

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 12 August 1993

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr D.M. Ferguson) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Deputy Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 225.)

**Mr OLSEN (Kavel):** As I mentioned in the Address in Reply and the Supply Bill debate, what South Australia urgently needs is an affirmative industry policy that targets its fire power to the long-term employment potential and export earning potential for South Australia. I mentioned in those previous speeches the plight of the small business community in particular and the difficulties it is experiencing in being able to survive. Until and unless we recognise that small business is the engine-room of the economy, and until and unless we recognise that small business needs to be profitable to maintain jobs and employment opportunities, and if we are to create employment opportunities for the small business sector in the future and employment for South Australians, small business has to be profitable. For it to be profitable, Government has a role to play as it relates to taxes, charges and costs of regulations and in removing the impediments that currently exist for small business to grow, expand and create jobs.

The theme of my remarks today is that we need an affirmative industry policy targeting its fire power to ensure that we start tackling some of the key areas for South Australia in the future: employment and export potential. I will look at the funding of the South Australian Development Fund and the strategy behind that fund. Such a look does not provide much feeling of security that the State is heading in any one direction with any long-term forethought. In fact, Arthur D. Little highlighted that point in his report, where he said that for 10 years, a decade, of lost opportunity we have not had the right policy settings and policy mix to create jobs.

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** The member for Napier says that that is selective quoting. The simple fact is that the Arthur D. Little report, if he would care to read it, quite clearly says that this State has not had a consistent, reliable and predictable policy setting and direction. And business will not invest in modern plant and equipment without predictability and certainty for the future. If, in the current economic climate, we are going to require those people to borrow funds, to upgrade plant and equipment and to be nationally and internationally competitive there has to be a degree of certainty and predictability about it.

But the Government has had *ad hoc* decision making and *ad hoc* policy implementation which gives no predictability and certainty to those business operators. That is why we have not achieved the targets that we ought to have achieved in South Australia over the past 10 years. The South Australian Development Fund appears to be allocated to firms without any strong rationale to the situation of the industry, especially as to whether it is traded or non-traded, high

growth or low growth. In addition, a firms-based approach creates fragmentation of effort because it simply does not address the need for confronting an industry-wide issue and problem.

Such firms-based funding is totally out of kilter to the needs of the State as a whole, and we are waiting for the Economic Development Board to give us this blueprint for the future so we can get these policy settings in place so that everybody knows where the priority of Government will be in those policy settings—but to no avail. The Economic Development Board has been in place now for a year, in effect, but we still do not have a clear, concise policy direction enunciated by the EDB or the Government. So much for predictability and certainty of policy direction for the business community.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** We well understand that the Minister got into a lot of hot water in terms of tabling the document that the EDB wanted to dissociate itself from. In fact, as the Leader says, many thrusts contained in the paper that the Minister presented are totally contradictory to other pronouncements and statements of either the EDB, its executive chairman or the Government over the course of the past 12 months; that is, there is no consistency between the Government's pronouncements and that 'confidential document' that the Minister scrambled together and put on the table.

I understand that the reason the Minister did that was because he was getting so much criticism from the business community which was saying, 'This EDB has been in place now for 12 months; you have still not given us a clear, concise policy direction for the EDB.' In the face of mounting criticism the Minister responded, brought in the confidential document, dropped it on the table and said, 'This is what we are using as a blueprint for a discussion point for the development of the paper that will contain the policy settings.' In other words, it was a kneejerk reaction, responding to some pressures that were coming from—and rightfully so, I might add—the business community.

**The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder:** The document was everywhere. It had been distributed widely.

**Mr OLSEN:** The Minister is wrong on this occasion. You only need to go back 10 days before when Mr Robin Marrett spoke to SA in Business seminar at the Festival Centre. That document was not available and was not presented at that stage. Anyway, to return to the thrust of my remarks about the South Australian Development Fund.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** It neglects the interdependencies and synergies of the wider community. As regards a consistent industry policy, it is further crippled by the weight of Labor's political and philosophical considerations. In fact, several companies that have been funded have subsequently gone out of business. I do not necessarily criticise that because you are going to have to have a go and some of them will succeed and some will fail. If business is going to have a go then in having a go you have to recognise that some will fail on the way. I do not necessarily criticise that. Funds from the SADF to, for example, the TCF sector between July 1988 to February this year were more than \$17 million—the highest allocation. Is this a blatant political use of funds to hold short-term employment levels rather than a realistic look at where the State needs to be to achieve its international competitiveness? A further example of odd decision making is the fact that

relocation assistance and building funds exceed those to research and development in the motor vehicle parts industry in a ratio of 4:1. Does that make sense?

What does make sense is directing funds with the objective of increasing productivity in the traded goods sector. Such gains would see their prices fall relative to non-traded goods, resulting in more favourable terms of trade for the State, increases in exports, a shift of resources to the traded sector and downward pressure on the price of non-traded goods. It must surely make sense that this is a far more solid and secure long-term global return from SADF funding than the present system applied by Labor Governments.

Obviously, the emphasis on assistance should be to those industries with products or potential products that are made for export to economies with rising incomes. Indonesia is a classic example of that. It takes hard decisions to cut such wrongly applied life support, but it must be done if we are again to be seen as relevant interstate and internationally. We desperately need investment, but we cannot attract it. We need business to take us seriously, to consider us worthy of relocating to or setting up in, but it does not at this point. Companies see no reason for establishing their head office here—and why would they?

We do not have anything to offer and we have detailed the costs of operating here *vis-a-vis* other States. In other cases, which as we hear may (although I hope it does not) include SA Brewing, they can find no logical reason to maintain their head office here. And some of our best skills and intelligence have left, not for greener pastures as such but in despair. Last week, for example, we were informed that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital CEO, Nick Hakof, one of the most capable health administrators, is to join the growing exodus and take his much needed skills to Sydney. Advertisements for his replacement confirm that. He is a perfect example of the person we can ill afford to have disappear from South Australia yet, realistically—

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

**Mr BRINDAL:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** In dealing with this Bill, I wish to concentrate, as has the member for Kavel and so many of my colleagues (in his second reading speech the Leader, particularly) on the neglect that has occurred under a decade of Labor. It is all right to concentrate on what Labor now says it will do with the money, but any organisation should be regarded not only on its promises for the future but also its performance in the past. The performance of this Government in the past decade is at best described as abysmal.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Spence used the word 'outstanding'. That is a correct description of the performance of this Government: it has been absolutely outstanding. There has not been a Government in the history of South Australia with such an outstanding record as this Government. The trouble is, outstanding does not necessarily mean good and, in this case, outstanding means outstanding because it is particularly bad. It is a decade of disaster. It is a decade of neglect.

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

**Mr BRINDAL:** I know the Minister was being very jocular, but I believe the Minister would be aware that if you quote *Hansard* very selectively you might end up in trouble because of it.

The lessons of a decade of Labor are clear all over South Australia, but nowhere are they more clear than in two particular areas: first, the rural area—and the member for Custance ably spoke about that last night; and, secondly, the other area of neglect under Labor is the southern suburbs. I note with interest that the Premier came in here yesterday and said that it is all relative, 'Everyone wants more in their electorate and my electors don't think they're getting as much as their next door electors, and Napier doesn't think it's getting as much as Elizabeth.' I concede that that is true, but if you look at the relativities of what has gone to the north of the metropolitan area—

**Mr Atkinson:** And in the west.

**Mr BRINDAL:**—in the past 11 or so years and what has gone down to the south, there is a huge disparity.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Spence interjects, as does the member for Playford, who calls out, 'Socialism for Burnside'. The member for Playford might have been a teacher, but I suggest that he consult his geography books. Burnside is in the east and I am talking about the south and the north, not the east and the west.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BRINDAL:** In this speech I want to concentrate particularly on the seat of Unley, because Unley has suffered from double neglect. It is represented in this place as a near southern suburb by a Minister; yet it has suffered 10 years of benevolent neglect. It is all right for people to go to meetings of ethnic groups and say, 'Look, would you like some more chairs for the hall?' They say, 'Yes, we'd love some more chairs for the hall.' They are convinced that the Government is doing a wonderful job because there in the corner are 20 stackable chairs that the Government has given them, or this thing or that thing. However, in the meantime, if you look around the streets of Unley you see benevolent neglect. The Government has concentrated on the stacking chairs, on the little things, and completely neglected the larger fabric.

For instance, Unley has less open space than, I believe, just about any electorate in Adelaide. When there comes a chance to give the Goodwood High School oval to the people of Unley, the Government decides to sell it, and to sell it at a price that is totally unfair. If one looks at the streets of Unley—and this is a serious matter—one sees that streets such as Unley Road, Goodwood Road, Fullarton Road and South Road are absolutely full to overflowing. If you ask the actuaries of Adelaide where statistically you have the most chance of getting your car door knocked off as you try to get out to go shopping, Unley Road heads the list by a considerable distance. In fact, on any one day there are likely to be three or four serious accidents on Unley Road.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Members opposite can laugh and make jocular remarks during the course of this speech, but I know the member for Albert Park and the member for Spence too well to know that they are not concerned about genuine problems in any seat. Traffic flow north and south is a genuine problem for the whole of this State. We cannot keep filling up the southern suburbs with more and more houses,

allow them to be dormitory suburbs because there are no workplaces there, have people commute every morning over the escarpment and back every night and expect the current roads system to cope. If we keep doing that the very least we will need is a north-south corridor, but that land has been sold.

Personally, I am not convinced that a north-south corridor is the answer. The lesson of Los Angeles was quite clear. You build a huge freeway, it fills up with cars, then you build another huge freeway which fills up with cars, and pretty soon all you have is freeways isolating the city. In Los Angeles they are now closing freeways. So, I am not proposing a north-south corridor as necessarily an answer. What I am saying is that we must pay attention to the southern suburbs and create work opportunities in those areas to cut down the flow of traffic.

It is not just Unley: it is every seat—the District of Walsh and a number of other districts—in the south-western corner that now really suffers because of the daily commuter traffic. It takes me as long to get from my home in Goodwood to this Parliament as to get from my electorate of Hayward to the city. It is almost an identical time. In fact, I envy the member for Morphet, who sits in this House, because he comes up Anzac Highway, and I am sure he can get here more quickly than I can. People who live five minutes from the city—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** If the member for Spence wants to come for a cup of coffee, he only has to ask: he does not have to pass snide hints in this place. Ten minutes is not much time, but we could go on and talk about the cultural assets of Adelaide, which have been let to decline under Labor. We could talk about the stormwater mitigation schemes. I will give this Government one thing: it has had a few good ideas, but the problem is that, between the good idea and putting it into effect, nothing much ever seems to happen. When the Minister of Education was Minister of Environment, she had some very good schemes about stormwater mitigation. We are all sitting here waiting; they are excellent schemes, but there is no action.

Rhetoric is cheap in this place; we all know that. It is the cheapest commodity in this House, and the Opposition does not have much else to fight with. The Government has the Government benches and the Treasury, and they occasionally come up with a good idea, but they seem to be too frightened, too petrified, to put the ideas into action. I do not care if the election is in one week, three weeks or three months. The people of South Australia have a Government and this Government owes the people of South Australia action.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphet):** The Government of South Australia will be remembered for several things, two of which will be the decline of sport in our schools and the decline of the racing industry. I would like to spend a few minutes this morning referring to those subjects.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphet has the floor.

**Mr OSWALD:** Thank you, Sir. I know members become concerned whenever we get on our feet and talk about the decline of industries in this town; there are so many that each member could devote the whole of the Address in Reply contribution to listing off the projects, industries and Government enterprises that have fallen over. The two examples with which I am linked through my shadow portfolios and in which I have a personal interest are school

sport and racing. They are areas of concern to the sporting community, because over the past few years we have seen a steady and serious decline in both.

I would like to refer first to the decline of physical education and sport in our schools. There is no-one in our community, other than those who are out there trying to defend the dying days of this Government, who would ever stand up and disagree with what I am going to say.

**Mr Atkinson:** You said that in 1982.

**Mr OSWALD:** In 1982 we had quite a difficult situation in this town; we had a Party in government which had major achievements on the board, and it is now in Opposition and ready to go back into government and continue those achievements. We must bear in mind that it was the Liberal Government in 1982 that had just set up the South Australian Sports Institute, an institute with which the present Government has been keen to associate itself, but we cannot deny the fact that it was the Liberal Tonkin Government that set up the South Australian Sports Institute. In fact, it was Michael Wilson who did the work when he was Minister—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:**—and he was a damn good Minister; I agree with the honourable member opposite. He was a good Minister; he set up the Sports Institute, and it has had some major achievements. Over the past 12 months the Sports Institute has gone through a settling down process and it is now setting in train some excellent programs through its staff. I certainly look forward to working with it next year as its Minister. I will refer to the Sports Institute again in relation to this whole question of the decline of sport in our schools.

Over the last few years the Education Department has progressively shirked its responsibility. We have seen the link between physical education and sport decline. We have seen a lack of support for physical education and sport in our schools despite the fact that it has been kept alive in schools by volunteer teachers who are desperate to see that sport is maintained in our schools. Many Federal and State reports regarding the decline of sport in schools have been brought down, and they all highlight that there is a need for physical education specialists, particularly in primary schools. Yet nothing is done about it: we just see the decline go on.

In our high schools, physical education does not rate highly at all: indeed, I am told that it is absorbed under the subject of health and personal development. Teaching of physical education in that instance is not done by physical education specialists. I cite the words of John Talbot, who has enormous credibility in the field of physical education and sport, and those words appeared in a recent article in the *Advertiser*: he said that the trend has resulted in an incredible decrease in the number of sporting teams available in our schools. I think that all of us who are associated with sport know this; all of us associated with school councils must express some concern at some time or other to see the way the Education Department has moved away. This has not been helped by the fact that the Sports Institute, to its credit, has set up the Junior Sports Development Unit, and through that unit it is moving to develop the junior sports policy, which has now become a model Australia wide. Full marks to the staff at the Sports Institute who have brought that about.

The result is that the Education Department, knowing that the Department of Recreation and Sport has its Junior Sports Development Unit, is using this as an excuse to walk away from sport in schools and to say that this is now being looked after by the Department of Recreation and Sport so that it is

not the problem of the department. Unless it is arrested, we will see a further decline as the Education Department continues to walk away from its responsibility. It is a major problem. It is not going to go away, and this Government in its dying days would do the students of South Australia some service if it set in train some sort of corrective measures, even if they were a stopgap, until next year when I can make a move to bring education and the Education Department back into some arrangement with the Department of Recreation and Sport, so that we can get physical education and sport in schools much higher on the agenda.

I would now like to refer to another disaster over which this Government has presided; indeed, the Government was the main reason for it. I refer to the decline of the racing industry in this State and to the three racing codes in particular: galloping, trotting and greyhounds. An open forum was conducted at Morphettville on Sunday 4 April. The Leader of the Opposition and I attended that forum because we thought that the meeting was important enough for the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister to attend. I have great respect for the man who was sent along but, indeed, he is a junior backbencher of the Government and I would have thought that the very nature of the meeting and the concerns being expressed warranted at least the Minister's presence or that of a Cabinet member. The Government was not interested: it just sent along someone as a token gesture so that it could say it was being represented.

A lot of information has come out of that meeting, and I want to get it on the public record. I have only four minutes left in this debate, so I will have to pick it up and use the balance of the information in another grievance debate at another time, linking the two speeches together. It is important to put on the record the concerns raised at that meeting, which was attended by representatives from the three codes: administrators in racing, bookmakers, breeders, trainers and concerned punters. The main concern, as the Chairman reminded us when he opened the meeting, was that employment opportunities no longer existed in the industry because it was slowly dying.

Apart from the employment opportunities, the fact is that the industry, as we all know now is dying. An argument could be put as to whether it is the third or fourth largest industry in the State in terms of its contribution to domestic product, but the ACIL report puts it firmly as the fourth largest industry in the State, and it is an industry which is dying for many reasons. One reason is the lack of State moneys compared with the situation interstate and another reason is the sheer greed of the Government in trying to grab all revenues that are generated within the three codes and not wanting to allow some of it to be redistributed. Even the Government's gesture of letting the galloping code have \$1 million for two years is feigned because it is the racing industry's own money in the first place and it is coming out of the Racecourse Development Board. In two years it will stop and we will be back where we were in the first place.

The thrust of the meeting was that the Government do something to inject more funds back into racing. If the Government does not do that, the industry will fall over. Some of the evidence is interesting and I am sure all members will be interested to hear it. Trainers such as Bart Cummings, John Hawkes and David Balfour have now set up stables interstate or overseas, while Lindsay Park has moved much of its breeding operations to New South Wales. The recent yearling sales have shown that few horses were bought by local trainers simply because they no longer had owners. That

is important. I did not hear the interjection opposite. I guess there was some criticism—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** —of trainers moving interstate—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Quirke):** Order! The speaker will be heard in silence.

**Mr OSWALD:** —and perhaps the honourable member has his own reasons to explain why trainers have moved interstate. The next statement is most applicable because they say that the recent yearling sales have shown that very few horses were purchased by local trainers simply because they no longer had the owners. The Government should be analysing that carefully as to why owners are no longer putting their hands up at auctions in South Australia and why they no longer want to own horses. They no longer want to own horses because they know the industry is about to collapse. Time will not permit me to continue this evidence now, but I will continue it at the first opportunity in the next grievance debate.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Water always has been, is currently and will continue to be the most important resource in this State and Australia. At the outset, I regret that the Minister of Public Infrastructure, who has the responsibility for the provision of water in this State has left the Chamber because I want to refer to a number of issues that will be of interest to him and his portfolio responsibilities. The aim and objective of any Government, particularly in South Australia, should be to develop and promote strategies for managing the surface, underground and waste waters of South Australia in a manner that encourages ecological, social and economic sustainability.

South Australia faces some major problems relating to its total water environment. This requires sound planning and tough political decisions to be made. Yesterday, I had the opportunity to meet with senior executive officers of the Hydrological Society of South Australia, who made me aware of their concerns about water issues in this State. I refer to a letter that they have written to the Premier. They have kindly provided me with a copy of that correspondence. They make the point that they are taking up this matter with the Premier on behalf of the Hydrological Society of South Australia to express their concerns about the inadequate profile of water resource management in this State.

They refer to a recent meeting that society members organised, where they decided that this concern should be conveyed to the Premier directly because of the critical importance of this State's water resources to our ongoing prosperity and the perceived lack of consideration of water resource issues in important State planning decisions, a concern that I would share. The letter states:

The Hydrological Society of South Australia is open to anyone with an interest in water resources, their management, protection and measurement. The society has about 200 members, mainly professional and technical staff from educational, research and consulting groups across the State, as well as from a number of Government and local government agencies. The society represents the most significant accumulation of expertise and water resources management in this State.

In its letter to the Premier, the society has stated that the water resources of this State will be a significant, and in many cases probably the most critical, constraint to economic growth. This is particularly the case with respect to some of the activities and industries that have been identified in the Economic Statement that was brought down by the Premier recently which he described as being critical and crucial to

the State's economic recovery. I do not want to dwell on that statement. The letter states:

For example, although the wine grape industry is seen as being an important player in the future economy of this State, there is not one premium wine grape growing area that is not already under threat due to limited water availability. Expansion in this industry will require careful management of the available resources and considerations of the constraints that limited water availability will impose on the planning process.

I hope the Government will recognise that process. The letter continues:

Similarly the development of industrial and tourism activities outside the greater metropolitan area inevitably is dependent on the availability of suitable water supplies and often may have significant impacts on existing users of local resources or on the local environment.

Unless adequate consideration is given to the constraints imposed by water quality and quantity and the options available to modify or mitigate these constraints, the future for the development necessary for the economic recovery of the State is bleak.

It makes the point that, as the Premier should be aware, there is considerable discussion at the moment regarding the future of water resources management in this State, brought about by a number of factors, including the impending merger between the E&WS Department and ETSA and the formation of an EPA and major reorganisations in several key Government agencies. Although the main question is where the water resources management function should reside, the society has made the point very strongly that it believes that the most important issue is the profile of this function within Government. It considers that water resources management lacks an adequate administrative and political profile in this State, despite the significance of water to the South Australian economy. Further, the society states:

Unlike other States, there is no Minister of Water Resources or Department of Water Resources. Despite the significance of water to the continued growth and prosperity of this State, there is not even a Director of Water Resources, which means that there is no executive level officer within Government with the sole responsibility to represent water resources issues.

In addition, the responsibility for various aspects of water resources management is disseminated across a variety of agencies, including the E&WS Department, the Department of Road Transport, the Department of Mines and energy, local government and the MFP. However, there is no clear understanding of any responsibility for overall coordination, particularly in relation to some of the emerging issues such as stormwater management and conjunctive use of resources.

The hydrological society goes on in its correspondence to the Premier to point out:

If this State is to prosper, the management of our scarce water resources will be critical.

Again, it makes the point:

It is essential that there be an effective advocate for water resources at a sufficient level within Government to ensure water management is adequately resourced and given sufficient profile in broad policy decision making.

Further, it is important that this advocacy is seen as being independent of the interests of operational agencies and that there is a clear understanding of responsibility for overall coordination of the various activities that make up the water resource management functions in this State.

In conclusion, the hydrological society has made clear to the Premier that these essential requirements can only be met by establishing a high profile reasonably autonomous unit within Government to coordinate and oversee all water resource policy development and management activities. It is recognised that a new agency may not be appropriate, but the establishment of at least a division of water resources within an existing agency would meet most of the critical requirements. Importantly, if this were promoted widely it would provide a clear message to the community that the

protection and management of water resources is vital to the future prosperity of this State.

I commend the hydrological society on that representation it has made to the Premier. I would also like to acknowledge the excellent work being carried out in various parts of the State, and I refer particularly to the successful implementation of the Munno Para arc pilot project. I would like to commend all those involved in that project, particularly the Hickinbotham group of companies. The project's aim is to replenish underground aquifers, reduce algae blooms, blend houses with an open space environment, and create jobs and export opportunities whilst lowering water and sewage treatment and housing costs. It is an excellent project. I hope that all members recognise the importance of this pilot project and that it is one that other developers and organisations in South Australia will follow. I commend the Department of Mines and Energy and other areas of Government for this development.

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

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** 'Christmas is the time when kids tell Santa what they want and it is their parents and their grandparents who pay for it. Deficits are when adults tell Governments what they want and their kids and their grandkids pay for it': I think that quotation epitomises the present situation in South Australia. Deficits are something of an enormous nature for which our children and grandchildren will pay.

The Supply Bill is traditionally brought before the House at this time to appropriate a sum of money to pay the Public Service until such time as the full budget has been debated. On this occasion it allocates \$980 million—almost \$1 billion. When I first entered this House, just over 20 years ago, that figure was approximately \$130 million. On the one hand, we experienced the effects of inflation and the devaluation of money while, on the other, we have witnessed the increase in services provided over that period. The figure of \$980 million is relatively meaningless, because it is a stop-gap function until the full budget has been dealt with.

However, over that time we have seen a run-down of the State's assets. The schools, the E&WS infrastructure, our roads and many other public facilities have been run down, and very soon we shall face an enormous maintenance bill, for which I do not believe appropriate reserves have been set aside to cover. We all know of the difficulty in maintaining schools; many of which still comprise the old timber transportable type of classrooms. While such classrooms may serve a useful purpose, we would all admit that they are out of date and certainly substandard.

The E&WS infrastructure is one that really worries me. Many of our pipeline structures are now 80 or 90 years old, and—let us face it—their lifetime must be shortly drawing to an end. I know that in recent times the Government has started to set aside a fund for the replacement of some of the infrastructure, but it will involve enormous costs. Regrettably, with the trend towards user pays, the people in the run down areas may well be facing increased costs in due course, particularly if the user pays principle is applied to them.

One of the problems we have in our community is the ability of business to survive and not only support the maintenance of their own business but also create jobs and provide jobs for so many people. We have an enormous unemployment problem, and much of that problem is hidden under various schemes where short term or subsidised

employment is given to certain people, whose details are therefore actually removed from the official figures. Positive approaches have been made by some communities, particularly the smaller communities.

