HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 14 April 1994

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

THE STANDARD TIME (EASTERN STANDARD TIME) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Standard Time Act 1898. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for the adoption of Eastern Standard Time throughout South Australia by stipulating standard time as the mean time of the meridian of longitude 150° east of Greenwich, England. The effect of that will be to advance South Australia's clocks by 30 minutes, bringing this State in line with the time zone of the States on the eastern seaboard.

This is the third time a Bill of this form has been introduced by the Labor Party in this Parliament. On two previous occasions it was defeated in another place. I hope that this time there will be the opportunity for this to be accepted by both Houses of the Parliament and indeed I hope that all members will look at this matter on its merits. I know there are a number of members on the Government benches who have differing views on this matter; a number actually support the proposition I have put before the House on this occasion. They do so for some very important reasons.

They do so because they agree with the Arthur D. Little report, which recommended that a change to Eastern Standard Time be undertaken. They indicated that it was an issue of direct importance to the future of the State and that it should not be viewed as a matter of regional distinction. We have that recommendation from the Arthur D. Little report being endorsed by none other than Robert Gerard, former President of the South Australian Liberal Party and head of the South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I remind members what he stated on this matter in his letter to the Premier, as follows:

> As you know, the chamber has always pushed for South Australia to move to Eastern Standard Time. We have taken that stance over many years because we firmly believe that that is one of the foundation building blocks necessary to encourage head offices to set up here in South Australia. As you know, some 55 to 60 per cent of the goods and services supplied in South Australia moved to the eastern seaboard, and to think that we have a half-hour time difference is really quite ridiculous. With a Government such as yours that is pro-business, we believe the time could never be better than now to move to Eastern Standard Time so that we are in line with the main business community in Australia. We must be seen in South Australia as a State that means business.

They were very interesting comments indeed. While I have to say that I do not always concur with the—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation across the Chamber. It is difficult to hear the Leader.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: While I do not always concur with the comments of Mr Robert Gerard, on this occasion we are as one. He is very much in support of the views that I and my Party have expressed on this issue. I think it really comes down to how we want to analyse the place of South Australia within Australia. The reality is that when the first colonies were set up boundaries were set as they are and that happened over 150 years ago. Those boundaries have never changed, but the economic reality of Australia has taken its own path over the intervening more than 150 years since the establishment of the colony of South Australia.

That economic pattern shows itself by the fact that there is, in reality, a south-east boomerang of development in Australia that stretches from Brisbane through to Adelaide. That boomerang of development—and it is roughly a boomerang shape if you look at where the population resides in this portion of the country—contains the overwhelming majority of the population of this country, something like over 80 per cent, and it certainly contains by far and away the majority of business: headquarters of business operations and manufacturing in Australia. The manufacturing centres of Melbourne, Adelaide and Sydney are joined by the commercial centre of Brisbane as well.

That is where most of the economic pulse of the country is taking place, in that south-east boomerang. What we need to ensure in South Australia is that we are part of the growth of that boomerang because it will continue to be a very important part of Australia's development for a very long time to come, or do we want to be part of a process that may see that boomerang shrink in size and become more dominated in the eastern States of New South Wales and Victoria? I would have thought that any right thinking South Australian would not want that process to take place. Any right thinking South Australian would want to get with the action and make sure that we are part of that economic potential.

In that context, if you then look at that south-east boomerang, what do you see in terms of the time zone issue? You see that in terms of the time zone issue, for basic non daylight saving time, that it is all on the one time zone bar one section. That one section, the far western most portion of the south-east boomerang of Australia's development, is on Central Standard Time while the rest is on Eastern Standard Time. I acknowledge that when it comes to daylight saving considerations in summer then, yes, more time zones apply within that area. Here I concur with the Premier's own approach on the matter. He has been supporting uniformity on this issue. In that regard I endorse and congratulate him on his actions. He is quite right to be moving for uniformity of daylight saving in the south-east boomerang of Australia. He wants to bring South Australia into that and I congratulate him on that as well.

