members for

Chaffey, Victoria and Mount Gambier—and said that they should know. The former Premier should have consulted those people. He should have gone down to the South-East. He should have read the correspondence that came across his table. He should have read the newspapers. He would have realised that that is not the will of the people. The will of the people is more towards the other way, to the 135° latitude, so that it is our natural time and more akin to the real time where we should be. The Government is way off track in this matter.

The member for Napier in his speech and several quotes to the House belittled many members of this House, particularly those involved in the rural community. He referred to the crop not flowering at the appropriate time. What utter drivel. It is an absolute insult that an elected member of Parliament should stand in this House and make comments such as that. That speech will be on record forever and it will be read by many people in years to come, just as the honourable member read a speech from 1898, and people will wonder what sort of members were in this House at that time. To make such a mockery of all that—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: That's a bit unfair.

Mr BLACKER: Well, the honourable member has brought it on himself. I do not like standing up here and saying that, but he has himself to blame in that certainly his speeches will be ridiculed in years to come. There is no doubt that there is an economic disadvantage for those people in the western part of the State. The member for Eyre referred to many of those examples. The Government of the day, if it is serious about it, should totally deregulate working hours so that farmers are not disadvantaged cost-wise in terms of deliveries to the silos. When the silo hours have been set with a five o'clock knock off time, with daylight saving and with Eastern Standard Time, those farmers have to take on extra storage. They therefore incur considerable extra cost because they cannot deliver to the silos at the most appropriate time for harvest. But, no, this Government heads down a different track. Who pays the penalty? Of course, it is the farmers who pay the penalty and the penalty rates because of the out of hours opening of silos, if that is the case, or they are further disadvantaged.

As one probably gathers, I am more than concerned about the way this Government is heading. I just wonder how dinkum the Government is. If it expects our children not only to catch the bus before the sun comes up but also to go home in the heat of the day, will it provide air-conditioning in school buses? Of course it will not. But it expects our kids to swelter. Many of them have suffered heat stress going home during daylight saving, and that will be half an hour worse as it goes on.

I mentioned the silo hours. Will this Government demand of its unions and bosses a more flexible arrangement for working hours so that a section of community is not disadvantaged? If it will not do that, will it compensate the farmers in some way for the extra storage required for the grain which is reaped during the extra hour and which must be kept on the property? Will it compensate or make some alternative arrangement for our seafood operators who are increasingly bringing more and more revenue into this State? It is an industry that needs to be sponsored and helped because it is a means of alleviating the economic demise that this Government has created.

There is no doubt in my mind that this is a ruse by the Government to get people's mind off the real economic issues. It will have absolutely no consequence for the economic survival of the State, because any industry that cannot use the mental arithmetic to work out the time zones is hardly worth its salt—it is not on. We have seen quotes about this and, more recently, Mr Rod Nettle from the Employers Federation was commenting on the Government's claim that the A.D. Little report was one of the prime reasons for the introduction of this legislation. The article stated:

> South Australian Employers Federation economist Mr Rod Nettle described the level of support amongst his members for the change as 'modest'.

In other words, it is not a big issue, and it is certainly not considered to be of any great consequence. We have seen many articles over the past six months. It goes back over many years prior to that time. We have had referendums on daylight saving, which has much the same effect. Daylight saving legislation has been passed only because of the recreational aspects. Surely when the Government is talking about this change, it is not talking about recreation. Surely we should be talking about the economic survival of this State, the welfare of the people and, more particularly, of those youngsters who will be so seriously disadvantaged.

Many of my constituents have to put their children on the school bus before the sun comes up. If some of my constituents—and certainly this applies to many of the constituents of the member for Eyre—want to send their children to a kindergarten, those 3 1/2 year old kiddies have to be put on the school bus before it is light. I know that might seem to be emotive, but it is true—it is factual. I was at a kindergarten only three days ago to verify that fact. If this Government is making this change, it needs consciously to know what it is doing. It should stand up and say, 'Yes, we are prepared to disadvantage those people in the west of the State to the extent that those kiddies have to be put on buses before it is light.' I note that many members are shaking their head and disagreeing with me. It is all very nice for them: they are not in that position.

Members interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I take the point. It is on the Government side, and that is the side to which I am referring. They could not care less about welfare. Where is the social justice? They do not know the meaning of that term; and they do not know what it is about.

Members interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: As the member for Custance says, it is just talk. I could cite many other examples and quotations. I have received numerous letters and a large number of telephone calls. There is a general expectation within my electorate that I will automatically oppose this legislation; that is a fair assessment. No doubt I have made my intention pretty clear in that respect.

I implore the Government, before it embarks on a change that will result in disadvantage for so many people, to re-think the situation. In the Government's terms, it might be only human misery that it is imposing on people, with the fictitious view that it might have some economic advantage, but that is a shallow argument, because even major employer groups are

questioning the Government's wisdom. These sorts of arguments need to be given full consideration. I hope that this House will oppose the legislation, and I certainly hope that Parliament as a whole will see that this legislation does not get off the ground. It is unfair, unjust and immoral.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): While I concur with most of what I have heard from members on this side of the House, I do have to gently chide my colleague the member for Flinders for his unkind remarks about the member for Napier. The member for Napier likes to think that the words of the old hymn 'Let all mortal flesh keep silence and in fear and trembling stand' apply to him when he rises to his feet and, in some sort of sequel to *Jaws,* rips the Opposition apart with his bare teeth.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the member for Hayward to the requirement for relevance, which he has imposed on several members tonight. Even though it is very early in his contribution, the Chair is having trouble finding the relevance in his remarks to the Bill before the House.

Mr BRINDAL: I am sorry, Sir. In his contribution to this debate, the member for Flinders criticised the member for Napier's contribution, and I thought he was a little bit harsh. It is not the member for Napier's fault that he does not understand what this debate is about. He quoted at length from a debate in 1895 and—

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

The SPEAKER: This is not a frivolous point of order, I am sure.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, Sir. The member for Hayward has misrepresented me. I was quoting from a debate in 1898.

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier will resume his seat.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Napier quoted from a debate in 1898 and tried to draw the long bow that the fact that many members in the Liberal Party saw the relevance of that debate as being equally applicable today somehow meant that we were out of touch or out of time. The member for Flinders and many other members on this side made the strongest point of the lot. The sun does not change in its orbit, and basically time, since the beginning of time itself, has been fixed by the course of the sun. I was going to talk a little about the current theory that time is cyclic as opposed to linear but, as I can see nobody on the other side who would understand the concept, I will not bring that into the debate tonight. Whether time is cyclic or linear, it is still fixed by the position of the sun.

Many members on this side of the House have very aptly made the comment that our true meridian time was fixed effectively on 1 February 1895 by the international conference held in Greenwich in 1884. That time was fixed to be nine hours east of Greenwich, based on the longitude 135 degrees east. The member for Ross Smith introduced this thought into his contribution: astronomist Charles Todd, when he originally established his observatory on West Terrace, declared that the meridian of Adelaide was in fact 135 degrees 35.1 minutes east, which means that in fact our true meridian time is not nine hours but nine hours 14 minutes 20.3 seconds east of Greenwich. Even if we adopt the time zone called on to be explored by the Deputy Leader and many members on this side of the House, we are still not at our true meridian time.

In May 1899, a group of businessmen influenced the Government to change it within half an hour of the Eastern States, and we have heard that in this debate. It was done supposedly in those days for some good reason. I see no good reason that has accrued because of it. I can see no reason why we should now, as part of the cultural cringe that seems to be indulged in by members opposite towards the Eastern States, rush headlong into adopting the same time as the Eastern States when it is illogical to the good functioning of this State.

Members opposite have contributed little to this debate. They have said nothing at all in answer to the serious questions posed by the Deputy Leader and other members on this side of the House when they said, 'If we are going to change our time, why not change it so that it is conducive to the markets we wish to develop in the Far East?' That would be much more logical, if the signposts of the A.D. Little report point to the north. It would be much more logical than rushing to Eastern Standard Time.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I will not delay the House much longer. I find the interjections of the two members opposite insulting, frivolous and stupid. I will therefore resume my seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I was a little disappointed to hear the member for Ross Smith earlier this evening repeat the impracticable suggestion that certain parts of South Australia, particularly those in the Far West of the State, should be prepared to adjust their timetables so that they either rise later in the day and take advantage of the daylight hours in winter, or that schoolchildren in particular should have their school hours scheduled in such a way as to allow them to take advantage of the winter daylight hours, whilst their parents are having to work to the usual South Australian time schedule. Therefore, that would mean that the parents would be unable, as the member for Flinders said, to look after their children either before or after school. They would be separating families rather than bringing them together. There was a strong element of impracticability about that suggestion.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am not sure whether the member for Napier is sitting on a feather but, if he is, it would have to be an ostrich feather with the frivolity that is coming out of him. In the South-East of South Australia, the Mayor of Mount Gambier has suggested that people could do as we do, and that is simply to start trading half an hour earlier by getting up earlier and making sure that we win that half an hour's trade with Victoria and New South Wales.

Of course, in the evening we gain another half an hour's trade from that very substantial western Victorian hinterland by allowing Victorians to shop for an extra half an hour in Mount Gambier. There are advantages as

well as drawbacks in being a border city as is Mount Gambier. I appreciate, however, that one sector of commerce in the South-East and along the South Australia/Victoria and South Australia/New South Wales borders is disadvantaged, partly because of the half hour time change and partly because of legislation.

I mention in particular the television industry, with Mount Gambier's television station having to commit around $200 000 per year, partly for salaries and partly for capital expenditure and recording equipment, so that it can stagger Victorian news bulletins and programs coming in and stagger the network material from the Eastern States to the South-East and to Adelaide. It has to record the material and play it half an hour later. Part of it is censorship, apart from timetabling, because many of the adult only programs cannot be shown on South Australian television at the time that they are broadcast by the networks.

However, a direct contradiction is that people in the South-East can, by satellite or local aerial, pick up Victorian programs directly broadcast and youngsters can watch, without any restraint or restriction, the adults only programs that are broadcast half an hour earlier. So, it is an anomaly that disadvantages the local television station.

I regard the comments by the member for Napier as being deliberately frivolous. He did not do the Government's argument any good at all. I will not deal with the rather specious comments that he made.

South Australia is already disproportionately disadvantaged as a result of the 1898 Act which committed South Australia to a standard time based on 142.5 degrees east. South Australia, lying as it does 12 degrees longitude from 129 to 141 degrees east, actually lies outside the standard of meridian that was selected for its time zone. The mean meridian for South Australia would have been 135 degrees east, which would have set a time zone difference of one hour from Victoria and New South Wales—obviously, as other speakers have said, a logical meridian upon which to base our mean time. Perhaps at some time in the future more consideration will be given to that.

I will launch into a brief argument about why that may take place. The lobby 100 years ago compromised half an hour behind Victoria and New South Wales. I suggest to members that a third alternative which has not yet been canvassed is that it is a great pity that at that time an additional lobby was not mounted and a compromise not arrived at to establish the South Australian/Northern Territory, New South Wales, Victorian and Queensland areas to standardise the entire time zone on 142.5 degrees east.

We then would have had a trading and time zone block that would have been quite formidable, and it would have meant that both the Eastern and Central States would have compromised by similar amounts. One would have conceded half an hour backwards and the other half an hour forwards. There would have been much more logic in such a decision than in South Australia's going, as proposed, to 150 degrees east—a line that runs between Canberra and Sydney, and in summer time, when we impose another hour penalty on the State, going to 165 degrees east, which takes us well to the east of Lord Howe Island and puts our sunrise at somewhere the western side of the South Island of New Zealand.

Surely, members on both sides of the House would have to see an element of nonsense in establishing a summer time zone that has the sunrise so far to the east of this State. I can imagine how the people in Ceduna are applauding this measure, and I can sympathise with them. We are a large State and, while the people in the South-East in my own electorate are the least affected, as are all of the Murray River townships (Renmark, for example) on the South Australian/Victorian/New South Wales borders, the residents of Ceduna in the Far West would be greatly disadvantaged: sunrise at 8.15 in the morning, with full light at about 9 o'clock. Even in the South-East, in Mount Gambier, youngsters catch a bus 1¼ hours before they arrive at school. They would do a round trip of 40 or 50 miles in cold, wet, crowded and bumpy school buses with more passengers than one is normally allowed to accommodate in a bus simply because there are special relaxed rules for transporting children. These youngsters would be grossly inconvenienced.

Another point is that modern communications are vastly different from the communications referred to by the member for Napier back in 1898 when fax machines were all steam driven or were flags in the wind—semaphore. Nowadays all the world can make contact almost instantaneously with any other part of the world. Never has communication been easier than it is today, yet we in South Australia are being told that for the sake of banking and international commerce we should be lining up with Sydney.

If members look at the world time zone map, they will realise that we are being asked to conform to Eastern Standard Time, to come into line with the modern world, when the Eastern Standard Time zone has no common traders of any repute within that zone. It is a time zone that lines up north to south only with a few islands and with the far east of Siberia, where there are only a few eskimos, Kamchatkans, or whatever, to trade with; yet we are being asked to line up with the Eastern Standard Time zone for business and commercial purposes for purely Australian trading.

South Australia is already nearer to Singapore, whose time zone runs through the Indian Ocean west of Perth, to Hong Kong, whose time zone runs through the Perth time zone and to Tokyo, which is immediately to the north of us, than it is to the Eastern Standard Time zone. As Prime Minister Keating says, it would be more appropriate if all Australians looked to Asia and the vast trading masses of China, Japan, Formosa, Taiwan or Korea for their future.

The suggestion that the Eastern States line up on 142.5 degrees east is not so foolish. It would bring them closer to the real trading world. The logic is simply to follow that rule and for all the Central and Eastern States to standardise on our existing South Australian time zone. As the Premier says, if there are business problems, people might arrive earlier to catch a half-hour pre-work at 8.30. It is no great problem but it is not really a commonsense solution.

I would like to remind members, if they telephone the Public Service in South Australia from Monday to Friday, that they would probably have far greater problems contacting South Australia's public servants in the morning early and after 4 o'clock in the afternoon than

they ever do trying to contact their trading partners in Victoria or New South Wales. As Clyde Cameron, the former retired Federal member of Parliament said, flexi-time was an error. Public servants flex off at their own discretion, often making themselves incommunicado at a time when we most need them. Certainly, I would like to give credit to the secretary in the Premier's Department or in the office of the Minister of Housing and Construction who was still on deck at 5.30 p.m. the other night when my computer system—a brand new computer—broke down completely. She was still there, giving us advice on how to work our way out of it at that time—a very responsible young lady and public servant.

The South-East is least affected by this move. I do sympathise with my local television station, for the reasons I have given, but it is no good the Government blaming the time zone situation for problems that it has created. It is covering up for its own demonstrated financial ineptitude; it has lost billions of dollars in record time in the past 10 years and, as Prime Minister Keating said, our trading places are to the north and north-west—in Asia, Japan and China—and perhaps a strong lobby might be mounted by this or another responsible Government with the Eastern States to see whether we cannot arrive at a mutually satisfactory compromise.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I oppose the Bill. I know the member for Ross Smith, who is the immediate past Premier, used the argument about the debate that went on back in 1898 and before, and said that we are old hat because at this stage we are still sticking to a time that was decided or finally settled in 1899. I ask the member for Ross Smith—the man who was in control of this State and saw the State brought to its knees as it will be for many years—to be fair in his comments and talk about the change that has happened in this century, which commenced three years after my mother was born. She is still alive and happens to have a good brain. She did not see satellites, as we had in the war with Saddam Hussein, where within a split second a message could be sent across the world from Australia to the American forces where to drop a bomb or say what was happening.

In 1886 the railway line had just been put through from Melbourne. We had telegraph of a type and we had overseas cables. We did not have the motor car; it was just starting to be driven. It was first used as a horseless vehicle in 1884 but we did not have that to carry communications backwards and forwards. We did not have the aeroplane that gives us great transport opportunities, where business people, Ministers, members of Parliament and people socialising can leave this State in the morning, go to Melbourne or Sydney, transact business or dine and come back in the same day. It was not dreamt of in those times. We did not have television. Using satellite, an image can now be put into our home or office from anywhere in the world.

We did not have mobile telephones. If people want to go out and have their business luncheon without organising themselves and fitting in with the Eastern States, they can take their telephone with them; or, if a message is faxed it can be held on delay on the fax. We have reached the stage where a computer can identify the voice of an individual and can respond to that individual with messages; in other words, we have got to the point where voice activated computers can talk to one another with a message from the boss. It is a different world, and there is no great benefit in this half hour.

A number of business people have contacted me—I think there have been about 14—to say they supported it. I met nine of them—one group of three and the others individually. When I mentioned that construction workers start at 7 o'clock on many sites and that they would have to change their starting time to start at daylight, they all said, 'Well, let them change their starting time.'

I mentioned the point raised by the member for Flinders and other country members, because I have heard that argument before and I sympathise with it, about young children getting on buses in the dark. Those businessmen said, 'They can start later. Change their starting time.' I said, 'Most of you live within 20 minutes of your office or you can have machines in your homes if you wish. Could you not start at a different time and finish at a different time or work the extra half hour a day if business is tough, trading with the Eastern States?' We had 65, including my brothers, on the payroll when I first came into this place, and we dealt with the Eastern States to some degree. There was no problem for us in communicating. We organised ourselves to do it. If we had not worked the extra hours, we would not have survived. I cannot understand business people saying that it is too difficult to trade with the Eastern States.

In addition, I pick up the arguments made by some of my colleagues about dealing with the north. Mr Keating and nearly every Minister in Australia responsible for trade and commerce tell us that we have to head north for our trade in the future. As the member for Mount Gambier said, the time slot should perhaps be drawn between the two times that exist now. In other words, we should bring Victoria back half an hour to our time.

I support the concept of having a wider community debate on going back to the 135 degree point, which is South Australia's point if we are to stick to the international agreement that was made many years ago. Those who say they cannot trade today, with all the time zones and all the technology that is available, are kidding themselves or they are trying to kid us. I have no doubt, as one or two have made the point to me, that it would be more convenient for them. That may be true if they want to work only eight hours a day or have their offices operating only eight hours a day and perhaps employ other people. However, a one person business cannot succeed in the long term working only eight hours a day; they have to work the other hours and fit in with the different operations world wide if they want to deal world wide.

I do not wish to delay the debate. However, I suggest that modern technology crushes all the arguments that may have been used around the turn of the century. When the member for Ross Smith, the architect of South Australia's financial disasters, argues that he is all for business, I ask him to hang his head in shame, because what he did to business in this State, to those who want jobs, to those who want an income and to future generations for some time was quite disgraceful. I say quite bluntly that I like his cheek in getting up and arguing that he is all for business in this State when he

sat idly by after he was warned about the disaster confronting this State. I oppose the Bill.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I think by now, as we have progressed well into the debate, all that could be said has been said certainly about the historical side, the technical data and the way that the city and the country see the issue. However, I want to relate to the House my experiences in the mid 1950s when I was employed by the Bank of Adelaide in Sydney. One of my jobs was to lay off on the short term money market the surplus funds that we had each day. There was no great problem. If we could not invest our surplus within New South Wales or on the east coast of Australia, I knew that we had half an hour to get those funds settled in South Australia through head office or wait an extra hour and a half from South Australian time and try to get those funds placed in Perth. Sometimes we might use Hong Kong. Then we would wait until we got into Europe, perhaps Bonn, and, if the time was not right, we knew that we had London or New York. So, we used to chase the world financial markets around the globe.

Our Sydney office had just over 70 staff. We were never disadvantaged; we made more profit in that branch than was declared for the whole of the bank, because during that period there was the wool boom, South Australia had extremely good seasons, our bank was well-positioned and we had good funds. We were able to discount and purchase foreign bills of exchange, particularly wool bills. We were one of the largest discounters of wool bills in Sydney. The New South Wales banks were in trouble because of the drought in the western part of New South Wales. All we had to do was get to work earlier and remain there a little longer so that we could place money in our surplus funds.

In those days, banks made their money out of dealing on the foreign exchange markets. Interest rates were extremely low; 2 or 3 per cent was the best you could obtain for your investments and mortgages were 3.25, 4.25 per cent. So, there were very low margins. In those days, banks were banks, bankers were bankers, and you ran your bank according to a very strict set of guidelines that had been established decades before. We had none of this punting and gambling that we saw in the 1980s, nor did we have the loose controls that we witnessed in the 1970s and 1980s. The entrepreneurs and conmen were there, but they came through the system under a different name and in a different style. However, most of them still came from Western Australia and, of course, Collins Street also tried to rule the financial markets, as it has always done in this country, but the Sydney entrepreneurs have been the greatest survivors. So again Melbourne and Perth let down the nation.

We had strict management practices. We did not have fax machines; we did not have mobile telephones. We used the telegram system or the cable system with the overseas telecommunications. There was many a time that we would have to remain in the office until 11.30 at night to then go to the ATC building in Sydney, which is not far from the bank, and lodge our last lot of cables to place the business for the day and be back at the office at 8 a.m. If you have lived and worked in Sydney, you would know that you need about 1½ hours to do a trip that would take you 20 minutes in Adelaide because of the traffic congestion. If you had to travel to Sydney over the Sydney Harbor Bridge, you would be in more trouble than anybody else.

The differential in the time zones between the States did not present any great problem. Banks in those days did well. Commercial undertakings developed, and I suppose it is fair to say that the 1950s and the 1960s, whilst they had their little credit squeezes periodically, was the era of building the greatest financial foundation for this country. Unfortunately, that foundation was built up by some very hard-working and conservative business people only to be wasted and frittered away in the 1980s, because those companies that had built up strong reserves were seized upon by the Holmes a Courts, the John Elliotts, the Alan Bonds—

Mr S.G. Evans: The corporate raiders.

Mr BECKER: —and, as the member for Davenport reminds me, the corporate raiders, as we call them—I call them conmen—and bled of their reserves. They lived high on the hog and lost all the money overseas to the very sharp financial institutions who charged exorbitant rates for establishing loans, not so much the interest rates but the procurement fees.

I have received several letters from small businesses just within or outside the electorate and one from Channel 9. I can understand John Lamb's concern; he is a New South Wales businessman and has run the Channel 9 network very well indeed. He is a very astute businessman and probably one of the great survivors in the television industry. I can appreciate his side of the argument, as I can that of other businessmen. They will be annoyed to think that I oppose this legislation. No doubt, they will be annoyed that my philosophy is quite simple: start earlier, work longer and seize every opportunity. In other words, capitalise on the opportunities that exist and make the best of what you can. There is money to be made in commerce and industry. There is an opportunity in this country to develop, to expand and to progress, and it is the astute business person who will do it.