I draw the attention of members to an article in today's *Advertiser*, referring to the efforts of people at Kimba, in particular Mr Peter Johnson, who are undertaking work through the Kimba economic development committee. There is quite a lengthy article, and it refers to the growing and propagating of the Sturt pea for commercial sale. It is an interesting, and very effective project, creating jobs for the local people, and it demonstrates that there are opportunities out there to get up and go if the right will is applied.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** There's a very good photograph in the paper this morning.

**Mr BLACKER:** Yes, I have just referred to the article in today's paper. For business to survive, we must keep the input costs down, and this is where the State Government can play a role. I am very concerned that it has been flagged in today's paper that the Federal Government will introduce a series of increased taxes on business. Fuel costs are almost certain to rise, particularly for unleaded fuel. This Government has to oppose that fuel tax rise.

Whilst we might understand that there is a problem in terms of the environment, do not hit the people at the lower end of the economic scale who are unable to acquire a modern car. It will be the people who have to have an older vehicle who will be taxed most heavily in this regard. I think it is an issue for which this Government will pay at its peril if it does not strenuously oppose this increase. I am sure that every conservative Government and Opposition in this nation would be actively opposing it, because it is country people in the main who will have to pay the majority of that cost. Country people must have a vehicle: they do not have access to public transport and, therefore, they must have their own means of transport. In many cases, it is the vehicle they can afford that they must have.

An article in the *Advertiser* last Monday has been drawn to my attention concerning an announcement by the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. Kym Mayes) that there will be an amalgamation of the various services involving the CFS, MFS, and SES. I do not know how much prior consultation has taken place on that matter but, from the reaction I have had in my office, I gather it is very little. Certainly the State Emergency Service is most up in arms about it. They see it as a takeover, as a usurping of their role. So far as country areas are concerned, I can see nothing but disaster emanating from the decision.

As one of the SES members said to me, if he wanted to join the CFS, he would have done so. The State Emergency Service has a different role in the community. On Eyre Peninsula, there is a requirement to be trained in such matters as those involving cliff rescue, boating accidents and lost vessels at sea, etc.—it is not in the league of the Country Fire Service. I do not believe that a case can be made out for these services to be amalgamated.

In any event, should that occur, the consequences on a very bad fire day would be quite severe because all the

resources would be tied up in fighting a fire and none of the resources, or the specialities of those resources, for accident recovery, sea, coastline or cliff recovery would be available. I am certainly putting on notice here today that the people in my electorate who have contacted me thus far are strongly opposed to the suggestion that is made in that article. I trust that the Minister will have a rethink on that and certainly liaise with the people most affected. After all, we are dealing with volunteers. These people are not paid to carry out the community service and if volunteers are going to be treated in that way and pushed and pulled around then obviously they will be not giving of their best. They will withdraw their services and then we, as a total community, will suffer as a result of that. I ask the Minister to seriously rethink the suggestions that were made in that article on Monday because he has not liaised with the appropriate men and women on the ground. Basically, he has ignored them, gone over the top of them, and they are very hostile. I am sure that every person would recognise that we cannot afford to allow these services to be run down and to disintegrate because of an over the top decision made which will have seriously demoralising effects upon the volunteers in those services.

I just wish to make one last comment. I would like to commend the member for Newland on the comments that she made last night to this House about the Hellfire Club. Certainly in my view that club is an unnecessary part of society. It is something that should not be encouraged. I do not believe that this House should allow it to occur. It is something which I think we as a Parliament and as parliamentarians must take a serious look at. We cannot simply walk away and allow this to occur without saying something and doing something about it. It is a time for leadership and I believe this House could show some leadership and work towards having it stopped.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** Over the next few months there will be a great deal of debate about the University of South Australia and its future direction. The focus for this debate will be the document entitled the Corporate Plan 1993-1998. The Corporate Plan is the first attempt by the university to provide a comprehensive strategy which deals with all aspects of the university situation, including its future teaching and research activities, its staffing and staff developments and its support systems, such as library, student support and financial resources.

I have represented, for 16 years, one of the campuses of what is now the university, that is, the Magill campus. In that time I have seen many changes and great suffering and personal strain caused to staff by those changes, but never have I seen the suffering that is currently being experienced by staff because of the way in which that Corporate Plan is being implemented. A brief summary of the Corporate Plan can be seen by a table outlining the impact on academic staff establishment of the move to ensure the equivalent full-time student units at \$2 200 per unit. I seek leave of the House to have the table, which is purely statistical, inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

|                                 | 1993<br>WEFTSU | 1993<br>\$/WEFTSU     | Existing<br>Establishment<br>(FTE) <sup>(1)</sup> | Reduction in<br>Establishment<br>(FTE) <sup>(2)</sup> |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| Aboriginal and Islander Studies | 460            | 3 546                 | 21.0  | 6.8   |
| Applied Science and Technology  | 3 854          | 2 368                 | 119.1   | 15.9  |
| Art, Architecture and Design    | 1 613          | 2 810                 | 58.5  | 11.1  |
| Business and Management         | 3 233          | 2 441                 | 106.0   | 7.1   |
| Education                       | 3 950          | 3 165                 | 204.3   | 88.4  |
| Engineering                     | 3 102          | 2 554                 | 88.5  | 9.1   |
| Health and Biomedical Sciences  | 1 899          | 2 852                 | 65.1  | 9.6   |
| Humanities and Social Sciences  | 3 327          | A&H 2 831<br>SS 2 747 | 139.3   | 38.7  |
| Nursing                         | 2 228          | 2 824                 | 99.2  | 25.5  |
| Whyalla                         | 704            | 3 239                 | 27.0  | 4.9   |
| TOTAL                           | 24 370         |                       | 928.0   | 217.1   |

Notes: (1) The Full Time Equivalent (FTE) academic establishment is drawn from human resource information system data as at May, 1993. Academic establishment consists of tenured and tenurable staff and those on contracts of over 12 months.

(2) Reductions needed to bring the academic staff costs minus on-costs to \$1 720/WEFTSU

Strategies for the period 1994-1998

A number of strategies together with associated salaries savings are outlined: any or all of which may be drawn on by faculties and Whyalla to reach their \$/WEFTSU target.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The table indicates that all faculties will suffer cuts in staffing levels with the highest proportional cuts being in education at the Whyalla campus and in Aboriginal and Islander studies. Some of the cuts are absolutely savage, from an existing establishment of 21 full-time equivalent, the reduction in Aboriginal and Islander studies will be 6.8; in education, from an existing full-time equivalent establishment of 204.3, the reduction will be no less than 88.4.

That cannot be achieved without enormous adverse impact on the people concerned. The way in which it is done is therefore critically important, and I maintain the way in which it is being done is totally insensitive, administratively inappropriate and guaranteed to inflict serious damage on the university and its staff.

In the newsletter entitled *The Third Degree*—aptly entitled, if I may say—the newsletter of the Union of Australian College Academics of South Australia, Special Edition, July 1993, it is stated:

No attempt is made in the plan to justify the use of the target figure other than that it is the national average. No attempt is made to outline the impact on teaching programs in individual faculties. . . No attempt is made to outline what kind of academic establishment is envisaged as a result of these cuts.

It is clear that cuts in contract staffing which are proposed will have a savage effect upon women. The key elements of the Corporate Plan ensure that there is a thrust to move approximately \$15 million from teaching costs to support research development and infrastructure over a period of five years. We know that this is a new university and that one of the functions of universities is research, but to attempt in five years to devastate the teaching function of this university—which we all know teaches the teachers who teach our children and is therefore critical to the future development of the State, socially, culturally and economically—in the way that is being proposed is, in my opinion, extremely damaging.

The Union of Australian College Academics, a body of some substance states that it:

. . . does not believe the reasons for this massive shift in resources has been sufficiently justified in the plan for it to be supported. . . In addition, insufficient justification has been provided for the application of the formula—

the very crude formula, if I may say so, Mr Deputy Speaker—

of \$2 200 per equivalent full-time student unit and no analysis has been provided as to the impact this will have on the teaching profile of the university.

The newsletter continues:

It is hard to imagine that any kind of academic record which a university may have built up over the years through its constituent parts could possibly be maintained by cutting academic staffing levels by 217. The prime objective for the university must be to maintain quality teaching programs.

In the opinion of the academics:

The university's teaching program will be irreparably damaged for little gain in other areas. This will leave the university with no clear direction or purpose.

To demonstrate the crude and, if I may say so, cruel manner in which this has been done, I quote from a letter from the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic), Professor Denise Bradley, dated 29 June 1993, to the academics who are going to be affected by these decisions—hastily taken. She starts her letter:

As you would be aware, you were identified as a staff member affected by the paper 'Rationalisation of Staffing and Teaching Arrangements' (Appendix 2 to 'The Future Learning Environment of the University of South Australia and the Rationalisation of Staffing and Teaching Arrangements', tabled at council on 14 May).

It turns out that the staff who got that missive, which sent them into a state of intense anxiety, were not aware. This was the first notification they had. Yet they were told that they were to respond to this initial recommendation no later than Wednesday, 7 July 1993, by advising their heads of school

as to whether they wished to accept the initial recommendations. That gave those staff, who were engaged, in the main, with full teaching loads, precisely six working days in which to decide their future. An indication of the response of those at the middle levels who were responsible for the staff comes in the form of a memo from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, dated 2 July 1993, to the beleaguered staff who were waiting in a state of high anxiety and trying to decide what they should do.

That letter, which is simply signed 'Anne', from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, states:

You will just have received a letter from the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) advising you of details of the placement process and of a tentative recommendation as to your future placement, and requesting your written response by 7 July. These letters have been sent simultaneously to all staff affected by changes arising from the corporate planning document.

The letter concludes:

I know how difficult it is to make sensible choices about your future in such complex, murky and shifting circumstances, and am grateful to you, and indeed to everyone in the faculty, for your forbearance and cooperation in such a trying period. I hope that, within a week to 10 days, all will at last be clear and your future placement satisfactorily resolved.

The letter ends with the salutation 'Courage!' What kind of way is that to treat staff? I am not criticising the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities; she is trying to do her best to console and reassure staff whose futures are at stake and who are being treated like so many economic units in a rationalisation program.

When I was first elected as the member for Coles I was put on a course planning committee for a new degree or diploma. In those days experts spent months planning new courses. Five new BAs have been developed in the space of one month recently at the University of South Australia. That should shock anyone who has any concern for the educational future of this State. To rummage and drag together in only one month courses which should be recognised nationally and internationally is an indictment of the administration of the University of South Australia. If this sort of thing continues, the university risks becoming a mickey mouse institution, even within its own ranks, let alone within the outer world where it is supposed to have credibility and where, as a State, we are supposed to be promoting our degrees nationally and internationally with a view to earning export income. It is not good enough, it has to be reviewed, and I urge the council to look closely at it.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** On Tuesday 10 August in this House I made a statement in my presentation which related to the late Dr Thomas. I said that Dr Thomas had been found by the court to have ripped off the system for millions of dollars. That is incorrect. That statement related to a later reference that I made, which was a letter from an employee of WorkCover. I correct that statement to make clear the matter to which I was referring.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** You don't deserve one. Yesterday in the House the Premier stated that the recession was over. I wonder whether the Premier goes out and talks to the business community and the community at large, particularly in his own electorate. I have a business in his electorate. If he walked around and asked a few of the small businesses in his electorate, he would find that the recession is not over and that in fact it has worsened. Indeed, a large number of small businesses in this State are in very difficult circumstances.

Yesterday I received in the mail a document entitled 'The Road to Recovery. Solutions for Small Business' from the Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia. That document sets out very clearly, probably for the hundredth time in the past 10 years, what is wrong with small business in this State and in the Commonwealth. It is interesting that almost every issue to which it refers relates to Government in some form or other.

The problem areas identified in the document occur in the following order of preference: shortage of equity capital; cost of regulation to small business; over-regulation by Governments; high taxes and imposts; lack of financial or managerial expertise; availability of debt finance; lack of marketing expertise; and poor record keeping. There is also an item called 'Other', in which it lists: competition; interests costs; labour laws; union regulations; and on-costs. It is fascinating that they are the issues that were put before this Parliament when the Small Business Corporation was set up in the very first year that I came into this place. It is interesting that still the issues of over-regulation by Government, taxes and charges, interest costs, labour laws and union regulation are still right up at the top of the list.

One of the issues that I think needs to be attacked very quickly if small business in this State is to survive is the interest rates that business is still paying. We have heard in recent days many comments from individuals within the community who are saying that the difference between the cost of money and what is being charged by the banks is outlandish, and I support that argument very strongly. The cost of money to business ought to reflect more closely the current inflation rate in the community.

Governments could do something about that if they really wanted to, even in the current deregulated banking market. As ministers would know, Governments do have an opportunity to put pressure on the banking system. Whilst, as I said, it is deregulated, formal pressure from Government would have a significant effect for small business in particular. The next issue that was mentioned at length was that of labour laws and the need to provide more flexibility within the industrial relations system.

**The Hon. M.K. Mayes:** Reduce wages.

**Mr INGERSON:** That is absolute nonsense. I can talk from practical experience. For nearly 25 years I have been in business and all of the small business operators that I know are interested in only one thing, and that is to ensure that they get the maximum productivity from their staff and staff satisfaction. You only get that Minister—and as you have never been in business you would not understand—if you pay your staff well above the award structure. You do not get the productivity, you do not get the flexibility, you do not get an opportunity to improve small businesses unless you get the productivity through providing more advantages than the award system offers.

The Opposition's position in relation to the award system and future industrial relations is to continue to support the award system, to update it and to run a special system as it relates to small business. Having practised in the system and having negotiated with staff and many employees—unlike most members on the other side who have done nothing but object to it—I know that you need to have a separate operation with which small business can identify.

That is the fundamental reason why in the Opposition's recent policy release we said that we would continue with the award system to ensure that it is modernised and is flexible for those who chose to stay within it. That was a very positive



decision, which, I might add, was supported by the Federal Labor Minister, Mr Brereton. He supported it absolutely; he picked it up from our policy release and transferred it into Federal Labor policy.

The second option, of course, is to give those who want to shift out of the existing industrial relations award system into a contract/enterprise arrangement the opportunity to do so. We need to ensure that every business in this State has the option to do that.

We have made very clear in discussions, both privately and publicly with the union movement, that we would hope and expect that it would be involved in that system. If it chooses not to be involved because it is not capable of getting sufficient membership in the small business area, that is its own fault, because our system will enable absolutely free choice in the joining up of employees if people want to join a particular union. It is clear that there is no intention to move away from the involvement of the union movement. It is up to the union movement to get off its backside and, instead of having a closed shop and a convenient arrangement system where the union leaders get their pay and do not have to chase membership, they can get out with probably the best opportunity to increase their membership. If they do not do it, it is their own fault. There is no difficulty in doing that.

*The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** The member for Hanson was a member and a leader of a union. I have been a member and a leader of a union, and I understand clearly what you can do if you get off your bronze and actually get out and chase membership. It is entirely up to the union movement to do that.

**The Hon. M.K. Mayes:** Your policy is about reducing wages.

**Mr INGERSON:** The Minister talks arrant nonsense. Our policy is a very clear one under which the award system will be the absolute base. We have put that down and all employers and employees know that they will not see any significant changes at all in our base. It was interesting that the need to make the labour laws easier, better to work with and more flexible, so that everybody within the industrial system could benefit, was an issue that was raised.

The other issue was over-regulation. Anyone in business knows that the amount of paper that you get to just stay in business is nonsense. This Government has promised it would do something about that over-regulation and the amount of paper for the past 20 years that I have known of, but all that has happened is that it increases and becomes more regular.

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

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I am disturbed about the Government's poor attitude towards answering questions on the Notice Paper. Some of my questions have been on the Notice Paper for over two years. One which I would have thought would be quite easy to answer is No.13:

Why did Beneficial Finance Corporation bank with the National Australia Bank? How many State Bank and former Beneficial Finance subsidiaries bank with other banks and, in each case, why?

I understand that at one stage there were about 556 companies within the conglomerate of the State Bank Group. That is a huge number of companies associated with the group, and I would have thought that, if you are chasing business or lending money, you would insist on these companies banking with your own banking organisation. I could not understand why money was lent to Woolworths or to the Industrial Equity Limited group via the State Bank when those large

companies were not banking with it. The cash flow alone would have been immense and would have assisted that banking organisation. Then, of course, there are other questions on the Notice Paper, for example No. 16:

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

It is an absolute insult to anybody to think that a question has to stay or the Notice Paper for so long to obtain a reply. Question No. 19 relates to the wives of executives of Beneficial Finance Corporation who accompany their husbands on overseas trips. I understand they were employed as secretaries and paid allowances, be it clothing allowances or whatever, and all sorts of expenses for carrying out the duties of secretary for their executives. That, in my opinion, is rorting the system. If it was necessary for an executive officer to take his secretary overseas, I would not have thought he would take his wife and then claim all those deductions.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** Who would you take?

**Mr BECKER:** I would go on my own. I would probably take Kym Mayes, the Minister. We worked extremely well together representing the State and we were absolutely robbed on that final decision regarding the Commonwealth Games. At least we worked for the benefit of South Australia. We were a great team, a whole committee, that worked for the State.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** You never know: we might resurrect it. Question No. 22 states:

Did the Government and/or the State Bank settle out of court with the Bank of New Zealand in relation to a dispute between that bank and the Remm Group for \$70 million in or about March 1990 and, if so, why?

I understand that the Bank of New Zealand took the Remm Group companies to court in an endeavour to retrieve money that was lent by that bank to the Remm Corporation, and it was not until the last minute that, through State Bank and Government interference, the matter was settled out of court. I believe that the taxpayers of South Australia have guaranteed moneys from the State Bank and paid that money to the Bank of New Zealand. In other words, the Bank of New Zealand walked away with 100¢ in the dollar: the taxpayers of South Australia are lucky if they have assets worth 30¢ in the dollar in relation to the Remm Group.

There is no reason why the Government cannot answer those questions, I understand from the State Bank. The answers have been provided to the Premier's Department, they have gone to Cabinet and they should have been relayed to me. I even had to write to the freedom of information officer in the Premier's Department to try to get some assistance, and I have been patiently waiting now for six weeks for answers to those questions. It is an absolute joke when a member of Parliament has to go to a freedom of information officer to find out what is contained in the docket to answer his question, because he cannot even get the answer to that.

If the questions are not answered within 45 days, I will need to take legal action to try to get information to which I believe the taxpayers of South Australia are quite rightly entitled. I am not happy at all at the way the whole process of the State Bank has been handled—the royal commission, the Auditor-General's reports—and I cannot understand why they have not followed through some of those issues I raised in the House. I started asking questions back in 1985, and

Marcus Clark knew jolly well what was behind the questions I asked then in relation to \$50 million being lent to a shopping centre in Geelong.

There is no reason why we should be taking money out of South Australia and pumping up shopping centres in another State when that money could have been lent for housing in this State. We could have had one of the best housing industries in Australia. We have an extremely good Housing Trust and a housing system to encourage home ownership, but we could have done better. Instead of that, we were chasing these magic dollars.

That brings me to the letter that has been circulated in the new electorate of Hanson by the member for Walsh. It is absolutely disgraceful. I hope I have time to read the whole thing. The letter states:

Dear constituent,

Like me, you were probably horrified at the conduct of the individuals who created the huge debts of the State Bank and Beneficial Finance which hit us all in 1991 like a bolt out of the blue. Before that shock announcement, there were rumours that things were not quite right. But the rumours were never backed by any solid facts and every inquiry produced the answer from the State Bank management that everything was in wonderful shape. To the best of my knowledge, the bank's position was never publicly disputed by the Federal Reserve Bank or by the State Bank's official auditors.

That is disputable. There were questions of the State Bank but we were not allowed to ask, because Marcus Clark and everyone else (particularly the then Premier) were threatening us that, if we caused a run on the bank, we would be sued and God knows what. The letter continues:

Yet the replies given to the Government and the Parliament by the banking and private enterprise experts who were running our bank failed to reveal its gigantic debt, largely created by people who got commissions for lending money to other people who couldn't pay it back. . . Why?

Regular statistics are provided by the Reserve Bank at least once a month. They should go to Treasury. The bank was getting them, we get them in the Parliamentary Library, we were fully aware of what was going on and we gave the warning signals through our spokesperson on finance, the member for Coles, that the overseas borrowings were immense. The State Bank's overseas borrowings were greater than those of the ANZ Bank, and the State Bank was borrowing money in every tax haven in the world. No-one knew whether it was drug money, oil money or money being laundered from ill-gotten gains. The letter continues:

Some of that State Bank money (for which we were all guarantors) will be repaid when property values improve—

it will be a long time before that happens—

but some State Bank and Beneficial Finance money seems to have disappeared into the pockets of greedy individuals and will not be easily recovered. I believe we should be doing everything possible to track down individuals, whether in the State Bank, Beneficial Finance or the accounting profession, who apparently betrayed the trust placed in them by the Government and the people of South Australia and who drew handsome salaries while the losses mounted.

We only have to look at the Remm Corporation and some of the large construction companies to find out who really ripped off the system, and that was some of the construction unions that were involved. The letter continues:

I believe it is now time for prosecutions to be launched where possible and for attempts to be made to recover ill-gotten gains, wherever they may be and whoever may be involved. Even though it will not be cheap to pursue them, any greedy crooks who enriched themselves at our expense should not be able to get away with it, and I cannot understand why Liberal Leader Dean Brown seems to be criticising the procedures involved. Do you agree with me about

bringing them to justice no matter how long it takes or how difficult it may be?

He does not say how much this will cost. The letter continues:

I have prepared a parliamentary petition urging the Government to launch prosecutions as quickly and as vigorously as possible, and to consider the confiscation of the assets (including any big termination pay-outs)—

good luck—

of those who can be successfully prosecuted. Copies of that petition are available from my office at 196 Anzac Highway, Plympton. If you contact me for copies, I will be happy to mail them to you for you and your friends and neighbours to sign. As soon as petitions are returned to me, I will present them to the Parliament as evidence that public opinion in our district is solidly behind the launching of prosecutions, even if we have to find a way to drag some of those involved back to South Australia.

That is all very good; it is great stuff inciting the people within the electorate, particularly the new electorate of Hanson, some of whom are my constituents. Of course they agree that something should be done, but obviously the former Speaker of this House (the member for Walsh) has not read the legislation. Section 29 of the State Bank of South Australia Act provides:

Immunity of directors and officers

(1) No liability attaches to a director or other officer of the bank for an act or omission done or made, in good faith, and in carrying out, or purporting to carry out, the duties of his office.

(2) Any liability that would, but for subsection (1), attach to a director or other officer of the bank shall attach instead to the bank.

In other words—

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** The Government should have amended the Act.

**Mr BECKER:** Well, the Government set up the Act.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.H. Hemmings):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Bright.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** During this debate today I wish to refer to management of information technology by the present Government, because it is fair to say that this Government has allowed expenditure on information technology amounting to some \$300 million per annum to run unchecked and uncoordinated. The Government has had plenty of opportunity to revisit the problems with information technology that it has been facing in this State through the warnings of the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General's 1990-91 annual report states:

For a number of years audit has expressed concern at the quality of management direction and control exercised over major computing development.

The Auditor-General flagged on that occasion that for many years the Government had been warned that information technology in this State was uncoordinated and was running out of control. Ultimately, after these many warnings by the Auditor-General the Government finally decided to look at the problem. I was interested to receive a copy of a submission that was placed before Cabinet on 22 March this year. The submission was signed by the Premier and also by his Minister of Business and Regional Development. The proposal that was put before Cabinet was:

That Cabinet note and endorse an overall strategy for improving the management and use of information technology in the South Australian public sector.

Two key points of the proposal to Cabinet were:

· Extensive use of strategic alliances with a range of private sector organisations to ensure better management implementation and operation of major systems, these allegiances to provide the foundation for increased investment by IT companies in South Australia.