It is the very same principles that are involved in the daylight saving uniformity argument, which he has put so cogently, that apply here in terms of the Eastern Standard Time argument itself. I know that that is a view that he himself actually supports, but he was not able to get it through the Party room. He was rolled in the Liberal Party room on this matter as there were three different contending schools of thought on the matter. The best he could salvage in the end, when he knew the numbers were against him, was to ask for permission to move the face-saving motion that would maintain the *status quo*: one great step forward for the *status quo*.

It is a great pity that he was forced to fold and to buckle under the pressure of a Party room revolt. I hope that he and others in his Party room will think again about their attitude. This morning I have called on him to make this a free vote in his Party room; to allow members of the Liberal Party to

vote in the way their personal opinions go on this matter—and we know that their personal opinions differ on this matter—and therefore allow them to express that in this Chamber. Who knows? We might then see amendments coming from some who want to go backwards in time, back to the future so to speak, by moving us half an hour further away from the eastern coast of Australia.

I mention this issue of the South-East boomerang of Australia's economic development and population settlement pattern because it is the key, I believe, to this issue; it is the reality that we live in notwithstanding what happened in the drawing of colonial boundaries. However, I now want to make some points about the individual matters raised by many business people who have approached the Labor Party on this matter over a number of years and others in the community who have likewise supported their comments. The advantages of the proposed time change are numerous, but I can detail some of them today. There would be an improvement in the competitive position of South Australian firms in the Australian market as a result of the increase in the available communication time with the Eastern States during office hours. As I said before, over 80 per cent of the nation's population lives in that region, making it the main market for consumer goods industries. There would be improved communication for firms with interstate branch offices and particularly for South Australian companies that source their supplies or raw materials from other States.

There is also the time or cost disadvantages that Adelaide money market operators and the Stock Exchange suffer. Those disadvantages would be removed. This is not a point to be taken lightly. Already there is a concern in Sydney and Melbourne over the difference in the daylight savings proposals between those States as to what that will mean to the volume of business that goes through the respective stock exchanges of Sydney and Melbourne. There is a fear in the mind of those in the Eastern States that it will result in a move away from one of those major stock exchanges to another, just for the simple period of the three weeks when daylight saving is not uniform between those two States. If those States are expressing that fear over a three-week situation, one can see how the reality of the situation will apply to the Adelaide Stock Exchange. I acknowledge that it is not the most major stock exchange in the country, but it is less likely to become a significant stock exchange if we do not join with the main thrust of Eastern Standard Time.

The State's recreation, tourism and entertainment industries will reap the benefits of South Australia's unique summer climate. It is a climate that we are fortunate to have in this State, and we ought to be trying to maximise the opportunities for people to come here and enjoy that.There is also the perception issue. I have made the point all along that perception is a key part of the consideration of this matter. There is the impression that South Australia is remote from the eastern seaboard, and that would be removed by going on to the same time zone as the Eastern States. I say that it is a perception because it need not be the reality: that South-East boomerang of economic development and a population settlement includes the South-East portion of South Australia—we are part of that. We have to make a commitment in respect of whether we choose to remain a part of that or whether we want to see the tide of economic development ebb away out of this State back towards Melbourne and the Eastern States.

We have an opportunity to reinforce the remoteness view that many have, or to go for what are not only the present facts but, even more, the future potential for us to become part of the economic vitality of the south-eastern portion of Australia. There is a number of matters that can also be taken into account, for example, timetabling and scheduling of interstate transport links, which will be much simplified. I am sure every member of this place must have some awareness of just how convoluted timetabling arrangements become, not only during daylight saving time but also throughout the year. Again, I come back to the Premier's own comments on uniformity: just how right he was on this issue, because we see that while different States do different things at different times of the year it becomes a major irritant. Frankly, when one is trying to seek economic development and investment one really does not help one's case by introducing or maintaining irritants in the system. That is all they are, because no fundamentally important philosophic issue is involved here.