I have not received any requests from very large, successful companies such as BHP. BHP has been able to survive all these years, and it has several undertakings in South Australia as it has all over the country. Many other very large and successful Australian and South Australian companies have developed in the eastern States and in nearby foreign countries, be they in Asia or New Zealand.

The other area that concerns me about the introduction of daylight saving and an issue such as this is the impact of the Adelaide Airport and its international operations on residents who live in the flight path. There has been no request from airline companies to support the introduction of Eastern Standard Time, suggesting that airline schedules should be changed at this time, even though we are now in our summer daylight saving time.There are no aircraft coming in at 6 a.m., which would be equivalent to 5 a.m., although we know that as from March next year Qantas wants to bring in 767 aircraft at 5 a.m. However, the point is that there is just no request. We have the comments of the former Premier of this State, who has always been a very strong advocate of Eastern Standard Time, and I can understand that he must be consistent. In his June 1992 report entitled 'Rebuilding

the South Australian economy', which is an overview of the A.D. Little report, on page 6 he states:

The Government has announced its commitment to moving the vast majority of this State to Eastern Standard Time. While this issue has been debated in the Parliament on previous occasions, the Government is now determined, it trusts with the support of all parliamentary Parties, to link the majority of business activity in South Australia into the wider Australian marketplace. This is no longer an issue of regional distinction.

One wonders whether that comment is made on the assumption that we will move to Eastern Standard Time or whether the comment is made that it really does not matter. The report continues:

This is an issue of direct importance to the future of this State. In so doing, the Government will work conscientiously with the small number of citizens and individuals who might otherwise find that the pattern of their communal and business lives were seriously dislocated to ensure that innovative solutions are devised to deal with any disadvantages that they might otherwise encounter.

If the Government was prepared to go that way, why is it not prepared to go the other way under the present time conditions to help anyone who is disadvantaged? I cannot see the problem or the need to continue with this issue. I well remember that, when I went to secondary school in the country, I had to catch the school bus at about 7.15 a.m. In winter it was dark, and by the time I got home at 6 p.m. on sports days it was dark. I would not want to put any other child through having to travel those hours under those conditions simply because someone thinks they have an opportunity of improving their business. I see no reason to change the current time schedules of this State. As I said, my colleagues on this side of the House have dealt very clearly with this issue, and they have my support.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I oppose the Bill. When the then Premier John Bannon announced that this State would seek to go to Eastern standard time, I saw it then, as I see it now, as a blatant diversionary tactic which sought to camouflage the Government's inaction regarding economic development for much of the past decade. There is no doubt that that is the basis for the Government's move, and I am very disappointed that the new Premier (Hon. Lynn Arnold) has not seen fit to drop this suggestion, because he must surely recognise that it is only there as a diversionary tactic. It is a diversionary tactic, because we have record high unemployment in this State, abysmal economic activity, the highest FID and bank account debits tax in this country, high taxes overall and the highest petrol levy of any State and we have had record bankruptcy.

For South Australia to go to Eastern Standard Time is completely unnecessary. The United States of America has five time zones compared with our three; yet, that country is faring very well. In fact, the central States of the United States are advancing at a great rate, and they seek to have the east and west coasts follow them. Perhaps that is highlighted most recently by the election of Bill Clinton as President of the United States. South Australia must do the same. I remember over a decade ago that under a Liberal Government South Australia promoted itself as the central State. It was starting to pick up in economic activity, showing that it did not have to follow the other States; rather, it sought to set the pace. I can only congratulate the former Tonkin Government on its achievements in a very short time. Now, we see that the Government is using any excuse it can to justify going to Eastern Standard Time.

Much has been said about the Arthur D. Little study. In fact, the Arthur D. Little report does not recommend a move to Eastern Standard Time. Indeed, one of the consultants reports:

Despite the expressed advantages of shifting to EST, the support for the move is weak. In a 1986 survey conducted by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce amongst its members (3 200 at the time) to gauge support for EST, only 256 responses were received (8 per cent response rate). Of those who responded, only half were in favour of a shift to EST. Again, in 1988, the chamber tried to engender support for the issue by surveying the 150 biggest member companies in South Australia. It was thought that these companies would be those most adversely affected by the time difference and, therefore, most in favour of EST. Yet, out of the 150 companies, only half responded to the survey and, of those, only half were in favour of the move.

It is quite clear, therefore, that the investigation by Arthur D. Little showed that business does not support a change to Eastern Standard Time. That is not surprising, certainly in the rural areas, when I refer to the statistics from the referendum on daylight saving. At that time in my electorate of Goyder some 9 371 persons were against daylight saving and 3 859 were in favour of it. It was close to 60 per cent against the referendum in my electorate. Whilst it was carried Statewide, it needs to be recognised that country areas suffer adversely in any shift in the time. The people on the West Coast more so than the people on Yorke Peninsula and in my electorate suffer from time changes because it affects not only their everyday working habits, particularly for the farming sector, but also their children who have to attend school. If we go to Eastern Standard Time those children for many weeks of the year will be leaving home and travelling to school in the dark. It is an unnecessary move.

Currently our central standard time zone is based on the 142.5° meridian which is close to Horsham in Victoria. By going to EST, our time will be based on the 150° east meridian which is near Sydney; but during daylight saving we will be using the 165° east meridian which runs through New Caledonia (near New Zealand). That has absolutely no correlation with our time or our State.

It is an erroneous argument that we should be looking to the Eastern States, when the Arthur D. Little report said that we should be looking north. It is quite clear if we want to make any changes we should shift our time back half an hour to the 135° east meridian, which is the time meridian for Japan and Korea, not to mention other parts of South-East Asia. That way we would be able to have much better contact with our northern neighbours and promote ourselves as a central State much more than we are doing today.

Much has been said during this debate and I believe that Opposition speakers have highlighted many relevant points. I simply say to the Government that its diversionary tactic will not work and that it is time it addressed the real problems affecting the economy—not the illusionary ones. I recognise that we need to do a lot of work to get our economy back on track, but changing the time zone will not assist us.

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

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

Motion carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I will be exceptionally brief on this subject. The arguments relating to this issue have been well canvassed by my colleagues who have spoken before me, particularly by the Deputy Leader. This legislation is a farce. It is a smokescreen by the Government to paper over its own inadequacies. This legislation has been touted by the Government as a means of bringing South Australia back to some degree of health and wellbeing but members on this side of the House know that it is purely a measure which has little consequence in terms of our future business prospects.

We know (and I have canvassed the businesses with which I have had some association) that there is no support for the legislation because businesses do not believe, in their dealings with their interstate counterparts, that they suffer any great disadvantage. In fact, one or two have said that it is marvellous to be able to get into the office a little early without the normal hassles of everyday working requirements and be able to call interstate and get the business under way. They have seen it as a positive advantage to have some time difference.

The question about whether we should come alongside or go back half a hour and make it a true meridian and bring it back to the time zone that existed last century is an argument that needs to be developed over time, because there must be some benefits and cost factors inherent in that proposition. My argument is based on the *status quo*. If it was so important to get South Australia lined up with the Eastern States and if that was a key economic consideration, could we then assume that Queensland, because of its being one hour off kilter with Eastern Summer Time, is somehow going to be disadvantaged? Of course it is not. Queensland will not in anyway be affected by the fact that it has not gone onto Eastern Summer Time. We know that it will continue to expand and grow as a State; we know it has very strong growth prospects in the long term because that is the nature of the State.

Presumably the current Goss Government will be removed at some time in the future and its prospects will be even further enhanced. Certainly the population in Queensland did not consider that being one hour outside the time being observed in Victoria and in New South Wales would be any impediment whatsoever in the conduct of business. Otherwise, I am sure that when they had the referendum Queensland would have vehemently rejected any suggestion that they should not have summer time.

The arguments have been canvassed about the fact there are five time zones in America, yet the people there seem to survive. I have recently been to the United States and Canada and there is no suggestion whatsoever that those five time zones in any way effect the conduct of their business. They are used to that arrangement; they live with it and prosper under it. It makes no difference whatsoever to the future health and wellbeing of States that are not lined up somewhere along the middle, on the west coast, on the east coast or somewhere in between. So, there is no real economic argument in terms of how they should place themselves on the time zone. But there certainly is an argument to say that South Australians should not have to put up with the disadvantages associated with EST that have already been outlined by my colleagues.

I remind the House of the argument put in this Parliament that it was the rural sector of our Party that was somehow opposed to the proposition of Eastern Standard Time. I assure this Parliament it is not just the rural sector of the Liberal Party that is so disposed. All of those arguments that have been canvassed by the Government and by the member for Ross Smith have already been thoroughly thrashed around. We do not believe this Mickey Mouse measure will make one iota of difference to the future health and wellbeing of this State. In fact, if it were not for the Government's preoccupation with using this measure as a divisive tool I am sure that the Government would have to live up to its responsibilities in the area of economic management.

The Arthur D. Little Report was quite specific on the initiatives that had to be taken to make South Australia competitive with its interstate and overseas counterparts. Arthur D. Little did not comment on the need for Eastern Standard Time and I see no reason why the argument should somehow spread to the issue of EST.

So, I am opposed to the proposition. There are no doubt some benefits. But, I do not want to be a slave to the Eastern States and I do not want all the television and radio programs from the Eastern States flooding our airwaves and wiping out our television, radio and newspaper industry in this State. I want South Australia to be somewhat different. I want South Australia to be able to live on its merits and survive on it merits because I believe as a region we have huge possibilities. They will somehow be diminished, because we know the national agendas of the national corporations. They want to down size in South Australia; they want to quit South Australia. We would like to think that they are going to come to South Australia, but it makes it so much easier for them to say 'No' if all the decisions are being made interstate and transmitted across the border, because the time difference that does prevail right now has been eroded.

South Australia has some great economic possibilities and a great economic future if we can remove this Government. I would love the Government to use EST as the standard upon which this next election is to be fought, because it would be overwhelmingly rejected, as would the Government. I oppose the Bill.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I too oppose this Bill and, as many of my colleagues before me tonight have already enunciated the arguments against the Bill, I will not need to speak for a long time this evening. This Bill is nothing other than a smokescreen from the real issues. It amazes me that, as this State faces the quandaries before it created by the State Bank, SGIC, WorkCover, the crisis in our hospitals, the spiralling of serious crime, the crisis in our prisons and our community leaving public transport in droves, this Parliament finds itself once again debating whether or not we should move toward Eastern Standard Time.

Anyone who has worked in the private sector dealing with Australian and overseas companies, as many of my colleagues and I have done, knows that the half hour time difference is livable and, at worse, nothing other than a minor inconvenience. One of my first jobs after graduating from university was buying manager with a major Australian retailer. As part of that role, it was my job to deal with Asian countries as well as our Eastern States. In dealing with the time zone difference, I found that the half hour mattered not one dot, and in fact I found the half hour rather convenient in the mornings, as I was able to ring the Eastern States uninterrupted by simply starting my working day at 8 or 8.30 rather than 9 o'clock. The South Australian business community has managed to operate in that way for some time, and I have certainly found that businesses with which I am in regular contact do not offer any support at all for this legislation.

The social ramifications of this Bill could be somewhat complex; there could be a significant effect on our community. I am particularly mindful that children commuting to school, and indeed people wishing to commute to work, will possibly find themselves, during the winter months, catching the bus and the train in the dark. That is not a situation that I wish to see as a member of Parliament, particularly as shadow Minister responsible for the police, because I am very much aware of the increase in crime within our community, and I do not wish to place women and children particularly at any greater risk.

This whole issue is an unnecessary smokescreen and one which this Government has put up in a bid to hide its own failures. If indeed this Government is serious about helping business to prosper, serious about creating high employment rather than high unemployment in our State, as my colleagues and I have consistently put to this Government, many other measures need to be addressed. We have the highest petrol tax in this State, and that was brought about by the recent passage of legislation opposed by the Liberal Party in this Parliament. We also have the highest FID tax, the highest BAD Tax and the highest WorkCover premiums. It is with some irony that I and many other members note the demonstrations on the front steps of this Parliament, with trade unionists opposing WorkCover reforms that you, Mr Speaker, and Liberal members would like to see put forward to try to save the cost of WorkCover and to try to pave the way for the creation of more jobs by reducing the cost to business, and we find Government members ducking for cover left, right and centre.

There is absolutely no need at all for this legislation to have been placed before our Parliament tonight and to have wasted the time that it has. If the Government is serious about assisting business in this State, there are many more reforms that it could look at. I oppose the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Unquestionably, the member for Ross Smith, supported as he was by other members opposite, has attempted to draw public attention away from the mess made by the Labor Party in office under his leadership over the past 10 years by having this measure introduced into the Parliament at this time. It was clearly hoped, I am sure, by those same half-witted strategists who botched up the reallocation of portfolios and who hatched up this plan that it would divide the Liberal Party, but it has not. In fact, there is unanimity of commitment in opposition to the proposal, because it is poorly thought through. Those few people who have sought to have the change made do it merely for their personal convenience. They ignore the organic realities of life.

Their argument, were it to be valid, should find some illustration in one of three general localities. In the first instance, there ought to be concern for solidarity between the constitutional jurisdictions of the Eastern States. That is to say, Queensland should feel so compelled to stay on the same time as New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania that it, too, adopts summer time when summer time is undertaken by those other Eastern States on Eastern Standard Time, but it does not.

Secondly, we should find that businesses which have themselves established in all three States—or all four States, if we take Queensland into account in the winter months when it is on the same time, or any two or more of the States—doing better because of the advantages they have of operating in more than one State, more than one constitutional jurisdiction and more than one politically managed economy than those businesses competing with them in all parts of the market where those other businesses in competition are not in any more than one of the States concerned. But that has not happened, it does not happen and it will not happen, because the determinant of success in business is not the time on the clock. More than anything else, it is the satisfaction of the people who work for and make that business tick, both with their lives in general and their life in that business environment.

One thing that will upset them, of course, is that the circadian rhythms of their children, whose intellects have not developed to the point where they can understand the notion of shifting the clock for the convenience of business, where their bodies and metabolisms have evolved over generations to respond to other stimuli than the clock driven by business, will be upset; they will find themselves less happy in their family lives. There is no reason to suppose, given the information I have put before the House, that they will be compensated with greater happiness in their work life. They will not. In fact, it is likely that they will be as crotchety as their children, because they will find themselves at odds with their natural biological inclinations.

The more important aspect of all this is that we should recognise the existence of circadian rhythms in human beings. They are there and are stimulated not only by changes in season on those parts of the globe where the seasons change, no matter who lives there and when they choose to live there, if that happens, but also by changes from day to night. Changes in light intensity affect mood, and changes in atmospheric temperature affect mood.

That can quite simply be measured by putting electrodes on the scalp, and measuring the brainwaves passing through the person's mind. The inclination for more creative thought occurs at different times of the day, and it varies from individual to individual. However, this is nonetheless a fact, which has already been established, even when one is in sleep mode. We therefore need to recognise that some things we do rely

on very much are called circadian rhythms. That is the nub of my argument, perhaps not covered by many other members. We will inconvenience people who have to rely on animals or crops for their income.

Let us look at what happens in the milk industry. We shift the clock and then the time at which normal work starts where award provisions apply in factories, but do not shift the function of the dairy cow and the extraction of milk in the alveolar sacks of the udder; the way in which it has to be removed is not altered in the least. However, the dairy farmer must make a compromise because, if we start work earlier for business purposes, the dairy farmer will have to milk that much earlier to have milk available in bulk for the work force when it arrives at the factory to commence work. The cows will not have reached a point through the night where they would normally think of going to milk. They are in some part creatures of habit, but not entirely so, because later in the day the same sort of problems arise. The predicament for the dairy farmer therefore is to adjust the function of milking his or her animals.

We have plenty of female dairy farmers: the Mayor of Murray Bridge is an outstanding dairy farmer and dairy cattle breeder, and has been so in her own right for most of her working life. These people must then adjust the way in which they work on their own farms to fit in with the twin problem created for them: first, the shift in the clock which affects when they can get the cheap electricity for their irrigation; and, secondly, the effect of the sun upon when to milk the cows and when they can otherwise conduct operations on their properties, for example, working with their pasture, and so on, when their labour commences work.

A problem also exists for grain growers where over-award payments automatically become necessary late in the day: even though the sun is hot and high in the sky and reaping conditions are ideal, farmers find that the silo operators either close down or go on over-award payments to continue to keep the silos open, well after hours late in the day. We will find often that moisture will hang around late morning or even early afternoon once we have shifted to Eastern Standard Time and Eastern Summer Time, so much so that reaping cannot commence until afternoon which is not a fair and reasonable way to expect their business to be conducted.

That is the kind of business on which we rely and need. It is our export income. It involves real jobs and not pretend jobs. Transfer payments are not involved in creating those jobs. Rather, great benefits are to be derived from the income that we get from selling the products we get from the efforts of our rural communities.

It is therefore important that we take into account the down-side consequences of making any such change as it will affect those kinds of enterprises, all of which are related to the natural circadian rhythm of the metabolisms of the species involved.

The point has been made that there is benefit to us in cutting the cost of operating the news media's functions. I do not know whether it is the news media or the moguls who own it. Frankly, I think it is more likely to benefit the people who own it rather than the people who work there. If they could simply network their programs and dump it on our market from the Eastern States, we would have our own Premier being referred to variously as Jeff Kennett, Fahey or Goss. For that matter, we would be lumped into the same ignominious group as Tasmania.

We are already obtaining radio programs broadcast out of Sydney, where we here the Minister of Labour being spoken of as someone other than the Minister who is the member for Florey here. I cannot go with that at all. There is no benefit whatever to society in what are claimed to be economies of scale in the marketplace, illustrated by the fact that New Zealand, which is in a separate time zone of its own and which has a separate national economy, is still able to function viably in providing media services to its national population, which is nowhere near that of New South Wales, for instance.

From time to time I have also drawn attention to the specious invalid aspects of the argument that have been put by those few speakers opposite about the necessity for us to go onto a common time zone with the Eastern States. If it were important for us to be on the same time zone as a significant economic centre, why do we not, for instance, tie ourselves not to the head offices in the Eastern States but to the international head offices in Geneva and shift our time 8½ hours back so that we could coincide our working day and our normal award rates, and so on, with Geneva, the international centre of banking?

Would that not make a lot more sense? It is the same argument. We need not care about where the sun is at any time—we should just decide to put our clock where we will derive greatest business benefit. What nonsense! For that matter, if the world needs to have a common time to improve the efficiency with which it conducts business, why does everyone not put their clock on Greenwich Mean Time, regardless of where the sun is? Then, the world would be better off, presumably, according to the arguments that I have heard advanced by the member for Ross Smith and that other political gopher on the other side.

All of them have behaved like brazen political hussies, chasing after the big buck for the Labor Party at the next election from those few business people who do not care about the consequences for the rest of the people in our community and who would like to be able to call (or take a call from) head office in the Eastern States at exactly the same time on their watch. How inane. If they wish, I advise them to adjust the hands of their clocks so that they are the same as those in the Eastern States and live their lives as if they were in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane or anywhere. Frankly, I do not need them in South Australia if that is their parochial insular indifference to the realities of ordinary human beings.

To my mind our argument has been well illustrated by reference to the USA experience, which spans seven hours from East Coast time where, say, in New York it is 4 p.m. and where there are stock markets in New York and Florida, yet less distance applies between Adelaide and Sydney in terms of latitude than exists between New York and Chicago.

Chicago is on prairie time, and it has a much bigger stock market than Sydney. So has Dallas-Fort Worth and Houston, which is also an hour ahead of mountain time. Denver, Colorado, still has a bigger stock market with a greater number of stock brokers with heavier turnover

than we will find in any Australian stock market. That is an hour ahead of west coast time—California, Oregon and Washington and all the way up the west coast of Canada to Alaska. If it were 4 p.m. in New York, it would be 1 p.m. in the stock markets and factories of Los Angeles and San Francisco, for example. Two hours further out into the Pacific at 11 a.m. there is Hawaii—yet another time zone—whereas it is 4 p.m. in New York. It has not affected the development of the economy across that nation, so I do not see why in Australia it should affect the development of our economy or any part of it. The same sort of thing applies in Canada.

We derive some benefits from the existing system and to my mind there is benefit in discussing the matter of going to true standard time. The benefits are already documented and placed on record by others wherein we would find our time zone in harmony with the time zones of Korea, Japan and the Philippines.

I am therefore compelled to say that I find no valid argument in support of the view that we should shift our clocks to Eastern Standard Time for the sake of allowing this Government to divert attention from its economic mismanagement and incompetence and to enable it to collect a few hundred thousand dollars in election campaign donations from those very few businesses that are run by people who have the sort of hegemonistic view of how South Australia ought to operate in conjunction with the Eastern States. They do not care about us; they are more interested in and focused on what is going on somewhere else in the world. It is simply crazy. I have found no reason whatever in anything I have ever come across to believe that we will get any benefit by adopting this proposition and, like all other members of the Opposition, I oppose it.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I oppose the Bill. I accept the fact that certain businesses would be advantaged. I can see the airlines in particular asking for this legislation to pass so that they can have common timetabling. I can understand some of the media and certain television stations wanting to link in so they can avoid this problem of having to re-record and re-broadcast. There are some advantages there. I can see some advantages for firms with head offices in, say, Sydney which, when businesses start over there at 8.30 a.m. and they want to contact their branch here, have to wait that half hour. Certainly, that does not apply at the end of the day. At the close of business, when they want to get a rush order through to South Australia or we telephone over there, they are closing down before us.

We have to bear in mind that the common good of all residents has to be considered. I do not know about other members, but I would say that the correspondence I have received is running at about five to one in favour of retaining the *status quo*. The common thread going through the letters asking us to go across to Eastern Standard Time is a sentence which seems to appear fairly regularly, namely, that the slight adjustment to daylight hours will not in reality disadvantage anyone. That is a plea from those who want to go across to Eastern Standard Time but, if we listened to the contribution tonight of the member for Flinders, who gave the examples of the West Coast and the disadvantages there, and also bearing in mind the comment made by the member for Bright, who drew a parallel to the daylight hours when the sun comes up in the middle of winter even here in Adelaide, then indeed we see that an awful lot of ordinary residents of this State will be disadvantaged by the time the sun comes up in winter. So, I do not really sense a clamour among the South Australian people for this legislation.

I recall that we had this debate some years ago and it has come up again. If there was a clamour for it from the general public and if the general public were not going to be disadvantaged, or if the general public were going to be advantaged, I would give it serious consideration. I do not believe that the clamour is there for it.

I repeat, I do understand that certain companies would have an advantage. There has been strong representation from organisations under the umbrella of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and they have practical reasons for asking us to go to Eastern Standard Time, but we have a responsibility because we represent people. The ordinary men and women in the street, who I believe will be disadvantaged, are not asking for this to happen. I also believe that, although the Government has taken a decision to pursue this course of moving to Eastern Standard Time, it is not totally supported by all members opposite. However, they are locked into the decision that was taken by their Caucus and they will vote accordingly.