· A revised form of information utility (IU) concept in which the Government strengthens and upgrades the status of State Systems and uses the revised organisation as its primary vehicle for securing strategic alliances.

Certainly, we are aware that, following that submission before Cabinet which was ultimately approved, the Government, through the State Services Minister, has made a number of announcements of its intention to sign strategic alliances with private computing companies and has announced the signing of one such agreement. However, I do not mind putting on the record in this Parliament that I have been contacted by a number of major national and international computing companies that have said they have no desire to sign a strategic alliance with this Government; they have no desire to work with this Government, because this Government has cost them millions of dollars in the past through its ineptitude, through its unsatisfactory tendering processes, putting up such proposals as the information utility, but never listening to the experts in the information technology industry who said it would not work. Those companies have wasted millions of dollars and have indicated to the Liberal Party that they are not prepared to sign agreements with this Government; they will wait for the election. The ineptitude that I am talking about is referred to at length in the submission to Cabinet. It says in part:

The overwhelming conclusion from the work of recent months is that we must achieve greater value from the Government's approximately \$300 million per annum expenditure on information technology.

It goes into some interesting details, and I again quote:

The non-directive approach of the Government Management Board in keeping with increased responsibilities of chief executive officers has led to several undesired outcomes:

1. We have probably purchased somewhere in the public sector every brand of computer hardware and associated software that has ever been marketed. Nowhere is this more apparent than in office systems.

2. Large numbers of people are involved in the tasks associated with purchasing, upgrading and maintaining these products.

3. No computer supplier has more than 8 per cent of our public sector market, meaning they have little base from which to invest in the State.

4. There are several examples of individual agencies simultaneously but separately pursuing large scale system development in parallel with each other, for example, plant management systems, customer billing systems, financial management systems.

This has been exacerbated by the fact that each initiative of each agency has been processed through the Government Management Board and the State Supply Board as a separate event. Opportunities to link with similar initiatives in other agencies have rarely been pursued and, where they have, have relied entirely on the goodwill of the agencies concerned.

I find that an absolutely staggering revelation. Here we have a paper signed by the Premier and the Minister of Business and Regional Development submitted to the Cabinet of this Government which admits that they have failed to manage information technology initiatives in this State and which indicates that the only reason that some agencies are working together is through goodwill. That is government out of control. This Government is admitting that it has absolutely no control over one of the most expensive areas of Government in today's modern world—the development of information technology. It admits it has no control over the expenditure of \$300 million of taxpayers' money per annum.

The revelations become even more alarming, for it says in part:

Our current management of the information utility is weak in the areas of project management, implementation of systems and acceptable time frames and within cost estimates.

So, the Premier and his Minister are admitting to Cabinet that the management of the information utility has been weak; they have less than desirable competence in project management and implementation of systems; they are not being implemented within acceptable time frames; nor are they being held within the cost expected. It goes further and again I quote:

Our tendering processes have not only seen the Government information technology business shared across the industry but have often involved enormous costs to both the Government and tendering companies.

The Premier is admitting to his Cabinet that the way in which this Government is tackling information technology has involved enormous cost to Government (in other words the taxpayer) and to tendering companies, and for that reason this Government will find it very difficult to sign strategic alliances with computing companies that have already lost millions of dollars because of its ineptitude.

That is the tragedy that this Government faces. We are supposed to be the smart State. Indeed, we have heard the Deputy Premier stand up in this Parliament before and claim that South Australia is the smart State; that information technology is going to further development and jobs. But if a company has lost millions of dollars trying to encourage the Government to implement computing strategies in this State, why should it spend any more under this present Government? That is the question companies have asked themselves: their answer is that they should not bother. It is for that reason that major information technology companies are now approaching the Liberal Party in preparation for a change in Government, and an opportunity for the first time to actually develop strategic information technology in this State.

Sir, the most alarming statement of all has been the Premier's admission about the information utility. I quote again from his submission to Cabinet:

There is now an increasingly held view within Government circles that the Government cannot justify being a shareholder in the information utility unless the IU is a profitable enterprise from its inception. However, it seems that in order for the organisation to be profitable the Government will need to make considerable and questionable concessions.

It goes on further to say:

With that in mind we would rather not put additional effort into establishing a cast iron case for the Government as a shareholder, but would prefer to explore alternatives to the original concepts of the information utility.

Those are the words of the Premier and of his Minister of Business and Regional Development about the information utility, which was supposed to be a cornerstone of the MFP; something that was supposed to be a mechanism for attracting enterprise to this State. That is an admission from the Premier that his Government has failed to develop high-tech in this State; has failed to deliver on a cornerstone of the MFP; has failed to provide incentive to provide opportunities for employment in an area in which it has consistently told this Parliament that it would deliver.

*Mrs Hutchison interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** This Government is an absolute failure, and it is time that it and some of the inane interjectors

opposite left this Parliament, and allowed a Liberal Government to get on with the job, a Government capable of delivering what this Government has failed to deliver.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** From time to time there can be some embarrassing occurrences for members of Parliament. Thankfully there have not been too many of those occasions during my period as the member for Goyder, but this morning such an incident occurred, and unfortunately it is the type of incident that has occurred too often in the last year or so. A constituent of mine rang my office and asked: Where is the answer from the Minister of Public Infrastructure as to what is occurring with broken water mains in the area where he lives? I am afraid that both my secretary and I had to check as to how long ago I took that up with the Minister, and why I have not received an answer. Looking at the correspondence, I saw that it was dated 2 June 1993, which is some 10 weeks since I took up this issue, an issue which my constituent had brought to my attention during the several weeks prior to that, and in desperation I had to go to the Minister.

The issue concerns the continual breaks of water pipes in an area approximately five kilometres north of Two Wells. I was receiving regular calls from the constituent, because he was furious that he was without water from time to time, and also because it appeared that there was no logical explanation for the pipes continually breaking. In fact, when I wrote to the Minister I asked: How many bursts have occurred in the past few weeks? What has caused the bursts? Is it proposed to lay new pipes in the area, or are the repairs considered satisfactory in the long term, and finally is it anticipated that further breaks will occur in the coming months?

We know the answer to the last question, because I received more information this morning: 'Yes, there have been further breaks.' In fact, yesterday my constituent broke, as he said, another glass in his hand. Why would he break another glass in his hand? After the pipes had burst it appeared that too much pressure had been put back into them and, as he turned on the tap, there were air locks, and suddenly the water spurted out and broke the glass he was holding. Apparently that was not the first time that occurred.

In addition, a near neighbour who runs a feed lot takes it upon himself to water down the feed lot, particularly if there is any chance of dust blowing off it in the evening or the following day. Yesterday, because of the broken water pipe, again that could not occur. I believe the questions I asked the Minister were simple and straightforward. They were not difficult questions and they could have been answered within a short period of time.

There is no doubt that the Minister will have a reply available in the next few days, but I just wonder how much longer this matter would have gone on if my constituent had not rung me this very day to ask what was going on. It is an embarrassment to me because I like action to occur quickly and promptly and I get a little upset not only with the Minister of Public Infrastructure but with other Ministers as well who seem to take things for granted that six weeks is normal and we should not complain if it takes 12 weeks or more. It is obvious that the Government is more worried about its own neck than occurrences to citizens throughout the State.

The second matter I want to highlight relates to the article that appeared about three days ago in the *Advertiser* of 9 August entitled 'Future of super department plan known soon, pledge on services', and it is a report by police reporter Lesley Johns quoting in part the Minister of Emergency

Services about the future of the proposed 'super' Emergency Services Department. In that article Mr Johns says that the future will not be known for two weeks and states:

The Emergency Services Minister, Mr Mayes, said last night the Premier, Mr Arnold, would announce what form the department would take in the budget session of Parliament. Mr Mayes said the exact format of the Emergency Services Department was still to be determined.

There was something disturbing in that article, because the last paragraph states:

Mr Mayes also indicated that it was likely country areas could see one of their emergency service operations 'swallowed' by another, but without loss of service. 'I would imagine the Country Fire Service would likely be the predominant emergency service in the country; it would take over the SES facilities, assets and volunteers,' he said.

There has been outrage in my electorate and, from what the shadow Minister said last night, throughout this State about the Minister's words. Why? There is a variety of reasons. It appears that there has been absolutely no consultation with the SES and, to the best of my knowledge, with the CFS.

**Mr Atkinson:** Absolutely none!

**Mr MEIER:** As the Government member interjects, there has been absolutely none and he would know, because the Government would have discussed it in its weekly meeting. There has been no discussion at all and I am pleased that the honourable member has confirmed what has been reported to me. Absolutely none!

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Why would the Minister make such a statement, particularly after this Government repeatedly has claimed it would always consult fully before making changes?

Here, the Minister of Emergency Services says it is likely that the CFS will swallow up the SES, and we assume that that announcement will be made within the next two weeks. There has been no consultation, and I know what will now happen: the Minister will run around madly and contact SES and CFS people and ask, 'What do you think of the idea?' Then he can legitimately get up in the Parliament and say, 'Oh, yes, consultation has occurred; I have spoken with people from both sides of the fence.' But the tragedy is that the Government, not the volunteers, has decided on the course of action.

What is wrong with the idea for a start? First, if there ever was an amalgamation to be contemplated it should be just that—an amalgamation, not a takeover. In fact, my personal view—and I believe it is that of my Party—is that we do not want to see any amalgamation. We believe that both services have their role to play and that both services are doing an excellent job in the community. But the SES has some features and characteristics that make it a very strong unit. It seems to have had no funding problems. In fact, as one of the members said, 'John, when we ask for a new item of equipment or need something within a short time, we are provided with it; our morale is very high; we are a closely knit unit; our members have complete confidence in themselves and in the SES organisation', and it is great to hear those positive comments.

Why would a Government want to destroy such an organisation? Why would it want to amalgamate it when it is performing so admirably? Why, when it is funded principally from the Commonwealth Government, would the State want to take over funding for it? These and many other questions need to be answered, and it is a tragedy that the

Minister made the announcement through the *Advertiser* without any consultation. He stands condemned, and he has a lot of explaining to do to the SES and I believe the CFS as well.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I want to raise a matter which follows, to some extent, the statement made by my colleague the member for Flinders referring to volunteers but which involves an entirely different area. Last Friday, along with other members of Parliament and a number other dignitaries, I was present at the official opening of the so-called Gawler bypass. The Hon. Barbara Wiese, the Minister of Road Transport, was present and, as part of the proceedings, we subsequently went to the side of the road and planted some trees, the total plan being to plant more than 6 000 trees.

The Road Transport Department requested expressions of interest from contractors who wanted to undertake that planting, as has been the case in many other areas, and a contractor who had worked elsewhere for the department on a number of occasions was successful in obtaining a contract. That contractor proceeded on the basis of giving the planting work to interested volunteer groups in the district, with the funds at full tote odds going to the people who planted the trees, the great advantage being that the trees could be planted in one weekend. So, Community Aid Abroad and other organisations were given the opportunity to provide volunteers to undertake this planting, and it was to take place this coming weekend.

What has happened? Somebody has suggested to the union movement that this is not according to Hoyle. Was it an unsuccessful contractor? Was it somebody wanting to create mischief? One does not quite know. However, a particular union (and with due deference to it, I will not indicate which one but will pass on the name of the union to any member interested) has been forced into the position of having to put pressure on the successful contractor not to allow volunteers to plant those trees and put the total amount they earn on a per tree basis into volunteer organisations—organisations that are important not only from a community point of view but also in terms of Community Aid Abroad, an organisation concerned with providing assistance for overseas countries in need.

I hope that by raising this matter here, somebody on the Government side will take up the cudgels on behalf of this particular contractor, as well as those members of the community who seek to donate funds to worthwhile causes rather than putting money in the pockets of a contractor or into somebody's bank account. It is the first occasion on which this particular contractor, who has quite a number of contracts across the State, has encountered such an impediment. I honestly believe that the union has been dragged into this matter unintentionally—against its will and its interests—but when the pressure is applied from certain directions there is a problem and unless it is responded to there may well be trouble.

I invite members opposite to seek additional information from me on this matter, so that they might use their good offices within the system and allow the many thousands of dollars worth of volunteer effort to proceed this coming weekend. I certainly hope that there will be none of these shenanigans in the future. I believe it is an absolute tragedy that such a set of circumstances has been allowed to occur. If the member for Spence does not believe in volunteer organisations looking after the interests of the community and

providing aid overseas where it is needed, then let him stand up and defend his position. I would not defend him, because I do not believe he could sustain an argument in support of taking those funds from where they are sorely needed.

On the subject of funds, I want to talk about slush funds which it would appear are in the hands of the member for Napier. I draw attention to an advertisement in the *Northern Messenger* this weekend, occupying a third of a page and referring to 'Annette Hurley, Australian Labor Party candidate for Napier; a caring advocate for the people of Munno Para (in the short time she has been there that may well be true: I would not deny that) committed to serving Munno Para through its community organisations (I would question that, although she may desire to do so); and prepared to fight for us.'

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** All candidates do that, some like the member for Albert Park doing it better than others. That has kept him quiet; he cannot argue about that. It maintains that she is a local who knows the area and the people of Munno Para.

Someone who moved in no more than six months ago—'knows the people'. But, who is it authorised by? Terry Hemmings M.P., suite 11, Elizabeth House, Oxenham Drive, Elizabeth, S.A. 5112. Then there is a contact office in relation to where the office is at Munno Para. The authorisation would suggest to me that there have been some funds, and the authorisation agent has had some involvement with these slush funds. I am told that the advertisement would have cost \$663.60 to put into the paper. The convenor of the slush fund is nodding his head in agreement. So what do we do? We have a situation here which is very intriguing, having regard to the present member for Hartley, the to be elected member for Napier come the next State election.

**Mr Atkinson:** Who pays for your ads?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am in the fortunate position that we do not have to have very big ads. There in fact will be no ads for me in the forthcoming election, but I will certainly be assisting my successor.

**Mr Atkinson:** Who pays for his ads?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I will be putting a little bit of money into that, but I will not be putting \$663.60 for one rendition. I say to the member for Hartley, the next member for Napier, that he has it made, because whilst this sort of activity goes on the people will turn off very quickly. It is a little like the letter to the Editor from the member for Napier's electorate secretary, who did not even live in the electorate but told us how good the member for Napier was. She happened to be one of my constituents. We have some rather intriguing battles going on. I back the member for Hartley.

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Over the past two weeks the Opposition has had much to say about the State Bank, particularly the behaviour of its management and directors. That has been in spite of the fact that now two and a half years have passed since those bank losses were declared and addressed. What the members opposite have not addressed is the behaviour that is still taking place in many of the private banks around this country at the moment. We also have not heard very much from those members opposite about the policies they might have in relation to the bank; but that is a matter for another day.

What I want to address today is particularly the behaviour of Westpac, because I believe there is some behaviour of that

bank which really ought to be brought to the attention of the House, and this is behaviour that is going on now. The first thing to say about Westpac is that it has loans to borrowers in some degree of difficulty totalling \$8.6 billion, which is \$2 billion more than the bank's underlying worth. Westpac has just recently appointed a new executive director, an American called Mr Joss. I believe he is being paid something in excess of \$1 million per year for that position.

**Mr Quirke:** \$1.5 million.

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** \$1.5 million, the member for Playford tells me. According to an article in the *Weekend Australian* last weekend, as well as those losses that have been declared, Westpac has a potential minefield in its loan book in Japan, which is worth some \$5.1 billion, for the Japanese property market and stockmarket have fallen even further than Australia's over the past two years. No doubt we will hear more about Westpac's performance in the years to come. What I want to address is the behaviour of some of these people within Westpac. As this article in the *Weekend Australian* pointed out:

This has been a difficult time for the bank's 80 000 shareholders, who saw their stock drop in value from over \$6 two years ago to a bottom of \$2.50 late last year. Understandably, many are still angry and want some explanations as to how management and the board could have presided over the losses.

Yet, at the special meeting last month to approve a lucrative options arrangement which could deliver up to \$7.8 million to Joss, Uhrig [the new Managing Director of Westpac] threatened to stifle debate when shareholders started pressing him for answers or threatened to vote against controversial motions.

The article goes on to point out:

One point on which shareholders were keen to get some explanations was the proposal by the board to release two former executives of liabilities over an executive share scheme totalling nearly \$3 million.

Obviously these former executives had entered into some arrangement whereby they would buy shares, no doubt to help reduce their taxation. It was a favourable deal but, of course, what had happened was that the price of the shares had fallen dramatically, as I mentioned earlier, from \$6 to \$2.50. So these executives were out of pocket and facing some losses. What happened was that the Westpac board released them from their obligations. The article continues:

Uhrig declared it was wrong to seek to punish past management.

The article further states:

This only raised shareholders' hackles more, but Uhrig told them bluntly that they had no chance of winning any vote because he had sufficient proxy votes to beat them. His arrogance in view of the losses suffered by many shareholders as a result of the bank's recent performance was breathtaking. The meeting also had a vote on the \$500 million converting preference shares issue. Capital is vital because it indicates the amount of lending banks can do, and lending is their lifeblood.

The article goes on to point out:

... this latest issue of shares designed to boost the base capital of Westpac from 10 per cent to 10.6 per cent is different. For a start, the offer has been rushed by investors, in stark contrast to the ignominious cold shoulder it received when it tried to issue rights last year. It is popular for reasons that should be ringing alarm bells for ordinary shareholders. Investors in these converting preference shares will receive a tax-free dividend return of 6.5 per cent—a generous return in today's low inflation environment.

But this is the important point:

The sting for ordinary shareholders is that these converting preferences will soak up all of Westpac's franking credits. These credits are earned by companies paying the full rate of corporate tax and allow them to pay dividends to shareholders tax-free.

What it means is that all those ordinary shareholders who have suffered enormous losses are now going to be paying for this capital raising. That corporate behaviour on the part of Westpac is absolutely disgraceful, and it brings forward an important issue. This Government has decided, in my view quite appropriately, that we should be proceeding towards the sale of the State Bank. My view is that, given the Government guarantee that exists with the bank, we can no longer afford to have a bank within Government ownership. However, we should be aware of the fact that if banks are privatised it is these sorts of people who will be taking over the funds of ordinary shareholders in this country. I think it is long overdue that the Commonwealth got its act together and started getting some decent regulation into the behaviour of the people who are running the finances of this country.

The unfortunate thing is that, whereas we have had a royal commission into the State Bank which has gone into the matter in intimate detail and the Government has taken great steps over the past two and a half years to put the affairs of that bank in order, no such thing has happened in the private sector with those private banks. They are still operating under the same inadequate corporate laws that allowed the corporate cowboys to lose all the money from these banks in the first place. Again I make the point that every single dollar that has been lost by banks, and it is some \$30 billion in this country, something like \$1 trillion in the United States and many hundreds of billions of dollars in overseas countries, has been lost out in the corporate sector by corporate cowboys.

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** The member for Heysen has missed the whole point. It is his friends in the Liberal Party, his business friends who have actually lost the money. They are the people who borrowed the money from the State Bank; it is the property developers. The Australian banks have loaned money, but it has been the developers and the spivs who have lost the money.

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

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** I am very grateful to the member for Heysen for bringing up the subject of friends of the Liberal Party, because one of the great friends of at least one very prominent member of the Liberal Party is none other than Mr Tony Summers, who happened to be a State Bank director and was also very involved with Bennett and Fisher. I would like to quote from the *Sunday Mail* of 11 July. The quote is from the shadow Federal Minister for Infrastructure and National Development, Ian McLachlan, as follows:

'Tony Summers is an energetic, bright person'... 'Sure, he's a friend, I've been to his house and he's been to mine—I guess you would say he's a business friend.'

Mr McLachlan is in a position creditors would love to be in. He has spoken to Summers in London. 'I've spoken to him a couple of times and he told me he was doing theology'... 'There was no indication he was worried, then again I wasn't discussing this matter with him. It never ceases to amaze me—'

This is Mr McLachlan talking—

how wise people are after the event. Nothing has been proven yet and the knockers never have the guts to do it to someone's face. I like Tony Summers and I think he did a great job when we worked together.'

That was Tony Summers, former Director of the State Bank; the man who is now, I believe, studying theology in the United Kingdom. It was his wife who bought a block of land in the city for \$190 000 and sold it a few years later for something around the \$4 million mark. He is not a friend of

people on this side of the House, but it appears he has plenty of friends on the other side of the House.

The other aspect that I want to conclude on is that, while there is a great need to tidy up the regulation of this sort of behaviour in this country—and I believe that the Commonwealth Government ought to get its act together and do it pretty smartly—the other question that ought to be considered is that of insolvency and the behaviour of people who handle losses and bankruptcy. A committee in the United Kingdom Parliament recently investigated what happened to Robert Maxwell's money, and what it has uncovered shows some quite disgraceful use of the insolvency provisions in respect of those funds. The massive costs involved have meant that a lot of the money that should have been going to the pensioners who lost their money has been going to these other people instead.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I want to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House and the Government in particular the absurd situation which exists in the building industry in South Australia at this stage with the shortage of *pinus radiata*. Of course, we all know that South Australia is a significant producer of *pinus radiata*, yet we seem to have a situation in this State where there is even a greater shortage here than anywhere else in Australia. Of course, we know the history of what has occurred in the South-East of this State in relation to the South Australian Government's involvement, particularly in relation to Forwood Products and prior to that, as it was, SATCO (South Australian Timber Corporation) and the disasters that have occurred in recent years.

I have received a letter from Binder's Building Supplies in Renmark, as follows:

In November 1991 we established a business in Renmark supplying timber and housing requirements for builders and local people. It has taken a lot of hard work and hours to build up the business. This is now being seriously affected by the short supply of *radiata* pine.

When we commenced there was an abundant supply of pine and I am at a loss to understand why this has changed so dramatically. I am unable to receive any satisfactory answers from anyone.

Some of the reasons given are: New Zealand is not exporting to Australia, Victoria and the Eastern States are being given first preference. If this is the case, I find this totally unacceptable, as the main mills are based in South Australia. (I am not sure what interest the South Australian Government has in these mills.)

I can assure the House and Binder's Building Supplies that the Government has a very large involvement in the timber industry in the South-East. The letter continues:

We are having to refuse supplies to some who are making inquiries, as we are struggling to be able to supply the people who have supported us since we opened. I do not like doing this.

I do not know if anything can be done to change this situation, but would like you, as the MP for this area, to make inquiries and see if you can find some answers that nobody else seems to be able to give.

I understand that this is Statewide and will have a disastrous effect not only on the building industry in the Riverland but Statewide.

What is stated in that letter is perfectly true. The Minister has approved the export of non-processed sawlogs from the South-East at enormous detriment to the South Australian industry and the building industry in particular, and we are well aware that the Woods and Forests milling operations in the South-East have not shown a profit for at least 10 years. The Government and the Minister have a lot to answer for with regard to this situation. It is incredible to have an industry the size of the *pinus radiata* industry in the South-

East, yet builders in South Australia, in our present economic circumstances, are unable to obtain sufficient building materials for those houses that are actually being built. That is absolutely absurd. How the Government can allow that sort of situation to occur is beyond belief.

It would appear that the Government is prepared to give preference to the Eastern States rather than to the building industry in South Australia. If that is not the case, I should like the Minister to respond to my comments today and outline exactly what the situation is and try to give some valid reason why the industry is not being supplied with the material. If he can do that, well and good. If not, he ought to do something positive about turning that situation around so that the South Australian building industry at least gets first preference for any timber that is available. I am conscious that there is a softwood shortage of timber around the world, but South Australia is a significant producer and the South Australian people and industry ought to receive preference over any others. I should like the Minister to respond as soon as possible, and if there is any possible way of turning this situation around it ought to be done as a matter of urgency.