The move to Eastern Standard Time does not involve a major surrender of State sovereignty. If it is the case that for some people it is a major issue of State sovereignty, that States' rights issue are involved all over half an hour—30 minutes—I suggest that such people have a shallow view indeed of the real issues involved in State sovereignty questions.

I am aware that there are concerns on the West Coast of South Australia about this matter. I certainly do understand the points made by the many people there who have approached me on this matter. I come back to the point we are aiming for: to keep South Australia's economy in the economic mainstream. It is, as I have said on other occasions, entirely possible that communities on the West Coast can choose to make *de facto* decisions of their own as to when they operate the activities of their communities during the day. I have cited, for example, schools and their operating hours. I know that people have talked about the problem of children getting up in the dark and having to go to school in the dark. The simple matter is that what we are surely concerned about as legislators is not the time of day that children go to school but rather the amount of time they spend in school per day and per year.

The point is this: we are trying to ensure that they get enough access and exposure to education to be a benefit to them. Surely, it is a matter of entire indifference to us when they start their day at school. If a school community on the West Coast wants to start their school day at 9.30 a.m., I do not believe it is a major problem in respect of South Australia's integrity. I do not believe we would be threatened by possible secessionist movements if people on the West Coast sent their kids to school at 9.30 and not 9 o'clock. Of course, they would then finish school at a later time as well. The reality is that this happens already in a number of schools in our State for a different set of reasons. I do not think there is any set starting time. Some schools start at 9, some start at 8.45, some even start at 8.30, and I know some schools where some students start at 8 a.m. or even 7 a.m. That has not brought apart the fabric of State unity. We have actually survived that crisis to our integrity as a State. I am quite certain—

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, as the mover of the Bill, do I not have unlimited time?

The SPEAKER: I understand there is a limitation in private members' time. The member may seek leave to extend.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to extend my remarks for one minute.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will leave other members on my side to debate the truth of this matter. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1—Short title. This clause is formal.

Clause 2—Commencement. This clause is formal.

Clause 3—Substitution of section 3. This clause repeals section 3 of the principal Act and substitutes a clause that provides that standard time in South Australia is the mean time of the meridian of longitude 150 degrees east of Greenwich in England.

Clause 4—Transitional provision. This clause provides that the principal Act, as amended by this Act, applies to any Act, order in council, rule, regulation, by-law, deed or instrument enacted or made before the commencement of this Act.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Goyder. Is the honourable member the lead speaker for the Opposition in this measure?

Mr MEIER (Goyder): No, Sir, I am not the lead speaker in this debate. I am absolutely staggered that the Leader of the Opposition has decided to bring in this Bill at this time. It is a political stunt. He knows it is a political stunt and it has backfired on him 100 per cent. In fact, now we can see why he has brought it in, because his leadership credibility has been crumbling day by day, week after week, since the election loss. Look at members back there; they are laughing. They realise exactly what the situation is. The Leader's performance today and his performance in the last few weeks relating to Eastern Standard Time has been nothing short of abysmal. It was quite clear—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: They do not like it and the Leader does not like it, but there was clearly a political stunt when on Keith Conlon's program earlier this week the Leader of the Opposition was being questioned. Various questions were asked but he did not have the proper answers. Then a question was asked, 'What do you think will happen?' He said, 'Whatever happens, the Premier will be rolled.' A few more questions were asked and then Keith Conlon said, 'Well, look, Mr Arnold, what do you think will happen then?' The Leader said, 'The Premier will be rolled.' That is all he wanted to push—that the Premier would be rolled.

The Leader was 120 per cent wrong, because the Premier had an overwhelming triumph: the Premier's motion was carried. We cannot release the figures. The *Advertiser* sometimes gets it wrong but it said the numbers were two to one and, in fact, that was very close to the truth. As the Leader well knows, it was not about moving to EST: if anything, it was about moving to our own time. For the Leader of the Opposition to put forward this Bill to move to Eastern Standard Time shows how out of step he is with the people in this State.