I know the hour is late—it is 10 o'clock—and I said that I would speak for only a few minutes, but I wanted to put on the record that, although I have reconsidered this issue and read carefully all the correspondence that I have received from the business community, on balance the interests of the general public are such that the additional half an hour to which we would be moving is not warranted. While being sympathetic to the argument put forward by the business community and those who would like to link in with common timetabling, I shall not support this legislation.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): I thank members for their contributions. If anything is illustrated by their contributions, it is that nothing much has changed as far as members opposite are concerned since this matter was first debated in 1894 and again in 1898. The Bill is about wealth generation. It is not about whether we have a State Bank debt; it is about wealth generation.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Mitcham is shooting his mouth off again. He has never really worked for anything in his life and he would not understand what it means. We are trying to link the people of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia into one common time zone, wherein most manufacturing industry takes place. The member for Mitcham, with all his professed knowledge, does not appreciate what is happening in terms of world trade. Primary industry, as part of world trade, is of diminishing value, and it has been diminishing at 1 per cent per annum for a considerable time. It has meant that our primary produce in Australia, as a net worth in comparison to manufactured goods, is decreasing.

The only way that we shall produce wealth in this country is to sell manufactured goods overseas, and the only way that we in South Australia will enhance the wealth of this State is to participate in that manufactured goods revival. If we do not make a level playing ground for ourselves in this State, we shall not survive in that area at all. We cannot take no notice of it; we cannot ignore what is happening around the world. We should not try to make ourselves believe that communications have advanced so much that we do not need it. We are not talking about someone's grandmother who as a child used to operate a telegraph on Cape Willoughby to tell somebody that their ships were arriving. What we need to appreciate is that modern communications require instant response. If people communicate and want knowledge and it is not available immediately, they will go somewhere else. It is not a case of one or two people swanning off for lunch in some pub with a portable telephone; it is a case of people at work in their hundreds doing all sorts of things.

The change was so rapid that members opposite did not even notice that it happened, and it will go past them so quickly they will not even see it. This is a real effort to improve the position of manufacturers in this State. All members opposite want to do is drag the State back into the dark ages of the nineteenth century.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Standard time.'

Mr INGERSON: In its second reading speech, in response to the A.D. Little report, the Government announced that there was a commitment to Eastern Standard Time. Can the Minister provide the information that substantiates the argument put forward by the Government that the A.D. Little report supports Eastern Standard Time?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I do not know what this matter has to do with this clause at all. However, it was in one of the papers that was considered by the A.D. Little report.

Mr INGERSON: What section of the A.D. Little report substantiates this argument by the Government? We have read the second reading speech—and we read it with interest—and we listened to the presentation of the previous Premier, who put down the argument that it was a very important issue in terms of South Australia's economic future. Part of the argument was that this whole scheme was backed up by the A.D. Little report. We are intrigued to find where this is the case. We thought that it was only reasonable that, as an Opposition interested in the development of this State and in the way that Governments put these arguments together, we should get some reasonable answer. Can the Minister say, if not today then at some time in the future, what justification the Government has from the Arthur D. Little report for making this recommendation?

Mr BLACKER: I tried to create for the Minister an opportunity to explain whether the Government has done any assessment on the economic benefits either for Eastern Standard Time or for Central Standard Time when comparing international trade involving international competitors. During my second reading speech, I tried to make the point that there is a parallel between Central Standard Time and Japan and many other South-East Asian countries. If they were on the same standard time—and they would be if they were on the 135 degree meridian—they would be able to deal on a minute-by-minute basis, whereas Eastern Standard Time provides no parallel, other than with one very remote place in eastern Russia.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thought that I made it quite clear in my response to the second reading speech that this approach by the Government is about creating a level playing field for manufacturing industry. I also made it quite clear that about 85 per cent of the Australian population lives in the triangle, if you like, of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. It is also where most manufacturing industry operates. If we want to compete on the world market, whether it be in Eastern Asia, North-Eastern Asia, America, Europe or anywhere else, and if we are to expand our trade it will be in manufactured goods, when our people get into niche markets.

If we are able to use the total resources of those three States, and our manufacturing industry is linked into that, we can do that, and that will enable us to compete in those markets in other States. It is more important to get our manufacturing base here fixed and operating correctly, and those overseas markets will look after themselves, because our people will then be in a position to be able to compete there.

Mr BLACKER: Bearing in mind what the Minister has just said, will he tell us whether any assessment of the social injustice that will occur to the people in the west of this State has been taken into account, and is he prepared to play off the inconvenience to those people and, more particularly, those children who have to board a school bus before day break, or will he say that they are just a casualty of the whole exercise?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Many children throughout the world go to school in the dark, and they seem to turn out to be really intelligent. I do not think that children in Australia are any different.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relation and Occupation Health and Safety): I move:

That this Bill be read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

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 (teller), 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 (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, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson (teller), 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.

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

Third reading thus carried.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 October. Page 1164.)

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition totally opposes the Bill. We are concerned with the general thrust of the Bill. It is typical of legislation in which the Labor Party sets down all the decisions which, in essence, support its mates. There are 'roping in' clauses and certified agreements in which I recognise that there is no free enterprise bargaining concept at all. As long as its mates in the union movement are hooked into the system, all is well in the labour market area. In the past two weeks, I spent a considerable amount of time talking to employer associations in this State. It is not very often that employer associations unanimously oppose everything. In this instance, each group was opposed to the Bill.

If I go through the Bill clause by clause I wonder whether we are in fairyland or in 1992. The very first clause ropes in kids who for years have been working in a general delivery position with, say, Messenger Newspapers or with delivery services around this town. Suddenly, they may be roped into an award system. It makes me wonder whether we are in pixieland or in 1992 and whether this Government is totally ruled and dominated by a third union party in pixieland. It is hard to believe that this is happening in the 1990s.

The first clause suggests that all kids in this city who are involved in delivering newspapers around the town for Messenger, for *Billboard* and for all the local newspapers and all the people who put catalogues in our letterboxes on a weekly basis—pensioners, superannuants and people who do not have jobs—suddenly have to be roped into an award where workers compensation and potentially long service leave, sick leave and all other conditions. This may apply to kids earning $10 a week. It makes one wonder who is running this State. Then again, when you look around at the chaos we have had in the past 10 years, this is the sort of drivel you expect from a Government that is so tired and out of touch with the community.

We have a thick piece of legislation that is not worth its own weight in the real world of today. When you go through the Bill you see the number of obstacles that have been placed in the road of business because we are asked to conform with the Federal Government and introduce this totally wrong system right around Australia. They make sure that they heap on top of our State awards and our State Act and introduce Federal conditions that are currently before the Federal Court because they are unworkable and they are being currently challenged. Yet we have a Minister who brings this sort of nonsense into our State industrial legislation.

You have to wonder whether we are talking about pixie-land. If you really believed that in 1992 we wanted an industrial relations system that was progressive and you then read this document, you could not believe that we are here tonight even attempting to discuss it. As I said, clause 1 has kids, pensioners and superannuants, some earning $10 a week, now being brought in as genuine employees under this legislation. When I was a newsboy I was happy to earn five bucks a week, and I was happy to work for it. I did not have to worry about whether I was going to be linked into some award system. Surely this is not about the dropping of union membership; it could not possibly be that. Surely the union movement would not say to the Government of the day, 'We are having a little trouble with membership, let's get the kids in.'

Some 1 500 kids work for Messenger Newspapers. Perhaps the Minister does not know what they do. They deliver papers on a weekly basis and make a few extra bucks for themselves because they put in inserts. Sometimes their parents or their friends next door help them. I suppose the Minister does not know that Messenger Newspapers runs bank accounts for these kids and puts in the money to encourage the kids to save. Perhaps that is the problem. Perhaps these kids are getting entrepreneurial, are starting to learn something about the work ethic and are getting the incentive to do something themselves. Perhaps that is what it is all about. I cannot possibly believe that the Government is serious about wanting to rope in kids to an industrial award and an industrial Act all because these poor little kids who deliver about 400 newspapers a week might be breaking some massive industrial agreement.

Perhaps it is the $62 a year they want for union membership out of the $500 the kids earn. Perhaps that is the real reason behind this clause to rope in as employees these young kids and pensioners. What about some of the charities? According to the definitions they will be roped in too. The legal advice we have had this week is that they are. I cannot honestly believe that this Government is really serious when one looks at page one of this Bill. When you turn to page two you start to get jittery because you wonder what is going on.

This will apply only to papers, etc. that are supplied free of charge to the public. When was the last time an industrial relations Act provided that we want to get items that are free of charge to the public? For God's sake, what is going on in this country and in this State when people who actually produce things free of charge have to be roped into this lovely big award menagerie system—where there are more reasons why one should not employ people and why one should not work—when we have these kids, pensioners and superannuants who actually want to get out there and do a few jobs cannot do so? Is it that the Government is frightened that the unemployment rate has gone up a little bit and it wants to bring it down with skilled labour in this area? Perhaps that is what it is all about.

I know I am being cynical but it is sickening to see this sort of nonsense legislation being put forward in this Parliament when people want a reasonable industrial relations system which treats genuinely people who are employed workers. If this Government were fair dinkum it would not have all this drivel here before us tonight. It

can only be a try-on. Who is trying on whom? Are we being tried on seriously by the union movement or by the Government? Really, does it matter? It is the Government and its side of politics that is putting this trash before us today.

When one looks at the next page one sees some amendments in relation to out workers. Whilst we oppose this particular area, there is some justification in this area because we are now starting to talk about adults. We are starting to talk about whether people should be subcontractors, and actually to decide themselves. But, of course, in this country, on the Government's side of politics, they are not allowed to decide for themselves, they have to be told or put in a position where they cannot think for themselves unless they are a union member or a member of some association that can advise them on how they can work or be paid, even to the extent of telling us that we are not allowed to work at home without getting roped into some award system.

What is the next issue? Will occupational health and safety people be coming around and telling us that our front room in which I have my computer does not have the right air-conditioning or lighting, or that I am not allowed to subcontract any more—because, as we read later on, I need to be roped in to certified agreements, to award conditions, in which I have no right as an employee any longer? Is someone else who has this super wisdom able the stand in and say, 'I, the union, know what you want and that is the way it is going to be in South Australia?' It is the Government that is standing up and saying that and, as we know in this State and as we have seen in other legislation, the Government is not saying or doing anything any more; it is being driven by its mates on South Terrace.

When one looks at this legislation one has to question what is going on. I wonder what would have happened to all of those entrepreneurs who were working on their computers from their homes, working out how they were going to develop their businesses, had all this sort of nonsense been in vogue then? What would have happened if, whenever they put out their work on the time-honoured basis of employment, they had had to race in to the Industrial Commission to find out under what award condition they had to contract?

I wonder how much of this country would have gone ahead had we had this sort of nonsense up until 1992? You have to ask yourself, 'Where is it going to end?' Next is advertising and promotional activities. One is now not allowed to set up one's own advertising and promotional company from one's own house. 'If you do any work on a contractual basis we are going to rope you in. The Government wants to make sure it gets back the 31 per cent of union membership up to some sort of magic figure'. Then we get stuck into the journalists and the public relations people and say, 'Look, you are not smart enough, you adults in this area, to work out what you ought to have under an agreement, an hourly rate, or conditions. We want to rope you in again. You cannot work these things out because we know all about this. We know that the people who happen to be at home, these skilled journalists, are not clever enough to work out how much they should be paying per hour, not clever enough to know whether they should build into their contractual rate some sort of loading for holidays, not clever enough to work all that out and so that is why we will put it into this sort of legislation.'

One really has to wonder how far we have to go back in time with this sort of legislation—instead of looking at the progressive '90s and where we have to go. Then, we look at people who have typing skills. Anybody who works at home who does any typing has to be roped in, has to be involved under this Act. What about the lawnmower operator, the poor little subcontractor who cuts lawns? Why is he not in here? Why not put in the motor mechanic who works from home? Why not put in the whole community and really mess up the system so that nobody has got any incentive any more to do anything other than be told by their mates down on South Terrace, 'We know how much you ought to get because we want to equalise everything throughout the community.'

That is what it is all about: 'The Government wants control of the system. We want their money for union membership and we are going to tell them how much they are going to earn'. It is not about incentive, it is not about getting on with the job of running the State; it is about tying everybody up. It is a little bit of a fear job. The Liberal Party might actually win next time and what a wonderful thing we are going to have to do. We are going to have to dismantle all this. Let us put it in and they are going to have to dismantle it. That is what I think it is all about. If it is not about that this legislation is the greatest amount of arrant nonsense I have ever seen put before this House in terms of industrial relations. It is a hotch-potch Bill.

The next clause is about tenure of office, I find it staggering that a Party that supported age discrimination legislation, which says in essence that there should not be any discrimination in terms of age, should change the existing clause from 65 to 70. If the Government were fair dinkum about its support for age discrimination, why have any age limit? We oppose it because we do not believe that there should be judges in the system over 65, but if you are going to be fair dinkum as a Government how can it support one lot of legislation in this place which opens up the whole area of age discrimination and then slot in age 70? These is certainly a backflip of the highest order.

When we look at the jurisdiction of the court we find that we are now going to register agents to be party to proceedings for fee in awards. This clause we support. We think it is an excellent idea because there are a lot of good people who can be involved and have been involved in the industrial situation representing employers and representing employees. A couple of commissioners have come through the system and they do an excellent job. This clause we support and all the employers in this State applaud it.

The next clause looks at the role of the court in terms of the awarding of interest. For overdue payment of wages note that here is the first example in this Bill where a Federal position is thrown on top of a State system. If the State system is so bad, why not amend that instead of throwing together what could be called this junkyard of two sets of legislation? If the Government wants the Federal legislation, it should put it in. If it wants the State legislation, it should fix it up. It is not consistent to play around with two sets of legislation.

Why not clean it up properly, if that is what the Government wants? It should recognise that, if people are not getting interest on their money because the process is slow, the existing State legislation should be upgraded to allow this to happen, instead of cobbling together a piece of Federal legislation and a piece of State legislation, and ending up with a hotch-potch.

Those comments are not only mine but those of the Law Society, employers and the Chamber of Commerce. Consistency in this case is what the Government calls convenient consistency. It is not the true consistency of bringing State and Federal legislation all together into one system. I refer next to the jurisdiction of the commission; the commission will be able to regulate the work of individuals who may be nude, partly nude or wearing transparent clothing. It is a very interesting inclusion in this Act. The comment made by all associations is that they cannot believe that award conditions are now being transferred into industrial Acts. They do not disagree with the argument that the commission have this jurisdiction. Some agree and others disagree with the final decision of the commission. But what they are saying is that this is the first time in this instance the Government put award conditions into an industrial Act. They are making the point that, as this has been decided in the commission already, why include it in the Act? What is it all about? Is this a future trend?

When I looked at some of the inconsistencies that were referred to by the Hon. Mr Sumner in the other place, the Hon. Mr Blevins and the Premier in opposition to this matter when it was debated at Labor Party level, one must wonder what this amendment is all about. Mr Sumner and others argued for freedom of choice and the rights of individuals, saying that this situation brings in all the genuine freedoms that the Labor Party has consistently argued about for 20 years. An article in the *Sunday Mail* on 9 July 1989 states:

> But with special privileges comes special responsibility. Too often, Labor forgets that. The policies adopted by previous conventions have created an over-regulated society that even a steadfast left-winger like Mr Frank Blevins has been known to refer to as 'the nanny State mentality'.

It is fascinating that this sort of clause should appear with Government support when the *Sunday Mail* reports on the same day the following:

> However, the present Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, came unstuck when he tried to defend the freedom of women to work topless in hotels and restaurants.

Even the Premier got involved. The article continues:

> The Premier, Mr Bannon, was baffled and privately heard to say he was old-fashioned—out of step with the new wave of puritanism. He personally thought topless barmaids would spoil a good drink, but felt it was not the State Government's role to interfere with freedom of choice.

What has happened? Obviously we have the wrong pieces of paper. It cannot possibly be the same group of people. Another article stated:

> [Mr Sumner] said the principle of the debate should be that the Government should not legislate to prevent people doing something which did not harm others. For 20 years the Labor Party has argued that it would not impose on people the moral views of others, yet that was what was intended by the Liquor Trades motion.
>
> Labor had decriminalised homosexuality but if the law had been framed on moral grounds it would not have passed. The same argument applied with abortion, decriminalisation of prostitution, nude bathing and some films, stage shows and reading matter. Mr Sumner urged the convention to condemn topless waitressing but not to require the Government to pass legislation that imposed on people's morals.

It is very interesting when three senior people in the Party argue that freedom of choice and rights of individuals and so on should be part of this legislation backflip. That has been put forward very strongly by the Labor Party. I would not want to quote anybody but the Labor Party, because I have been known before to get tangled up in this. The *Advertiser* editorial of 3 July 1989 puts the point of the whole legislation, as follows:

> The motion directing the Government to ban topless waitresses, while a relatively minor matter, was a major sign of moral arrogance of a Party feeling that, after too long in power, perhaps it has the supreme right to dictate how citizens conduct themselves. It is also hypocritical. This is the Party that says that prostitution and homosexuality, however abhorrent many people find them, are genuinely matters for private morals of citizens. This same convention, helped by the eloquence of the former Premier Don Dunstan, rejected a motion that would have directed the Government to ban X-rated videos, yet delegates were swept with indignation about people bearing their bosoms while serving food and drinks—people who are not being compelled to do so. Delegates even brought the clap-trap that it discriminated against waitresses who would not disrobe. One principle of a democratic society must be that, if people wish to work thus and others with to patronise them, it is their business—it is not the business of Government. Indeed, the less Governments can concern themselves with attempting to manipulate human affairs, the more chance we have to make ourselves a stronger society. While there is a precedence for the Government to ignore such hare-brained motions, as it must, it is a decision which would haunt the Labor Party when an election campaign raises its head.

It is fascinating that all three senior members of the Labor Party have such high morals in terms of freedom and rights of individuals, yet today we see this clause in the Bill.

We support the next clause in relation to the compulsory conference. In terms of unfair dismissal, it is fascinating that in this area we now have some 1 600 section 31 claims a year. You will now extend the clause to include those highly paid salary earners earning over $67 000. An argument has been put to this Parliament strongly and eloquently by Labor members in previous times, but the Government has done another back-flip and sees a need to support it. Where will the staff come to set up, properly monitor and work through these section 31 cases? I believe we have to delete compensation from the clause and get back to the intention of Parliament when the legislation was initially brought in.

The second objectionable part—that is reinstatement—is the review of unfair contracts. Here we have the true Labor Party coming out and putting its bare chest right on the line. Here we have a Labor Government deliberately interfering with all the contractual arrangements in the housing industry. I always wondered how long it would take before the whole union movement decided that now was its chance to look at the housing industry and say, 'Now is the chance to really screw up the housing industry in this State.'If this contract system of review stays in the Bill, we will see housing prices in South Australia go through the roof.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It will happen. Prices will go through the roof in an industry that builds affordable homes for our kids and your kids. We will see the whole housing industry and its fundamental base of agreements and subcontractor arrangements change, and prices will go through the roof. My colleague the member for

Heysen will deal at length with housing industry comments. It is fascinating that every single association involved in discussions on the Bill could not believe that such arrogance was being forced on the housing industry by the Government in trying to bring it to its knees.

The next area involves family leave and part-time work, and it is carried into a more detailed schedule at the back of the Bill. We support this clause. We believe and recognise that parental leave, maternity leave and adoption leave are part of our changing society. Unfortunately, we have a large number of single-parent families in our community today, and we need to recognise that there will be husbands and wives working where there are two parents, or fathers and/or wives working if there is only one parent. We must recognise and accept that unpaid parental leave, whether male or female, and adoption leave, must be part of our future industrial system packages, whether they be in an award system or under an enterprise bargaining arrangement.

We have no problem in supporting that provision in the Bill. We are concerned, however, that fundamental award conditions are now being transferred into industrial Acts and becoming part of those Acts. In my view the Act should just set out the principles of industrial relations and not get involved with what conditions apply in the awards; these matters should be settled in the commission, either on an award basis or as in the present structure through the Industrial Commission in relation to industrial agreements.

The Opposition is opposed to the next clause in relation to industrial agreements. I have put on record many times previously that, if we are going to have industrial agreements between employers and employees, they must be that. However, parties should not be forced to do that. There should not be a position in industrial law where a registered employee or employer association must be involved.

It is absolutely nonsense that it should be compulsory for these so-called experts again to tell two individuals that they are not capable of making an agreement—and that is what this clause is all about. The Bill sets out some new options in terms of industrial agreements, and I support those. Fundamentally, however, behind it all is the fact that if you are not a union member you cannot have it in South Australia.

So, we are still the only State in which an enterprise bargaining agreement cannot be entered into unless a union is involved either directly with the shop or indirectly so that this agreement can be written. That is really 1950s stuff. It is so far out of date that it is not even funny, yet we still have it being put forward in 1992, when enterprise bargaining is considered by everybody in the community as being a fundamental new direction to take.

We still have the employers in this State who are not unionised being told, 'I am sorry; we cannot let you have enterprise agreements. We cannot actually let you sit down with your staff and enter into an agreement that might be beneficial to them and to you, because you have no union involved.' That is absolute nonsense and it should be opposed, and we intend to do that very strongly in this clause.

The rest of the Bill involves the second schedule, which involves family leave. I have commented on that and we support it in principle. The final section of the Bill involves changes to penalties and the upgrading of penalties as they relate to different sections of the Act. We recognise that those penalties need to be changed and in principle we support those parts of the Bill.

To sum up, in essence, the Bill is in three sections. First, it changes the definition of the status of employees, and I cannot believe that in the 1990s any Government would go so low as to try to involve kids in industrial roping in, because that is exactly what it is: it is no more and no less than that.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It is fascinating, isn't it? These kids happen to have work after school delivering newspapers, yet members opposite want to rope them in to be in award systems. To follow through with the philosophy of this whole Bill, unless one is in a union, one cannot enter into an award or agreement, and they will have to end up being union members. So, what will we do? Will we charge them $50 a year to be members of a union? These kids are earning only $10 a week. There are 1 500 at Messenger and 450 at Billboard, and Progress Press employs about 2 000 overall around the State. They are not adults but kids from the age of 10 through to 15, and this Government roping them in under this special employee clause.