Another matter that I wish to raise in the time available relates to a letter that I received from the Loxton-Waikerie Pest Plant Control Board, which states:

Please find enclosed a copy of correspondence to the Primary Industries Minister, Mr Terry Groom. We are seeking a support subsidy for our farmers devastated by the mouse plague. Your support in pursuing this matter with the Minister, on behalf of rural South Australia, would be appreciated.

The letter from the Loxton-Waikerie Pest Plant Control Board to the Minister is as follows:

The mouse plague devastating rural South Australia is costing our rural industry an estimated \$40 million, and no doubt this figure will rise before the plague is brought under control.

The board is highlighting the fact that the grain industry is worth about \$40 million to South Australia. The letter continues:

For our rural farmers, this mouse plague, on top of other problems within the industry, is a disaster and one they can ill-afford. To date approximately 100 tonnes of wheat has been mixed with strychnine at a material only cost of \$300 000 plus the cost of spreading. Many farmers simply cannot afford this untimely burden that may continue into the spring with the strong possibility of reinfestation.

In my view, this is a State disaster; it is a disaster that individual farmers cannot carry by themselves.

A small proportion of the \$40 million that can be produced by the rural sector actually stays with the farmers who are producing it. That is typical of most primary industries: the producer retains very little of the real value of the product. If there is not support for the farming community to come to grips with this problem, a significant proportion of that \$40 million will be lost to South Australian and to each and every individual in this State. It is a burden that should not be carried purely by the grain farmers themselves, because most of the benefits go to all South Australians, whether they live in rural areas or in the metropolitan area.

Unless the Minister is able to sort out this issue very quickly, the farmers themselves will not be able to cope with the plague and much of that \$40 million will be lost. As I said, at this stage we are talking about a cost of \$300 000 to the farmers. In many instances the farmers are so heavily in debt that there is no possible way that they can effectively come to terms with this problem. Unless the Government is more forthcoming, this State will face the loss of an enormous level of potential income.

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** I support the Supply Bill and I wish to comment on individual areas. I recently asked the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, the Hon. Martin Evans, a question about elective surgery in country areas. I was very pleased to have a response from the Minister that indicated that my electorate, and indeed all South Australian country electorates, have benefited.

For example, the Port Augusta Hospital will have an allocation of \$40 000 to pay for 50 ENT procedures. I know that ENT procedures in city areas have been of concern, but they have been of particular concern in Port Augusta, which is in my electorate. Port Pirie—the other half of my electorate—is to receive \$120 000 for 50 joint replacements, 10 neurology procedures and 15 cataract operations. As you probably would be aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Port Pirie Hospital has recently been upgraded and is now an excellent venue, being able to cope with specialist surgical procedures, as are the procedures to which I referred. I am sure that the fact that we are now tackling the longest aspect of booking lists would please everyone in country areas.

I refer now to tourism and arid lands funding. I referred recently in this House to this project and its benefit to Port Augusta. I was pleased that the Minister of Tourism had granted \$300 000 and—

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** It is an excellent project.

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** Yes, it is an excellent project, as the honourable member says. The Federal Government also promised \$300 000 towards that project. That leaves the way open for corporate sponsorship of the Arid Lands Botanic Garden at Port Augusta, and that would mean that that project would be able to go ahead with some substance behind it.

One of things that I am looking forward to seeing there is some plantings, which will encourage people to visit that area. That is notwithstanding the fact that a substantial number of people, not only from within the State but also from interstate and overseas, visit the garden. The membership of the friends group comprises people from all those areas as well. So obviously this is a very important project and one into which I was very glad to see the State Government putting money to support it. There has always been an in principle agreement to support the project but it is very nice to have that money coming in to ensure that the project does actually go ahead and, hopefully, that will generate much more income into the project from the corporate sponsorship.

I refer now to local government. I was interested to read this morning in the local government magazine, which I had recently received, some very positive comments about what has been happening in the local government area and about the new association that has been set up by the State Government. The President, Mr Leon Broster, recently went to a congress in Toronto, Canada. He spoke to people at that congress and the various speakers from around the world were also putting the viewpoints of local government in their areas. In the 'President's comments' in the local government magazine, Mr Broster says:

It became obvious that in South Australia our relationship with the central Government is far in advance of most other countries and there was great interest in our memoranda of understanding and amazement at how local government is involved in the development of our new Local Government Act by actually managing the process rather than having the legislation imposed on us.

I think that members would agree that those comments are very positive and show that South Australia is really in the

forefront in the management of local government in South Australia in particular. Mr Broster went on to say:

Many local authorities have created varying forms of commercial activities ranging from daughter companies such as our LGFA etc. to undertake or provide specific services for councils or groups of councils, to full privatisation of services by leasing out operations to the private sector, although it seemed to me that the trend to full privatisation was tending not to occur as much as it did several years ago. Again in South Australia we seemed to be well up with the rest of the world.

I think that is because of the very good consultation between both State Government and local government, which ensured that the transition to a local government association proceeded as smoothly as possible. Mr Broster further said:

Australia is still the lucky country and while we have major problems such as unemployment our problems pale into insignificance compared to those of some other countries.

I would like to pick up that point, because it seems to me that too often in this House there is knocking and a negativism which I find to be quite distressing and distasteful. I think it is time we realised that we are indeed the lucky country and, whilst countries around the world are in much more trouble than we are in, we should appreciate that and we should be working towards making our situation better but realising that we are indeed extremely lucky. I think that the sooner we realise that, the sooner this State will go ahead. It needs to come from both sides of the House. This continual knocking from the other side is not productive for South Australia as a whole, and I would have thought that any parliamentarian was interested in seeing South Australia go ahead rather than knocking all the time and, in fact, promoting a bad image around the nation and overseas.

I wish now to pay tribute to the CFS. I recently attended the CFS regional championships at Ceduna, and I would have to say that I was astounded to see the number of young people who are becoming involved in the CFS. Young people from the age of 12 years onward were involved, and the skill that they were showing at that very early age were a credit to them. Much credit is also due to go to the people who train those young people, particularly in the country areas, but I believe that this trend is occurring also in the city, where more young people are becoming involved in the CFS.

I was interested to note that unfortunately the local CFS was unable to compete in the championships because the members were required to attend either a chemical or an oil spill which occurred almost 600 kilometres from Ceduna. Their regional responsibility is extremely large. All the training that the members of the local unit had done toward the regional championships was not lost but they were not able to make use of that by competing, so I would like to pay a tribute to them. Whilst they were not actually able to perform at the championships, they were certainly performing by doing their job some 600 kilometres from Ceduna.

Speaking to the organisers of the championships, I was very pleased to hear that there is a very great interest in performing in those regional championships and in contributing their services to help the fire services in country areas. As everyone would realise, they are extremely important for the people in country areas of South Australia, and I was happy to go along to support them in those regional championships.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I take the opportunity to pick up some of the points the member for Stuart has just raised in accusing this side of knocking. What the honourable member is really saying is that if a Government sits back and



lets \$3.15 billion be wasted, we should say nothing; if we see executives in organisations doing the wrong thing, we should say nothing; if we see a Government that wants to attack business all the time, we should say nothing; if we see a Government that goes into the Federal field and makes all sorts of promises and then, within nine months, wants to bring in new tax laws and breaks its promises, we should say nothing; and when people overseas read that there will be no increase in taxes and think that this might be a good place to go and start investing, and that Government breaks its promise within a few months, we should say nothing. We should sit back and say 'It is all right to tell fibs and break promises,' because if people overseas believe that such a Government here is accepted by all and is able break promises, that is all right.

Would the honourable member invest money in any organisation that tended to tell untruths or to break promises? Of course she would not. Yet that is what the honourable member is saying. It is quite obvious this is an attempt to say to the Opposition 'Please don't criticise us when we do the wrong thing: sit back and let it happen.'

The honourable member is right: we do have a lucky country, but not one created by the present socialists who control the Federal and State Parliaments. There is no luck in that at all: that was bad luck and bad judgment. The good luck comes because this country can grow any crop on earth and has every type of weather to grow the crops. It has a continental shelf equivalent to two thirds the size of the land area that has hardly been investigated to see whether there are any benefits there for the country. A little bit has been undertaken for oil and gas but not much else.

It has a wealth of virtually every type of mineral that needs to be available to the human race, and in quite reasonable quantities. It has iron ore, on the present needs of the world, for 1000 years without recycling. That is not created by socialist Governments, by Mr Keating, Mr Arnold or Mr Bannon with their waste of public money: that is created by nature. It was put here for us to use in a sensible way.

That is what the honourable member is saying when she talks about the lucky country. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the attitudes of Government. We have a Government, whether it be the Federal socialists or the State socialists, that says 'We will help small business,' but then puts all sorts of regulations in their way. They put those barriers there against small business, and we know they do it. And when they interject, we know it hurts; we know it is the truth. That is the way you find out what the truth is.

Who would go into small business with prescribed industry tax papers to fill out, payroll tax and now superannuation? And the Prime Minister (Mr Keating) says that the superannuation levy might have to go to 16 per cent.

In other words, if you employ someone you have to pay payroll tax. If you have enough employees for that, then you have to pay a tax to the Government for employing that person and you then have to pay 16 per cent on top of salary—that is what he is talking about. It is equivalent to an increase in salary of 16 per cent, and the employee contributes nothing. I would not mind a system where both make a contribution; I could understand that because we do have trouble in the long-term with saving money.

We then have another problem. The Federal Government says that if you own shares or have some securities and apply for a pension it will take into consideration the value of the shares as they increase in deciding what your pension benefit will be, that is, even if you retain them and do not sell them.

That reminds me of this same socialist Government when it applied a law in relation to the payment of death duties on estates. A lady in my electorate lost her husband at a time when Poseidon shares were \$260 each. Some members would remember that period. That was the price of the shares on the day on which her husband died. They bought them when they were very cheap for, I think, about \$1.60. If they could have capitalised on them I would not have minded their paying tax, but by the time that estate was wound up the shares had dropped to \$22 each. The lady lost everything; the Government took everything she had.

That same attitude is expressed by the present Government when it says that the accrued benefit that a person might be able to get if they sold their shares should be taken into consideration when deciding what their pension should be. I would not mind if the Government changed the rules and said that, in this lucky country, as the member for Stuart describes it, if a person buys shares in Australian companies it will not take that accrued benefit into consideration when determining a pension.

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** I rise on a point of order. I have a motion on this subject on the Notice Paper. Is it in order for the honourable member to debate this subject at this stage?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** As long as the honourable member is not actually addressing that subject, his remarks are in order, because these debates are wide ranging. However, if the honourable member is addressing that subject, I ask him to take that into consideration.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*[Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2 p.m.]*

#### **GARBAGE RECYCLING TRANSFER CENTRE**

A petition signed by 42 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to oppose the establishment of the proposed Waste and Garbage Transfer Centre at Royal Park was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

#### **WATER QUALITY**

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** The *Advertiser* of 5 August carried a photograph of the member for Heysen and a bottle of exceedingly dirty water, under the headline, 'New row over hills water'. In the accompanying article, the honourable member described the water, collected at the home of Mrs Flo Rayner of Crafers West, as 'typical of that piped to many homes there'. The article said the issue would be raised in Parliament that day and that I would be presented with a bottle of muddy tap water from a typical home in the area. The article also stated that Mrs Rayner had made her complaint about the water to the member for Heysen on the previous day, 4 August. Contrary to the newspaper prediction, this matter was not raised in the House. The bottle of water was left by the member for Heysen with my colleague the Minister of Education before I entered the Chamber—presumably for the benefit of the media.

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Heysen to order.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** However, as the House might expect, the E&WS Department immediately followed up the matters raised in the article and, as we have also come to expect, this investigation revealed that all was not as it seemed. A check with local departmental officers established that at the time of the article Adelaide Hills consumers were being supplied with unfiltered water from the Murray through the Murray Bridge-Onkaparinga pipeline. Water quality in the river was then at its best for some time and few complaints about water quality were being received by E&WS.

The consumer who provided the member for Heysen with the water was identified as living at Emmett Road, Crafers. However, an investigation of the condition of the water in this area on 5 August showed it to be consistent with the normal unfiltered River Murray supply. E&WS attempted to contact Mrs Rayner by telephone on the same day, without success, but a waterworks inspector had a discussion with Mr Rayner on a follow-up visit to the property on 10 August. This established that the muddy water sample was taken on 19 July—more than two weeks before the *Advertiser* article. E&WS also established that tank cleaning—an operation which has the potential to cause dirty water in the surrounding area—had been carried out three days earlier on 16 July.

It is evident that the water sample taken by the Rayners was affected by the tank cleaning operation and was not a true indication of the water being supplied at the time of the newspaper article. E&WS has advised that, in line with normal procedures, notices were inserted in the press, including the local press, prior to the tank cleaning operations. Mr Rayner indicated that he was not aware of this planned maintenance. He told the inspector that he was satisfied with the water then being supplied, although he indicated he had problems from time to time.

It should be noted that the muddy water received by the Rayner family on 19 July was not reported to the E&WS Department. The best advice I can offer to consumers who experience problems of this kind is to report them immediately to the department. In many cases, the problem can be resolved by such simple actions as flushing the mains.

## DISABILITY SERVICES

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I am pleased to announce today to the House major changes in the way disability services will be provided in South Australia. In January this year I set in train a major reform process in this area. I appointed Mrs Judith Roberts as a consultant and Chair of the Disability Services Implementation Steering Committee. Its role was to consider the recommendations of the Disability Directions Project and advise me on:

- a framework for a disability service delivery system;
- on the role of the Disability Services Office in relation to other Government agencies and non-government organisations;
- and on the establishment of a Disability Advisory Council.

The Disability Services Implementation Steering Committee worked within the context of broader reform for the public sector as a whole and the need for collaboration between

Government and non-government sectors in human service provision.

There exists at present a complex range of support services that many people with disabilities require to live in the community. These services, mostly provided by non-government agencies, are now part of a complex network of local, regional, State and Commonwealth agencies.

While these services provide enormous benefits to people with disabilities, their families and carers, there are gaps and overlaps in the system which means some people might be missing out on the most appropriate services. The committee has recommended changes in the system for the ultimate benefit of people with disabilities, their families and carers.

Cabinet has endorsed the recommendations and I will briefly outline them to the House. It is proposed that priority be given to introducing a model which deals with the complexity of the current service delivery framework and which is capable of responding equitably in accordance with need. The direction proposed by the committee deals with these issues in a number of ways.

First, it clarifies the roles and responsibilities of the people and agencies involved in the current system. Secondly, it proposes an arrangement for providing clearly identifiable and accountable access points for clients to the disability system. These access points will consist of a number of agencies, each with a focus on specific disability groups which will collectively provide coverage right across the disability field.

People needing assistance will be able to deal with workers who are expert and competent and who have a clear responsibility for responding to the needs of individuals and/or their carers and families. These workers, to be called 'options coordinators', will create, coordinate and manage the range of assistance required.

I acknowledge, as does the committee, that this vision will not provide overnight solutions to the disability system's currently identifiable problems. But a model will ultimately emerge over time which will offer improvements to people with disabilities and provide clear goals and pathways for future development. In order to achieve this vision existing agencies will need to review their current roles and functions to determine the most cost effective and efficient ways of assisting people with disabilities and their families.

As well, training for the workers who will become options coordinators will need to be undertaken to ensure that they possess the necessary knowledge and skills. All the interested parties in the current system will be involved in the reform process to creatively negotiate the funding arrangements necessary. The reforms will mean efficiencies and savings which will be redirected right back into service delivery. There will, of course, be negotiations with staff, unions and agencies.

The new framework we will be putting in place for disability services will be an evolutionary process which will build on and support the best aspects of the current system. The new Disability Council will be established to monitor the process of reform.

I look forward to working with groups in the disability field over the next few years to achieve the best services in the country for people with disabilities. I am grateful to the members of the Disability Services Implementation Committee and its Chair, Judith Roberts, for their hard work during the past six months. I commend to the House the committee's report, a copy of which I now table.

## DINGO CONTROL

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** I have received correspondence today that Mrs Jones, the owner of Diesel the dingo, wishes to have her dingo placed in the Northern Territory and has requested an extension of time until 23 August to allow this to be undertaken. Last week I intervened in this matter to ensure that the dingo was not destroyed but instead that a humane option be found to place the dingo in a wildlife park or that an alternative acceptable placement be made interstate.

I am pleased to accede to the Jones' request for the dingo to be transported to the Northern Territory, and all the proper precautions will be taken by the officers of the Animal and Plant Control Commission to facilitate this. I am disappointed that the Jones family have not taken up the generous offer from three South Australian wildlife parks—one in Whyalla, one in Mount Gambier and one in the Adelaide Hills—to take Diesel in and reintegrate the dingo with its own kind in a safe and controlled environment.

I am aware that the Animal and Plant Control Commission has successfully overseen two cases where illegally kept dingoes have been integrated at local wildlife parks—both Urimbirra and Cleland—so that not only were the dingoes safe and happy but their former owners have been able to visit them from time to time. I believe with cooperation and respect for the laws as they stand a satisfactory compromise has been reached.

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** I bring up the minutes of evidence given before the committee on the general regulations under the Firearms Act 1977 and move:

That the minutes be received.

Motion carried.

## QUESTION TIME

### NATIVE TITLE

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier confirm that the Government has been sitting on legal advice that Mabo-style native title claims can be made over parklands, foreshore areas and other locations commonly used and enjoyed by all South Australians? In July last year, the Government established a working party comprising officers from the Crown Solicitor's office and the Department of Environment and Land Management to report to Cabinet on the likely impact of Mabo-style claims in South Australia. The Government has been asked on a number of occasions to make public the advice it has received from this working party, but so far it has refused to do so.

I have now been approached by a legal adviser to the Government who is concerned that the Government has failed to fully inform the public of the likely impact of the Mabo judgment on future land use in South Australia. I have been provided with access to advice this working party has given to Cabinet which identifies a range of public areas exposed to native title claims including parklands, foreshore areas, river banks and river beds, national parks, conservation parks,

game reserves, recreation parks and regional reserves. For example, the advice to Cabinet states:

Dedication of lands as parklands or lands otherwise set aside for the use and enjoyment of the inhabitants of an area will not necessarily be inconsistent with any native title that may subsist in those lands.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** There are a couple of points to be made. First, I have indicated on a number of occasions that we will introduce legislation in this session once a complementary approach has been agreed to between the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments. I am pleased to say that my offer to consult with other States on this matter remains open. Indeed, I have written previously to other State Premiers on the matter, and I note that a number of other State Premiers have indicated their agreement to participate in national discussions. I remain open to doing that, and I can inform the House that active discussions are still taking place.

That legislation will provide the security that is wanted by South Australians. It will give a guarantee that we respect and acknowledge as a rightful judgment the recognition of the concept of native title—and I certainly do so, although I wonder whether the Leader does. Is the Leader suggesting that he rejects that judgment of the High Court, as his colleague in Western Australia has done? The Leader has not even indicated a 'Yes' or 'No' on this—as usual it is going to be total silence, a total policy hole from the Opposition with respect to whether or not the judgment of the High Court was correct. We will have legislation that will provide the security of title that people want in this State. So, those titles created that may be seen to have been at risk will be assured that they are not at risk—they will be validated titles. As to the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I just told the honourable member what is going on in this process. If he reads what I have just said, he will find out. Another point on this matter work was done within Government on the various implications, and a report was prepared by a working group within Government on the implications of the Mabo judgment. If my memory serves me correctly, that paper came to us in late 1992—it may have been a bit later than that; I am not sure. The working party said that it did not see that as the finish of its work and wanted to do more work on the issue. Indeed, it issued a supplementary implication statement, I think, in March or April of this year.

In some cases the statements in the supplementary document took issue with the working party's own statements in the initial document because more work had been done and it discovered that some of the points made in the first document were not correct. So, if the first document had been released at that time, that would have been argued to be the definitive situation when in fact, by the working party's own acknowledgment, it was not.

I believe that there should be all this information. The study that has been done in respect of the implications should be made available to the Parliament, and that will occur when that legislation is debated. I give the assurance that we will be tabling that legislation. When we table that legislation we will table the working group's assessment as to what the implications are so that everybody can see this considered opinion. However, it must be the working party's considered opinion—not its first opinion or its second opinion but the opinion that it has finally reached upon completion of this work.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** As to the matter of parklands, foreshores and national parks, as I recall—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** You want all the opinions? You can have all the opinions. It really is a non-issue. So, if the Leader wants them, when the legislation comes down, all of those can be brought in as well. I call on the Leader to respect the work of this working party. It has made some developments of its own thinking on this matter because it is a matter that is very fluid as people develop a further understanding of the implications of the issue and have to take into account the Federal Government's response.

As a result, the working party has made changes of view on certain matters, but that should not reflect on it. It has given the matter further consideration and it would be unfair of the Leader to say, 'Because at some stage it held a view before full information was available, it must now stick to that view.' I hope the Leader would not require that of the working party.

On the matter of the parklands, foreshores and national parks, I cannot remember chapter and verse the details of the implications document, but in the section on national parks I recall reference to some possible confusion in the term 'unalienated Crown land' as opposed to 'undedicated Crown land'. It does raise the possibility that there might be a question there. In fact that was one of the reasons why I raised that issue during the Council of Australian Government meeting held in Melbourne. We were having extensive discussions and very nearly reached an agreed position between all the States but for the cavalier action of the Premier of Western Australia and the Premier of Victoria pulling the rug on the situation at the last minute.

Apart from that we discussed a number of points, and one of the issues I raised was to have that point clarified. I wanted to ensure that undedicated Crown lands, such as national parks, would not fall under the net of the title 'unalienated Crown land' and therefore be liable for claim by a general native title claim. They are issues that I do think need to be further pursued and will indeed be further pursued in the legislation that we have. A further point on this matter needs to be made about exactly what native title is. I think the Leader should stand up and acknowledge this point so that people are not raising unnecessary—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is a complex question. You either want the full answer or not. If I sat down and did not give you the full answer, you would criticise me for not providing all the information on the matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Leader can have it only one way: he is going to get the information. Pastoral leases, for example, in this State already have built into them, under legislation in this Parliament first passed in 1859 and then by subsequent passage or amending legislation reaffirmed, some native rights. There is the right to traverse those lands by Aborigines who live in traditional lifestyles so that they can hunt and gather and reside on those lands. That is a concept of native title in its own right already built into our legislation.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I suggest you read the judgment and look to see the concept of native title in the High Court judgment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to sit down. I hope that we shall be able to conduct this Question Time in the way that the people of South Australia would like to see it conducted. I should like no interjections, or as few interjections as possible, and I should like the answers to be kept as short as possible. This question has now gone on for nine minutes, which is three minutes longer than is usually taken for the first question. I am looking to the Premier to wind it up as soon as possible. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** With one sentence I will wind it up, Mr Deputy Speaker. I believe it would be appropriate for Opposition members, if they do not want to look to the Labor Party's views on this matter, if they are so blinded in their opportunism that they will not look at the work we have been doing on this matter, to look at their own Federal shadow Attorney-General, Premier John Fahey in New South Wales, whom I commend for the stand that he has taken on the Mabo issue, and to Marshall Perron in the Northern Territory and realise from their words that the Liberal Opposition in this State is missing the boat.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

## EMPLOYMENT

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Premier give the House more details of the July labour force figures which were released today?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I heard an interjection that they are a disgrace. Let us look at what happens in these figures. In Australia, overall employment grew by 2 600 for July 1993 compared with July 1992. In South Australia the figure for the growth in overall employment for July 1993 compared with July 1992 was 9 000. In other words, South Australia had a growth of 9 000 people in overall employment taking home—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I will come to full-time employment in a minute. With a bit of patience, I will get there. South Australia had an increase of 9 000 in overall employment compared with a growth of only 2 600 for the whole nation. In fact, other States were losing jobs to enable us to pick up that figure. I understand that I must refer to full-time employment, because I would not want to mislead the House and be thought to be somehow hiding behind the overall employment figures. I do want it to be thought that these are all part-time jobs and that there has been no growth in the number of full-time jobs. The number of full-time jobs for Australia at large has gone up by 35 200. While the number of overall jobs has gone up by only 2 600, the number of full-time jobs has gone up by 35 200.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Very droll. The growth in full-time employment in South Australia—and I suggest that the Opposition listens well to this—between July 1993 and July 1992 was 11 100 compared with a national growth of 35 200. About one-third of the extra full-time jobs in Australia occurred in South Australia. Some 11 100 more

South Australians than last year are taking home a pay packet. That is excellent news.