It saddens me, because a few years ago the now Leader of the Opposition—and he will not be in that position for much longer, but while he is there we acknowledge that—was Minister for Agriculture and, in fact, I had the opportunity to shadow him for two years. While the Leader was Minister for Agriculture he supposedly supported rural interests. I will acknowledge that many rural people thought that the then Minister for Agriculture was doing a satisfactory job: some people even said he was doing a good job for the agriculture sector.

The truth was that he was ignoring them. He was ignoring their high interest plight; he was ignoring the fact that commodity prices had bottomed out; and now the truth comes out that he ignores them in relation to Eastern Standard Time. He ignores the desire of the farmers and the rural sector to maintain at least our existing time. If members opposite had their way, they would see us move to our own Central Standard Time. The farmers and the rural sector were sold out by the Labor Government and are being sold out now by the Labor Opposition. The Labor Party will stay in Opposition, I would hope, for the next 50 years. None of these people sitting opposite me will ever see government.

I can tell members that the rural sector is hopping mad at the Labor Party. Rural people are most unimpressed with the move by the Leader of the Opposition to go to Eastern Standard Time. They have asked me, 'What on earth does Arnold think he is doing?' I said, 'I cannot speak for him but it shows you what the Labor Party thinks of the rural sector: it has no interest in you at all. It will let you sink in your current economic situation. You have all the problems in the world and it just wants to add to them.'

The Leader would know only too well the difficulties faced in the rural sector because of the present arrangement and the extension for daylight saving. He mentioned something about school children going to school in the dark. I can tell the House, having lived at Yorketown for many years and having seen children catching the bus 1½ hours before they arrived at school, that daylight saving causes an enormous problem for those people, but the Leader is quite happy to take us another half an hour forward so that the children will probably be on the bus in the dark virtually the whole way to school.

Of course, we heard the Leader say, 'But the schools can change their opening hours.' Heavens above! He is trying to get business somehow to be attached to a different time scale with the Eastern States. He then says, 'But let the schools run things their own way. Don't worry about the businessmen who send the kids to school. That is their problem. Don't worry about the interruptions, the upsets. Don't worry if one school in one section of the country is on one time frame and another 20 kilometres away is on another; that is too bad. They can accommodate themselves.' He also mentioned the West Coast and said, 'Let those people have their own time zone.' Sure, split the State in half. Make it the laughing stock of the country. That is quite all right. But that is the implication without any—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Come on: you have said it in this Parliament before. Your own Government in earlier years said, 'We are quite happy to create another time zone', and members opposite know full well they would have been happy to create a second time zone in this State. Obviously, the implications of anyone going to Eastern Standard Time would be exactly that. The implications are horrendous from the point of view that, if we went to Eastern Standard Time and then had daylight saving on top of that, our time zone would run very close to that of New Zealand, on the 165 degree east line. We would be hours and hours out of our true time. Why do we want to go that way? There is no commonsense at all—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I said if we included daylight saving on Eastern Standard Time. There is no mention in this Bill that we would do away with daylight saving.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I am against daylight saving, yes, and I have made that view known on many occasions in this House. I believe that I reflect the views of my electorate in this area, too. The other thing about going to Eastern Standard Time, let alone with daylight saving time, is that it will add expenses to the rural sector over and above those they have at present. Most of us know the extent to which the rural sector is battling. It has had great difficulty in trying to get budgets to balance. In fact, those who can do that are the exception rather than the majority.

I am sorry that the Leader has decided to try to make this a political point scoring exercise. It is disturbing when he brings forward arguments from so-called business saying that it wants to go to Eastern Standard Time. I think most members, if not all, would have been approached by many businesses that are happy to stay on our own time. I can tell members that virtually all the business people I have spoken with in my electorate have said that it is just outrageous to want to go to Eastern Standard Time. They would like to stay either with the time or, preferably, to go half an hour behind, so that we were one hour out from the Eastern States and one hour out from Western Australia. But that is another argument. I had to smile, with a sense of sadness, knowing that the Leader of the Opposition is in his last days in this House; he has made a last valiant effort through the media to try to gain some credibility as the knives are slowly closing in around him.