The other major area to which I wish to refer relates to certified agreements. As I said, we are opposed to them, because they are not a genuine enterprise bargaining system; they are a union controlled, employer association controlled system, and that is not good enough in the 1990s. In the final part of the Bill there are many minor amendments, which we support in principle. In essence, the Opposition will oppose the overall direction of the Bill but note clearly that there are some areas that are an advancement in terms of industrial relations that the Liberal Party supports.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): We have just witnessed an extraordinary performance from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I think that, in all the years that I have seen him standing here talking about industrial affairs, without a doubt, this would be his worst effort. Not only did he use the wrong industrial terms, but the proposition that he just put in front of us demonstrates his absolute ignorance of what is happening outside this place in relation to industrial matters.

Let me get it straight; this has nothing to do with roping in. 'Roping in' is a term, but the honourable member does not even know what it means. 'Roping in' is a term that is used in a totally different context in industrial matters and it has nothing to do with the proposition before us. Nobody will be roped in as a result of this proposition. It merely gives an opportunity for people, if they so desire, to approach the Industrial Court and Industrial Commission to get proper rates and conditions for the work they are doing. I am not surprised—

An honourable member: What about the kids?

Mr FERGUSON: Let me talk about the kids. The honourable member made much of the proposition that somebody wanted to rope in (the term he used—the wrong term) kids to the trade union movement. That is not so. I am not at all surprised that the honourable

member supports the multinational *News* and *Messenger Press* and *Progress Press*, which is an offshoot of a company connected with the *News*, regarding the exploitation of people that is now going on.

I will tell the House something about this exploitation. I can understand why the Deputy Leader bypassed it and did not want to talk about the exploitation of those kids about whom he was talking. I refer to the 1989 report on outwork in South Australia, entitled 'Out of sight, out of mind' by Jane Tassie, which found that outworkers, including leafletters, received very low rates of pay, had problems with underpayment and late payment of work completed, suffered detrimental health impacts from the work and had little or no reimbursement for costs incurred. This is the sort of thing that is going on with people who are engaged in that part of the distribution industry that we on this side of the House would like to refer to the Industrial Court and Industrial Commission. That will not necessarily be so, because it will depend on whether those people want to organise themselves.

I should like to quote from that report. This is the way that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to defend the Murdoch Press in the exploitation of these kids he has just described who go out after school and earn a few dollars. It is nothing of the sort. You, Sir, would know, from observations within your own electorate, that people are engaged full time on leafletting seven hours a day, six days a week. I will quote from some of these people and the way that they have been treated:

> The first lot took seven hours. They said the second lot was less and so I got paid less, but it seemed to weigh as much. The third lot they sent to me was even less than the second lot. It didn't seem to be getting any smaller to me so I counted them and they were even more than the first lot, so they were underpaying me all along. I told them this and they denied it. What could I do?

Access to the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission will enable leafletters to argue for and obtain enforcement of fair wages and conditions. This is what the proposition before us will do, and I am extremely surprised that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is going to oppose it in total. Every word, every sentence of this proposition before us, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said he will oppose.

Workers should be able to challenge a work contract if they believe it to be unfair. What could be more unfair than a 12-year-old boy or girl who is contracted to do work for a multinational organisation like News Limited, which completely owns *Messenger Press*—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Heysen also agrees to exploiting these young people by his interjection. I ask him and I ask you, Mr Acting Speaker, how in the world can there be a fair contract when you have a 12-year-old boy or girl pitched against the might of a multinational organisation such as News Limited? This is the position that the member for Heysen and members of the Opposition wish to maintain in this State.

Workers need to be able to challenge a contract of work if they believe it is unfair because, particularly in times of severe competition for work—and that is what we have now—people can be pressured to accept payment and conditions that are unfair for fear of not getting any work. Unfair contracts can be used to pressure others to accept the same or less at a downward spiral. All this measure does is allow this matter to be discussed in the Industrial Court and Commission. Even with this legislation there are no guarantees that these matters will be discussed in the Industrial Court or Commission because those people who are doing the work will have to decide whether or not they will organise themselves. If they do not organise themselves, the situation as it is will remain.

I am very surprised at the reaction of the Liberal Party to the problems associated with outworkers. The number of outworkers in the industry is increasing on a daily basis. The proposition that these people should be properly paid is fair. With technology going the way it is, it is not impossible for us to see a continuing upward spiral in the number of those people who will be working from home. Some of these people have been surveyed, and some of the things that have come out of that survey reveal a lack of safety training awareness, home duties blurring the line of the work space and the home space, and the carrying of WorkCover costs. All these things have not entered the consciousness of those people, and they are certainly not receiving the benefits of others who are engaged in what I might call normal occupations.

Sixty-four per cent of these people have no superannuation; 64 per cent have no sick leave; 59 per cent have no paid holidays; 47 per cent have no workers compensation coverage. Sixty-four per cent of outworkers have no superannuation, compared to 28 per cent of all employees; 64 per cent have no sick leave, as against 20 per cent of all employees; and 47 per cent have no workers compensation, whereas all other workers have some form of workers compensation. All these people work on a casual basis. The clerical area, which is an area that lends itself to working from home, comprises the largest occupational group of people who will be classified as outworkers.

The Opposition's argument is the same sort of argument used in 1890 in Australia to make sure that there was no union coverage and no unions involved with the organisation of these people in the work force. The very things that started legislation in this field in Melbourne in 1890, when women in the rag trade were being dreadfully exploited, are the same as those with which we are being confronted today. So, we are trying to do something about it, and the Opposition tells us so far that this is interfering with enterprise bargaining.

This is the old, old story: it is not new; this is something from the last century that is now being reused by the Liberal Party. I was surprised at some of the things the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said when he referred to lawn mower contractors being roped in by the proposition that is before us. Lawn mower contractors will not be roped in, to use his words, by this proposition but, certainly, those people who work for lawn mower contractors and who are entitled to coverage in the same way as any worker, who are entitled not to be exploited, will have an opportunity, by organising themselves, to get themselves into the Industrial Court and Industrial Commission.

The other ridiculous suggestion made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was that entrepreneurs will be stopped by this proposition. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in my life. Entrepreneurs will not be affected one iota by this provision, and I could not think of a more ridiculous suggestion. The Deputy Leader of

the Opposition and the Opposition speakers who will follow him are searching for reasons to ridicule the proposition before us, and this is one of them. This is so ridiculous that even the member for Mitcham would not be so stupid as to present an argument like that before this Parliament.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: I don't know about that.

Mr FERGUSON: I am not too sure. So far as the legislation relating to unfair dismissals is concerned, we are used to members of the Liberal Party complaining time and again in this House about this legislation. I have never once heard any members opposite say that they are prepared to support the legislation in relation to unfair dismissals, and we know that they will not do it tonight, because we have already been told that the Liberal Party is opposed to this proposition in its entirety.

I have never heard of anything so ridiculous in all my life. In a Bill this size, there would need to be something that anyone with a reasonable amount of industrial nous would agree with, but we have this blanket coverage as far as the Liberal Party is concerned that it is totally and absolutely opposed to the Bill. Now we get around to the problem of opposing industrial agreements. Of course members opposite will oppose industrial agreements, because they have already told us that they want the New Zealand system of individual contracts.

If that is not their policy, will they please stand up and tell us what their policy is, because I understand that when the member for Victoria was Leader of the Opposition he promised us in this House unequivocally that, if the Liberal Party were to gain power in South Australia, it was his intention to bring in a New Zealand-type industrial system into this State. We can see the way in which Kennett has already attempted to exploit the workers in Victoria under a Liberal administration, and I have no doubt that, if we were so unlucky as to have a Liberal administration in South Australia, we would have the Kennett-type proposals in this State from the Liberal Government.

Of course, the honourable member does not want legislation like this proposition on industrial agreements to go into this Bill, because he would have to dismantle them before being able to bring in the sorts of proposition we have seen entered into both in New Zealand and in Victoria. The Bill certainly contains the three elements. It gives greater freedom and flexibility to certified industrial agreements. This is enterprise bargaining: it is a big move from the present position into enterprise bargaining. It means that the Government will support both employer and employee organisations in South Australia.

Unpaid family leave provisions have been included in Federal awards and in awards in other countries, many of which are heavily industrialised. There has been no trouble whatsoever in having unpaid maternity and paternity leave included in awards in this country and in other countries. The Bill will simplify the process of recovery of unpaid award wages. You may be surprised, Sir, that employers in this State have had to be sued for the recovery of hundreds of thousands of dollars of unpaid wages. If you think deeply about how action has to be taken against employers for underpayment of wages—and I am sure, Sir, that you will think deeply about this because you will be seeking support in a marginal seat—you will wonder how enterprise bargaining can work if under the present system the court has to be used to recover hundreds of thousands of dollars in unpaid wages.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Millions.

Mr FERGUSON: The Minister says that it is millions. Where there is no sanction of a court in enterprise bargaining, where there is completely unfair competition between the employer and the employee as to their ability to enforce a contract, one would wonder how that could work.

I have been able to go to New Zealand—and I thank the Parliament for that—to look at what has happened there. The situation is disgraceful, particularly regarding the exploitation of women. The member for Coles should be terribly interested in this, because there has been a desperate exploitation of women in New Zealand. If enterprise bargaining comes into South Australia, as the Liberal Party wishes to see it, the people who will be hit the most are the semi-skilled, the unskilled and, in particular, women. I happened to see a contract that was arrived at in New Zealand between a hotel proprietor and a young lady. It was a completely unfair contest, and I believe that contract was absolutely disgraceful. It was made quite clear to the young lady that she was expected to work at any hour her employer wanted her to.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brindal): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): We have before us a piece of legislation that I can only class as junk. I am amazed that the UTLC, the heartland of the Labor Party, has been conned. What we have here is a little bone for the dog. The dog has been getting very restless lately; it has been getting rolled by the Government. The Government cannot live with the UTLC and its hard line attitude on a number of items. It is in grave difficulty in a number of areas, as the Assistant Secretary of the UTLC recognises. His members know what is going on. The Assistant Secretary of the UTLC might like to play his funny little political games, but he knows that his members are very restive. They do not believe that this Government has treated them well, that it has looked after the workers or that it is even doing its best for the working class people of South Australia, something which the UTLC would always suggest to the populace at large that it represents.

What we have here is a piece of legislation in which the Government says, 'Forgive us for all our wrongs; forgive us for the State Bank's $3 150 million loss; forgive us for the economic chaos this State is in; and forgive us for the mismanagement. We will look after you. We will protect your place in the sun.' That is what this piece of junk is about. It is a cyanide pill with a bit of sugar coating—nothing more, nothing less. The Assistant Secretary of the UTLC knows that: the only trouble is he is not being fair dinkum with his membership and it is about time he was.

What we have here is a travesty. It is absolutely inappropriate for the 1990s to have this backward step placed in legislation. We know the other agenda, and it is in keeping with throwing the dog a bone—it wants to make it very difficult for the next Liberal Government to

institute reforms in industrial relations. What it means is that we will have to spend a few more hours redrafting the legislation to reverse it if this Bill somehow succeeds, and I do not believe it will in its current form.

The Deputy Leader outlined a number of the more important aspects of the Bill. There is a bit of sugar coating in it. What we see is a recognition of the changed working relationships which affect families. There is a recognition that the current industrial system is inflexible in respect of meeting the needs of modern day people and families. In relation to unpaid leave, there should be a safety net for employers, but I do not know how it can be managed legislatively. If a person takes unpaid leave for family reasons and then goes out to work for other than family reasons, the contract to have that person restored to their previous employment should be immediately repudiated.

I know a number of people who would love to walk away from their job for a certain amount of time. They could get a short-term contract paying very large sums of money for two weeks, three weeks or three months. If the excuse is that the legislation gives them the right to family leave, the employer will be put at a grave disadvantage. Whilst I recognise the need to be more flexible in respect of working arrangements, there is also a need for employers not to suffer the consequences. I believe that something needs to be done, and we will look at that in more detail at a later time, and certainly when we come to Government.

Let us look at where the Bill is heading—100 kilometres the opposite way to that in which it should be heading. The Deputy Leader has already outlined the position of those people who distribute leaflets. In my electorate we get a very large number of leaflets, as members opposite can well appreciate. I am sure they have the same servicing of their area with leaflets from Coles, Woolworths, real estate agents, the Messenger press and all the other paraphernalia that seems to clog our letter boxes and lawns. In my electorate I do not have any able-bodied fully-employed person doing that job. I have young lads, occasionally young ladies and retired people. They are the only people who do that sort of work, and they are quite happy to do it. They do not complain about the price that is paid for their services.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brindal): Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: They are genuinely pleased to be able to do it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the member for Heysen said, they are genuinely delighted to have that sort of work. Most of the people in my area who do this are over the age of 65. They go for a walk—and some of them take the dog—and deliver the pamphlets. They are absolutely delighted with a bit of extra income. Members opposite want to cut it out. They do not like anyone to benefit unless they have them under some sort of control, which they would deem to have if this matter was considered by the Industrial Commission.

We have a number of people who contract their services in terms of lawn mowing, gardening, leaflet distribution and clerical work at home. I remember that we had before this House some out worker legislation to which reference has already been made. When this Government succeeded with that legislation I know 20 women who were getting well in excess of $12 an hour for their work and who were immediately put out of work. Members opposite know that.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: We have already debated that Bill, and if members want to refer to it and the opposition that I expressed at the time they have only to look at the record. Members opposite should be well cognisant of the fact that these women were absolutely delighted about the work, they were being well paid and were not being exploited in any shape or form. However, it was ruled that they had to have minimum contracts. The terms that were laid down stated that they had to have contractual terms which specified a minimum amount of work that could be performed in any one period.

The employer of these women said, 'I cannot guarantee that sort of work.' The women who were doing it said, 'We do not want to be guaranteed that sort of work. We live or die by the quality of our performance. We are being paid exceptionally well for what we do. We can do it with our family around us. We do not have to go out into the work force to compete. We can do it at times when the baby is asleep or when the children are at school.' But not this Government. This Government said, 'Look, these people are on a good thing. Let's get rid of that.' That is the drivel we have from the other side of the Parliament. So, 20 women have their work wiped out. Members can refer to *Hansard*. The employer said, 'I cannot guarantee a time and a place that all this work will be made available. It is seasonal work. The fashion industry is seasonal.' So, what happened, of course, is that the work went off shore to the cheaper markets.

Mr Ferguson: Name them.

Mr S.J. BAKER: You can go back to the reference I made previously. We know what this Government is all about. It wants to control the system; it wants its union mates to be able to control the system. Well, it is not on. In terms of the certified agreements, here again they can be ruled out by the Industrial Commission on the basis that they are not in the public interest. We all know that; that is under the industrial law of this State. However, we know also that any union has a right to intercede in any agreement. How fair is that? Some unions that have nothing to do with the industry or the firm that we are talking about have a natural right to intercede. We know that, given the way the Industrial Commission is currently run, it is impossible to introduce industrial agreements for the benefit of employers and employees if the union movement does not agree. That will not be tolerated, now or in the future.

As to the improved capacity for the Industrial Commission to deal with unfair contracts, we all know with contracts between two parties the only time that there should be a right of intercession relates to (a) if all the facts were not known at the time the contract was broken, or (b) the contract is broken in some material sense. They are the conditions. What our friends want in this particular circumstance is the right to keep mulling over contracts on the basis that they may have affected one or other parties unfairly, but those contracts were entered into with full knowledge. We will reach the ludicrous situation that if people are bidding for their labour, particularly in the building industry, and they underbid another competitor they then have the right to

go along to the Industrial Commission and say, 'This is unfair. I am only going to get $3 an hour or $5 an hour out of this because I deliberately underbid knowing that I had a right of recall to the Industrial Commission to say it was an unfair contract.' That is not on.

It is only where contracts have been entered into and all the facts have not been known or, as I said, a contract has been breached in some material sense that we should have some means of reparation. They are some of the major conditions in the Bill which I find totally objectionable. I presume everybody in this Chamber at some stage in their childhood stood on a street corner selling papers or delivered material. I sold shoes at the age of 14. I got 10 shillings an hour and it cost me two shillings to get in and out to work every day. I got eight shillings for four hours' work. That was terrific; I had a job. I got something out of it, something I would not have had if I did not have that work available. When I stood on street corners selling newspapers the remuneration was even less but I did not regret or resent the fact that I was getting very little money.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Look how you ended up!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Exactly right, look at how I've gone. I presume that every member in this Chamber at some stage has worked because they have wanted to work at a price which they felt was fair and reasonable under the circumstances, yet this Government wants to change all the rules. It wants to cut out all the people who deserve a chance. It wants to stop the young people. It wants to stop the pensioners from earning an extra buck, and I find that quite insidious.

In relation to other amendments in the Bill there are some matters that have been canvassed by the Deputy Leader, and those comments I support. In relation to the procedural or technical adjustments to the Act relating to the power to rule out a particular action being taken in the Industrial Commission for an inspector to deem that an agreement should have been reached or a compromise should have been reached prior to the matter being brought before the commission, again, I find quite unpalatable. The ultimate arbiter should be the commission. I have had grave reservations on many occasions about how the commission operates, but that is not what I intend to address tonight. Those particular rules are not assisting employers in this State.

We know what happens in relation to unfair dismissals: it is just too costly to pursue them. Even if you are right you are wrong. Under the way that section 31 operates in the commission at the moment, employers have very little option but to settle, even when there has been criminal activity involved on behalf of the employee, which is not in many cases but it has happened in a number of cases which have been brought to my attention. When there is criminality involved the employer finds it better to settle and get out of it rather than go through the increased expense of pursuing the claim. I find the Bill objectionable. There are one or two items which I would support but, overall, the Bill takes us backwards. I reject the legislation.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the House to sit beyond midnight.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): The member for Mitcham, in his miserable contribution, said that he knew of 12 people who had lost their jobs as a result of the outworker legislation. That is very typical—no names, no industries involved, just a blanket 12 people who were earning this mythical $12 an hour and, because of the outworker legislation, they had lost their jobs.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, the number was 20, not 12.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Well, Sir, that just goes to show that the member for Mitcham increases the number as time goes on. I know of 42 who actually came to me and expressed their eternal gratitude for the outworker legislation.

Mr Becker: Name them!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It just goes to show exactly the way members of the Liberal Party can twist and squirm as it suits them when it comes to industrial legislation. I wondered why the Liberal Party was opposing this legislation in its totality. The penny dropped when I received a letter from the Housing Industry Association. The envelope was addressed to me but, when I opened it, it read, 'Dear Colleen'. I thought 'Well, I've had a sex change operation!' But I looked at the top and it was addressed to Mrs C.F. Hutchison, Parliament House, North Terrace. The Housing Industry Association cannot even get that right. There we had a blackmail letter which said, in effect, that if this legislation went ahead, especially in relation to clause 14—which refers to section 39 and review of unfair contracts—it would do everything in its power to have it repealed. It states:

> Our opposition will continue unabated and with all the resources at our disposal. We do not seek to openly campaign against the Government, but if all other efforts fail we will have no other choice. This could include extending our campaign up to and including the next State election. Our opposition and campaign will cease immediately the Government withdraws the Bill or repeals it (should it pass through Parliament). Yours faithfully, Don Kennett, Chief Executive Officer.

I know Don Kennett and the Housing Industry Association of old. You, Sir, when you were making your contribution, said you could not understand why the Opposition was opposing it in total. There is a quid in it for the Liberal Party for its election coffers; if it opposes the Bill the HIA will levy all its members to give some money to the Liberal Party. It has done so in the past. It did so in the 1982, 1985 and 1989 elections. It gave money to the Liberal Party. Why should it give money to the Liberal Party?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to sit down. I ask the member for Hanson to contain himself. If he wishes to enter the debate, I will give him the call, but in the meantime I ask him to show some decorum. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Housing Industry Association should be applauding what this Government has done because, through its policy not only on public

housing but by encouraging people to get into home ownership, it has done more to keep the housing industry afloat than has any other organisation or Government elsewhere in Australia. But the Housing Industry Association has a record of biting the hand that feeds it. Every time the Housing Industry Association has been taken to task for the kind of outrageous letters that it sent to me, by mistake, rather than to my dear friend Colleen. It says it has been misunderstood and taken out of context. The letter is perfectly clear: it is a blackmail letter.

In support of that blackmail, we get the same old tired excuses put up in support of the subcontracting system. There is a view in South Australia, especially in the building industry, that the subcontracting system is the most perfect system in the world. That is stated in the HIA's explanation of its opposition to the clause. We all know that, under the subcontracting system, those people who are not unionised are at the whim of the builder and, when times are bad, the subby pays, and the subby will always pay. When these builders go bust, it is not the builder but the subby who pays. The myth has developed over the years that the South Australian building industry is perfect because we have the subcontracting system.

I remind members that in 1986 when we succeeded in fixing a maximum price throughout the building industry, surprise, surprise, the same old rhetoric was put to the Government that, if we went ahead with it, it would provide the unions with an opportunity to destroy the highly efficient subcontracting system. They say it now and they said it then. They said that it would have a devastating effect on house prices, resulting in an increase of at least 15 per cent and possibly as high as 25 per cent. The percentage figures still remain the same. They said it then: it did not happen. They said that it would decrease the number of houses built: it did not happen. As a result of the stability within the industry, efficiency was increased, and the number of houses built also increased.

We are now getting the same old tired rhetoric. As a result of stabilised prices within the housing industry, especially in respect of public housing, the profit margin for the builder was increased. It increased the take-home pay for the subcontractor, and it kept the price of public housing to a minimum. That is a fact that cannot be disputed, but who was not party to that agreement? The Housing Industry Association was not. The MBA was party to it, all building unions were party to it and the Housing Trust was party to it, but the HIA could not bring itself to come in and sign that agreement, yet it benefited; it still wanted to keep the subbies under its thumb.

That is one of the main reasons why house prices have remained as low as they have, because there are still many unscrupulous builders out there who will take advantage of subcontractors and, when times are bad, subcontractors do not work 40 hours or even 45 hours a week: they work 50 and 60 hours a week to meet the deadlines and requirements of builders. That is the system that the lot opposite want to support. They have received their riding instructions from the HIA, they have been assured that they will get a substantial amount of money for the next election campaign, and they are paying the price. Let just one member opposite stand up—we have got one and we always get a fool.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Napier imputes to me improper motives by suggesting that I have been blackmailed and/or bribed. I have not and would not even countenance such a situation. It is an inference with my privilege—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot accept that as a point of order. I believe that the member for Napier was referring to members as a group, and I cannot accept that as a point of order. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. What I have said in regard to the HIA is undisputed fact, and I would encourage any member opposite to prove what I have said about the HIA and subcontractors is not true. Certainly, I would listen intently to any such claim. How could an organisation which purports to represent most of the major builders in this State and which has links with its Federal counterpart write a letter, signed by its chief executive officer, to this Government and to members on both sides of the House saying that, if we proceed with clause 14, which amends section 39 and which relates to review of unfair contracts, it will do everything at its disposal to fight against that provision right through to the next election.