We are seeing a very interesting trend line take place in this matter. Looking at the last three months in a row, we see that South Australia has had a higher rate of growth in full-time employment than the Australian average. There have been proportionately more full-time jobs in South Australia for three consecutive months. Looking at overall employment, we see that the situation is that since about August or September last year we have had month on month on month of more people in employment, full or part-time, compared with a year ago.

I know that this is not information that the Opposition wants to hear, but it cannot deny the reality of the figures. While it is certainly true that we are all concerned about the level of youth unemployment and the unemployment rate in this State—and it has to be a priority for us all to address—it at least is being addressed when we are seeing 11 000 more people in full-time employment now than a year ago. That is not the situation that members opposite like to hear, but they are simply the facts.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Let us look at the unemployment rate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I caution the member for Bragg that when I call 'Order!' I do not wish him to continue to raise his voice and try to shout above mine or that of the person who is speaking. I do not enjoy interrupting Question Time continually because that reduces the number of questions that are available to the Parliament. However, I am forced to do so and I would firmly request that the Parliament conduct itself in the right way so that we can get through Question Time in the way that is expected.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I wind up with just one more sentence, comparing South Australia with the rest of the country. In July 1992 our unemployment rate was 11.5 per cent and Australia's was 11 per cent. That means that we were worse than the national average. In July 1993 when Australia's was 10.7 per cent, we were 10.4 per cent—better than the national average. That has been the trend line we have seen in recent months. The only States that have lower rates of unemployment than South Australia are Western Australia, on 9 per cent, and Queensland, on 10.3 per cent, which is .1 per cent better. Regarding the Liberal States, New South Wales is exactly on our figure, Victoria is 12.4 per cent and Tasmania is 12.8 per cent. While certainly understanding that there is a long way to go and a lot of work still has to be done, and this Government is doing that, we should at least be heartened by the news we have had to date, and so should the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

#### NATIVE TITLE

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** How does the Premier justify his previous claim that pastoral leases have extinguished native title when this is disputed by the Government's own legal advice? The Government's working party has given advice that the impact of the Mabo judgment on pastoral leases in South Australia is not clear and further judicial interpretation will be needed to establish the full effect. The Liberal Party has also been provided with legal

advice which states that pastoral leases in South Australia 'contain various reservations in favour of Aboriginal people which leave open the argument that native title has not been extinguished other than in areas in the vicinity of improvements'. The document continues:

Approximately 60 per cent of South Australia is either pastoral land or conservation reserve which is open or susceptible to claim.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I have given the assurance, on a number of occasions since these various conferences have taken place, that we will do whatever is necessary to validate titles. One of the points that I made at the Council of Australia Government (COAG) meeting was that the advice was that pastoral leases were probably okay but we wanted the assurance that they would be okay. I might say that the Prime Minister, in terms of dealing with the proposition they were prepared to support, made sure, on my request, that the words 'pastoral leases' were added into the area of guaranteeing that validation of title would take place. That was not in the first draft. It was included because of my standing up for the pastoral lessees of South Australia.

The advice we had on the matter was that pastoral leases before 1975 are not, in fact, likely to be at risk but that those after 1975 might well be. The further advice I have—and I must say it is advice that I have, because I cannot guarantee that the figures are absolutely correct—is that there have been no new pastoral leases since 1975. Therefore, it begs the question whether there is a problem for any pastoral lease at all. Nevertheless, I have made public statements on my return from the Melbourne conference, on my return from the special Premiers Conference and on various other occasions that we will ensure that pastoral leases in this State are validated to remove any possibility of question about them. So, while there are many sources of advice that say that there is no problem with them, we will be doubly sure, and I repeat the assurances that I have given previously.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Leader asked the question about pastoral leases being renewed. In fact, once the pastoral leases take place, that extinguishes the native title. What is not extinguished is the right of traverse to Aborigines living in the traditional style to cross those lands, because that is in our own legislation and we do not intend to see that right removed, and I know that the pastoralists do not want it removed. The National Farmers Federation of South Australia is quite happy for that right to continue. I might add that it believes we are going about this matter in the right way.

#### EMPLOYMENT

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Will the Premier inform the House of the likelihood of the creation of 200 000 jobs in South Australia over 10 years? The Liberal Opposition Leader promised in his document 'Making a change' that, should the Liberal Party ever win Government, it would create 200 000 jobs in South Australia. To date the public has yet to be informed of exactly how the Opposition would create these jobs, despite Liberal members' claims that they would provide not lavish promises but openness, honesty and competence.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** First, I must put on record what has actually happened over the past 10 years with respect to employment in this State; how many extra jobs there have been. In July 1993 there were 111 000 more South Australians working than in July 1983. Over that 10 year

period, 111 000 extra South Australians have been in employment. That is a very impressive figure, and I might say that if you look at the difference between July 1990 and July 1980 that figure was 111 700, and we did have the recession in that time, but that indicates that we have now come out of that and gained back those jobs that were lost as from July 1990.

To turn to the Leader's figure, I indicated these details previously. In fact, I gave earlier figures that spoke at one stage about 80 000 more, then 105 000 more, and now it is 111 000 more than for the same month 10 years earlier. The Leader is a bit like one of those people you hear stories about, when—

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I understand that Standing Orders preclude the Premier from being asked and answering hypothetical questions. I believe this question is completely hypothetical and, therefore, out of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not accept that the explanation is hypothetical to the question. The question related to the prospective increase in employment, and I assume one has to look back at previous employment in order to give a detailed answer. However, I indicate to the Premier that I hope his reply does not go on for too long.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The hypothetical nature of this issue is the Leader's own statement that he would create 200 000 jobs were he in Government. That is what is highly hypothetical, so the member for Hayward is quite correct. The reality is that he is like those stories of people who sit around the table comparing the hardships they went through as a child. One will say, 'I walked three miles to school every day' and the next has to better it and say, 'I walked five miles to school every day', and the next one says, 'I walked 10 miles.'

The Leader, seeing my figure of 111 000 extra jobs in South Australia over the past 10 years, says 'Quick, a figure—a figure: my kingdom for a figure.' So, he comes up with, '200 000 sounds good.' The interesting feature is that John Hewson, before the last Federal election, said that he would create two million extra jobs. What Dean has done is some very simple mathematics. It was a bit difficult for him to work out 8.7 per cent of two million, so he decided to go instead for the easy 10 per cent rule, and decided that 200 000 is the figure he should go for. We know what the Australian electorate thought of John Hewson's hypothetical figures. We know what the electorate thought of—

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, it is quite obvious the Premier is debating the answer.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I cannot accept that the Premier is debating, but we have now been on this question for about five minutes, so I do ask him to draw his answer to a conclusion.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** With one sentence, I will finish this answer. The Leader owes it to South Australians to give details, to give specifics, about how he believes a Government under his direction could provide 200 000 jobs, because, as with everything else—every other supposed policy he has come up with—there is a lot of rhetoric and no detail, no specifics. We have seen 111 000 additional jobs created in South Australia over the past 10 years, and all they come up with is a hypothetical (in the word of the member for Hayward) figure plucked from mid-air or, rather, plucked from the policies of John Hewson.

## STATE BANK

### **Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):**

I hope the Premier's answer to this question will be shorter. Will the Premier admit that he gave a wrong interpretation of the royal commission's terms of reference yesterday; that the terms of reference now do not permit the Royal Commissioner to consider whether the Government was involved in a conspiracy to cover up alleged illegal conduct by executives of Beneficial Finance; and, in light of his serious error, will he now give a specific reference on the matter to the criminal prosecutions task force?

The Premier said on a number of occasions yesterday that the Royal Commissioner was able to consider the conduct of the former Premier and other members and officers of the Government under term of reference No. 4, relating to the institution of civil or criminal proceedings. The original terms of reference for the royal commission set in March 1991 would have allowed this. However, the Government amended the terms of reference in September last year, just after the former Premier gave his evidence on the royal commission, and one wonders why. The amendments mean the Royal Commissioner is now limited to considering only actions of the State Bank Group board members and executives in determining whether he should recommend civil or criminal proceedings.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** There have been three variations to the terms of reference of the royal commission. The first was on 28 March 1991, to define the notions of subsidiary and the State Bank Group. The second, on 27 February 1992, was to provide for an extension of time for the final report from 1 March 1992 to 30 November 1992. The third variation was on 17 September 1992, which was to permit the Royal Commissioner to hand down his second report, that is, reporting on terms of reference Nos 2 and 3, without first having received the report of the Auditor-General and enabling him to proceed with term of reference No. 4. That is the sum total of the effects of the variations to the terms of reference—no more, no less. So, that has not in any way changed the ambit or the scope of the power of Royal Commissioner Mansfield in that matter.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I reject that it has changed the terms in any regard.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader to order.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Day after day, members of the Opposition come up with statements that they believe they have evidence to prove that there is something more, something additional, something besides what appears in the evidence given before the royal commission that justifies some further action. I have indicated that they should come forward with that information and make it public. I repeat this assurance today. Why do they not go to the Royal Commissioner and take that information to him? The term of reference allows them to go there, but I give this undertaking: if by any quaint legal device there is an interpretation that queries their capacity to take the information to the royal commission, we will make a variation accordingly that allows them to take it.

So, I put the challenge right back on the Leader: if he is telling me that there is some impediment in that term of reference and that his legal advice is saying that he cannot do that, he should come to me and we will make a variation

accordingly that will allow that to happen. If he has any information additional to what is already in the evidence that is already able to be examined by the Royal Commissioner in his term of reference No. 4—that is already there and can already be taken—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** —he should take it to the Royal Commissioner. I repeat that offer. If he believes the terms of reference do not allow that new information, he has to come up with the new information, which to date he has refused to do. I invited him to do so last week and there was silence, just ongoing questioning on a very old theme but, in terms of new information, absolute silence. Then, he was offered the opportunity to debate with the member for Ross Smith, and he rejected that; he ran away from the opportunity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the members for Albert Park and Napier to stop shouting across the Chamber and I ask members on my left to stop interjecting as well, so that we can hear the answer to the question.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: we are getting repetition again. This is the third time the Premier has referred back to the debate that was offered by the former Premier, and that is repetition.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not accept the point of order at the moment, but I will certainly be listening carefully to what is said from here on. I feel this is a very important question, and I am surprised that the House is not exhibiting a different sort of attitude. I will take cognisance of what the honourable member has said and I will be listening from here on. The Premier.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Leader does not like it, but the ball is in his court. It is up to him. If he has any new information, as I said in my ministerial statement last week (which he obviously did not listen to), he should come up with the information. Yesterday I repeated the same thing but he still has not come up with any new information. If he has any new information, he should take it to the royal commission so it can be examined.

## FORESTS

**Mr HERON (Peake):** My question is directed to the Minister of Primary Industries. What steps are being taken to protect jobs in the timber industry in the South-East, to ensure that our forestry industry is safeguarded against the damaging effects of log exports? I understand that the Federal Government recently granted a limited licence to export saw log and pulp log from the South-East and Victoria. Given this development, I am concerned about the future of the forestry industry in the South-East and the implications for employment opportunities, should exports of saw log be expanded.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** That is a most important topic—

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** —you just wait—which has caused considerable concern in the South-East. The export of unprocessed—

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** The member for Mount Gambier wants to be quiet; his record on this is not the best. The export of unprocessed wood is under the constitutional control of the Commonwealth Government and is operated

through the Export Control Act 1982. An export licence of unprocessed wood from plantations is approved only if the export price is consistent with prevailing world prices, environmental values are protected and it is not commercially feasible to process and add value in Australia.

On 28 May this year, the Woods and Forests Department received a communication from the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industries and Energy, informing the department of an application by the TreeCorp Group, of Colac in Victoria. This group applied for a licence to export 100 000 cubic metres of softwood saw logs and pulp logs to Japan and Korea from the ports of Geelong and Portland. The amount to be sourced from South Australia was 5 000 cubic metres, with 95 000 cubic metres coming from Victoria. My department wrote back and advised that the material would be used in local value-adding for domestic and export markets. The export licence was issued, and there was considerable community debate in the South-East.

A problem is being created by the fact that we are sitting on a gold mine in the South-East with regard to our forestry industry; there is a world shortage of timber and very high prices are presently obtainable on the export market as a result of that shortage. One of the tasks of any Government, of course, is to stimulate and encourage private investment in forestry plantation. State Governments throughout Australia have been criticised for a very tight regulatory regime.

Our processing industry is part of the internationalised commodity wood market, and its long-term success depends on its being able to compete in these markets for raw material and with its finished products. We must value-add, but it is no good value-adding if we are not able to produce finished products that can be sold on the domestic and international markets. Coincidentally, the Government had to respond to the Industry Commission's draft report, which was published in May this year.

As a consequence of that a Government position was arrived at concerning the future of export controls. I should say for the benefit of the honourable member that when this issue arose I consulted widely with all the industry groups and asked for advice from the South-East Economic Development Board as well as obviously seeking advice from the departments, and I met with the unions involved. All of the groups advised me that 5 000 cubic metres being sourced from South Australia would not cause one job loss, but what—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** The concern of the industry was that this might be the thin end of the wedge and that the gates might be opened to a wider problem that would adversely affect the local industry. That was the concern. No-one I consulted with advanced the proposition that sourcing 5 000 cubic metres of sawlog and pulp from South Australia would cause any job losses in the South-East. Some of the private growers want the Government to get out of the road, and a number of them believe they should be able to dispose of their commodity in any way they see fit. Our responsibility as a State Government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** The State-owned forests are under my control as Minister, and obviously I will do what is necessary to protect the local industry. With regard to private growers, it is important to stimulate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** The Leader of the Opposition says he would ban all exports, but I do not think that that is a sustainable position.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** I think he did say that, but I do not think the shadow Minister was of that view, nor do I think were some of his Federal colleagues who participated in this decision. This Government has arrived at a very balanced approach. In a period of transition, because there is a national view being taken of the forestry industry and how we harness the future, a balanced approach will protect the local industry and at the same time permit a measure of log export where there is no demonstrable harm to the domestic industry. As I say, I believe in a balanced approach of this nature. We have asked for export controls to remain during the period of transition to ensure that our local industry in the South-East is protected.

### SUBMARINES

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier join the Liberal Party in urging the Federal Government to order an additional two Collins class submarines for construction at Osborne for the Australian Navy? The Premier will be aware of the statement by retiring Rear Admiral Oscar Hughes that the Australian Navy should order another two Collins class submarines. Such an order would mean, at least, keeping another 1 100 people employed here in South Australia for three years at the Australian Submarine Corporation at Osborne. I point out to the House that these jobs are needed because the unemployment figures released today show that South Australia lost 5 600 full time jobs in July alone.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** No. It is a fact that the Premier did not bother to reveal earlier: South Australia lost 5 600 jobs in July alone.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I ask the Leader to take his seat. Interjections are too loud and are stopping the Leader asking his question. Interjections are also unfair because we have had some long answers to questions so far in this Question Time, and the explanation put forward so far has taken only two minutes. I ask that the Leader be heard in silence.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was pointing out to the House the fact that unemployment figures released today show that 5 600 full time jobs were lost in July, a month ago, and the Premier failed to reveal that fact when selectively quoting employment figures for South Australia.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I hope that what the Leader is saying by that is that he fully supports the calls that the South Australian Government has made over a number of years concerning the two extra submarines. This is an old story, Dean! Where were you before when we were making these calls on a number of occasions previously? If you are now saying that you are prepared to join us—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I call the member for Bragg to order.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** If the Leader is now—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bragg.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** —saying he is willing to join us in our ongoing calls on this matter, that is good news.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Says who?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** When?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I ask the Premier to address the Chair and ignore interjections.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** When?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** They are full of challenge but short on detail. It is part of their hallmark: they have much rhetoric and absolutely no detail. They are now making an assertion yet, when given the chance (improperly, I know, because one should not court interjections) to say when, there is silence. This Government has pushed for the extra two submarines to be added to the contract. We would be happy to see the extra two on the contract and, if the Opposition is now saying that it will support the extra two on the contract, that is a good thing.

I will be brief, with just one further reference that the Leader wanted to overlook. Let us look at the three month averages in full time employment in South Australia. In the three months to the end of July, 484 500 people were in employment in South Australia. For the three months of the previous quarter, the three months ended April 1993, there were 471 700 people in employment. We had 12 800 extra people in employment in this last quarter compared to the quarter before, not to mention the annual moving figure that I spoke about earlier in Question Time.

### INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** I direct my question to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. Following my representations to the Minister, were approaches made by the State Government to the Federal Government concerning the unfair situations wherein employees miss out on wages due to them when a company goes into liquidation because workers are given a very low priority as creditors, and what action has subsequently been taken by the Federal Government about this injustice? During Question Time on 29 April I raised the case of a constituent who had \$2 000 in overdue wages owing to him when his former employer's restaurant business collapsed.

Employees in these circumstances, metaphorically speaking, are on the end of the queue after all other creditors, including the Australian Taxation Office. Many of these unfair incidences have been reported in the media in recent months and the community feeling seems to be one of sympathy for the plight of workers who up until now have been treated in this appalling manner.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the member for Walsh for his question. This is a matter that has grieved me from time to time, and I refer to managers of companies who ensure that when they go broke there are no funds to pay the money that is owed to workers.

**Mr Becker:** Why do they go broke?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Poor management in most cases.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!



**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** One of the problems has been that in many cases taxation has been deducted from the worker's salary and has not been paid to the Taxation Department. Because the department has first call, before wages, Taxation Department officers have not been too bothered about getting onto the companies that were not paying their pay-as-you-earn tax. They were not bothering to do that because they knew they could get to that money. One company that got up my nose had not collected the pay-as-you-earn tax for 13 months. If it had been collected it might have enabled those workers who were retrenched, because the company was wound up, to obtain the money that was owing to them.

It is all right for the member for Bragg who has some residual wealth, but I can assure him that blue collar workers who are owed \$27 000 in untaken wages and long service leave cannot afford to lose that, and it grieves me to know that they will not get a cent of it.

As a union official, I took up this matter at a Federal level when I was an organiser; as a member of the Australian Council of Trade Unions executive, I took it up with them in submissions to the Australian Government. I must say it was with some pleasure that, at the International Labour Organisation conference last year, the Australian Government delegate told me that, in her submissions to the working group dealing with the insolvency problems of employers and payment to workers, she had put forward the Australian Government's position that workers should receive benefit ahead of the Government.

What has happened is that, from 1 July this year in the winding up costs of a company and alterations to the Corporations Law, the first call is on the winding up costs, the second call is on secured debts, the third call is on wages, the fourth call is on injury compensation, the fifth call is on payments due to leave of absence, the sixth call is on redundancy payments and the seventh call is on any other payments. Whilst that is an advance on the previous situation, it is one of the provisions that the convention and recommendation has. In Europe, there is a convention whereby many employers pay a percentage of their payroll into a fund, which is used to reimburse employees when they find themselves in this position. The Australian Government has made a considerable step in ensuring that workers who are placed in a grievous position are dealt with in fairness. In addition, because the Taxation Department is now further down the pole, I think it will generate action earlier, and that will ensure that there is residual wealth to pay the workers.

#### ASH WEDNESDAY BUSHFIRES

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** My question is directed to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. How many claimants for compensation from the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfire have their claims still to be finalised; how can the Minister justify such a delay after more than 10 years; and what will he now do to speed up the process so that these people can have their trauma finally put to rest? I have been informed that one such claimant is a 66-year-old man, Mr Reginald May, whose home in Yarrabee Road, Greenhill, was destroyed and his wife killed in that terrible holocaust. His home was insured so he made no claim for compensation. Subsequently, he left Adelaide and lived for six years in Alice Springs, unaware that he could legitimately make a claim for personal injury on the death of his wife. I have been told he

has been severely scarred psychologically by the death of his wife.

On returning to Adelaide, he applied for an extension to make a claim. Master Bowen-Pain granted the extension, but ETSA has appealed against it. Further, Mr May has been told that, if this appeal is rejected by a single judge, ETSA will further appeal to the Full Court.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I do not have the figures with me but, the last time I looked at them, well over 90 per cent of the claims that had been made as a result of Ash Wednesday 1993 had been dealt with. I cannot remember exactly what the figure is, but I will provide it to the honourable member later. The situation where some claims have not yet been paid out or dealt with appropriately has usually been due to the fact that the people involved have submitted their claim very late: there are a number of stages in the claim, and the final stage of their putting a claim to ETSA has not yet occurred. I cannot be expected to know the situation with regard to a particular instance at this stage but, if the honourable member will give me as much detail as he can—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** If this is all the detail he has available, we will work from that basis but, if he can give me more in order to assist the process, that is fine. If he does not wish to assist the process or does not have any further detail, that is also okay.

#### HELLFIRE CLUB

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Will the Premier ensure that the proposed establishment of a sado-masochistic Hellfire Club will be closely scrutinised by the relevant licensing authorities, and will he endeavour to ensure that every method legally available to the Government is applied in response to the community outcry against this decadent public entertainment?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the Whip for the question. It is correct that I have just received advice from the Liquor Licensing Commissioner that the licensee of the premises, known as Nicholas Nickelby, has undertaken not to proceed with the Hellfire Club, or any similar form of entertainment on those premises, while he is the licensee. That is good news. But the Deputy Leader sought, I think, to interject to stop the answer proceeding because of that information. The reality is that that is on those premises with respect to that licensee. I would have thought that the member for Walsh, the Whip, was asking a more general question as well: what about general activities? What about this organisation applying to operate in other premises?

We guarantee that every avenue within the law is pursued to ensure that activities of this nature are within the law; that the Liquor Licensing Act ensures that a licensee is a fit and proper person, and that the activities of any such organisation are examined in accord with any other Act of Parliament to the fullest extent possible. I believe that has already happened in processing this application. As I say, the licensee has decided not to proceed with his original proposal, but if there are similar propositions the same process will be repeated.

#### YEAR OF THE FAMILY

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** Will the Premier and the Government now declare a South Australian Year of the

Family to coincide with the national Year of the Family and encourage all departments and organisations to actively participate in promoting family orientated activities during 1994? All members will know that I have raised this issue on a number of occasions over recent years. On each occasion the Premier of the day has said that the idea had merit but would be better coordinated on a national basis. As the Federal Government has identified 1994 as the Year of the Family, my constituents believe it would be appropriate to have a complimentary South Australian Year of the Family program in the interests of promoting a focus on the desirability of family activities.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I will check out the exact processes in this regard, but it is not my knowledge that when a year has been declared either internationally or nationally South Australia is required separately to declare that year; it would automatically apply if we choose it to apply, as has occurred with a number of other international years that we have had including International Year for the Disabled, International Children's Year, and so on.

I will check it out and, if it requires a formal declaration, so be it—that will be done. In any event, quite apart from that, a significant amount of work has been going on within Government to work out how the Government can play a part in celebrations and activities in 1994 to pick up that theme of Year of the Family. That work is going on. Whether or not it requires a formal declaration I am not sure, but I can assure the honourable member that South Australians and the South Australian Government will be celebrating 1994 as the Year of the Family.

Of course, 1994 is a very important year for another reason as well, that is, the Centenary of Women's Suffrage, which we will also be celebrating in this State. In fact, it will be actively celebrated by members on both sides of the House. I am well aware of that. We will have a busy year next year, and it will be very good to see both those years acknowledged.

#### FERGUSON, MS BARBARA

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Can the Minister of Correctional Services advise the House whether allegations regarding Barbara Ferguson, raised by the Leader of the Opposition, are true?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the member for Price for his question. In this House on 10 August the Leader had this to say:

Will the Premier immediately stop the appointment of ministerial advisers to Public Service positions because these and other recent appointments politicise the Public Service shortly before an election?

He referred to a Barbara Ferguson of the ALP centre left faction who was a manager of Human Resources in Correctional Services and who had just been promoted to Director of Support Services in the Correctional Services Department. During that day I called on the Leader to apologise to Ms Ferguson, because he had it wrong.

Ms Ferguson was born of parents who were displaced after the war in Europe. She was educated at Adelaide Girls High School and Adelaide University. She gained a Bachelor of Arts degree with honours and she joined the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations in Adelaide in 1973. In 1984 she went to Canberra where she was selected to be the first national Equal Opportunity Coordinator for the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations. Other positions that she held within that

department included Director, Staff Training and Development and also Project Manager, Human Resources System, DEET.

She won a nationally advertised position of Manager, Human Resources in the Department of Correctional Services in 1989. The process was conducted by a consultant and Ms Ferguson was shortlisted from over 50 applicants. Her references were senior public servants from the Department of Education, Employment and Training, her department at that time. She won a temporary assignment as Acting Director, Support Services in April 1992. After the temporary position had been advertised a formal selection process took place, which included an elected job rep on the panel. This, I might add, is not a recent appointment.

Ms Ferguson has excellent qualifications. She is an academic and a professional in the Public Service. As I said earlier, she is from a non-english speaking background and I believe her membership of organisations is irrelevant. I point out to the House that her membership with the Australian Labor Party ceased on her moving to Canberra. She advises me that she did not rejoin the Australian Labor Party when she came back to Adelaide. She has just won appointment, after national advertising, to the position of Human Resources Manager at Flinders University. She won that position in open competition, nationally advertised. She was offered the appointment last Friday.

I think that we should be proud that people such as Ms Ferguson are able to be educated in South Australia and then apply for jobs in open competition and get them. They should be able to do that without somebody coming into this House and spreading baseless rumours about them. I call upon the Leader to apologise to Ms Ferguson because as a public servant she can only sit there and cop it.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I call the member for Albert Park to order.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME SERVICE

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** What action will the Minister of Correctional Services take in response to a plea from the Victims of Crime Service, which has written to the Government asking for additional funding to enable it to meet the demands being placed on it by the recent large rise in serious crimes of violence in South Australia? I have been given a copy of a letter sent to the Attorney-General's Department by the Executive Director of the Victims of Crime Service, Mr Andrew Patterson. The letter states, in reference to the Victims of Crime Service:

The recent spate of serious crimes has placed us in a position where our resources are severely stretched as never before.

The relationship with the Police Department, the letter states, is now at the point where the service is expected to be involved in the aftermath of every major crime of violence that occurs in South Australia. In recent weeks the service claims that it 'picked up every murder that has occurred'. The letter states further that many people are required to wait some two or three weeks for services, when it is preferable to provide the services within a few days.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the member for his question. This matter obviously is one that is being dealt with by the Attorney; it is not something that has come directly to me. Quite obviously in this area the South Australian Government has been recognised, in terms of dealing with victims of crime, as leading the world in terms of changes.

I recently attended a national forum where people from interstate, representing a variety of community groups, made that comment both publicly and privately.

Obviously, if that matter has been directed to the Attorney, the Attorney will deal with that expeditiously, as he has in the past, and with full commitment, because the Attorney, as has the Government, has taken it very seriously in terms of not only a community approach but our attempts to address with all endeavour the aspects of crime within our community. I will refer the matter to the Attorney—obviously there will be discussions between my officers and the Attorney's officers—and bring back a report to the House.

### PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services advise the House about the current status of planning for the redevelopment of the Port Augusta Hospital?

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I can, and I appreciate the honourable member's interest in this project. The board of directors of the hospital has approved the project definition report for the redevelopment of the hospital and this is now being considered by the Health Commission. The estimated total cost of the redevelopment of the hospital is \$22 million. Stage 1 of the project, which involved the purchase and refurbishment last year of the Flinders Terrace property for conversion as a community health centre, is well under way. That will permit space for the internal rearrangement of the hospital during the redevelopment project.

Some \$480 000 has been provided for the immediate upgrading of fire safety systems at the hospital because of their very high priority. During the total redevelopment of the hospital, the areas which will be given most feature will be the accident and emergency sections, the medical imaging section and the operating theatres. The sum of \$1 million has been provided for the project in the capital works program this financial year. It is expected that a start will be made on the design and documentation drawings in the next few months—perhaps in October or November—with construction planned to commence in this financial year.

---

### WATER QUALITY

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Earlier today the Minister of Public Infrastructure, in a ministerial statement, referred to an article in the *Advertiser* of 5 August which carried a story relating to exceedingly dirty water in the Adelaide Hills. In his statement, the Minister suggested that I had not raised the matter with him in the House, as was indicated in the *Advertiser*. I make the point that, as the Minister would know, it is against Standing Orders to display any item in the House. On that particular day I delivered that bottle to the Minister's desk, I left it on his desk, and it was removed by the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. I will not have it said that I did not make the Minister aware of that situation on that day. The Minister knows that I delivered that sample

of water to him, as I said I would, as was mentioned in the *Advertiser* that morning.

The Minister also stated that the muddy water received by the Rainer family was not reported to the E&WS Department. I took the first opportunity that I had in this House to bring that sample to the attention of the Minister because, time after time after time, when similar representation has been made to him, he has failed to take action. That is why I took it upon myself, on behalf of my constituent, to bring it to the personal attention of the Minister, which I did.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** Earlier this week I brought to the attention of the House some of the quite disgraceful things that are happening in the Department of Fisheries and how it is disadvantaging many small business people—fishermen—in South Australia. In fact, the lack of action by the Minister has the potential to send some of them broke. However, I want to quote a letter which was faxed to me today by a fisherman on Kangaroo Island about the lack of action by the Fisheries Department and, worst of all, as is claimed in this letter, some promises that were made to people on Kangaroo Island which were obviously lies. The letter, addressed to Mr David Hall, Director of Fisheries, states:

I would like to comment on the closure of the Kingscote Fisheries office. Just prior to closing this office a meeting was held at Kingscote where Mr Robert Lewis promised the people of Kangaroo Island a much improved and more efficient service from the Department of Fisheries. It seems that these promises were just lies.

The level and quality of law enforcement given to the scalefish industry is considered a joke both from within the industry and the community.

As we have seen our licence fees grow immensely, '300 per cent in three years,' we the fishermen can only see a decline in service from the Fisheries. In particular, we no longer have a deterrent to fish thieves that a resident inspector provides just by being here.

Buzzing boats with helicopters and attempting to monitor scalefish activities from a 50-ft boat is certainly not going to deter any would-be fish thieves. Boat ramp and mooring checks have been very few and very poorly timed. The 212 man-days spent around Kangaroo Island don't go very far when there are four officers on the boat and three in the helicopter. These certainly are very expensive measures as cost cutting and improving efficiency were two of the main reasons for relocating Fisheries officers to Victor Harbor.

The Victor Harbor office has been given specific details of blatant illegal operations at American River, but Fisheries officers arrived during a strong northerly wind when no boats were out. The person making these complaints told me the department did not appear concerned about the illegal operations and was just going through the motions of answering a complaint. You have received very few complaints from Kangaroo Island because it is a waste of time ringing Victor Harbor. By the time your people could arrive on the scene, it would be far too late to make a conviction.

It takes many years for a fishing inspector to gain respect and build a working relationship within a small community. Our inspector was dedicated to the industry and it was well known he was preventing a lot of illegal activity by being a resident.

The next paragraph is very interesting:

If the Labor Government can justify in excess of 30 National Parks employees on Kangaroo Island, just one Fisheries officer seems little to ask for. I urge you to reinstate our officer for the people of Kangaroo Island and the preservation of our fish stocks.

This letter comes from a professional fisherman who is concerned about what is going on in the industry and on Kangaroo Island. He is concerned that an officer of the

department went over and promised a better service. In fact, as he says, those promises were lies.

Once again, the Minister has the ability to step in and fix the situation. Why will he not step in and appoint a Fisheries inspector for Kangaroo Island? Both commercial and amateur fishermen are screaming out for help because they do not want their industry and recreation interfered with by poachers and thieves. But, once again, the Minister has allowed his officers to hoodwink and lie to the people of Kangaroo Island and he will not step in and take action to fix the problem. He seems more intent about the battle in Napier than looking after fish stocks in South Australia and, above all, controlling the Department of Fisheries.

If ever a department required control and strong management, it is that department. If only the Minister had the guts to stand up to it, fishermen in South Australia would be well pleased with the Minister instead of having to contend with the kowtowing that goes on at present.

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

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I think it was yesterday or the day before that the member for Hayward said that I call a spade a spade, and I believe that to be the case. I have been in this Parliament for nearly 14 years and I believe that, if a member of Parliament makes a statement that he or she subsequently finds to be incorrect, they should have the intestinal fortitude, the decency and the honesty to stand up and say, 'I made a mistake and apologise unreservedly'. It was this week, or last week, that I apologised to the member for Coles about a statement I had made and an issue I pursued in respect of Debendox way back in 1980, and I see the member for Adelaide acknowledge that. That is the way in which I operate.

I know I am a bit rough from time to time in the way I speak in this House—and the member for Adelaide again concurs—but what disappoints me, and disappointed me today, was the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had obviously been ill advised in asking a question relating to Ms Barbara Ferguson.

**The Hon. J.P. Trainer:** It was poorly researched.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Whether or not it was poorly researched, in my opinion there is no excuse for the Leader of any political Party or any member of Parliament, where it is shown that they are incorrect, not to stand up and apologise to that person or persons or organisation and say, 'I regret the error; the information that I had received is obviously incorrect and I apologise unreservedly.' I would think that today the opportunity existed for the Leader of the Opposition to show that he has a big heart, that he is a human being—

**The Hon. J.P. Trainer:** That he has some grace.

**Mr HAMILTON:**—that he has some grace and decency, and that he is a person who, like others, is fallible and does make mistakes. I would have thought that he would be like many others in the community who would have the wit or the honesty to stand up and say, 'I regret that I made that mistake and therefore I apologise.' I would ask the Leader's minders and indeed his colleagues to persuade him that there is still the opportunity while this House sits today for him to apologise to Ms Ferguson. Why he cannot do that is beyond me. I have made thousands of mistakes in my life, as have many others. I believe that the community would respect the Leader of the Opposition if he stood up and said, 'Yes, I did make a mistake' but he is not prepared to do that and has not done so.

As someone who aspires to be the top political figure in this State, the Premier of South Australia, I do not believe it is too much to ask the Leader to apologise to Ms Ferguson, and it is not too late for him to do so. I know what I would do if I made that mistake: it is very easy to pick up the telephone, or stand in this place, and say, 'I'm sorry, I erred; I made a mistake.' I hope the Leader will do so although, given his past record, I do not believe that he will.

I wish to refer to one other matter briefly, and that is the question of real estate and land transfer documents that justices of the peace are repeatedly called on to sign. I have written to the Attorney-General, and I am still hoping that South Australia will fall into line with the practice that occurs in other States, whereby justices of the peace do not necessarily need to know a particular person, and that the Real Property Act will be amended accordingly. For over 13 years now I have been addressing this issue.

I would hope that the people responsible can amend the Act so that justices of the peace, like many other members in this place, do not have to refuse people when they come into their offices believing that they will be able to get a lands transfer document signed, only to be told that, because they are not known to the JP or member of Parliament concerned, the document in question cannot be signed, and in many cases they cannot even refer to the long form of proof.

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

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** On 10 August we had what, in relation to the Health budget, would be called the gloss. I am quite sure that the dross will come later, but one part of that media release, which was clearly meant to set a certain perception (which most people in South Australia know is a false perception) about the Health budget, indicated that there was an unspent \$34 million from last financial year. I have questioned the Minister publicly as to why that money was not spent on people's operations. I intend to detail, with the approval of the person who has written to me, the sort of case which is the reason why people get so angry when \$34 million is squirrelled away within a health budget for use as a pre-election sweetener.

On 22 October last year I received a letter from Teresa Varricchio, of Windsor Gardens, indicating that her father needed vascular surgery because he could no longer walk more than five to 10 metres. That letter said it was the second that she had written to an MP, having previously written to Dr Hopgood. Her letter had been acknowledged and a problem admitted, and after that letter, in March 1992, her father had an assessment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, followed two weeks later with X-rays, and three weeks after that with an outpatients appointment. When the outpatients appointment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was complied with Mr Varricchio was told, in April 1992, that an operation was necessary.

When asked how long before it was likely that the operation could be performed, when he had been told that he would just have to go back onto the operating list, the doctor who saw him said, 'Patience'. That is why morale is low in the public hospitals. Doctors, nurses and health administrators like treating patients; they do not like saying to people, 'Have patience, your problem will be solved later.' However, let us go on. Later on in the year this vascular problem presumably caused varicose ulcers, as the story goes that her father developed large red patches on both legs that were sore to touch and painful with not enough blood circulating.

I have had a series of discussions and telephone calls with Mrs Varricchio since that time, because each time there has been, like a carrot dangling in front of them, the potential for an operation, the potential for treatment. I am told that eventually there was an appointment on 13 May and Mrs Varricchio felt that an operation was not far off so they were prepared to wait. Shortly after that I rang and still no operation. Admittedly there had been some procedure presumably in an attempt to open up the arteries, but still no operation. I telephoned again and on 5 August there was an appointment for a further assessment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital but, lo and behold, the appointment was cancelled and that appointment is now on 26 August 1993, still with no guarantee of an operation despite the fact that Mr Varricchio was told in April 1992 that an operation was necessary.

I repeat to the House that Mr Varricchio cannot walk more than five or 10 metres. It means that he cannot mow the lawn, cannot go to the shops, cannot do simple tasks around the house such as gardening and helping, and cannot socialise. We are expected to stomach all of this with an announcement which grandly trumpets that we have \$34 million of money unspent from last financial year in order to gild the lily, pre-election. Is it any wonder that the loss of confidence of South Australians in our present health system is enormous?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith):** This time each month marks the day when the unemployment and employment figures for Australia are released. They are of course always looked at with a great deal of interest. The warning needs always to be given that the month to month statistics, particularly for smaller States and work forces, bounce around a lot, so too much weight cannot be given to one off results. Nonetheless, they are an indicator, particularly if the trend line is looked at, of the state of employment and unemployment, that key economic indicator.

Usually, an indication of just how those figures that are released on a Thursday morning have turned out can be gleaned from proceedings in this place when Parliament is sitting. I had not heard the figures today and I imagine that a good many members had not caught up with them, but it was apparent that they were very good, because we got no questions about them whatever from members of the Opposition. If they are in any way bad or questionable, or South Australia looks as though it is not doing so well, you bet your life we get a question first off, and much huffing and puffing about them.

In fact, it is pleasing to note that the figures show a very significant fall in unemployment in South Australia: .5 percentage points. It has been rare indeed over most of the past years for South Australia's unemployment, because of the particular structure of our economy, to be lower than the national average. It is lower at the moment, and it has been consistently. That is a very sharp and stark contrast, I suggest, to the situation that existed under the Tonkin Liberal Government, when the Leader of the Opposition was in charge of this area and unemployment was consistently and continuously the highest in the nation, month after month after month.

More encouragingly, there was a 1 900 increase in total employment, and the number of people in work in the State is 9 000 higher than for the same period last year. That gives us some cause for optimism, and one hopes that good news of this kind, which can only improve confidence and get our economy kick started, should be spread as widely as possible by everyone with a stake in the future of South Australia,

irrespective of their political differences and of their particular political agenda. And I apply this to the media as much as to anyone. We are all in this State together and there are some positive signs, and they need emphasis so that people's confidence can be raised.

Figures recently, for instance, on our overseas export performance show just what is happening as far as South Australia's contribution to that area of economic activity is concerned. We heard the other day from the Premier about the 100 per cent increase in road vehicles, parts and accessories exports: up they go. They have more than doubled, and that is a fantastic performance, based on the restructuring that took place during the 1980s. There are other star performers. The wine industry showed a 14 per cent increase over the 10 months to April 1993, representing \$143.7 million worth of overseas sales. In machinery there was a 13.5 per cent increase.

Petroleum and petroleum products had an 11.3 per cent increase, and all the other indicators, with one exception, went up. The unfortunate exception was wool and sheepskins, which was down 11 per cent, and we know that market is having a problem. So, there is good news, and we could do no better than look at the words of the immediate past President of the Building Owners and Managers Association as reported in its newsletter the other day, which drew attention to the fact that there are many things in South Australia of which we should be proud; that the media tends to focus on negative financial news, but in South Australia there are more businesses large and small which have not only weathered the storm but been highly successful during the recession.

Mr O'Grady concludes by saying that, while we should not deny the problems we have, we have to face up to them realistically and we need to think positively and rely on our own creative resources. He says:

If we believe in ourselves, we can achieve success, despite the odds appearing to be against us.

A very good and strong message indeed.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am delighted to have the opportunity to participate in this grievance debate, because I want to raise some of the issues that were debated during the public meeting that took place at Birdsville on 19 May, and I particularly want to quote from an address by the Chief Executive of the Queensland Mining Council, Mr Michael Pinnock. Mr Pinnock acted on behalf of the timber workers and other people in north Queensland and is particularly familiar with the many outrageous aspects of the legislation that the Federal Parliament has passed in relation to world heritage legislation.

I would recommend to all members of the House the address that he gave, so that they can be aware of the grave implications that would apply for the people of South Australia, the unnecessary restrictions that would be inflicted upon a very large part of South Australia, and the lack of economic development that could take place. Mr Pinnock stated:

Well, I've had 10 years involvement with world heritage. . . and I've seen a lot, of course, of what's happened in Tasmania. This morning I'm not speaking from a mining perspective, I'm simply giving you what I've learned in the last 10 years about world heritage so you know precisely what it's about. Then, I'm going to give you a run through of what's happened in world heritage areas that we've been closely associated with. . . Let's start with what world heritage is. It's basically an international treaty that Australia signed in 1974,

so it's been going 20-odd years. 108 nations in the world belong to the world heritage convention, which means they agree to list certain areas in their country and protect them under the terms of this international treaty. It's a perfectly reasonable concept. . . Australia is the only country out of that 108 which has its own Act of Parliament which forces world heritage on its citizens. The only one out of that 108 nations. The rest do it by consent and agreement. It does not cause problems.

It was originated by France. Mr Pinnock continues:

Australia is one of the original members of the treaty. The treaty itself does not say what can't be done, it merely allows for this development of a list of the areas and calls for the protection of those areas in any way that country thinks fit. The convention does not say there shall not be pastoral activities or agriculture, farming or forestry or whatever—that's when it comes back to the individual country. . . The conservation movement decided in the late 70s that when they couldn't get what they wanted from the State Government in terms of locking up certain areas, they would ratchet it up. They start at local government level, then they go State Government, then Federal. . . So, by using the External Treaties power in this World Heritage Act, which I will call it from here on, it overrides any legislation of any kind in any State. That was challenged in the High Court. You might remember all through the 80s Tasmania and Queensland took a number of High Court challenges against those powers and they were all lost. So, it's quite clear, within our Constitution, the Federal Government has that power, they can overrule the States. . . Moving through what happened. . . the Act came in in 83. Then in 88 came the very big fight in north Queensland about the closing down of the timber industry. . . They brought in a proclamation which said, 'There shall be no logging, no forestry operations.'

And they did that by the stroke of a pen—bureaucrats! The document continues:

That is what happened in north Queensland. They simply declared that logging and forest operations were no longer permissible in that area. . . As a result, Senator Richardson, then the Environment Minister, rushed into Parliament amendments to this Act. So then we had the Act in an amended form, to retrospectively beat those court challenges.

The situation now is that people who want to challenge a decision to list their property or their region under world heritage are denied the opportunity to challenge it in any court in the land. It is a quite outrageous situation. Mr Pinnock continues:

The Act first of all says that, when an area is declared for world heritage, it is under the control, in terms of responding to the treaty, of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government usually chooses to set up a joint management authority in that area. In effect, any State or Territory cedes the land and its boundaries over which it may have sole power under the Constitution.

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

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations):** I rise to defend the reputations of three very fine schools in this State. I have had the honour to serve two schools, Pembroke and St Peters College, for the past 14 years as the member for Norwood, the constituency in which those schools are situated. I have had occasional associations with the third school, Rostrevor College, over the years since my childhood. These relationships were enriched during my seven years as Minister of Education. It is with some regret that I have to make this speech, along with other members of Parliament from both sides of the House, to set the record straight.

The member for Coles' Address in Reply speech earlier this week, which she devoted almost entirely to an attack on these schools, I believe will end her years of parliamentary service on a sad, even pathetic note. I am astounded that in

the circumstances the member chose to reveal to the House the names of the victims and to reveal in effect very intimate personal details about those persons. Even if the victims consented to this course of action, which I understand they did, I believe there is an overriding duty to act in the best interests of the individuals concerned, and I cannot see how the naming of these two young men is in their best interests, as much as I feel for them in the tragedies they have experienced.

I want to make clear that the criminal behaviour that the member for Coles outlined to the House must be dealt with swiftly and effectively by all the relevant authorities as soon as it is discovered. There is no place in our schools for persons of this predilection. If, however, the community is to attempt to rehabilitate into the community as responsible, law abiding persons once again individuals such as the honourable member revealed to the House, hounding such persons through public forums under parliamentary privilege may not achieve the objectives the honourable member was seeking to achieve through her speech.

I have spoken to the principals of the schools named by the honourable member. Those schools were named in this speech, clearly with the intention that the information about those schools would be published—indeed, very widely published in our community. I believe that those schools have been done a grave disservice and were not afforded what I would consider as basic natural justice in order to defend themselves and to place relevant, and, indeed, vital factual information before the honourable member before she spoke, although I understand that two of the three schools were contacted and advised of the course of action the honourable member was taking. The employment or voluntary status of the offender was not sufficiently explained by the honourable member in her speech; it was vital information. The reference to the word 'teacher' was misleading and factually incorrect and gave rise to public mischief about the schools' employment policies and those of the independent school sector.

I could go on further to analyse this unfortunate speech, about tragic events which occurred many years ago, but I want to end on a positive note. They are three excellent schools; schools that have national and international recognition. They are schools of which all South Australians can be very proud. They provide leadership to the whole of the South Australian education community. Their staff—and I know many of them personally—and the principals and deputy principals are very professional indeed. They are people in whom as a community we can have the utmost confidence.

It is disappointing to see that the press picked up some of the more negative aspects of the situation, particularly, I understand, the *7.30 Report*, which tended to paint a picture that these schools placed their reputations above the needs of the individual students and the school community. Each of these three schools has a very strong pastoral program and is based on Christian beliefs. The community can set aside this unfortunate incident and continue to have great faith in these three great schools.

#### **ELECTRICIANS, PLUMBERS AND GAS FITTERS LICENSING BILL**

The Hon. M.J. Evans, for the **Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure)**, obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the licensing of

electricians, plumbers and gas fitters; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** 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.

The licensing of electrical workers and contractors, plumbers and gas fitters is provided for in the Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act 1966, and the regulations made under the Gas Act 1988, the Sewerage Act 1929 and the Waterworks Act 1932.

Plumbing and gas fitting are skills related trades and, in practice, the licensing and education framework are closely allied. It has been the intention of the Government, for some time, to combine the licensing function for gas fitting with that of sanitary plumbing and hot water plumbing.

There are some overlaps in the work that electricians and plumbers and gas fitters do. This has led, in recent times, to restricted cross-licensing. It makes sense to consolidate the legislative provisions for these licensing functions.

This new legislation achieves several things—

- it brings the licensing of these occupational groups under the umbrella of the Minister of Consumer Affairs—a logical extension of the ‘one-stop-shop’ concept for licensing;
- it makes use of the Commercial Tribunal as an appellate body for dispute resolution and discipline thus separating the policing authority, the licensing authority and the disciplinary authority and thereby eliminating the perception of any conflict of interest;
- it retains the advisory boards for the respective trades, which are an indispensable part of the national networks that play an important part in national uniformity and micro-economic reform.