The member for Murray-Mallee in his innocence, foolishness or stupidity—I do not know which, and he can pick whichever one he wants—will then say that he cannot believe that the Liberal Party will demand a price for that support, when we know that it received financial support in 1982, 1985 and 1989. I imagine that, given the way the HIA is organising itself, its contribution to the election campaign of the Liberal Party will be substantial.

When you, Sir, spoke on this Bill, you said that we would not know what the fate of this Bill would be once it left this Chamber, and I know that I cannot refer to that in my speech. Again, it worries me that a group of non-democratically elected people can then have the final say-so about the plight of those subcontractors in the building industry and, perhaps more importantly, those people who are out there as outworkers in this State and who currently have little or no protection whatsoever.

I do not want to canvass some of the comments that you, Sir, made in relation to that, but the figures themselves are frightening as to the way in which the numbers have increased in three short years. It has been identified by the ABS that there has been an increase from 93 000 in April 1988 throughout Australia to 112 400 in March 1992—an increase of 19 300. In South Australia, the figure has gone from 4 000 in April 1989 to 7 800 in March 1992—almost double, and an increase of 3 800. Those people have not deliberately chosen to leave a factory environment or an office environment to go and work at home.

Mr Lewis: Yes, they have.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: They have not deliberately chosen to do that. The fool over there says, 'Yes, they have,' but we know, and the intelligent people in this Parliament and in this community know, that economic circumstances have forced them to go from the factory and office environment to work in their own homes. They are away from the protection that they have

in an office or factory, and they are there, in the main, at the whim of employers.

I am not making this up. The facts are there: most people who work in the home environment are victimised and used by their employer. They use their own homes as an office; they use their own furniture, power and telephones; and their wages are being driven further and further down as more and more people go into that kind of working environment. I am not making it up: that is an undisputed fact and has been documented, not by the Labor Party, not by the Trade Union movement but by those who have no vested interest whatsoever in the matter. People have written screeds about the way that those people are being used—

Mr Hamilton: And abused.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —and abused, as my colleague says—by unscrupulous employers, and there is a need to give them protection. However, the Liberal Party says that it is a joke and that they do not need that protection. The member for Mitcham invents those mythical 20 people who were earning $12 an hour (lucky things; I would like to know what they were doing) and who suddenly lost their job when the Minister in this Government put in some basic protection for these people who could be classified as outworkers.

I have long learnt that the Liberal Party opposite has no conscience when it comes to dealing with ordinary people. As I said, where there is a quid in it for them, they react accordingly, and they do all the right things and mouth all the right words, as their masters outside ask them to do. There is a price for everything. There is a story that anyone can be bought. The Liberal Party happens to sell its allegiance very cheaply.

As I said, the outworker system, at least as far as we have gone, offers some form of protection. This is taking it just a little further so that those who are in that system have the same rights as those who work at GMH, anywhere in the Public Service and in the factory or office environment. That is all that it says: they have the same rights as others. There is nothing draconian about it. We have not bowed to union pressure; we have done this on grounds of justice and equity, about which the Deputy Leader, the wealthy $4 million chemist, would not know. It is a wonder that the Deputy Leader can even mouth the platitudes that he sometimes does in this House.

This legislation is nothing major; it just tries to give a bit of dignity and self respect to those who are working outside the factory environment. It also gives the subbies a little more support than they are getting now from unscrupulous builders.

If Liberal Party members think that this is so bad, I suggest that, rather than oppose this legislation completely, they should circulate some amendments that would suit them and be in tandem with the Kennett type of industrial legislation that they keep telling us is so good for Victoria and will be so good for South Australia when they get into Government.

But no, if they do that, they will signal to the people of South Australia that they do not care a damn about ordinary working people and that their sole aim, if they got into Government, would be to destroy the trade union movement. They do not fool me; they do not fool the community; I am sure they do not fool the trade union movement; and hopefully they will not fool those idiots in the Upper House.

[Midnight]

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): What a load of garbage! It is what we would expect from the member for Napier. We recognise that members opposite, particularly the member for Napier, would grovel to the BLF and turn their backs on the average first home builder and first home buyer. The first home builder can get lost as far as the Government and the member for Napier are concerned; they are not the slightest bit interested. They want to push up house prices and make it more difficult—and the member for Napier leaves the Chamber now because he cannot take it.

My colleague the Deputy Leader has addressed a number of issues relating to this Bill about which we are particularly concerned. I want to refer to only two. The first relates to unfair contracts. We learn that this Bill provides measures that are complementary to the Commonwealth Act. We know about the Commonwealth Act. Go out and ask subcontractors and home builders about the Commonwealth legislation and see how they feel about that. There is considerable opposition to that legislation, and a lot will be seen over the next few months in regard to that opposition as more people become involved in mounting that campaign. I am particularly disturbed to find that the State Government is now introducing supporting legislation. Regrettably for the people of South Australia, this State legislation is even more draconian than the amendments passed by the Federal Government.

The member for Napier has referred to the representation that has been made to the Government and to all members of this House by the Housing Industry Association. I for one support very strongly the submission made by that organisation. Thank goodness we have an organisation such as the HIA in South Australia to stick up for those who want to build their own home, for those who want to be subcontractors, for those who want to participate in the building industry and do it their way rather than being told what to do day after day by the unions in this State and by this Government.

The effect of clause 24 (39) will seriously damage the the housing industry; it will sharply increase housing prices in South Australia; and it will create housing shortages through a big drop in housing affordability. Let the Minister get up and deny that that will happen as a result of this legislation. It will also cause the best world practice standards now available through the subcontract system in the industry to sink to the worst world standards. It seems that the intention of this Bill is to aspire to the lowest common denominator in performance and productivity. Of course, that is what this Government is all about; we have come to realise this with each new legislative measure it has introduced.

The member for Napier has referred to the submission made by the HIA, and I want to refer to it as well. As it has indicated, it is vehemently opposed to the proposed amendments for a number of reasons, including the fact that it will provide unions with the opportunity to destroy the highly efficient subcontract system. It will have a devastating effect on house prices, and it is suggested that

we can expect an increase of at least 15 per cent and possibly as high as 25 per cent.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The honourable member opposite can laugh about it. He is obviously not the slightest bit interested in his constituents, including young people in his electorate who are interested in building their own home. This measure will also decrease the number of houses built in the State. It will throw people out of work in housing-related industries. As the housing industry has said, it is basically unfair as it penalises and discourages success by dragging efficient people down to the lowest common denominator. And, as I said earlier, let the Minister get up and deny that.

Finally, the Industrial Relations Commission is not the forum to deal with contractual issues: these are judicial matters and should not be dealt with in a commission which arbitrates, mediates and conciliates. Let us look at how the unions will use this legislation. The unions will have the vehicle to bring before the Industrial Relations Commission applications to have housing subcontract agreements varied on the ground that they are harsh, unfair or against the public interest.

Let us consider the legacy of union intervention in the commercial construction industry. Where building unions have been successful in imposing industrial/commercial conditions on housing sites, on-site labour costs have been 40 to 60 per cent higher than in non-unionised housing—and I am sure the present Government would be pleased with those sorts of statistics. Should building unions succeed in having any one subcontract overturned by the commission, enormous pressure would be placed on home building companies to make sure they adopt the revised contract as the industry standard.

The whole basis on which the housing industry has operated will have been turned on its head. Home buyers could not expect to be offered a fixed price contract without having to pay extra to cover the possibility of subcontracts being varied by the commission. In this State, builders will no longer be sure that their contracts with subcontractors will not be reviewed by the commission and varied.

As a result of that, every householder and home builder in this State is vulnerable. People building their own home in this State will be faced with the unpleasant reality that, to remove the prospect of contracts being challenged in the commission, they will need to engage subcontractors on union imposed terms, including no ticket, no start. That will suit the Government down to the ground but, again, if this legislation is passed we are turning our back on home builders in this State and making it more difficult for those people, while the Government will continue to grovel to the BLF and other unions in this State.

As far as I am concerned, it is not on. The legislation is totally unfair, there is no doubt about that. The competent and efficient subcontractors in the housing industry, because of their productivity, have always been and will always be an asset to the industry, and the remuneration they receive is based on their performance. This is why housing is highly competitive and affordable, and long may that be the situation in this State.

However, a tradesman wishing to leave the commercial or industrial sector of the industry and to enter the housing sector would find it quite difficult for two reasons, particularly: first, the skills used in the two sectors are different, especially in the carpentry trade, if I can use that as an example; and, secondly, the attitudinal change that is necessary is very difficult for some to cope with; for example, changing from being paid for time spent on the job to being paid on the basis of what one produces to a certain quality. Many cannot make that change.

The Opposition certainly supports the stance that has been taken by the Housing Industry Association. As I said earlier, we in this State are very fortunate to have such an association representing home builders in South Australia. It is no surprise at all that the Government would want to turn its back on these people. Certainly, the Liberal Party will not do that and, in fact, if this legislation is successful, on coming to Government I can give an assurance, since I know that the Leader has already given an assurance to the industry, that at least this section of the legislation would be revoked.

I feel very strongly about this issue, as do my colleagues on this side of the House. The member for Napier can grin like a Cheshire cat as much as he likes, but we will continue to oppose this legislation, because we believe that the majority of people in the State would have us do just that.

I want to refer briefly to another part of the legislation that relates to minimum standard safety net provisions. This, of course, deals with family leave, and is an area of particular concern to me. It is something which I have raised before in this House on a number of occasions and which I will continue to raise, because I believe it is essential that the appropriate safety net provisions be provided in legislation for making family leave appropriate. As the second reading explanation states:

> As for the present, large numbers of women workers are today in the work force, combining paid work with continued responsibility for care of children.
>
> One in three mothers in the labour force have school age children, almost two-thirds of mothers with primary school age children are now in the work force, and families with children with two working parents now outnumber families with one.

I am very much aware of my responsibility in the family and community services shadow portfolio for the concerns of single parents, whether they be mothers or fathers, who have the responsibility of bringing up children by themselves and the difficulties they face at times when it is necessary for them to take leave. I believe strongly that it is necessary that appropriate time be given for maternity or paternity leave, and I have no objection to those matters being introduced into legislation. It is a matter of either placing them in legislation or dealing with them as award conditions or as private enterprise bargaining agreements, but I believe very strongly that they should be recognised.

In fact, I would go further than that. I am concerned that recognition is not being given to the situation where parents—in particular, single parents—find it extremely difficult to be able to take leave to care for their children. I have a motion on the Notice Paper that will be debated tomorrow. It is not appropriate for me to refer to that motion in detail at this stage, but it emanates from a report that has just been prepared on caring for sick children and how working mothers cope. It relates to the

work of a national women's consultative committee and Children's Services Office consultative committees performed in this area this year, an area that I support strongly.

I recognise that we have reached the stage where, in some cases, parents are forced to lie about the situation in which they find themselves to enable them to take time off to care for their sick children. I think that is abhorrent and totally inappropriate, and I believe very strongly that action should be taken to cover people in those circumstances. So, I support that part of the Bill but, as I have said, I particularly oppose clause 14, which amends section 39, and which I have mainly addressed tonight, as I oppose other areas that have been addressed so well by my colleague the Deputy Leader.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I did not intend to enter this debate until, while sitting upstairs, I listened to the puerile nonsense of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. If ever a man was born a silvertail, it is the Deputy Leader. He typifies those people who do not have a clue about what life is like. I do not know how much letterboxing he does in his electorate. I suggest the only time he does it is at election time when he wants to con people into voting for him.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The fool opposite wants to continue. He really is a fool. He has had his say. He sat down five minutes short of his time, but he still wants to interrupt and be rude. That is typical of those silvertails opposite. Let us get back to the issue. Members opposite rarely go out and letterbox their electorate. As the House knows, I letterbox my electorate and I talk to people; I meet people who are in my electorate.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I challenge any of the clowns opposite, including the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who continue to interrupt to come with me to my electorate. I knocked the Deputy Leader off in 1982; he has never come down there again, and he is not likely to. The fact of the matter is that there are hundreds of people who are being exploited by low wages—-if they can be called wages; they are a pittance—-provided to them through these organisations that get them out to letterbox. I see them at all hours of day and night. If members opposite think they are going out to walk the dog and get a bit exercise they are bigger fools than I thought they were. That is not the case, as we all know. The overwhelming majority—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: You have had your say, belt up. Those members opposite would not have a clue, because I know from talking to those people out there that the reason they go out letterboxing and putting out these pamphlets is, in the main, to supplement their pension. That is what it is all about. It is not that they want to go out and get the exercise at all. Are they not entitled to reasonable compensation for the amount of time they put in?

Let me remind members opposite of what happens. They get a great bundle of pamphlets or leaflets, they sit home and they fold them up hour after hour. Then, when that is completed, they go out and letterbox them. I do not know how many letter boxes members opposite do in an hour. But I know the number I can do in an hour. What do these people get? They get a pittance. Members opposite know that. They know damn well that these people are being exploited and the reason why they are being exploited is that they know that is the only sort of work they can get out in the community.

I do not know what it is like in the silvertail area in the eastern suburbs, but I certainly know what it is like in the working class areas in the western suburbs, where they are out all the time. I see the leaflets, chock-a-block—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I wish he would get back in his hole. I see the number of leaflets going out into the electorate. On weekends those people are out all the time, in all sorts of weather—in rain, hail or stinking hot temperatures. Yet members opposite try to convince us that they do it for exercise. We have that fool from Mitcham with his puerile contribution. When the *Hansard* is printed I will show it to a chap who lives not far from me. He is in his 70s and a real battler. Yet, we have this absolute fool opposite who says they go out because they want to get exercise. That is absolute nonsense. The honourable member is a bigger clown than I ever thought he was.

Then we have these people on the other side who talk about their concerns for women. What a joke! I think we are getting close to 100 years of women's suffrage in this State. We have people like the member for Coles standing up and saying wonderful things that sound nice and rosy to try to get a bit of support in the community. But when it comes to Bills such as this, which provide decent working conditions for women, what do we find? We find the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—the silvertail—who says he rejects the Bill completely. There is not one thing in the Bill that he can support.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: He has had his say but he keeps interrupting. He still cannot make his point. I heard what the Deputy Leader said. He cannot cop it; he is like Paddy's dog: he dishes it out but he cannot cop it.

Let me remind him of these provisions. There is family leave; allowing access to the industrial umpire for clerical out workers working at home; allowing the industrial umpire to ensure that women can work in dignity and not topless; allowing individual women workers the right to challenge an unfair contract; and new provisions for certified industrial agreements.

That is what it is all about: to protect those people in working class areas who, because of their particular circumstances, because they are sole parents or single mothers, in the main have to work at home because that is the only work they can do. I have been around, knocking on doors, and these people say, 'Mr Hamilton, come in. I want to have a bit of a talk about conditions.' For many years I have argued the need for these people to have decent conditions, to which they are certainly entitled. Imagine sitting down doing a thousand leaflets, folding them up and then going out and letter-boxing them, and work out how much they get. Very little for the time they put in. I suggest that members opposite would not do it, that is for sure, and nor would they want any member of their family to do it.

Mr S.J. Baker: I do it for free.

Mr HAMILTON: I will just ignore that clown. The longer he is here the bigger the idiot he becomes. There is no question about that. He is not concerned about unfair practices; he does not care about that. It is no wonder he was unloaded in the manner he was by his own people because of his stupid and inane responses. His knowledge of the industrial arena is abysmal to say the least. We know that increasing numbers of women are working at home. I know my colleagues have mentioned these facts but I want to read them again into *Hansard*. The proportion of all employers working at home is growing. In April of 1989 in Australia there were 266 600; that was 3.5 per cent. In March 1992 there were 307 900; that was 4 per cent. This comprised 6.4 per cent of all employed women and 2.3 per cent of all employed men. This is an increase of 41 300 in three years. That is in this country. I suggest there are those—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: If you want to rabbit on you will get your chance later on. The facts of the matter are that there are employers who will exploit those people who they know are looking for some form of remuneration or some additional income to supplement their family income. They are being exploited and exploited in a very poor fashion. When we look at the average gross earnings of employees in March of this year we see that working at home paid $279. The average of all employees in February 1992 was $507.90. Here is another clear illustration of the difference between those people who are working at home and how they are exploited.

It is fine for members opposite to say, 'Well, they choose to work at home.' In many cases they have no option at all but to take whatever work is available and work from their home so that they can assist their families. I do not know how many sole or single parents other members have in their electorate but I know how many are in mine, and I have in my electorate of Albert Park one of the highest ratios of retired people.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I will ignore the fool opposite. Many of those people I see in the early hours of the morning, in the rain, their baskets chock-a-block full, or carrying big carry bags on their shoulders, lumping these leaflets around on their shoulders and getting $3 an hour. One could suggest that it is not enough to compensate for the footwear. I listened to the member for Heysen rabbiting on about costs and about the building industry and the contract system. I have a long memory about the building industry and the actions that the HIA took many years ago against the Trade Union movement.

Their actions were in the contract system. They want the cheapest they can get and, when we talk about cheapness in many of those contractual arrangements, from what I have seen in so many areas you get what you pay for. If you want quality, you have to pay for it. However, in many cases, with contract systems we receive complaint after complaint at our electorate offices with a request for assistance where contractors cut corners in these areas. That is why contractors are used. For example, I have seen many homes, particularly in the West Lakes area in recent years, where contractors have been used. People have complained bitterly to me about the poor quality of work that has been carried out. These people come back time after time and say, 'Look, I just cannot get anywhere.' It takes so much time and effort. They have often said to me, 'I wish to hell that I had not opted for these cheap contract arrangements because we have paid more than it is worth.'

Further, I remember between 1979 and 1982 when we had these contract arrangements in South Australian hospitals. I refer particularly to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is very dear to my heart, where a Liberal Government brought in contractors, but SACON workers (or their equivalent at the time) had to go in after they finished and clean up the mess because of their poor quality of work. Yet members opposite say they believe in the contract system. Suddenly they go quiet.

Let me refer to the *Australian* of 10 November. The member for Heysen spoke about the costs that would be imparted onto people out in the community, with his so-called concerns and crocodile tears about the costs for people who want to build their own home. On page 2, an article states:

> The Leader of the Federal Opposition faces a major row with the building industry amid fears he will reject advice to amend Fightback to remove indirect taxes on factories and office blocks. It is understood Dr Hewson has serious concerns about changing Fightback to meet the demands of the $30 billion commercial building industry.

So much for their concern. They know that, under Federal Liberal Party policies, those costs will be passed on to the building industry, and that will flow on throughout a whole range of areas.

I do not want to delay the House, but I will refer to one matter in the Bill with respect to ensuring the ability of the commission to regulate or prohibit the performance of work where the employee is required to work nude, partly nude or in transparent clothing. Many members would have read that one of the hotels frequented by members of the Labor Party had this sort of situation. It was something that was not known to me, but quite clearly many members of the Labor Party, including me, objected very strongly to this sort of arrangement. For my part, if this arrangement still continues—and I am told that it does—I will not go back to the Colac Hotel. I think it is a shameful sort of thing and, as a member of the Labor Party, I am not proud of the fact that this practice has come into effect.

I hope that anyone who is concerned about this issue will not frequent that hotel when the occasion arises. I made clear through the local branch to which I belong by way of resolution that we totally oppose such conditions because the bottom line is that not one of us in this place would like to see our wife or daughter involved or working under those conditions. It is to the eternal shame of the people involved that they have allowed the situation to continue at the Colac Hotel. It gives me no pleasure to put that on the record, but I do not walk away from the issue that women are being exploited in those areas and when I hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition say that there was not one good thing in the Bill, not one thing with which he could agree, he is saying *de facto* that he supports such a proposition and will allow it to continue. He is saying that there is nothing in the Bill he would support, yet by that statement he is saying to me and to the women in the community that he will allow the situation to continue in South Australia. Let him squirm out of that or get away

from it because I know and he knows that he cannot do so.

I listened intently to what the Deputy Leader said. He reckons that I have no idea; but all too often we have seen the Deputy Leader twist and squirm. As someone said to me once, he would hide behind a corkscrew. I thought that that was most uncharitable but, nevertheless, by his statements in this House that he finds no good in the Bill, he is saying to members of the House that he believes that women should be allowed to continue to work under such conditions. I refer to the matter of a simpler process for recovery of unpaid award wages. If members are in contact with their electorate they would know of the number of people coming in complaining about trying to recovery unpaid wages. I support the Bill. I know that members opposite will not support it, but nothing is new.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I do not support this legislation. There are aspects of it which have not been dealt with by any other speaker to date. The point I make first in that regard is to draw attention to the fact that, where the legislation proposes on the grounds of compassion to provide unpaid family leave to members of the family, it is taking from award provisions for large employers and placing into legislation a practice which small employers and the rural community has taken for granted. Commonsense prevails. In law, there is no necessity to compel an employer to provide this facility. What it will do, of course, is destroy a large number of small businesses, which rank in the order of thousands. If a business has only one employee, and if we entrench in law—not in an award, but in law—a provision such that to break that law is a criminal offence, a provision which requires that the individual employee must be given unpaid family leave, it smacks of the kind of ridiculous tommyrot of which this legislation provides a number of examples.

In this instance, consider the situation that occurs where the law says for whatever reason that the employee, being the only employee in the business, or even if there are only two or three (a handful), must be given the time off at their request. What happens to the business itself? How does that business survive? If it is only a matter of a few days or, on the other hand, if it is a matter of months, the problem is enormous. The business simply has to close its doors if it is only for a few days because it is not possible to replace that employee with someone who understands what has to be done in many instances to get the job done in a way that ensures that no damage is done to the reputation of the business or its ability to provide a service to its customers, whether that is in the form of sales or a service.

If it is for a matter of months, then the employer has the unfortunate obligation, duty or necessity to train someone to do the work. In those circumstances there is an economic loss that could be so great as to cause the business to fail. I know of a number of instances where that will happen if this becomes law. Another and an even worse aspect, in my judgment, of this provision in law is that, because an employee can simply say, 'I want unpaid family leave from now until then'—whatever the time may be—the employer must grant it and then employ someone else.

I now want to focus upon what happens to that individual employed presumably on a casual basis when the employee, taking unpaid family leave or any other form of unpaid leave they can demand under these provisions, returns. That poor unfortunate soul has to be put off. They lose their job, yet they were willing to do that work for that interim period. They did not seek, nor were they provided, with any of the so-called benefits, and they are on costs on all the jobs. If employers finds themselves in the unfortunate position of being unable to meet the cost, they lose their business and, if they have money invested in stock, if it is a small retailing business, in law, that is just too bad; they should not have bothered to go into business.

I do not know how we get big oak trees if we do not start with small acorns. Someone somewhere has to make a judgment and take a step in faith to establish such a business for it to be able to grow to become a business employing a large number of people sufficient to enable it as a business from within its resources of personnel, to provide the buffer that is then available to enable any one employee to take such leave without pay.

The provision as it stands is unnecessary because it can be included in awards. It is ridiculous in that it will do the very opposite to what everyone in this Chamber seems to be saying at present, namely, that we want to create jobs, restore employment opportunities and make South Australia great again. No way is that possible by pursuing things in this fashion.

To illustrate the kinds of things to which I have drawn attention, let me just mention the anger which is felt at present by teachers and other Government employees who come onto staff to replace someone who has taken leave without pay, when that person returns to their position in the Government service—when that teacher comes back, for instance. Since there are very few positions available in the Education department these days (much fewer than there were 10, 15 or 20 years ago) and since only a small percentage of the total number of people who train to enter the profession and who have the educational qualifications are involved, the young teacher (very often the *creme de la creme*) or the teacher out of work who replaces the teacher taking the unpaid leave finds themselves simply shunted off when that teacher returns from their leave.

That makes them very angry. They are the flotsam and jetsam in the system, being shunted around at the will and whimsy of the other employees who have permanent jobs. That is very unjust, in my opinion. We only have to look at the consequences this provision will have for someone who is running a small subcontracting business, for someone who is operating a couple of milk rounds (where they employ another person to do one of them) to see the ridiculous situation to which I refer and the anger that is felt by the person who comes in as the temporary to relieve the person who has taken the leave.

Another aspect which is very distressing indeed is that, on occasions, when people who take this unpaid family leave for whatever reason, decide to do so in order to help a friend (and not for family purposes) they are indeed out moonlighting. They were probably getting a slice of the profits, and I know of instances where this

has happened in the Public Service; an employee has taken unpaid leave for five or six months to help a spouse, a relative or a close friend to establish a business or to relieve a close friend in the operation of the business, leaving their Public Service post and making money out of it. They have made more money taking the unpaid leave employment than they would otherwise have obtained had they stayed in their job. They have done that selfishly because, on return, they displace the person who was employed as a temporary in their role during their absence.

Of course, the unfortunate consequence of our including such a provision in law—and this is what the Minister needs to bear in mind, at least as much as the other matters to which I have drawn his attention—will be that not just hundreds, not just a few thousand but thousands upon thousands of people employed in small business from now on will not be employed as permanent employees; they will all be employed at casual rates. No employer in their right mind, as a small business operator, will employ anybody on other than a casual basis from now on, if this becomes law. I know I will not. There is no way known that I would risk having the unfortunate consequences loaded onto me or any business I was associated with; I would not risk having to hold open a position for someone who was taking their right in law to unpaid leave where I as an employer could not negotiate with them the amount of leave needed after learning of the reason why they needed it.

In any instance in which I have been confronted with the necessity to provide leave to someone who has worked for me or for a business in which I have had an interest, I have always listened to their suggestion, never denied their request and been able to reach a satisfactory accommodation with them. I suppose that is because I have never employed anybody in a permanent job where their total payment has not included bonuses—bonuses not only for producing an income or an output, however their work is measured, greater than was estimated would be obtained from their efforts but also for their saving of other resources that they have to use in the course of doing that work, such as keeping down the costs of repairs and maintenance or using fewer production factor inputs in whatever they are doing. I have always done that, so I have always been able to talk to them as human beings, regardless of how many may have been employed in that business, whatever it has been from time to time.

In times of labour shortage, sensible, responsible employers are always able to get their work done, and they are still sought after by people who wish to obtain work, whereas unreasonable and stingy employers who are unable to provide that kind of consideration lose their best staff and their best brains. Their businesses, therefore, cannot sustain profitability and they eventually fail either by simply going broke or by being taken over.

There are other measures in this legislation which I find equally ridiculous and about which I could talk at some length. However, I make plain that much of what the Bill proposes to place in law can and should be included in arrangements between employers and employees. This proposal makes the labour market in this State so rigid, inelastic and impossible for employers to manoeuvre that, if they have any wit at all, they will simply take their capital and jobs to a friendlier environment where they are exposed to far less rigidity and a more elastic atmosphere in which they can make satisfactory arrangements with the people who work in the enterprises that they establish and manage. It is regrettable that many of the arrangements that are being made at present in contract will extend for three or four years, because that will prevent the kinds of reforms that we will introduce upon being elected to government from having effect and benefit to the South Australian economy until we reach our second term.

The last thing I would say about all this legislation is that it is unnecessary if only the Minister would use his wit and the wisdom of industrial sociologists and economists. If, instead of bringing in this kind of draconian legislation that has its origins in the inverted snobbery of earlier this century and last century and in the exploitative approach that was taken by employers towards their work force during the Industrial Revolution, the Minister would put that aside and consider how best to secure the most rapid expansion of the State's economy and the greatest possible worker satisfaction in the jobs that they do, we would be able to get somewhere.

For example, I refer to the preparation and presentation of legislation which provides incentive to employers and employees alike to establish an employee share ownership plan within the business, whatever it is, and then the workers, whoever they may be, are at once providing a service to the enterprise as well as benefiting not only from the salary wages—or whatever other term you use to describe the emolument. They are at once obtaining reward for effort on that basis, as well as a dividend for the investment they have made in the shares that they possess.

There are plenty of ways to provide incentives for people to take shares in businesses and to ensure that everybody then looks at the main game. The main game is to make sure that our businesses can compete not just with each other in South Australia but on the world market for their products—especially on the world market—whatever they may be, whether it is flowers, fruit, wool, wheat or, more particularly, though, manufactured articles to which we have added value. That is the kind of proposal that the Government should be bringing before this Chamber now, not this kind of nonsense which will destroy the capacity of South Australia to attract capital and destroy the capacity of this State's economy to regenerate confidence and rebuild jobs for the people who are currently unemployed.

What has been done over the past 10 years by this Government has been very destructive. Indeed, the way in which the Government has exacerbated the Federal Government's mess has been wicked: it has generated a situation in which over 40 per cent of young people who would otherwise take work if it were available cannot find it. Many of these young people are not participating in the job market because they know it is hopeless. But the fact is they could and should be employed, if the right environment were provided for them. This Bill takes us in exactly the opposite direction. It is troglodyte; it is the dreams of troglodytes; it is in no small measure destructive, rather than in any way constructive, of those prospects; and it simply reinforces the strength and the relationship of the unions in the labour force and between

those unions and the inane halfwits who depend on them in this place.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): As far as I am concerned, this Bill is a mixed bag. My colleagues have canvassed at some length the provisions in it that they find obnoxious. Nevertheless, there are some clauses in the Bill which are very much worthy of support, and I intend to outline the reasons why I do support them.

There are three principal elements to the Bill: first, the provision for certified agreements; secondly, a range of minimum safety net provisions; and, thirdly, a range of technical amendments, some of which are non-contentious. I should like to address myself to what I described as the minimum safety net provisions, which are to be found in clauses 4, 9 and 17. Clause 4 amends the principal Act in respect of the definition of 'out-worker' and includes those who are working, processing or packing articles or materials, those who are performing any clerical service, or those who are either soliciting funds, selling goods or offering services or carrying out advertising or promotional activities.

The definition also defines 'clerical service' as meaning any kind of work usually performed by a clerk, including typing, administrative or computer-based duties. The amending Bill also includes journalistic services and public relations services. That, of course, is a wide range of outwork performed by people at home. I want to express my very strong support for the inclusion of clerical services under minimum standard safety net provisions. I believe that several speakers have already referred to the considerable increase in the number of employees working from home, and I do not wish to be repetitive. However, I think it is important to make the point that, of those employees working at home, the majority, and in some cases the great majority, have no access to superannuation, no access to sick leave, no paid holidays, no workers compensation coverage; and, of that great proportion, there is a strong contrast to their counterparts who are doing identical work within the confines of employers' premises in commerce or industry.

I cannot see why people who are doing identical work at home should not enjoy the same protection as their counterparts who are working on the premises of employers. There is even more reason to ensure that these people who, in the main, are women receive some recognition for the fact that they are not only performing the work but also providing the premises and, in very many cases, providing the capital assets on which the work is performed. In many cases, and increasingly, these assets are word processors and personal computers.

I believe that previous speakers have incorporated into *Hansard* statistics which indicate the increase in the number and proportion of employed people who are engaged in clerical work at home. The dramatic increase that we have seen from 93 000 in Australia in April 1989 to 112 400 in March 1992 is but a minor increase compared with what we are likely to see in the next two decades. There will undoubtedly be an explosion in this kind of home based work, and society and industrial law must accommodate themselves to take account of this dramatic shift.

I believe that it will be comparable in its impact to the shift that occurred in work locations at the outset of the industrial revolution, when workers left agricultural areas and moved in large numbers to the cities, whence they left their homes in the early hours of the day to spend long hours working in the factories. We are now seeing a reversal and the beginnings of an exodus from factory and office situations to home based work. As I said, I believe that industrial law should take account of that.

I am less convinced that we should be including in this outworkers clause those who are distributing articles in mail boxes, because that is not the kind of work that has ever been able to be done on premises; it has always been work that is carried out by individuals on a freelance or casual basis.

Similarly, I am intrigued to see that public relations services performed at home are to be included under this provision. As one whose occupation before entering Parliament was that of a freelance public relations consultant, self-employed and working from home, to me there is not a great deal of justification for including that category under these provisions. I simply established my hourly rate, as I presume most other self-employed home-based public relations consultants do. I had no difficulty in finding clients who were prepared to pay that hourly rate and I negotiated that rate with them. Nevertheless, I support the inclusion of clerical services in the minimum standard safety net provisions of the Bill.

I also support clause 9, which gives the Industrial Commission jurisdiction to regulate the performance of work where the employee is required to work nude or partially nude or in transparent clothing. The notion of people being required to work topless, as the phrase has it, in order to attract custom for the employer is to my mind totally offensive, obnoxious and demeaning. It undermines not only the dignity of the person but the dignity inherent in that kind of work, namely, waitressing.

I fully support the Government in its efforts to ensure that the Industrial Commission is given power to regulate that kind of work and to negotiate awards that do not have as a requirement that people shall work without clothing. I find it totally beyond belief that anyone with any sense of dignity could condone that sort of thing. I therefore want to place on record my full support for clause 9 and for the inclusion of clerical workers in clause 4.

I also want to place on record my very strong support for the lengthy and varied provisions of clause 17 which deal with family leave and part-time work and which ensure that family leave—maternity, paternity and adoption leave—is included not just in awards but in the law itself as a minimum standard safety net provision. To my mind, these provisions rank in terms of their fundamental importance with equal pay for equal work and should be part of the law, not negotiable in terms of an award but guaranteed to every worker.

I would go further and say that, until Australian Parliaments recognise that to have a fair and just society the importance of families must be absolutely recognised not by lip service and by rhetoric but by practical action to ensure that people can fulfil their family responsibilities, we will never achieve a fair and just society. We will certainly never provide the kind of

nurturing environment that children need, nor will we recognise the vast emerging need of ageing people for care by members of their families.

The second report of the Select Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying, which was released earlier this year, had as one of its recommendations a suggestion that the Government, employers and industrial bodies investigate the desirability of including bereavement leave as well as compassionate leave in the legislation to enable people to care for the dying. The demography of this State and this nation demands that we face the prospect of that kind of care being an essential part of industrial provisions. Otherwise, there is no way in which society can possibly cope with the massive requirements for care which will emerge in the early years of the next century.

There is no way that we can pay people to undertake this kind of care; it will have to be done by families. Given that it will have to be done by families, there must be recognition in industrial law of the need to provide for that kind of leave. I suppose that, having said that and given the time (namely, 1.5 a.m.), I do not need to go on and labour the point, except to reiterate that since 1907 and the decision of the Harvester judgment, when a minimum wage and standard working hours were set for men, women have had to fit in the best they can—and very often that has not been very well as far as the women are concerned—into a framework that has been designed solely for the industrial convenience of men. The working day, the working week, the notion that this was designed for a man who would support a wife, has been the framework on which this country has based its industrial law. It is time that that framework was adjusted and amended, as we are doing under portions of this Bill, to ensure that the needs of women, children and families are taken into account.

I regret that there are other aspects of the Bill that I cannot support. But, I want to place on record my wholehearted support for those aspects of the Bill to which I have referred in my speech and to say that I believe there will in years to come be widespread recognition and support for the need for even further and greater change. In saying that, I acknowledge that the economic impact of this change has to be taken in account, and I simply conclude by making the point that I find it very sad indeed that so many people in this country are working under such enormous pressure without access to time with their families whilst others have no work at all. We surely can organise society better so that everyone has a purposeful and gainful activity as well as sufficient time to care for and enjoy the company of their families.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I will not speak on all the subjects that I wished to address. However, I will refer to clause 9, which inserts proposed new section 25(1a), which provides:

> The jurisdiction of the Commission includes the ability, by award, to regulate or prohibit the performance of work where the employee is required [and I emphasise 'is required'] to work nude or partially nude, or in transparent clothing.

I find hypocritical some of the arguments that have been put forward by members of the ALP and by some other people who may argue over the years that women should have a right to have control over their own body. That has been argued many times in recent years.

Earlier this year, at the time of the Festival, two French artistes performed in our city clothed only in G-strings and body paint. It caused a lot of controversy and the police were criticised for arresting those people. These actions were carried out in public, where children as well as those adults who might not want to see such performances were placed in a position of having to view it. It was not behind closed doors.

At that time the member for Hanson asked a question of the Government. The question (No. 449) was as follows:

> Is legislation being prepared to amend the Summary Offences Act to exempt persons performing artistic expression of theatrical events in public which are offensive, and, if so, why, and when will it be presented to Parliament?

Eventually he got an answer from the Minister of Education, at that time representing the Attorney-General. The response was this:

> The Attorney-General has been requested by the Premier—

that is, Premier Bannon—

> to consider the issue of possible amendments to the Summary Offences Act 1953 to ensure that *bona fide* theatrical performances and other artistic expressions do not attract prosecution for offending "public decency". An announcement will be made when any decision is taken.

At that time it was quite clear that the Government was saying, through the Premier, the Attorney-General and the Minister of Education, that that was all right. There has never been any announcement; it was just a cover for the day. I wonder where those three people stand, after making that statement? In an article in the *Advertiser* of 13 March 1992, a police officer was reported as saying:

> Obviously there is a place for this type of behaviour in legitimate theatre but the real issue here, in our view, is what is appropriate in a public place.

I agree with that. In my view, the police took the right action over that issue. I think the vast majority of the community will agree with that.

Our topless restaurants have long been an integral and harmless component of Adelaide's hospitality and tourist industry. I mean by that that we have never had any disturbances; there have never been any fights, abuse or anything that would cause concern such as we see at discos and some of the other drinking places we have within the city. The topless restaurants have been harmless. These restaurants have been operating now for 17 years. Community standards have broadened during that time yet this legislation runs contrary to that trend.

Look at the range of TV programs, and I refer in particular to SBS. Programs on SBS show the complete body and sexual acts for anyone of any age to see. Anyone in their home has the opportunity to switch the TV off or change stations—that is true. Likewise, people who may enter a topless restaurant or hotel bar and find it offensive, can walk out; the choice is theirs. Last Saturday night I entered a room where some other people were watching a TV program, which I watched, I do not deny that. It was called 'Bachelor', and there were bare chests, if you want to call them that, of females and males by the dozens and in one incident a lass was sitting on the end of a bed, stark naked, facing the camera, talking to her ex-boyfriend before he went off to be married saying, 'Take me, take me' on a continuing basis. This was at 8.30 at night. What is more offensive?

The TV can be turned off but kids and others, when parents are not home, can turn it on but topless restaurants and bars are frequented by adults and they know before they go in, whether they be men or women, what it is. One night myself and another member of Parliament walked into a place thinking it was a particular venue, but that happened to be a hotel with the same name just down the road. There was a case of two people walking in, not wishing to stay, and leaving. The choice is there for the individual. I just say that freedom of choice exists for both the waitresses and the patrons. Those who do not wish to be involved need not be. There is such a thing as freedom of choice within a democratic society. I will quote a couple of comments made by different people. In the *Sunday Mail* editorial on 9 July 1989, it is stated:

> Labor Party conventions are prone to doing silly things. The problem is that even silly ideas, if approved by the convention, become part of the Party's official policy platform. The now thoroughly discredited policy of 'equal opportunity' in primary school sports is one example of how the Labor machine can compel its MPs to legislate, or regulate, a loopy idea into hard reality.

It went on to say:

> The policies adopted by previous conventions have created an over-regulated society that even a steadfast left-winger like Mr Frank Blevins has been known to refer to as 'the nanny State mentality'. Last weekend, the ALP convention endorsed another loopy policy. It wants topless waitressing banned.

It further stated:

> ...so long as it does not cause harm to others, no one group of people has the right to impose its belief on others. Admittedly, no-one seems particularly content—with some groups claiming we have gone too far, others claiming the opposite.

Further, it stated:

> Topless waitressing may be tasteless. Some may even consider it immoral. But it is sheer nonsense to claim it victimises anyone. It is a practice carried out by consenting adults, largely away from the view of the general public. Regardless of whether or not we, as individuals, approve or disapprove, none of us has the right to ban it—or make it compulsory.

I think that is quite a clear statement of where we stand on that issue. Many women who supported legalising or decriminalising prostitution opposed the idea of banning abortions. Their argument was that they should have control over their own body. Some of those same women, the leaders in this group now, are saying in the case of topless waitresses that they do not have the right to have control over their own body.

Some women could not or would not be successful in that profession because of their build—that is obvious. Some women would not be successful at modelling, because of their build. Some would not be successful as film stars, because of their looks, and the same applies to men. We have places in this city that have 'women only' nights where men go around bottomless, whether it is 'Dazzling Darryl' or whomever they are promoting through advertisements in the newspaper at times. It is a fact. The women who patronise those places are sensible members of society and they believe it is great entertainment. I do not know whether or not it is, but they believe it is.

Last Saturday night in the theatre here, two nude men walked around the stage during a performance. Do we say, 'If you work as a waitress or a waiter, you cannot wear see-through clothing or be partly unclad because it may offend someone'? I understand that. It would offend many. Do we say that it is all right in the theatre but it is not all right serving on tables? Or are we now telling these people that they cannot serve behind the bar but, if they are under a contract as entertainers, the same as those in the theatre, it is okay? We put the people carrying out those performances under a worse situation because they are on the other side of the bar where alcohol may have had an effect on individuals, and they could be up for harassment or handling, and that is unfair and unwarranted. It is indecent, and it would be illegal.

Is that what we are saying—that if one is a theatrical performer and hired as such, one can be topless, bottomless or both? Where are we going in this area? The girls choose to work topless, so I am told by the restaurant people. They say that they seldom have to advertise for staff and they say that Mr Sumner is quoted as saying that the Government should not legislate to prevent people doing things that are not harmful to others. An article written by Rex Jory which referred to Mr Blevins stated:

> The Government will ban topless waitresses in South Australian restaurants. The Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, opposed the motion, and said that it effectively instructed the Government to outlaw topless waitresses. 'I doubt that it can be done in the way set out in the motion.' He said that the principle of the day should be that the Government should not legislate to prevent people doing something which did not harm others. For 20 years the Labor Party has argued that it would not impose on people the moral views of others, yet that who what was intended by the Liquor Trades motion. Labor has decriminalised homosexuality, but if the law had been framed on moral grounds it would not have passed. The same argument applied with abortion, decriminalisation of prostitution, nude bathing and some films, stage shows and reading matter. Mr Sumner urged the convention to condemn topless waitressing but not to require the Government to pass legislation that imposed on people's morals.

That has been the argument of the ALP for 20-odd years and suddenly a group of women took hold of it and said, 'You have to go down this path.' It did not come from the people working in the profession.

In this field, as members can see, I have tried to collect some detail. The times during which they have most custom include the Adelaide Cup, the Festival, the Grand Prix, the football grand final and other such times. The venues are packed—it is part of the tourism industry. It is the same in virtually every city in the world. If members can find where it is not, they can tell me. I would be happy to say that it should all be banned if we did the same with television and the theatre. Members have heard me argue in this place that if we use violence, nudity or whatever as a form of entertainment on television or in the theatres and films, a percentage of society will think that it is reality and we will have a problem with crime. The area of violence has been the subject of my argument in the past. We will not tackle that issue.

In the case of these operations, I found that many of them are not conducted by men, as some people argue, but in fact by females, employing other women. We have some 40 hotels and several restaurants employing topless waitresses. Job losses in the restaurants alone would be in excess of 50 people, including not only waitresses but also chefs, kitchenhands, cleaners and a myriad of administration staff. The proprietors of the businesses would suffer huge losses. I will promote an amendment that provides that we put off the operation of this clause until 1 July 1994. That is a moratorium and gives the business houses the opportunity to change their operations over that time. That is not unreasonable if we

still believe that business should operate in this State and if we believe that these people should get an opportunity.

One group I know has loans totalling $250 000. That is the sort of money they have to find. They have to pay the rent on premises and fill contracts and, if they go to the wall, people lose their jobs. All the business will not automatically go to other restaurants, because they do not provide the sort of entertainment that those clients will accept. Businesses will close down, there will be bankruptcies and loss of jobs. The industry has been going for 17 years, so does it matter if it continues for another couple of years? I hope members will think of that and not think of the liquor union being a ventriloquist perhaps having Premier Lynn Arnold sitting on the ventriloquist's knee saying what they should be doing when deep down another person would prefer to say that he would not want to impose his morals on others.

The clause contains the words 'if they are required to work'. It would be interesting if a potential employee turned up and said, 'I want to work in the restaurant, but will you employ me topless?' They would not be required to do it, but they offer to do it. What would happen then? For a long time one group in society has said that a woman should have control over her body. The ringleaders of this campaign have said that that control is being denied to women on this occasion. We used to say, 'You can look but not touch.' Now we are saying, 'In prostitution you can touch but you cannot look.' That is what this clause provides through the attitude of the people who promote this sort of operation. I oppose the clause, but I would be happy if there was a ban overall, including television and the lot. There would be no qualms from me, because it is unnecessary. If we are going to have it in one field, behind closed doors, people know that, when they walk into these places, it is also behind closed doors.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): I listened with some interest to the contribution of the member for Bragg and it was the first time I have ever heard someone be totally opposed to something and then support small portions of it. In doing that, the member for Bragg again demonstrated his ability to do things that other members cannot do. I am of the view that he again demonstrated tonight his lack of understanding of how industrial matters work and how the legislation itself works and what we intend to do with the Bill.