Public health and safety are ever present concerns in electrical, plumbing and gas fitting work. It is important to ensure that only appropriately qualified people are allowed to practise these trades and that public health and safety are not put at risk by poor quality workmanship. This Bill ensures that this will not occur.

The original intention was to consolidate these licensing schemes with that under the Builders Licensing Act 1986. However, with further investigation, it has become apparent that a separate Bill will more completely satisfy the objective. I commend the Bill to the House.

#### PART 1 PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause is formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause contains the definitions of words and phrases used in the Bill and, in particular, defines electrical work, gas fitting and plumbing.

Clause 4: Exemption

This clause provides that the Governor may, by regulation, exempt (either unconditionally or subject to conditions) any specified person or class of persons, any specified work or class of work or any specified transaction or class of transactions, from the application of this proposed Act or a specified provision of this proposed Act.

Clause 5: Non-derogation

This clause provides that the provisions of this proposed Act are in addition to and do not derogate from the provisions of any other Act.

Clause 6: Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to be responsible for administration of Act

This clause provides that the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is responsible, subject to the control and directions of the Minister, for the administration of this proposed Act.

#### PART 2 LICENSING OF CONTRACTORS

Clause 7: Categories of licences

This clause provides that there are 6 categories of licences for contractors for the purposes of this proposed Act—

- contractors licences (ie: electrical contractors licences, plumbing contractors licences and gas fitting contractors licences)—authorising a person holding such a licence to carry on business as an electrical contractor, a plumbing contractor or a gas fitting contractor without restriction; and

- restricted contractors licences (ie: restricted electrical contractors licences, restricted plumbing contractors licences and restricted gas fitting contractors licences)—authorising a person holding such a licence to carry on business as an electrical contractor, a plumbing contractor or a gas fitting contractor subject to conditions attached to the licence by the Commissioner.

The Commissioner may, on granting a licence under this proposed Act, attach conditions (which may be varied or revoked by the Commissioner on application) to the licence limiting the work that may be performed in pursuance of the licence.

Clause 8: Obligation to be licensed

This clause provides that a person who carries on business as an electrical contractor, plumbing contractor or gas fitting contractor (or who claims or purports to be entitled to carry on such a business) except as authorised by a licence under this proposed Part, is guilty of an offence the penalty for which is a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Clause 9: Applications for licences

This clause provides that an application for a licence must be made to the Commissioner in writing in the prescribed form and be accompanied by the prescribed application fee. The Commissioner must, before determining an application under this proposed section, take into account the advice of the Electrical Work Advisory Board or the Plumbing and Gas Fitting Advisory Board, as the case may require. Where the Commissioner proposes to refuse an application for a licence, the Commissioner must allow the applicant a reasonable opportunity to make representations in relation to the application.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that on an application for a licence, the Commissioner must (subject to the proposed Act) grant the applicant a licence on payment of the prescribed licence fee if the Commissioner is satisfied (among other requirements) that—

- where the applicant is a natural person, the applicant has—
  - the qualifications and experience prescribed in relation to the kind of work that the applicant would be authorised to perform if granted the licence or, subject to the regulations, qualifications and experience that the Commissioner considers appropriate having regard to the kind of work that the applicant would be authorised to perform if granted the licence; and
  - sufficient business knowledge and experience and financial resources for the purpose of properly carrying on the business authorised by the licence;
- where the applicant is a body corporate—
  - subject to the regulations and any determination of the Commissioner—every director of the applicant body corporate has qualifications and experience prescribed in relation to the kind of work that the body corporate would be authorised to perform if granted the licence or qualifications and experience that the Commissioner considers appropriate having regard to the kind of work that the body corporate would be authorised to perform if granted the licence;
  - the directors of the body corporate together have sufficient business knowledge and experience for the purpose of properly directing the business authorised by the licence; and
  - the body corporate has sufficient financial resources for the purpose of properly carrying on the business authorised by the licence.

Proposed subclause (6) provides that where a natural person applying for a licence, or a director of a body corporate applying for a licence, is or has been (during the period of 10 years preceding the date of the application) insolvent or the director of an insolvent body corporate or a body corporate applying for a licence is or has been (during the period of 10 years preceding the date of the application) insolvent or in a prescribed relationship with an insolvent body corporate, the Commissioner must not grant the application unless satisfied that there are special reasons why the application should be granted.

Proposed subclause (8) provides that the Commissioner must, by notice in writing served on an applicant under this proposed section, advise the applicant of the Commissioner's decision on the application and, in the case of a decision refusing an application, state in the notice the reasons for the refusal.

Clause 10: Duration of licences

This clause provides that a licence remains in force until the licence is surrendered or cancelled or the licensee dies or, in the case of a body corporate, is dissolved. A licensee must, not later than the prescribed date in each year, pay to the Commissioner the prescribed annual licence fee and lodge with the Commissioner an annual return

containing the prescribed information. Where a licensee fails to pay the annual licence fee or lodge the annual return, the Commissioner may require the licensee to make good the default and, in addition, to pay to the Commissioner the amount prescribed as a penalty for default. Where a licensee fails to comply with such a notice within 14 days after service of the notice, the licence is, by force of this proposed subsection, suspended until the notice is complied with. The Commissioner must cause notice of a suspension under proposed subsection (4) to be served on the licensee.

This clause further provides that where a licensee fails to comply with a notice under proposed subsection (3) within six months after service of the notice, the licence is, by force of this proposed subsection, cancelled.

Proposed subsection (7) provides that a licensee may at any time surrender the licence.

Clause 11: Business may be carried on by unlicensed person where licensee dies

This clause provides that where a person carrying on business in pursuance of a licence dies, the personal representative of the deceased, or some other person approved by the Commissioner, may continue to carry on the business for a period of six months and subsequently for such further period and subject to such conditions as the Commissioner may approve. A person is, while carrying on business in pursuance of proposed subsection (1), to be taken to be the holder of a licence of the same category as the licence held by the deceased.

### PART 3 REGISTRATION OF WORKERS

Clause 12: Categories of registration

This clause provides that there are 6 categories of registration for workers for the purposes of this proposed Act—

- workers registration (ie: electrical workers registration, plumbing workers registration and gas fitting workers registration)—authorising a person so registered to act as an electrical worker, a plumbing worker or a gas fitting worker without restriction; and
- restricted workers registration (ie: restricted electrical workers registration, restricted plumbing workers registration and restricted gas fitting workers registration)—authorising a person so registered to act as an electrical worker, a plumbing worker or a gas fitting worker subject to conditions attached to the registration by the Commissioner.

The Commissioner may, on granting registration under this proposed Act, attach conditions (which may be varied or revoked by the Commissioner on application) to the certificate of registration limiting the work that may be performed in pursuance of the registration.

Clause 13: Obligation to be registered

This clause provides that a person who acts as an electrical worker, plumbing worker or gas fitting worker, or claims or purports to be entitled to act as such a worker, except as authorised by registration under this proposed Part, is guilty of an offence and liable to a division 7 fine (\$2 000).

This clause further provides that an electrical contractor, plumbing contractor or gas fitting contractor who engages a person as an employee to carry out electrical work, plumbing or gas fitting where that person is not authorised by registration under this proposed Part to carry out such work, is guilty of an offence and liable to a division 7 fine (\$2 000).

Clause 14: Application for registration

This clause provides that an application for registration must be made to the Commissioner in writing in the prescribed form and be accompanied by the prescribed application fee. The Commissioner must, before determining an application under this proposed section, take into account the advice of the Electrical Work Advisory Board or the Plumbing and Gas Fitting Advisory Board, as the case may require. Where the Commissioner proposes to refuse an application for registration, the Commissioner must allow the applicant a reasonable opportunity to make representations in relation to the application.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that on an application for registration, the Commissioner must (subject to the proposed Act) register the applicant on payment of the prescribed registration fee if the Commissioner is satisfied that the applicant has—

- the qualifications and experience prescribed in relation to the kind of work that the applicant would be authorised to carry out if granted the registration; or
- subject to the regulations—qualifications and experience that the Commissioner considers appropriate having regard to the

kind of work that the applicant would be authorised to carry out if granted the registration.

Proposed subclause (6) provides that the Commissioner must, by notice in writing served on an applicant under this proposed section, advise the applicant of the Commissioner's decision on the application and, in the case of a decision refusing an application, state in the notice the reasons for the refusal.

Clause 15: Duration of registration

This clause provides that registration remains in force until the registration is surrendered or cancelled or the registered worker dies or, in the case of a body corporate, is dissolved. A registered worker must, not later than the prescribed date in each year, pay to the Commissioner the prescribed annual registration fee and lodge with the Commissioner an annual return containing the prescribed information.

Where a registered worker fails to pay the annual registration fee or lodge the annual return in accordance with this proposed section, the Commissioner may require the registered worker to make good the default and, in addition, to pay to the Commissioner the amount prescribed as a penalty for default.

Where a registered worker fails to comply with such a notice within 14 days after service of the notice, the registration is, by force of this proposed subsection, suspended until the notice is complied with. The Commissioner must cause notice of a suspension under proposed subsection (4) to be served on the registered worker.

This clause further provides that where a registered worker fails to comply with a notice under proposed subsection (3) within six months after service of the notice, the registration is, by force of this proposed subsection, cancelled.

Proposed subsection (7) provides that a registered worker may at any time surrender the registration.

### PART 4 APPEALS AND DISCIPLINARY PROVISIONS

Clause 16: Appeals to Tribunal

This clause provides that the following appeals may be made to the Tribunal:

- a person who applied for a licence or registration may appeal to the Tribunal against a decision of the Commissioner refusing to grant the licence or registration or imposing a condition of the licence or registration;
- a licensee or registered worker who applied for variation or revocation of a condition of the licence or registration may appeal to the Tribunal against a decision of the Commissioner on the application.

An appeal must be made in a manner and form determined by the Tribunal, setting out the grounds of the appeal and must be made within two months after the making of the decision. The Tribunal may, if it is satisfied that it is just and reasonable in the circumstances to do so, dispense with the requirement that an appeal be made within the period of one month.

Clause 17: Powers of Tribunal on determination of appeals

This clause provides that on hearing an appeal under this proposed Part, the Tribunal may affirm, vary or quash the decision appealed against, remit the subject matter of the appeal to the Commissioner for further consideration and make any further or other order as to costs or any matter that the case requires.

Clause 18: Tribunal may exercise disciplinary powers

This clause provides that the Tribunal may hold an inquiry for the purposes of determining whether proper cause exists for disciplinary action against a person who is licensed or registered under the proposed Act or a person (whether or not being licensed or registered under the proposed Act) who has carried on business as an electrical contractor, plumbing contractor or gas fitting contractor or acted as an electrical worker, plumbing worker or gas fitting worker.

Proposed subsection (3) provides that, subject to the regulations, any person (including the Commissioner) may lodge with the Tribunal a complaint in the prescribed form setting out matters that are alleged to constitute grounds for disciplinary action against a person referred to in proposed subsection (1). Where a complaint has been lodged with the Tribunal, the Commissioner must, at the request of the Registrar, investigate or further investigate any matters to which the complaint relates and report to the Tribunal on the results of the investigations.

Where the Tribunal decides to hold an inquiry under this proposed section, the Tribunal must give the person to whom the inquiry relates ('the respondent') reasonable notice of the subject matter of the inquiry.

Proposed subsection (6) provides that if, after conducting an inquiry under this proposed section, the Tribunal is satisfied that



proper cause exists for disciplinary action, the Tribunal may exercise one or more of the following powers:

- it may reprimand the respondent;
- it may impose a fine not exceeding \$5 000 on the respondent;
- where the respondent is licensed or registered—it may reduce the respondent's licence or registration (or both) to a more limited category, attach conditions or further conditions to the respondent's licence or registration, suspend the respondent's licence or registration (or both) for a specified period or until the fulfilment of stipulated conditions or until further order, or cancel the respondent's licence or registration (or both);
- it may disqualify the respondent permanently, for a specified period, until the fulfilment of stipulated conditions, or until further order, from being licensed or registered (or both) under this proposed Act.

Proposed subclause (7) provides that if a person has been convicted of an offence and the circumstances of the offence form, in whole or in part, the subject matter of an inquiry under this proposed section, the convicted person is not liable to a fine under this proposed section in respect of conduct giving rise to the offence. Where the Tribunal attaches a condition to a person's licence or registration or imposes a condition as to the conduct of business by a person and the person contravenes or fails to comply with the condition, the person is liable to a division 7 fine (\$2 000).

Proposed subsection (10) provides that there is proper cause for disciplinary action under this proposed section against the respondent if the respondent—

- has been guilty of conduct that constituted a breach of this proposed Act;
- has in the course of carrying on business as an electrical contractor, plumbing contractor or gas fitting contractor or acting as an electrical worker, plumbing worker or gas fitting worker been guilty of conduct that constituted a breach of any other Act or law or acted negligently, fraudulently or unfairly;
- being a person licensed under the proposed Act—
- has obtained the licence improperly;
- has ceased to qualify for such a licence under this proposed Act;
- is a director of a body corporate that is insolvent, or, in the case of a body corporate, is in a prescribed relationship with a body corporate that is insolvent;
- in the case of a body corporate—has directors who have ceased to qualify for such a licence under this proposed Act;
- has failed to comply with an order of the Tribunal under Part V of the Builders Licensing Act 1986 or an order of the Supreme Court made in relation to such an order;
- being a person registered under the proposed Act, has obtained the registration improperly.

The powers conferred by this proposed section in relation to persons licensed or registered under the proposed Act may be exercised, in the case of a person who was also licensed or registered under the repealed Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act 1966, section 17b of the Sewerage Act 1929 or section 28 of the Gas Act 1988, or those regulations under the Sewerage Act 1929 or the Waterworks Act 1932 revoked with effect from the commencement of this proposed Act, in relation to conduct or circumstances occurring before or after the commencement of this proposed Act.

Clause 19: Restriction on disqualified persons being involved in contractors business

This clause provides that a person who is disqualified from being licensed or registered under this proposed Act who, without the prior approval of the Tribunal, undertakes any employment, or is otherwise engaged, in the business of an electrical contractor, plumbing contractor or gas fitting contractor is guilty of an offence and liable to a division 4 fine (\$15 000).

This clause further provides that where a person who (to the knowledge of an electrical contractor, plumbing contractor or gas fitting contractor) is disqualified from being licensed or registered under the proposed Act is employed, or otherwise engaged, in the business of the electrical contractor, plumbing contractor or gas fitting contractor without the prior approval of the Tribunal, the contractor is guilty of an offence and liable to a division 4 fine (\$15 000).

Clause 20: Record of disciplinary action to be kept

This clause provides that where the Tribunal takes disciplinary action against a person, the Registrar must—

- make an entry on the register established under the Commercial Tribunal Act 1982 recording the disciplinary action taken; and

- advise the Commissioner of the name of the person and the disciplinary action taken.

Clause 21: Advertising suspension, cancellation or disqualification

This clause provides that where disciplinary action taken against a person by the Tribunal consists of or includes the suspension or cancellation of the person's licence or registration or disqualification of the person, the Registrar must cause notice of the action taken to be served personally or by post on that person and to be advertised in a newspaper circulating throughout the State.

#### PART 5

#### ADVISORY BOARDS

Clause 22: Establishment of advisory boards

This clause provides for the establishment of the Electrical Work Advisory Board and the Plumbing and Gas Fitting Advisory Board.

Clause 23: Membership of boards

This clause provides that the Electrical Work Advisory Board will consist of six members appointed by the Minister, of whom—

- one (who will be the presiding member) will be a person nominated by Southern Power and Water;
- one will be a person nominated by the Minister of Public Infrastructure;
- one will be a person nominated by the Minister administering the Technical and Further Education Act 1975;
- one will be a person nominated by the Electrical Trades Union of Australia;
- one will be a person nominated by the Electrical Contractors Association of South Australia Incorporated;
- one will be a person nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council (not being a member or official of an organisation representing any of the trades in relation to which the proposed Act applies).

This clause further provides that the Plumbing and Gas Fitting Advisory Board will consist of 11 members appointed by the Minister, of whom—

- two will be persons nominated by Southern Power and Water (one of whom will be appointed by the Minister as the presiding member);
- one will be a person nominated by the Master Plumbers' and Mechanical Services Association of South Australia Incorporated;
- one will be a person nominated by The Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union of Australia (South Australian Branch);
- two will be persons nominated by the South Australian Gas Company Limited;
- one will be a person nominated by the Federated Gas Employees' Industrial Union;
- one will be a senior teacher in the School of Plumbing in the Regency College of Technical and Further Education nominated by the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education;
- one will be a person with expertise or experience in the area of public health nominated by the Public and Environmental Health Council;
- one will be a person nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council (not being a member or official of an organisation representing any of the trades in relation to which the proposed Act applies);
- one will be a person appointed to represent the interests of consumers of plumbing and gas fitting services.

At least one member of each board must be a woman and at least one must be a man.

Clause 24: Terms and conditions of office

This clause provides that a member of a board will be appointed for a term of 3 years on such conditions as the Minister determines and will, on the expiration of a term of office, be eligible for reappointment. A vacancy in the membership and casual appointment to a board may occur on the usual terms.

Clause 25: Allowances and expenses

This clause provides that a member of a board is entitled to such allowances and expenses as the Minister may determine.

Clause 26: Procedure of boards

This clause provides that a meeting of a board will be chaired by the presiding member or, in his or her absence, by a member chosen by the members present at the meeting. Subject to proposed subsection (3), a board may act despite vacancies in its membership. A quorum of a board is constituted of the number of members of a board equal

to half the total number of members plus one and no business may be transacted at a meeting of the Board unless a quorum is present.

This clause further provides that each member present at a meeting of a board is entitled to one vote on a matter arising for decision at the meeting, but the person presiding at the meeting has, in the event of an equality of votes, a casting vote as well as a deliberative vote. A decision carried by a majority of the votes cast by the members of a board present and voting at a meeting of the board is a decision of the board.

Each board must cause accurate minutes to be kept of its proceedings at meetings but the procedure for the calling of meetings of a board and for the conduct of business at meetings will, subject to this proposed Act, be as determined by the board.

#### Clause 27: Functions

This clause provides that the Electrical Work Advisory Board has the following functions:

- to advise the Commissioner in respect of applications for licences or registration;
- to advise the Minister or the Commissioner in respect of any other matter relating to electrical work or the administration of the proposed Act;
- any other functions prescribed by regulation or prescribed by or under any other Act.

This clause provides that the Plumbing and Gas Fitting Board has the following functions:

- to advise the Commissioner in respect of applications for licences or registration;
- to advise the Minister or the Commissioner in respect of any other matter relating to plumbing or gas fitting or the administration of the proposed Act;
- any other functions prescribed by regulation or prescribed by or under any other Act.

### PART 6 MISCELLANEOUS

#### Clause 28: Name in which licensee carries on business

This clause provides that a licensee who carries on business in pursuance of the licence except in the name appearing in the licence or in a business name registered by the licensee in accordance with the provisions of the Business Names Act 1963 (of which the Commissioner has been given prior notice in writing) is guilty of an offence and liable to a division 8 fine (\$1 000).

#### Clause 29: Publication of advertisement

This clause provides that a licensee who publishes, or causes to be published, an advertisement relating to the business carried on in pursuance of the licence where the advertisement does not specify—

- the licensee's name as it appears in the licence or any registered business name in which the licensee carries on business and of which the Commissioner has been given prior notice in writing; and
- the licence number assigned to the licensee by the Commissioner and, where the licensee carries on business in partnership, the licence number of each partner;

is guilty of an offence and liable to a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Proposed subsection (1) does not apply in relation to an advertisement offering or seeking applications for employment or an advertisement directed to other licensees or builders.

#### Clause 30: Licensee to have sign showing name, etc., on each of licensee's building sites

This clause provides that a licensee must install or erect in a prominent position on the site of any work performed by the licensee or on the outside of the place where the work is being performed a sign showing clearly—

- the licensee's name (as it appears in the licence) or any registered business name in which the licensee carries on business; and
- the licence number assigned to the licensee by the Commissioner and, where the licensee carries on business in partnership, the licence number of each partner.

The penalty for failing to comply with this proposed subsection is a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

This clause further provides that where a licensee is performing work on a site for some other licensee who is performing work on that site (whether the other licensee is a licensee under this proposed Act or the Builders Licensing Act 1986), it is sufficient compliance with proposed subsection (1) if the provisions of that proposed subsection or the corresponding provision of the Builders Licensing Act 1986 are complied with only by that other licensee.

#### Clause 31: Unlicensed persons not entitled to fees, etc., for work

This clause provides that an unlicensed person who performs electrical work, plumbing or gas fitting in circumstances in which a licence is required under this proposed Act is not entitled to recover any fee or other consideration in respect of the work unless the Tribunal or any court hearing proceedings for recovery of the fee or consideration is satisfied that the person's failure to be licensed resulted from inadvertence only.

#### Clause 32: Evidentiary

This clause provides that in any proceedings in respect of an offence against this proposed Act, where it is proved that a person performed electrical work, plumbing or gas fitting for another for fee or reward, the person is (unless the contrary is proved) to be taken to have been carrying on business as an electrical contractor, plumbing contractor or gas fitting contractor.

#### Clause 33: Investigations

This clause provides that the Commissioner must (at the request of the Registrar) cause officers to investigate and report on any matter relevant to the determination of any application or other matter before the Tribunal or any matter that might constitute proper cause for disciplinary action under this proposed Act.

#### Clause 34: Annual report

This clause provides that the Commissioner must, on or before 31 October in each year, submit to the Minister a report on the administration of this proposed Act during the period of 12 months ending on the preceding 30 June and the Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving the report, cause a copy of it to be laid before each House of Parliament.

#### Clause 35: Service of documents

This clause provides that a notice or document required or authorised by this proposed Act or the Commercial Tribunal Act 1982 to be served on any person is to be taken to have been duly served if it has been—

- served on the person personally;
- posted in an envelope addressed to the person at the person's last known address (or, in the case of a licensee—the licensee's address for service); or
- in the case of a licensee—left for the licensee at the licensee's address for service with a person apparently over the age of 16 years.

#### Clause 36: False or misleading information

This clause provides that a person must not, in furnishing any information required under this proposed Act, make a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular. The penalty for contravening this proposed section is a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

#### Clause 37: Return of licence or certificate of registration when cancelled, etc.

This clause provides that where a licence or registration granted to a person is suspended or cancelled, or a condition is to be attached to it, under this proposed Act, that person must, at the direction of the Tribunal, the Registrar or the Commissioner, return the licence or certificate of registration to the Registrar or Commissioner (as the case may be). The penalty for contravening this proposed section is a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

#### Clause 38: Offences by bodies corporate

This clause provides that where a body corporate is guilty of an offence against this proposed Act, each director of the body corporate is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence unless it is proved that the director could not by the exercise of reasonable diligence have prevented the commission of that offence.

#### Clause 39: Continuing offences

This clause provides that a person convicted of an offence against any provision of this proposed Act in respect of a continuing act or omission—

- is liable (in addition to the penalty otherwise applicable to the offence) to a penalty for each day during which the act or omission continued of not more than the amount equal to one-tenth of the maximum penalty prescribed for that offence; and
- is (if the act or omission continues after the conviction) guilty of a further offence against the provision and liable, in addition to the penalty otherwise applicable to the further offence, to a penalty for each day during which the act or omission continued after the conviction of not more than the amount equal to one-tenth of the maximum penalty prescribed for the offence.

#### Clause 40: Commencement of proceedings

This clause provides that proceedings for an offence against this proposed Act may not be commenced by a person other than the

Commissioner or an authorised officer under the Fair Trading Act 1987 except with the consent of the Minister.

Clause 41: Regulations

This clause provides that the Governor may make such regulations as are contemplated by this proposed Act, or as are necessary or expedient for the purposes of this proposed Act, including—

- prescribing any form and the information to be contained in any form for the purposes of this proposed Act;
- prescribing fees (including differential fees) for the purposes of this proposed Act;
- prescribing penalties (recoverable summarily) not exceeding a division 7 fine for contravention of, or non-compliance with, any regulation.

A code of practice may be prescribed for the purposes of this proposed Act by referring to, or incorporating, in whole or in part, and with or without modifications, a code of practice for the time being, or from time to time, adopted by a body which, in the opinion of the Governor, represents the interests of a substantial section of persons licensed or registered under this proposed Act.

#### SCHEDULE

##### Transitional Provisions

The Schedule contains provisions dealing with the transition of a licence, registration or other authority under—

- the repealed Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act 1966;
- the repealed section 28 of the Gas Act 1988;
- the repealed section 17b of the Sewerage Act 1929; or
- those regulations under the Sewerage Act 1929 or the Waterworks Act 1932 revoked with effect from the commencement of this proposed Act,

to a licence or registration of an appropriate category granted under this proposed Act.

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

#### SUPPLY BILL (No.2)

Adjourned debate on the question:

(Continued from page 244.)

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Earlier in the debate I referred to the Federal Government's proposal in relation to the unrealised capital on shares or debentures held by pensioners. I was making the point that there may be some benefit if that provision were applied only to shares in non-Australian companies; in other words, we would encourage people to invest in Australian companies. I also made the point that we are really telling people, 'Do not bother saving through any form of share or security. Do not do that. We do not want you to save, we do not want you to prepare for your future; we want you to spend the lot and then apply for a pension.'

Surely that is contrary to what some of the ALP socialists were saying just before and just after the last election when they said that the problem in Australia was that people are not saving, and therefore are not preparing for the future. However, if we do, the Government wants to tax us on something we do not have. The unrealised capital gain is not in the person's pocket and it is not in their bank; it is available to them only when they sell it. The share may be worth \$10 this year and \$1 next year. Do they get a refund through this proposed new tax system? No they do not. As I see it, it is a tax on their pension application. That is where the injustice hits even harder.

If there is another boom, as there was many years ago with Poseidon, a person could be wiped out so far as the pension is concerned and have no money in their pocket and we are

saying, 'Sell them.' I believe it is a foolish decision by the Federal Government and I hope that the select committee, which has been organised by the Liberal/ National Party Coalition, will bring about a belief in the Federal Government that its decision is wrong and that it changes the policy, because many of us operating at the grass roots level know how much heartbreak it is bringing to many people who are on a small or significant part of the pension.

#### **Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):**

In the grievance debate following the second reading of the Supply Bill I, too, support the proposition that the Federal Government needs to rethink its policies, particularly those in respect of pensions. The comments that I will make during this 10 minutes really relate to the antics of the Federal Government and the extent to which it is hitting the poor of Australia and South Australia. South Australia is in difficult circumstances.

I know that, if we looked at Federal outlays over a 10-year period, they have kept pace with inflation and, in fact, have more than exceeded inflation. We would also recognise that early in the term of the Hawke Labor Government it supported the States with respect to revenue to the extent that the States were flush with funds. In fact, the States did particularly well, as they did previously under Prime Minister Fraser. However, in recent years that has not been the case and we have seen real reductions in Commonwealth grants to the States.

We have had reductions also in the capital area. We have had a squeeze on the housing grants that allow us to maintain our public housing stock. So, from a position during the mid 1980s where the States were receiving far more than their due and just deserts, as I would call it, we are now in a situation of being weened off Commonwealth revenue. However, it could not have come at a worse time. It is quite true that, if the State Government had operated efficiently and effectively, this reduction in Federal Government funding would not be of great concern.

However, we are all aware what a difficult situation the State is facing, and that is compounded by the way in which the Federal Government is changing the rules of the game. Not only is it not maintaining overall grants in real terms but it is seeking the equalisation of State grants to the extent that South Australia will be embarrassed in a major way by the policies being implemented. One of the strong tenets of Fraser federalism was the fact that it recognised that some States had a lower capacity to collect taxation than other States, whether it be because of their Government, their background or their industry base.

South Australia has been assessed at around 83 to 85 per cent of the national capacity in its ability to attract taxation, if the same rates of taxation are applied across all States. That means that, if we put 10¢ a litre on fuel as State excise, we could expect generally that we would collect 83 to 85 per cent of the per capita collection for Australia. That has been reflected in the grants as well as some other deficiencies relating to South Australia.

We now have a Prime Minister of Australia who has spared himself nothing as Treasurer and Prime Minister. He has not kept his own budget under control, yet he is placing all the States in a difficult situation. We all have to go through a system of repair; we all have to fix up our budgets; and we all have to save money. That is important. However, the Federal policies are not allowing the process of reconstruction to take place before debt burdens are placed on the

States. For some States it is a question of simply surviving during this period.

I have some sympathy for the current Government, although, as I said at the beginning, if the State Government had not lost \$3 150 million with the State Bank disaster and \$350 million with SGIC and if it had not lost all the projects that it has lost over the years, we would not be in this difficult situation, but it would still be pretty tight.

I refer to the role played by the Commonwealth. We have to question seriously a Federal Government such as we have today. As I mentioned previously, Prime Minister Keating seems to operate with a set of rules that no-one in Australia can understand. He operates for himself and no-one else. He seems to be fighting the old wars that were part and parcel of the potato famine in Ireland, and he seems to dislike anything British. He is dividing and conquering wherever he goes on whatever issue comes before him. That is a particularly unhealthy state.

I made the statement that Prime Minister Keating has a mental problem, and I believe that to be the case. I believe that he does need some psychiatric help, because I have never seen someone who was so destructive in the way that he operates. He seems to operate from an inner hatred of either himself or other people around him, and I do not believe he is a fit and proper person to hold the highest office in this country. Specifically, in relation to the last election and the promises that were made, we know that they are now being broken in substantial form. I suppose, as the Prime Minister would say, 'No-one ever believed me anyway and we were only doing it for election purposes, and we have that right.'

I do not believe he has that right, and I do not believe that the people of Australia or South Australia should tolerate the behaviour of the Prime Minister or his incapacity to operate the budget in a fair and favourable manner. The Federal budget is \$16 billion in debt, and there has to be corrective action. That debt has to come down to well below \$10 billion in the next year, I believe, and then be further retracted over time.

To do that he is suggesting that he will allow a taxation decrease of about \$5 billion to be given to certain areas of the work force. At the same time he has to reduce the budget deficit. That means that we are facing a horror budget, and that will not help anyone. I do not believe the Prime Minister has the right to place further imposts on motorists in South Australia and Australia. We now have a suggestion, which will probably come to fruition, that sales tax on vehicles will be increased from 15 per cent to 20 per cent, that petrol tax will be given another slug, that cigarettes will be targeted and that the service and hospitality industry will also be targeted for taxation.

As mentioned by the member for Davenport, the issue of shares and the status of pensioners and retirees in this country is extraordinary with unrealised gains on shares being taken into account as revenue for the calculation of pension benefits. The Prime Minister is really destroying the very fabric of this country and doing it in a way that will take many years to repair. I do not believe that he is being fair to the States or the people of South Australia.

I do not countenance that a Prime Minister can stand up and talk about massive taxation cuts of about \$8 billion when he knows that his budget is in such complete disarray and then repudiate promises in respect of child care—and there may be other promises on the education front that he is going to repudiate—and expect the people of South Australia and Australia to take it lying down. I am concerned about the

quality of leadership of this country. I am concerned that we have in Prime Minister Keating a person who is unfit to govern this great country. Certainly, I hope that there will be an uprising and I hope that there will be an attempt by my Liberal colleagues in Canberra to block supply, which I believe is the only way that the Prime Minister can be brought to heel. When we do that we might get some sanity and reasonable assistance for the States so that we, too, can survive.

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** I wish briefly to continue the theme of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition involving the repudiation of promises on the Federal scene which, as we know, has been carried on in South Australia as well over the past decade. The reason I wish to carry on that theme is that a friend of mine has a child who is involved in a debate, and it may even be that that debate is occurring at this moment. I was telephoned this morning, being one of the people they knew as a practising politician, because the debate was that 'all politicians are honest or dishonest, depending on which side of the debate one took'. The fact that this 12-year-old child wished me to confirm was when our former Prime Minister had said those famous, oft-repeated and unfortunately easily ignored words 'No child will live in poverty by the year 1990'. I said 'famous' words: perhaps it would have been better had I said 'infamous' or, as the member for Mount Gambier says, 'famous last words'.

It is sad when a 12-year-old boy wants to put into his debate that our Prime Minister, the person to whom Australia looks for leadership and whom all Australians, particularly the youth, should respect, blatantly and unashamedly pulled the wool over the eyes of the Australian people knowing full well that he was doing so at the time. No matter what representations he may make now, everybody knows he was deluding the people, and it has had effect in 1993—some six years later—when a 12-year-old boy remembers that fact, and that is what he thinks of politics and politicians. The more promises that are repudiated and the more gross and misleading promises that are made and ignored, the more often this is likely to happen.

In continuing the theme of both the member for Davenport and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I hope that the Federal Government will see the light of day in relation to this quite bizarre proposal to decrease pensions commensurate on unrealised capital gains in the share market. The details of members who have shares are on public record in the House, and there are members on both sides of the House who have owned and done very well out of shares in the past. People who have had that experience realise that a gain is a gain, only when it is realised.

Anyone who has owned shares—and I believe it is a very reasonable way of helping to create wealth in a country—knows only too well that shares go up and down with monotonous regularity. To have one's pension docked according to an unrealised capital gain is doing nothing more or less than encouraging people to sell their assets to make up for the pension decrease, and that, of course, does nothing more than decrease the overall wealth, particularly of retirees and pensioners in the community, which of course is another complete antithesis of what our Prime Minister and his Finance Ministers were saying immediately prior to 13 March.

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**Dr ARMITAGE:** As my colleague the member for Chaffey says, it is too big a risk. It is simply stupid and I hope

that the Federal Government sees its way clear to changing that decision, given the overwhelming anger that this is creating in the community. I wish briefly to address a matter that is causing considerable concern within the Health Commission of South Australia, and that is the issue of decisions being made and then unmade as part of the award restructuring process.

My office has been inundated with letters from people who work at the Southern Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Service, which is an excellent service and which I visited recently, and I was delighted to note the care and concern for the community. Over the last lengthy period, a number of people within the award restructuring process, case coordinators in particular, applied for a reclassification from PSO1 to PSO2 on 28 July 1992. There have been lengthy individual submissions and interviews with a review panel, and so on. On 22 July 1993, a year later, they were delighted to be individually notified in writing that their applications for review of classification had been successful and approved at the PSO2 level. They were also delighted that this had been made effective from 1 October 1991.

I have been provided with a copy of a letter written by the Executive Director, Human Resources Division of the Health Commission, Mr Paul Case, dated 19 July 1993 to the Chief Executive Officer of Southern Domiciliary Care in which just those details are conveyed.

Unfortunately, on 3 August 1993, about 10 or 12 days later, each case coordinator received a second letter advising them that the classification of case coordinators had been withdrawn pending further discussion between the Southern Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Service and executive management of the Metropolitan Health Services Division and the Human Resource Division of the South Australian Health Commission. I have been provided with a copy of a letter written by Mr Ray Blight, Executive Director of the Metropolitan Health Services to the same CEO, which states:

Further to correspondence from Mr Paul Case, I am writing to advise that approval for the classification of case coordinator, PSO2, is withdrawn, pending further discussion.

This has created considerable, justifiable and completely understandable confusion, anxiety and anger, because this process has been going on since July 1992. It is now August 1993. Surely the Health Commission, with the bureaucratic parameters within which it works, has had plenty of time to have sufficient negotiations, as Mr Ray Blight asks. Surely it does not need further discussions. Surely it does not need yet more concern to be raised within the community. What has gone wrong?

One has every reason to question the inner processes of the award restructuring procedures and deals within the Health Commission. One can only ask, if such a mistake can be made, where there has been 12 months or more to get it right, what other mistakes are being made? Is it any wonder, when \$34 million of public money is not spent on people who desperately need operations, that daily we see examples where Health Commission processes are simply not up to providing the right services and doing the right thing by South Australians? Surely the Minister must take responsibility for that, because the Act says that the Health Commission is the direct responsibility of the Minister.

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

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to participate in this debate on the Supply Bill, because Supply is an important

issue as the taxpayers of South Australia expect the Government, when it introduces Supply Bills, and those who are supporting a particular Government clearly to explain to the people of South Australia the direction in which they intend to lead this community—whether we are to have more of the same or whether they will create some opportunities so that the young people in this community have a future.

I have listened to the radio in recent days; all sorts of statements have been made by one Minister trying to outdo the other and various others competing for publicity. It reminds me somewhat of rats jumping off a sinking ship. This is their final fling. However, the important thing is that at the end of all of these statements and all the rhetoric, where have they created any employment, any opportunities or any incentives for investment? There is only one thing that will improve the welfare of all citizens in this State, and that is a change in the economic climate to create some incentive, give people confidence and create the circumstances where people can look after themselves. We can have all the social welfare programs in the world and we can treat the disease but, of course, the exercise has to be to prevent the disease from occurring.

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The other thing is, as the member for Chaffey points out, that we cannot look after the underprivileged effectively and fairly unless we have a strong, viable, expanding economy. What this State requires—what this nation requires—is an expanding economy. We have to create more. It is not a matter of this nonsense about redistribution of wealth: such things as death taxes, wealth taxes and all those non-productive programs which left wing socialists like to put forward or which certain sections of the welfare agencies propose, probably for the best of motives, are counterproductive.

We have to encourage people to create more, to invest wisely and to build better companies, whether in agriculture, mining or manufacturing—whether in the Riverland or whether it is the wheat and wool growers in this country. Unless they have the ability to produce more, and more cheaply, and put high quality products on the market, we have no future in this country. All those ministries that are set up to stop development and to interfere with management processes and techniques must be re-assessed, because we cannot have a situation where people want to make decisions, get on and invest, and do things quickly: if we stop those people, there is no future.

I cite a couple of examples. About a fortnight ago I received a phone call from a constituent who, to put it mildly, was most irate. He had just achieved a contract for approximately \$2 million to cart salt, which had to be moved by road trains. It was to create 25 jobs. However, some brainstorm in one of the departments had refused to issue him with a permit to operate those road trains in the most isolated part of the State because it was alleged there was some problem with some corner. When he spoke to me, he was far from impressed. People overseas who are buying our products are not interested in our paper shufflers in Government departments. You either deliver on time, or that is it. They are not a bit interested in our foolish bureaucracy or our weak Ministers who have allowed these people to carry on in such an irresponsible fashion.

After a few telephone calls, I got the right person and we had a brief conversation. He clearly got the message and fixed the problem. I do not care whether they have to get their team out late on a Saturday or Sunday—what does it mat-

ter?—but he issued the man with a permit so that he could get on with his business. Trucks have to run around the clock. As you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, if the Japanese sign a contract, they want the goods delivered. They do not want their ships stuck in ports. Hopefully, this will be the first of many. Those 25 people who did not have a regular job were not interested in a stupid permit regarding a road at the back of Penong; they wanted those jobs and I wanted them to have jobs, too.

However, it should not come to that. The attitude of the person in the department should be, 'You do not meet the criteria. However, we are going to fix it for you. We are not going to say "No" and stop the whole thing.' What a foolish escapade! That is just one of many of the problems that members face. This country must stop such nonsense and get on with producing things more quickly and cheaply. If not, we will not have 30 per cent of young people employed; it will become worse.

One of the worst aspects of this recession and lack of activity is the failure to encourage young people to take apprenticeships. It concerns me greatly that fewer and fewer people are undertaking apprenticeships. Obviously, we are not building for the future. In our rural towns and regional centres, in the past we had a large number of farm machinery agencies and trades which employed apprentices. There have been cutbacks at Port Augusta in ETSA, the railways and BHP with regard to apprenticeships. When young people complete their apprenticeships, they have nowhere to go. Unless we have a large pool of people going through the system, we shall not have any tradesmen in future and we shall return to having to bring in such people from overseas. I believe that everything possible should be done to encourage people to acquire practical as well as academic qualifications. There appears to be a lack of understanding. In Australia, we shall still require people to get out in the wind, the dust and the heat and get some grease on them as well, because we need practical people.

As I indicated last week, if we had had more practical people in this Parliament, particularly on the Government side, perhaps they would not have gone down the road to ruin as quickly as they have done. This country achieved its greatest success and best standards of living during the Menzies-Playford era. We had many practical down-to-earth people running Government departments and they wanted people to succeed. They were not so concerned about affirmative action and that sort of program. At the end of the day, how many jobs has that created? Not one. However, it has certainly interfered and been a costly exercise.

As far as I am concerned, the most important thing that the Government can do with the money that this House will appropriate to it under the Supply Bill is to assist industry to develop and employ people. We need to understand clearly that the tax system has to be changed. There are too many imposts on industry and commerce. I suppose all members have received the submission from the Institute of Chartered Accountants. I have been reading my copy today. It clearly indicates the sorts of imposts and blockages which are put in the way of industry. The Minister of Primary Industries knows that agriculture in Australia has been efficient and effective. It requires a bit of commonsense from the Government, but the Commonwealth Government has made a number of foolish decisions in its early days, because it is driven by the politics of envy and the socialist outlook with which most of them come in. They immediately set out to take away benefits to industry. What is the result? Disaster.

There is a choice as to whether we allow people to compete on an even basis. I do not hold for one moment that there is an equal playing field. It is nonsense. It does not make economic sense and it is not in the interests of this country.

In the past we have been able to mitigate to some degree some of the outrageous barriers that have been put in the way of industry by having a sensible and sympathetic taxation system in this State which allowed people to consider their future. We gave them accelerated depreciation allowances, and so on. People could also buy Australian-made goods. They have now done away with them. Consider what has happened to manufacturing in this country. People cannot even afford to buy new equipment. Farmers and other groups have to buy second-hand Government vehicles, because the only persons we see driving around the country in new commercial vehicles are people in Government departments.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I should like to say a few words about unemployment and refute some of the erroneous statements that have been made by members opposite in the last week or two. First, I want to mention the Government's economic statement Meeting the Challenge, which was released in April. This document was well received in the community but was criticised by the Opposition. It is easy in Opposition to sit back, to criticise, to be negative, and to carp and carry on when they do not have to deliver. Where is their economic statement? The Government has put out an economic statement for criticism, but we do not see the Opposition's economic statement. Indeed, it is conspicuous by its absence.

The history of this State and at Federal level is that conservative Parties seem to be able to govern successfully and control economies only when there is rapid economic growth and things are all go, such as post-world wars or post-recessions and depressions, when things are building anyway. However, as soon as we get into difficult times—recessions or world wars—we get Labor socialist Governments coming in, not only in this country but in other countries, because they are the only ones that seem to be able to pull the country back onto the rails and get the economy moving. We have only to read our history books to see that that is the situation. It is a fact of life. People in our community are not stupid. They realise this and we shall see at the next State election that the Arnold Government will be returned with a healthy majority.

I should like now to refer to unemployment. Both State and Federal Labor Governments have borne the brunt of the blame for the tragic and unacceptably high levels of unemployment that are being experienced at this time. It is a tragic level of unemployment. But this criticism is unfair for three reasons, to which I shall come later. The member for Kavel said that unemployment is the result of Government policies, taxes and charges, and regulations. These factors have some impact, but very minor, in the overall employment situation. There have to be regulations. The majority of people are law abiding when they drive their vehicles on our roads. However, because some are not, laws have to be made to keep them under control. That, therefore, makes life difficult for the vast majority of people who do the right thing. It is the same in industry. There have to be regulations, taxes and charges, and legislation to protect society from the crooks. Most employers are responsible, hard working, honest people, but we have to legislate and regulate to control the crooks, and good employers are penalised accordingly.

I should like to touch on the three main reasons why we have record unemployment. The first is that the work force and work practices have undergone immense changes in recent times. We have more women in the work force, we have more people registered for employment, we have more and more people working overtime, and we have more efficiencies in relation to flexible working hours—flexitime, and so on. While the Opposition and the media say that we have this dreadful and tragic unemployment, as we do have, we also have record employment in this State in terms of the number of people who are employed. We have more people employed now than ever before in this State's history. They never quote that; they quote only the negative side about there being record unemployment, but we have indeed record employment.

The second factor is competition from exports, and we all know that these sorts of pressures and competition within the country and the State are keeping prices and profits down. I agree with the member for Kavel when he said the other day that 'profit' should not be a dirty word. I agree with that. There must be profits for business, especially small business, to survive. Certainly those profits are being affected by the need to keep prices down, to compete and to compete specifically with other countries.

One area that is subject to some Government control in policy is that of protection which is given to the motor vehicle industry, for instance. What did the Opposition do in this regard? They opposed it. They do not support the retention of tariffs to protect the motor vehicle industry in South Australia. The ALP has a policy of retaining 15 per cent, and the Opposition wants to go down to zero, so they do not put their money where their mouth is in that regard.

Recently, the member for Chaffey, who is a grapegrower, said that the price that he gets for his grapes these days is one sixth of what he got 10 years ago. That is an indication of the situation we are faced with. I sympathise with the member for Chaffey and the people whom he represents, as I do for many other people in small business. Some of the most anti-small business people are big companies and monopolies—certainly not the Government—some of which are screwing the companies to the wall, getting their prices down.

The primary producers and the manufacturers of many goods these days are getting a mere pittance for their labour. They produce the items and get practically nothing for them because they are being screwed to the wall by some of these big companies and having to compete with overseas exports. Many of the middle men get a lot of the profits but the actual people who do the hard work and produce or grow the goods get practically nothing. I can certainly sympathise with them in that regard.

The third point is the impact of technology, which is by far, in my view, the biggest factor in unemployment. As members would know, I worked for General Motors-Holden for many years. In about 1978 about 27 000 employees were working for General Motors, and today the figure is fewer

than 6 000. Yet, despite that loss of over 21 000 jobs in just one Company they are producing more and better quality cars, and this is because of technology. I was a mechanical design draftsman for some 20 years, and we had over 120 mechanical design draftsmen working for General Motors. Now there are five or six each sitting at a computer aided design machine, and they churn out as much work in one day as the others would do in a month.

**Mr Meier:** Which model did you design last?

**Mr De LAINE:** Right up until—

**An honourable member:** The one that you were driving?

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**Mr De LAINE:** No, before that. I forget the last one in which I took part, but that is the situation: not as much tool design is done now. Nevertheless, that is nearly another 120 jobs that have gone down the drain. Technology is wonderful but it is taking jobs.

Another example are the waterside workers from my area of Port Adelaide. Thirty years ago there were over 3 000 waterside workers, and today there are fewer than 100. Yet, despite that, more cargo is coming in and out of Port Adelaide than ever before in the State's history. That includes the days when ships used to be tied up three or four deep at the wharves and waiting out at the anchorage. There is still more cargo coming in but, of course, containerisation and technology once again claim nearly another 3 000 jobs, as well as the supporting 40-odd shipping companies that used to service those.

Another example is the local garbage collection. There used to be four people on a truck, and now there is one person with a mechanical lifter attached to the truck. The bowls clubs are putting in synthetic greens, and the greenkeepers are losing their jobs. This is the situation right across the board, and it is completely out of the control of Governments. This is because of technology and it is something that Governments have to try to pick up and help create jobs. The loss of jobs, I am emphasising, is not the fault of Government policy: it is happening because we live in the real world and these changes are thrust upon us. I believe that there are two classes of people in our society now: people without a job and people with two, three or four jobs. How often do we see people stressed up by working exorbitant amounts of overtime to keep up with the pressure of their jobs when there should be more workers put on to do those jobs? If the jobs were spread out, I am sure there would be work for everybody. One particular company I heard about recently had 120 people working for them and now they have 14.

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

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 17 August at 2 p.m.