That was demonstrated when he was trying to scare old women and little kids about the definition of 'employee', because he was trying to convince members that volunteers who work for Meals on Wheels would be roped in. I suggest that, if the member for Bragg looks at the definition of 'employee', he will see that it is as follows:

Any person employed for remuneration in any industry

The member for Bragg knows that people who work for Meals on Wheels are volunteers and are not paid. Consequently, this provision does not mean anything. The member for Bragg made great play of this—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: You did. There you are—you are interrupting again. You want to get some manners. I also want to draw the attention of the member for Mitcham to the provisions on maternity leave that he was referring to in his speech. He was going on about protection of people and he described to this House the sort activities he would get up to if he were to have access to maternity leave, and he might go off and do another job. That is what he was on about. He ought to look at the Bill and find out that, if people are doing something that is not in accordance with their contract of employment, it can be terminated.

What we need to do is to appreciate what the Liberal Opposition is about. Members opposite do not want to see provisions made to protect the weak, the old, the untrained, the young and females who are working in industry in South Australia in very many ways and who are contributing an enormous amount to the State's economy. What they are about is ripping out from underneath those people the rug that supports them. What they want to see is the removal of the standard 38 to 40 hour week; they want to see the removal of overtime, the rostered day off and bereavement leave; they want the employers to be able to set an unlimited number of consecutive days that can be worked without penalties; and they want to be able to force people into collective agreements between employers and employees—and then stand in this place and say that it is innovative and new, not appreciating that it is something which a long time ago caused unions to be formed and which caused an enormous struggle, so that people could get benefits and protection for themselves.

Members opposite even want the ability for employers to be able to fine workers and the ability for employers to stand workers down because they do not have any work just for that moment. We have parallel examples of that right now, where young people working in the catering industry for some of these fast food places are called into work and the boss says, 'I cannot employ you right now, I am not busy, you had better go home.' They are not paid anything. I had that situation described for me only on Monday night by a mother whose young child is working for one of these fast food places.

I will not go on any more, because I think that the Liberals will parade their ignorance in this matter and, when we go into Committee, they will try to remove from this Bill all those protections we are building in to help the small person—the person whom they are running around saying they are trying to protect but whom in reality they are trying to disadvantage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.35 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, 11 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 November

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HOSPITAL FUNDING

108. **Mr BECKER:** How much was spent on upgrading or erecting new hospitals in each of the years ended 30 June 1990 to 1992?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The reply is as follows:

In 1989-90, $43.3 million was spent on upgrading and erecting new hospitals.

In 1990-91, $36 million was spent on upgrading and erecting new hospitals.

In 1991-92, $17.7 million was spent on upgrading and erecting new hospitals.

These figures for acute hospitals include fire upgrading and design fees; however they exclude additional and replacement equipment.

STATE BANK

117. **The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:**

1. How much did the State Bank spend on paintings in each of the years 1983 to 1992?
2. What was the title, artist and price of each painting?
3. Have any paintings been sold and, if so—
   (a) were they valued before sale and, if so, by whom and what was the valuation of each;
   (b) when, at what price and by what method was each sold; and
   (c) have any of the paintings been bought by State Bank staff, directors, or spouses of staff or directors and, if so, which?
4. What arrangements were made by the bank for the curation of the paintings?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The bank's Register of Artworks records the following particulars:

1983	$2 450
1984	$13 815
1985	$54 805
1986	$73 780
1987	$62 355
1988	$239 542
1989	$276 038
1990	$19 000
1991	$3 000
1992	Nil

In addition, Beneficial Finance's Register of Artworks records the following particulars:

1983	$1 000
1984	$2 000
1985	$11 500
1986	$2 200
1987	$2 250
1988	$22 950
1989	$9 830
1990	$15 000

2. The attached schedule provides details of the title, artist and price of each painting.
3. No paintings have been sold.
4. David Dridan was engaged in September 1984 as the bank's art adviser and the curation of the paintings was his responsibility until early 1991. At the present time the Senior Manager, Property Department is responsible for the curation of the paintings.

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
			$
1983	Audae, Bobby	Sweet Days of Summer	100
1983	Audae, Bobby	Carefree Summer Days	100
1983	Crabtree, Chris	Wilpena—The Pound	480
1983	Dowler, Cynthia	Shades of Summer	200
1983	Ellis, C.	Creek Bed	170
1983	Phillips, A. T.	Low Tide	500
1983	Swaffers, D.	Galahs in the Treetops	400
1983	Woods, Maureen	Coorong Flight	500
		Total	$2 450

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
			$
1985	Barton, Hal	Pt. Glorious S.E. Qld	850
1985	Bayly, Clifford	Body Surfing	2 500
1985	Borrack, Jillian	Early Light	950
1985	Cowlam, Keith	Sandhill, Port Noarlunga Dypditch 1	
1985	Cowlam, Keith	Sandhill, Port Noarlunga Dypditch 2	2 600
1985	Dowie, Penny	Kangaroos	2 250
1985	Dridan, David	Manunda Landscape	5 000
1985	Dridan, David	Barramundi Gorge, N.T.	4 250
1985	Dridan, David	On Mount Eba Station, S.A.	5 000
1985	Hadley, Basil	Untitled Yellow landscape	3 000
1985	Hall, Rita	On the Edge of Lake Eyre	1 750
1985	Hinge, John	I Sweep Low, as Dawn Breaks	500
1985	Irving, Tony	Late Spring Afternoon at Evans	3 250
1985	Jack, Kenneth	Streaky Bay	450
1985	Jack, Kenneth	Storm, Mount Sonder and the Finke	4 900

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
			$
1985	Jarvis, Sue	Warrumbungle Range	600
1985	Olsen, John	River Birds and Wattle	10 000
1985	Parsons, Allyson	Early Morning in the Scrub	1 300
1985	Rosenbilds, Jeff	Persian Fair	750
1985	Schubert, Rod	Landscape with Smoke	800
1985	Schubert, Rod	The Murray Walker Flats (4 Panels)	2 800
1985	Sherlock, Max	Over the Dunes	495
1985	Sherlock, Max	Heron Aflight	360
1985	Walls, Bill	Shearing Shed Off Carpenter Road	450
		Total	$54 805

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price $
1987	Apponyi, Silvio	Platypus at Play	2 600
1987	Apponyi, Silvio	Wombat	3 500
1987	Borrack, John	Late Afternoon Eildon	2 500
1987	Bush, Charles	Summer Torrent	1 575
1987	Bush, Charles	The Murray Walkers Flat	1 800
1987	Campbell, Robert	Blinman South Australia	750
1987	Campbell, Robert	Coorong	750
1987	Cole, Marianne	Blue Pot	185
1987	Cole, Marianne	Ceramic Pot	1 850
1987	Cowlam, Keith	Red Beach Bag	2 250
1987	Crooke, Ray	The Village	7 000
1987	Crooke, Ray	Thursday Island	300
1987	Crooke, Ray	Thursday Island	4 750
1987	Curtin, Dee	The Red Kite	1 450
1987	Galloway, Graham	Murray Riverboat Days	525
1987	Guthrie, Tim	Road to Cradle Mountain	1 800
1987	Guthrie, Tim	Mount Emo Creek	2 000
1987	Hadley, Basil	Blue Bird on Perch	1 650
1987	Hadley, Basil	Kakadu Scrub	3 150
1987	Hadley, Basil	Nullarbor	3 500
1987	Hadley, Basil	Rose Coloured Plains	1 600
1987	Jack, Kenneth	Oakbank	1 800
1987	Lang, Margaret	Native Plant, Flinders Ranges	825
1987	McCormack, Dorothy	Coorong Dunes II	200
1987	McNamara, Frank	Dry Summer Jugiong	1 200
1987	Palmer, Robyne	Stream	500
1987	Parsons, Allyson	Yorke Peninsula	900
1987	Roberts, Judith	Springtime	230
1987	Seidel, Brian	Boathouses at Sorrento	2 450
1987	Seidel, Brian	Moored Boats at Sorrento	2 200
1987	Seidel, Brian	Boat House Evening	1 665
1987	Stanley, Shaun	Sherwood Forest	650

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
			$
1988	Ainslie, James	Muloorina Emu	600
1988	Apponyi, Silvio	Seal	2 000
1988	Bayly, Clifford	After the Storm, Noosa Qld	2 500
1988	Borrack, John	Lake Glenmaggie	3 500
1988	Boyd, Arthur	Lake Glenmaggie	400
1988	Caldwell, John	Bulloo River	3 500
1988	Caldwell, John	Shipley Edge	1 200
1988	Clohessy, Carmelita	Indian Girls	200
1988	Clohessy, Carmelita	2 Birds	200
1988	Dridan, David	Boab and Hills	5 500
1988	Dridan, David	Mundoo Island	4 000
1988	Dunlop, Brian	Poets Room	700
1988	Gilbert, Ross	The Pond	400
1988	Gilbert, Ross	The Waterfall	650
1988	Gleghorn, Tom	Moon Morning, Yellow Water	2 000

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
			$
1988	Gleghorn, Tom	Last Season Crocodile Nest	2 000
1988	Gleghorn, Tom	Death Adder Creek	2 000
1988	Griffen	Coast Wind	450
1988	Hadley, Basil	Out in the Midday Bleach	3 500
1988	Hadley, Basil	Pink Plains	3 500
1988	Horsefield, Raymond	Bushland	2 000
1988	Houston, Ian	Seaview	3 500
1988	Illustrated Adelaide News	The Bank of South Australia	250
1988	Lawrence, Christine	Drifting	4 000
1988	Lawrence, Christine	Mirror Image	2 500
1988	Lawrence, Christine	Reflections of Adelaide	3 500
1988	Lawrence, Christine	South Coast	600
1988	Layerty, Ursula	Flowering Orchids	275
1988	Layerty, Ursula	Birds in a Tree	275
1988	Leslie, Babra	Heavy Sky	635
1988	Messack, Timothy	Seascape Goolwa	1 000
1988	Michael, Pat	Ghost Gums	400

ADDENDUM

In addition to the 1988 purchases, in that year, the Board of the State Bank commissioned the following works:

1988	Apponyi, Silvio	Past, Present, Future	$44 951
1988	Duncan, Greg	Past, Present, Future	$46 000
1988	Patrick, Margie	Past, Present, Future	$15 000
1988	Patrick, Margie	Flinders Songlines	$50 000
		Total	$155 951

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
			$
1989	Giacco, Francis	The Silent Figure	1 500
1989	Gleghorn, Tom	Kakadu	1 800
1989	Gleghorn, Tom	Kakadu	1 800
1989	Gleghorn, Tom	Escarpment Kakadu	1 750
1989	Hadley, Basil	Misty Kakadu Landscape	2 475
1989	Hadley, Basil	Palms	3 000
1989	Hadley, Basil	The Ridge	3 250
1989	Hannaford, Robert	Shearing	5 000
1989	Hinge, John	Summer Morning, Murray Cliffs	1 200
1989	Houston, Ian	Farm Near Bendigo	2 000
1989	Ingoldby, Jim	Early Morning Murray	600
1989	Ingoldby, Jim	Willow Reflections	600
1989	Jack, Kenneth	Brisbane from Kangaroo Point	Gift
1989	Jack, Kenneth	Nearnoon Cloncurry	5 400
1989	Kypridakis, Ben	Platter	750
1989	Kypridakis, Ben	Platter	750
1989	Lawrence, Christine	Mount Wilson	5 750
1989	Lawrence, Christine	Mount Wilson (2)	5 750
1989	Lovell, Max	Sentinel of the Last Night	950
1989	Magilton, Walter	Eagle Over the Olgas	1 700
1989	Magilton, Walter	Morning Light	3 000
1989	Magilton, Walter	Soft Light Lake Hume	1 000
1989	Magilton, Walter	Standley Chasm	2 000
1989	Magilton, Walter	Carnavon	1 475
1989	Magilton, Walter	Grampian Summer	2 250
1989	Millward, Clem	Kalbarri	3 000
1989	Morrison, Russell	Northern Landscape	850
1989	Morrison, Russell	Red Hill	350
1989	Morrison, Russell	Sheltered Bay	1 250
1989	Morton, Patsy Nambajinpa	Yam and Yacka (Wild Onion)	500
1989	Olliver, Anne	Anne and Man	2 400
1989	Phillips, A. T.	The Palm	3 000
1989	Phillips, A. T.	Low Water, Coorong	3 500

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA
REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
			$
1990	Barton, Hal	Shedding Bark, Pomona Forest	3 750
1990	Engel, Alfred	Pigeons	6 250
1990	Henwood, S.	Sydney Harbour	3 500
1990	Lupp, Graham	Hills Face Landscape	3 000
1990	McNamara, Frank	Murrumbidgee Pastoral	2 500
1990	McNamara, Frank		
1990	Newman, Nicole	Henry	
		Total	$19 000

BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION
REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
1983	Jack, Kenneth	Paddle Steamer on the Murray	$1 000

BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION
REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
1985	Jack, Kenneth	Grindels Hut, Flinders Ranges, Balcanoona	$3 500
1985	Borrack, John	Golden Summer, Summer Valley Stath Creek	$2 450
1985	Parsons, Allyson	Rock Form and Plants, Yorke Peninsula	$ 500
1985	Cowlam, Keith	Blackwood Botanical Gardens (Wittunga)	$1 200
1985	Hadley, Basil	'The Nullarbor Plains', 1985	$1 600
1985	Schubert, Rod	The Cry of the Cockie	$1 125
1985	Schubert, Rod	The Cry of the Cockie II	$1 125
			$11 500

BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION
REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
1987	Hannaford, Alfred	Gull Rock	$2 250

BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION
REGISTER OF ARTWORK—AS AT 1 OCTOBER 1992

Date of Purchase	Artist	Title	Purchase Price
1989	Barton, Hal	The Little Desert	$3 100
1989	Barton, Hal	Trees in the Bush	$3 100
1989	Schubert, Rod	Sandhill 1988	$3 150
1989	Apponyi, Silvio	Tortoise	$ 480
			$9 830

FUNERAL DIRECTORS

133. **Mr BECKER:** What is delaying the promised legislation concerning funeral directors?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I assume that this question refers to the draft Disposal of Human Remains Bill. The draft Bill does not propose to regulate funeral directors by licensing or registration. It concerns funeral directors in that it provides for a revised system of authorisation to dispose of human remains and contemplates regulations on a variety of matters including the

transportation, storage and handling of human remains, the construction and use of mortuaries, and the construction of coffins.

Finalisation and introduction of the Bill has been delayed pending the completion of negotiations between the State and local government about options for rationalising the planning, coordination, and management of public cemetery and crematoria facilities in the wider metropolitan area.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

147. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:**

1. Why were preliminary investigations and miscellaneous items under capital expenditure in 1991-92 $6.6 million when the estimate was $12.5 million?

2. Was the policy on what is regarded as capital expenditure changed and, if so, how?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. The preliminary investigations and miscellaneous items line was underspent by $6 million compared to the 1991-92 estimate mainly as a result of slippage in Information Technology projects viz.:

- IT Computing Infrastructure $4.5 million
- Customer Services Information System $1.6 million.

This was due to the timing of the signing of the IT contract between the State Supply Board (on behalf of E&WS) and Tandem Computers Pty Ltd, which was not finalised until late June 1992 by which time the Engineering and Water Supply Department had closed its books for accounts payable transactions.

2. This question has been recently answered in the response to Question On Notice No. 136 (question 1).

ELECTRICITY TRUST

150. **Mr BECKER:**

1. How often does ETSA conduct clearing sales?

2. Why was it necessary to advertise on 26 September 1992 800 the lot sale as an 'Important Spring Clearing Sale'?

3. Were some of the tools being sold still being used or usable by workshop staff and, if so, why were they being sold?

4. Were all items sold and what were the gross and net profits from proceeds of the sale?

5. Why had it been necessary to stock so many new automotive parts included in the sale?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. There is no fixed schedule for auctions of general purpose materials but generally two auctions per year are held. The auction of 26 September was the first in 1992.

2. The words 'Important Spring Clearing Sale' were used as a marketing ploy to attract the attention of potential customers in an endeavour to maximise the value of the sale.

3. As part of the salvaging process all tools and equipment are inspected for damage and wear. If the items are considered to be in a sound condition and there is a definite future requirement for their use, they are returned to stock. None of the equipment was currently in use. The first 100 lots of the auction, mainly new tools and equipment, were the property of Kearns Bros. ETSA appreciates the implication which may arise from this practice, and has decided to discontinue this practice of allowing external lots to be included in its auction sales.

4. Four lots were unsold. The gross proceeds were $39 577. Expenses associated with the auction included commission, advertisements, catalogues, postage and staffing which amounted to $7 198.26. The agent's commission was 2 per cent of the proceeds (about $790).

5. The transport store at Mile End for many years purchased and stocked vehicle components for use throughout ETSA. Following a departmental restructure and change of work practices associated with vehicle maintenance the store was relocated to Angle Park. All stock holdings were reviewed prior to the transfer, some parts were surplus to requirements or for vehicles disposed of. Spare parts which were still relevant were transferred to the appropriate locations. Those which were not, were sold.

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

163. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What were the amounts of interest earned by the Lotteries Commission for the years 1989-90 and 1990-91 and what are the reasons for variation from the $1.083 million earned in 1991-92?

2. Why were these amounts not shown separately in financial statements printed in the Auditor-General's Report in each year?

3. What was the average rate of interest earned in each of the past three financial years on moneys invested by the commission?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The amounts of interest earned by the Lotteries Commission from SAFA for the years 1989-90, 1990-91 and 1991-92 are as follows:

1989-90	1990-91	1991-92
$2 422 357.70	$1 631 475.39	$1 082 696.60

The variations are directly related to the average amount of principal invested and the rate of interest earned, namely:

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92
Average funds invested	$14.385m	$12.846m	$12.828m
Average rate of interest	@ 16.84%	@ 12.70%	@ 8.44%

2. Interest earned from SAFA has been included in Sundry Income, which has been a relatively stable component of the commission's revenue over the past three financial years, viz.:

1989-90	1990-91	1991-92
$'000	$'000	$'000
3 971	3 862	4 322

Interest earned is not considered to be a major source of the Lotteries Commission's business income and is expected to become even less significant in the future. For these reasons, it has not been considered necessary to report interest earned as a separate item.

3. See answer to 1 above.

164. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Why did the Lotteries Commission operate a bank overdraft of $1.328 million as at 30 June 1992 and what was the interest rate?

2. Where were the Lotteries Commission's surplus funds, reserves, unclaimed moneys, etc. invested as at 30 June and what were the interest rates?

3. What was the average rate of interest earned on investments during the past year and how does this rate compare with the previous year?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The 'Bank Overdraft' in the Lotteries Commission's 1992 annual report represents the cash balance in the commission's books of account as at 30 June 1992. The main reason for the negative balance was that the commission paid its outstanding creditors, totalling $1.39 million, on the last day of the financial year. As these cheques were unlikely to be presented at the bank on that day, the commission did not call on the funds from SAFA until the following day.

The 'Bank Overdraft', therefore, should be offset against cash held on short term deposits.

The commission's working account with the Westpac Banking Corporation on 30 June 1992 was in credit by $399 163.19 and therefore no overdraft interest was incurred.

2. The entire $17.351 million of short-term deposits, representing surplus funds, provisions and unclaimed moneys, etc., is invested with SAFA and earns the average 30 day bank bill rate. This was 6.62 per cent as at 30 June 1992.

3. The average rate earned on investments in the past year was 8.44 per cent, compared with 12.70 per cent in 1991.

STATE BANK

172. **Mr S. J. BAKER:** What is the reason for the reduction in the cost of borrowing to fund the State Bank bailout to $175 million this financial year compared with $220 million in the past financial year, given the 11.8 per cent common public sector interest rate?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As explained in the budget speech delivered on 27 August 1992 and also at page 63 of the Financial Statement (Financial Paper No. 1) the reason for the

reduction in the estimated interest costs on debt associated with the State Bank assistance is the effect of lower interest rates.

The amount of $175 million is based on SAFA's three year borrowing rate as at 30 June 1992. This rate is used because it approximates the average term to maturity of SAFA's overall debt portfolio. The common public sector interest rate is not relevant as it is based on the weighted average interest rate of all of SAFA's debt, including 'old' debt at rates significantly higher than those applying in financial markets in recent times. Accordingly it is considered more appropriate to adopt the three year rate as a measure of the costs associated with new borrowings incurred for the purposes of providing assistance to the bank.

ENTERPRISE INVESTMENTS

173. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** What is the basis for calculation of the fee of just over $1 million payable to BCR Venture Management for the management of Enterprise Investments and why is it that the fee represents over 20 per cent of the operating revenue of Enterprise Investments?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Enterprise Investments Trust is managed by BCR Venture Management Pty Ltd, an external manager, under the terms of a Management Agreement with the Trustee company, Enterprise Investments Limited. The manager is responsible to the Board of Directors of Enterprise Investments Limited for managing and monitoring the investment portfolio and identifying and evaluating new investment proposals. The Manager also provides all administrative services, employs all staff and incurs the costs related to those activities.

The Management Agreement provides for the payment of a quarterly management fee, which is the greater of a base fee, set at the time the fund was established and indexed to inflation and 0.75 per cent of the net fund value, which is reviewed twice yearly. The total management fees paid in 1991-92 at around 3 per cent of funds under management as at 30 June 1992, are consistent with the general level of management fees paid in the venture capital industry.

The standard approach to the establishment of management fees across the venture capital industry is to set them with reference to the level of assets under management.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FINANCE (HONG KONG) LTD

174. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** Why was there no profit from the operations of South Australian Finance (Hong Kong) Ltd in the past financial year?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: South Australian Finance (Hong Kong) Limited (SAFHK) was established in 1986 to facilitate attractive borrowing and reinvestment activities.

The majority of its activities have been undertaken as trustee of South Australian Finance Trust (Hong Kong) for which SAFA is the sole beneficiary.

During the 1991-92 financial year, SAFHK (in its own right) produced profits of US$0.4 million (before guarantee fees payable to SAFA) on total assets of US$42.2 million, while in its trustee capacity it produced profits of US$5.1 million on total assets of US$356.1 million.

The profits generated from the operations of SAFHK are significant.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

175. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** What is the breakdown of the increased Government indebtedness to SAFA of $1 968 million to $8 billion during 1991-92?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There are five main factors contributing to the increase in the Government's indebtedness to SAFA during 1991-92 of $1 968 million.

The most significant factor was the need to borrow $1 300 million on account of the State Bank indemnity arrangements.

The Consolidated Account borrowing requirement in 1991-92 was $470 million of which roundly $2 million was provided by the Commonwealth and $468 million was satisfied by borrowings from SAFA.

Arrangements for the recapitalisation of the State Government Insurance Commission involved, amongst other things, assumption by the Government of $314 million of the Commission's debt to SAFA. An additional $21 million increase in the Government's debt to SAFA arose in respect of the arrangements by which SAFA entered into a participation agreement for 333 Collins Street.

During the year the Minister of Housing and Construction reacquired the housing mortgages acquired by SAFA as part of the original State Bank assistance package. The opportunity was taken to simplify and rationalise the liabilities to SAFA assumed by the Government as part of those arrangements. The loans were restructured into one loan on standard terms. To ensure the overall financial position of the Government was not affected by the transaction there was a net reduction in the face value of the loans of roundly $62 million.

The final factor involves the Government's decision to convert some $65 million of the former Woods and Forests Department debt to equity and to transfer that equity to SAFA in consideration of a reduction in the Government's debts to SAFA.

176. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** How was SAFA's $409.3 million valuation of the Woods and Forests Department arrived at and why was a further $64.7 million of debt converted to equity?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The valuation of $409.3 million as at 30 June 1992 for SAFA's equity interest in the Woods and Forests Department was based on the net present value of the estimated future cash flows arising from the Department's Forestry and Timber Products operations. The valuation of the Timber Products Division was also supported by a valuation based on the net realisable value of the assets of the Division. The discount rates applied to the expected future cash flows from operations reflect an estimated required market rate to return.

The decision to convert $64.7 million of the Woods and Forests Department's debt to equity was based on the fact that the Department has over the last two years experienced severe cash flow difficulties as a result of several factors i.e.:

- a high level of debt, largely attributable to the 1983 Ash Wednesday fires;
- depressed trading conditions in the timber products market, placing severe downward pressure on product prices and sales volumes;
- the inability to rapidly alter its cost structure in response to market trading conditions.

It was considered that continued injections of debt funds from the consolidated account to fund cash shortfalls during periods of severe downturn in the timber products industry would have compounded the Department's difficulties and provided a temporary solution only.

The recently announced merger of the manufacturing operations of the Woods and Forests Department and South Australian Timber Corporation are a positive step towards further rationalisation of and improvement in the return on the State's investment in this activity.

177. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** Why was SAFA's lending rate in the June quarter 1992 13.2 per cent compared with the average five year bond rate of 8.3 per cent and ten year rate of 9.15 per cent?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: An explanation of the matter raised by the Member for Mitcham was provided in my opening statement at the recent Estimates Committee proceedings covering SAFA.

It is incorrect to compare the Common Public Sector Interest Rate (CPSIR) to borrowing costs prevailing in June 1992. Clearly, the 13.2 per cent CPSIR for the June 1992 quarter is not fairly comparable with the five or ten year bond rates that were applying at that time.

The CPSIR is based on the average yield on virtually the whole of the State's debt (which has been acquired over time from various sources—including the Commonwealth Government). This cannot be compared with the cost of borrowings at any particular point in time—especially recent times when interest rates are at their lowest levels since the 1970s. It is impossible for SAFA to turn over the whole State's debt portfolio to achieve today's costs instantaneously.

SAFA manages its debt in a professional manner—like its counterparts in other States and major investment fund manag-

ers—and it has been able to ensure that, over time, the CPSIR has tracked market movements relatively quickly despite the magnitude of debt portfolio for which it is responsible.

SAFA has, over the course of 1992, increased the portion of its debt that is exposed to the very low short-term rates that are currently available; this has helped reduce the CPSIR quickly and the beneficial effects are reflected in the budgeted interest costs for 1992-93 of the Government and those semi-government authorities which borrow from SAFA at the CPSIR.

SAFA can (and does) borrow at the current relatively low rates available in the market place, and suffers no major disadvantages vis-a-vis its interstate counterparts.

178. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** With reference to the SAFA Annual Report, page 19, to which bodies was debt of $1 422 million serviced through special deposit accounts?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As at 30 June 1992 the following departments were responsible for servicing indebtedness of the Government to SAFA of $1 422 million through the Special Deposit Accounts:

Department	Level of Debts $'million
Agriculture	0.6
Engineering and Water Supply	964.2
Housing and Construction	182.5
Industry, Trade and Technology—	
(SA Economic and Development Fund)	22.2
Lands	39.5
Marine and Harbors	133.9
Treasury—	
(Local Government Disaster Fund)	9.0
Road Transport	23.5
State Services	41.9
Woods and Forests	4.7
TOTAL	1 422.0

180. **Mr S.J. BAKER:**

1. By how much did SAFA benefit in 1991-92 from the 1 per cent margin applied to departmental and authority borrowings?

2. How much of SAFA borrowings will be rolled over this financial year, what is the average interest rate applying to these loans and what average rate and average term is being sought from the rollover?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Assuming the Member for Mitcham is referring to the margin incorporated in the Common Public Sector Interest Rate essentially to cover the value of the Government guarantee and SAFA's costs associated with borrowings, SAFA's income in 1991-92 included an amount of roundly $54 million as a result of the imposition of the margin.

It should be noted that the margin is based on consideration of how best to distribute the benefits of lower cost borrowings, which accrue as a direct result of SAFA being provided with a Government guarantee. Government policy is for these benefits to be utilised to support the Budget generally (through the contribution made by SAFA to Consolidated Account) rather than allowing them to accrue only to agencies required to borrow for capital works. This policy allows a wide distribution of the benefits.

2. In 1992-93 SAFA has maturing gross borrowings from external markets of $3 436 million (face value) being gross borrowings excluding borrowings from affiliated companies, deposits from the Treasurer and other public sector deposits.

The weighted average interest rate applying to these borrowings is 8 per cent per annum. While there is some high fixed interest rate debt maturing this financial year, a significant proportion of debt is in the form of short term promissory notes/commercial paper.

The interest rate applying to refinancing of gross borrowings will depend on the market rate at the time and debt management strategies that SAFA may undertake during the course of the year.

The net rollover of borrowings will be affected by maturing investments, interest rate swaps and the repricing profile of assets and liabilities. SAFA may also retire debt earlier than the year of maturity as part of its normal debt management activities.

In respect of the average term sought from rollover, SAFA aims to spread its borrowings in line with the desired interest rate repricing profile for the stock of net debt. Currently, allowing for the effect of offsetting assets and swaps, 35 per cent of SAFA's net debt is being repriced on a floating rate basis (i.e. within 1 year).

REVENUE RETENTION POLICY

182. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** How much of the growth of 14.9 per cent in fees and fines in 1991-92 will be returned to departments under the new revenue retention policy (Financial Statement, page 58)?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As a general rule, revenue to be retained in agencies' deposit accounts is principally that generated from the provision of goods and services. The revenue cited by the honourable member is not retained by agencies. Instead it is credited to Consolidated Account.

Fees and fines contributing to the 14.9 per cent increase in 1992-93 and paid into Consolidated Account are summarised below:

Agency/Description	Fees and Fines Revenue ($'000) 1991-92 Actual	1992-93 Estimated	% Change
Court Services Department—Court Fines	7 793	8 235	5.7
Environment and Planning— Fines (under NP&WL Act)	20	20	—
Police—			
Firearms Licence Fees	2 923	2 515	(-)13.9
Expiation Fees (classified as fines)	23 000	29 055	26.3
Mines and Energy—Stony Point Pipeline Licence Fee	1 087	150	(-)86.2
Total	34 823	39 975	14.9

The growth, in the main, relates to an increase in expiation fees due to the full year impact of speed cameras progressively introduced in 1991-92, an additional two speed cameras planned for 1992-93 and fees being increased in line with CPI.

The table shows that 93.3 per cent of total fees and fines estimated to be raised in 1992-93 are fines. The Acts these agencies administer or operate under require them to return fine revenue to the Consolidated Account. Had the Acts been silent on the treatment of fine revenue, then section 29 of the Acts Interpretation Act would apply requiring agencies to credit fine revenue to the Consolidated Account.

Although the Department of Mines and Energy operates through a deposit account, the licence fee associated with the Stony Point pipeline is appropriately credited to the Consolidated Account as there is no direct linkage between the fee and the Department's operations. The fee is paid by the Pipelines Authority of South Australia and the Department of Mines and Energy is merely the vehicle for crediting these moneys to the Consolidated Account.

It is important to point out that the Police Department (which recovers a significant portion of the increased revenue estimated for 1992-93) is not affected by the new revenue retention policy as it is one of the few remaining agencies, by choice, that continue to operate through the Consolidated Account rather than a deposit account.

TAXATION

183. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** Is the increase of more than $700 000 in capital spending on taxation enforcement to improve surveillance of tax payments or merely to update existing systems?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The State Taxation Office has embarked upon a necessary redevelopment of its administrative and information technology systems to achieve the productivity and cost savings gains that are essential to all organisations and to improve taxpayer compliance and service delivery. The redevelopment process is on target and the movement to a

'corporate' view of data and associated processing systems is being achieved.

185. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** How much of the $10 million tobacco tax fraudulently avoided (page 16, Treasury Annual Report, 1991-92) relates to South Australia and how much is expected to be recovered?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Of the $10 million avoided licence fee identified to 30 June 1992 throughout Australia, approximately $500 000 was directly associated with the illicit trade in South Australia. That identified trade took place during the months December 1990 to June 1991. An assessment has been issued against one South Australian merchant for $219 150 and arrangements have been made for the outstanding licence fee to be paid on an instalment basis.

It is anticipated that the full amount outstanding in respect of that assessment will be recovered.

VEHICLE REGISTRATION

186. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** What is the motor vehicle exception reporting project, how much has been spent on it to date and what are the cost escalations referred to in the Program Estimates and Information, page 19?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The motor vehicle exception reporting project aims to compare values declared on applications to register and applications to transfer the registration of motor vehicles against a set of median values to detect potential underdeclarations of value.

A computerised system has been proposed which would use a two digit code for identification of a vehicle to allow comparison of the value declared with a value guide used by motor vehicle traders. The system would permit exception reporting outside of a set variance. Applicants identified by this process would be contacted to determine the reason for the discrepancy.

The proposal would streamline the process of detecting underdeclarations of value.

A cost benefit analysis has been completed for the project and tenders have been called to provide the necessary software. Other than the costs of preparing the cost benefit analysis and calling tenders, no money has been spent on the project. The project has been placed on hold while further statistical analysis is completed to review the revenue benefits of the proposed system in light of recent changes to other administrative processes.

The 'cost escalations' refer to the fact that the tenders submitted were significantly higher than the anticipated cost. This has led to a review of the cost effectiveness of the proposed system.

TAXATION

187. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** Why did the cost of tax collections increase from 53c to 60c per $100 during 1991-92 (page 19, Programme Estimates and Information)?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In a number of areas the revenue collected by the State Taxation Office did not achieve budget estimates principally as a result of the greater than anticipated severity of the economic downturn.

Capital expenditure on the implementation of information technology further increased the cost of collection of State Taxation revenue in 1991-92.

The cost of collection of revenue by the State Taxation Office compares very favourably with interstate jurisdictions.

CONSULTANCIES

188. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** To whom were the consultant's fees of $43 500 paid in 1991-92 and what consultancies are or have been commissioned in relation to the $200 000 estimate for 1992-93 (Program 1, page 29, Estimates of Payments and Receipts)?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Payments to consultants in 1991-92 were as follows:

	$
Computer Power Pty Ltd	
Joint Application Development Workshop (1991)	6 000
User Design of Common Receipting System (1991)	11 000
Technical Design of Common Receipting System (1991)	14 000
Prototype of Common Receipting System (1992)	2 500
Build Common Receipting System (1992)*	10 000
	43 500

*Work still in progress as at 30 June 1992.

Consultancies so far commissioned in relation to 1992-93 are are as follows:

	$	$
Computer Power Pty Ltd		
Complete Common Receipting System	48 500	
User/Technical Design of Generic Returns & Assessing support Project	9 450	
Contract Variation in relation to Common Receipting System	3 075	
Information Technology Plan Review	9 600	70 625
Megasearch Pty Ltd		$
Mortgage by Return System		9 410
Total to Date 1992-93		80 035

ADVISABILITY FEASIBILITY STUDY

189. **Mr S. J. BAKER:** Will the Treasurer release the 'report on solutions to the problems identified in the review of Department and Treasury Accounting' (page 22, Programme Estimates and Information)?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The current Advisability Feasibility Study stage (Phase Two) of the Departmental and Treasury Accounting Review Project (DATAR) is scheduled to be completed in May 1993.

This work is currently proceeding in close cooperation with the Information Resource Management Subboard of the Government Management Board.

This report, as was the case with the phase one report, will be released to all Chief Executive Officers for comment. If the member for Mitcham also wishes to make comment, I will ensure that a separate copy is made available to his office.

TAXATION

190. **Mr S. J. BAKER:** What is the breakdown by category of unpaid taxation of $5 million identified by taxation inspections during 1991-92 (page 83, Treasury Annual Report, 1991-92)?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Unpaid taxation revenue identified by the State Taxation Office, compliance branch during 1991-92 can be itemised as follows:

Taxation Head	Unpaid Revenue Detected $
Pay-roll tax	1 918 854
Tobacco Products (Licensing)*	10
Stamp Duty—Conveyance	1 361 597
Stamp Duty—Annual Licence (Insurance)	103 186
Stamp Duty—Motor Vehicle	67 262
Stamp Duty—Rental	976 256
Financial Institutions Duty	611 149
TOTAL UNPAID REVENUE DETECTED	$5 038 314

*The figure for Tobacco Products (Licensing) does not include the revenue detected as a result of the interjurisdictional taskforce conducted in conjunction with the National Crime Authority.

PUBLIC SECTOR FRAUD

192. **Mr S. J. BAKER:** What is the nature of fraud involving $346 000 reported in The Treasury Annual Report and when will this money be recovered?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Treasury accounting system is a large computer based system operated at State Systems to pay accounts for all departments. To save costs this system processes invoices only every other day. Urgent payments

required between system runs are made following submission of a 'request for a manual cheque' signed by two authorised officers from the department requesting it.

Someone fraudulently obtained one of the signatures required to a 'request for a manual cheque' form for the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education and forged the other. That person had access to the manual cheque request forms, and knew both TAFE and Treasury procedures sufficiently well to arrange for its processing.

Treasury duly processed the request and produced manually a cheque for $346 295.23.

Someone arranged through a bank for the urgent clearance of this cheque to an account opened only the previous day at a branch of that bank in Victoria. It seems this account was opened on the basis of forged papers.

Most of the money was withdrawn in cash from that account the day after the cheque was drawn. Two people collected the cash after the bank had arranged a special delivery of this amount by Armaguard.

The fraud was discovered by Treasury staff as a result of normal follow-up procedures.

Although the police believe that three people were involved in the fraud, only two have been arrested. They have not pleaded guilty to the charges against them and therefore recovery of the lost funds apart from a small balance remaining in the account is expected to be a difficult process.

PUBLIC SECTOR DEBT

194. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** How does the Treasurer reconcile the 1992-93 estimated net interest bill of $698.5 million with the net State debt of $7.3 billion incurring an average interest rate of 10.8 per cent (based on SAFA's report that the CPSIR will be 11.8 per cent which includes a 1 per cent margin)?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The question asked seeks to compare net interest costs on Budget sector debt not specifically allocated to Departments with the level of net debt (which includes interest bearing and non interest bearing financial assets) of the total public sector.

A more meaningful analysis of the two figures mentioned is provided below.

Public Sector Debt

	$ million
Estimated net interest costs in 1992-93 of the total public sector (from page 158 of the Financial Statement, 1992-93)	853
Net debt of the total public sector (i.e. debt net of financial assets)	7 268
Net interest bearing debt (i.e. debt net of financial assets other than equity investments)	7 949

Therefore, net interest costs expressed as a percentage of net interest bearing debt is 10.7 per cent. This simple calculation will not agree exactly with SAFA's estimated cost of funds as:

(1) there are some authorities other than SAFA (eg ETSA) contributing to the State's net debt which may have an average cost of funds different from SAFA's; and

(2) there will be movements in the level of net debt over the year.

Budget Sector Debt

The $698.5 million relates to estimated interest payments on:

(1) borrowings of the Government which have not been specifically allocated to departments;

(2) Deposit Account and Special Deposit Account balances;

less interest received from

(3) investment of cash balances held by the Treasurer; and

(4) sundry minor advances.

Treasurer's statements C and I published in the Auditor-General's Report show that at June 1992:

(1) borrowings of the Governmnent not specifically allocated to agencies were	$6 676 m
(2) Deposit Account and Special Deposit Account balances were	$814 m
(3) Cash balances held or invested were	$862 m

giving a net debt (consistent with the net interest amount) of $6 628 million.

It is this level of debt with which the $698.5 million net interest should be compared.

EXPOSURE DRAFT ED53

195. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** Does Exposure Draft ED53 issued by the ISC have relevance to funds under the control of the Treasurer?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Exposure Draft, ED53, 'Accounting for Employee Entitlements' was issued by the Australian Accounting Research Foundation on behalf of the Australian Accounting Standards Board and the Public Sector Accounting Standards Board, and not by the Insurance and Superannuation Commission.

The purpose of ED53, which was issued in August 1991, was to seek public comment on proposed methods of accounting for, and reporting on, employee entitlements. The scope and nature of the comments provided were such that the Boards will hold a public hearing later this year and it is likely that the resulting accounting standard will be issued during the first half of 1993.

At present there is only one accounting standard which directly addresses the topic of employee benefits and that is AAS 25, 'Financial Reporting by Superannuation Plans'. For the past two financial years, Financial Paper No. 1 has included information on the public sector's liability arising from the provision of superannuation benefits. The reported liabilities include all public sector schemes and have been measured in a way which is consistent with both AAS 25 and ED53.

FRIGATES PROJECT

197. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** What guarantees had to be given by SASFIT in order to secure a $26 million contract for AWA Defence Industries for Nobeltech in relation to the frigates project?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This contract is currently being negotiated between AWA Defence Industries and Nobeltech. The contract value is confidential and it would therefore be inappropriate for me to comment on the amount mentioned by the member for Mitcham.

However, SASFIT holds 30 per cent of the equity in AWA Defence Industries with the balance of 70 per cent held by AWA Ltd.

The Commonwealth Government, which is the major source of defence contracting business in Australia, invariably requires bank guarantees and/or parent guarantees, which guarantee performance in specific contracts.

Nobeltech as a subcontractor in the frigates project requires such undertakings from AWADI as a subcontractor to Nobeltech.

Consequently, SASFIT and AWA would intend providing parent guarantees of contract performance to Nobeltech ensuring that should AWADI fail in any respect in relation to the contract Nobeltech and the project itself will not be disadvantaged.

SASFIT's obligation is 30 per cent of any proven claim by Nobeltech which is equal to SASFIT's shareholding in the AWA Defence Industries.

Effectively the obligation would equate to the cost of transferring the work to another manufacturer less the value of work done to date. The obligation at any point in time is therefore considerably less than the total value of the contract.

As stated above, such arrangements are generally required as a matter of course by the Commonwealth Government in defence contracts.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

198. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** In relation to the Life Fund Revenue Statement in the 1992-93 SGIC Annual Report, what are the reasons for—

(a) the fall in single premiums revenue from $88.4 million to $74.5 million;

(b) the increase in net investment income from $45.5 million to $69.5 million; and

(c) the increase in income tax from $4.5 million to $17.8 million?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

(a) The fall in single premiums revenue occurring in non-superannuation products reflected the fall in funds people were willing to invest in this area. This trend also occurred in the rest of the life industry.

(b) The major reasons for the increase in the net investment income were:

- an increase in investments held of 13 per cent;
- an increase in the market value of fixed interest investments and a fall in interest rates;
- a rise in the market value of equities held.

(c) The increase in income tax is partly a consequence of the increase in investment income referred to above. In addition, there was an adjustment at 30 June 1991 of $9.1 million due to an overprovision in previous years. The adjustment distorted the 1991 figure.

There was also less by way of franked dividends available from equities during the year, so the effective rate at 30 June 1992 was higher than for previous years.

SAGASCO

201. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Why does SAGASCO provide limited services during the day at ordinary rates and after 3.30 p.m. on weekdays charge overtime at the rate of $72 for the first 20 minutes and $10.50 for every 10 minutes thereafter?

2. What action will the Government take to ensure that a monopoly service such as SAGASCO will provide emergency service to families at a reasonable cost?

3. What type of service calls are classified as urgent or non-urgent?

4. Why does SAGASCO not provide a same day service and yet closes its service department at 3.30 p.m. on weekdays?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Gas Company provides a full service from 7.30 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday to Friday at a standard rate of $48 which includes the first 20 minutes, and additional time at the rate of $7 each 10 minutes or part thereof. Overtime rates apply from 4 p.m. until 8 p.m. These rates are $72 for the first 20 minutes and $10.50 each 10 minutes thereafter or part thereof. After 8 p.m. The Gas Company's Duty Inspector is available until 7.30 a.m. the following day to attend 'urgent' work.

The Gas Company have for some time been concerned about the high cost of providing service to customers after 4 p.m. each day. This issue was discussed during their award restructuring consultations with both unions and they have now negotiated a revision to standard working hours which has been incorporated within the new Award. This will enable the Gas Company to offer appliance servicing (by appointment or otherwise) until 7 p.m. each day. The Gas Company anticipate introducing this improvement in service quality on or before 1 January 1993.

2. The Gas Company does not consider it has a monopoly in servicing gas appliances. All major manufacturers offer a service facility as do many plumbers and gas fitters. The consumer has, therefore, a choice in this matter.

3. The Gas Company provides same day service in the majority of cases. Obviously during their peak periods in winter this may not always be possible. Same day service does, however, remain one of their stated corporate objectives. At present 75 per cent of all service requests are attended to the same day.

4. The Gas Company provides an 'emergency' after hours service to the community. It is of course difficult to define what constitutes an urgent or non-urgent service request. Each request for service after hours is treated on its merits, and the circumstances are taken into account before determining whether it is urgent or not. As a general rule, however, when there is any potential danger to life or property it is deemed urgent and acted upon immediately.

SEPARATION PACKAGES

211. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** With respect to early retirement packages for public servants accepted in 1991-92, in how many cases have superannuation benefits been of a higher order than those prescribed under the Act (excluding the minimum age constraint)?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There have been no cases where superannuation benefits have been higher than those prescribed under the Act.

The voluntary separation scheme does not include superannution benefits. Employees who accept an offer of a voluntary separation package receive the same superannuation entitlement they would have received had they resigned or retired without receiving a voluntary separation package.

STATE BANK

219. **Mr BECKER:** Why did the State Bank continue to pay the electricity accounts on the unit previously owned and occupied by Mr Tim Marcus Clark for three years after the property at Colley Terrace, Glenelg had been sold and what was the cost in each year?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The State Bank has been unable to find any evidence to indicate that it continued to pay electricity accounts after the above property was sold in October 1986.

If the honourable member is able to provide any more concrete evidence in support of his assertion, I will be happy to have the matter investigated further.