Who the successor will be, we do not know, but for him to try to score political points on this, when he got it 100 per cent wrong, when it was quite clear that the Liberal Party was overwhelmingly in favour of retaining our current time, is a shame on him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I guess I have learned a lot from the former shadow Minister's speech, because what we have heard today—and I hope the press will report this—is that the Premier had an overwhelming triumph in his major reform to return to the *status quo*. I want also to take the opportunity today to pay tribute to the Minister for Industrial Affairs, who is not in the Chamber at the moment, and the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development who, I understand, did argue against the Premier's current triumph in terms of having EST.

Indeed, the Premier himself seemed somewhat confused when he was questioned about this. It is very interesting that today he is not in the Chamber to tell us about his overwhelming triumph. I wondered about this. Perhaps he did not adjust his watch properly. Perhaps he thought we started at 11 o'clock. Perhaps he is at home listening to 'As Time Goes By' or 'Now is the Hour'. The fact is that he talked and talked about his decisive action in negotiating with his top ranking interstate colleagues about bringing in uniformity, micro-economic change, and when it came to the test he wimped out. No-one believes that the Premier was not rolled, because he was rolled, and members know it.

The fact is, too, that it was with even more ignominy that he was rolled by the likes of the former shadow Minister who just spoke and the member for Custance. How humiliating! He would go into the bar after Caucus and have a cup of coffee with his mates and say, 'Hello, Ivan, you have just rolled me.' Really, what an incredible humiliation. Put the member for Custance on the front bench where he belongs. Is that an overwhelming triumph for economic reform or for what he told us about in his policy speech: that he is going to be behind business?

Who funded the leaflets that went out? Bob Gerard. Bob Gerard is someone I have a great deal of time for, because Bob, of course, is someone who is not like most business people in the Chamber, who would tell us that we have to get off the backs of business, that we must allow the private market forces to flourish unfettered, because Bob is someone who does not just want a hand up from Government: he wants a handout and a bow out—a big one—and he is prepared to do this sort of thing.

We have all heard of his wonderful speech during the recent Royal visit on the day after the Premier insulted the Princess of Wales. I am told that Prince Edward had the good fortune to listen to the wits, somewhat emotional, of Bob Gerard on that occasion, and I am sure he told the Prince that we must move towards Eastern Standard Time, because when I was Minister for Business and when the former Premier was Minister for Industry we were constantly told, time and time again, by the business community in this State that we needed Eastern Standard Time to bring us into the main game, to be part of the action, to be where it is in the eastern States, where 80 per cent of the markets are. We need that not just for the airlines, not just for the television stations to be viable rather than putting things on relay, but to be part of the market forces of Australia. That is what the business community that backed those on the Government side expected; and that is what they were told would happen. However, the Premier, tough and decisive, fighting for uniformity, wimped out and got rolled by the member for Custance. That was his triumph on the day.

The fact is, too, that the Arthur D. Little report recommended that a change to Eastern Standard Time was an issue not just of symbolic importance about being part of the eastern States market action but also important to the future of our State directly with a real economic impact. That is what the Employers Chamber of Commerce said and said again.

I am surprised, by the way, that the former shadow Minister for catfish did not tell us it was going to affect the way the birds woke up in the morning. That is the sort of nonsense that we have been getting. I believe that moving the clocks ahead by 30 minutes will send the right signal to our community, and particularly to the business sector, that we do have a regional economy in this State that is most definitely, absolutely inextricably, linked to the eastern seaboard. It is vitally important to those doing business with the biggest markets in Australia and it is an overdue micro-economic reform. Every member of this House knows it, and to try to hope that there might be some poor reporter out there who is still so much in love with the Premier and his bold reforms that he would write that up as a triumph, that he is actually out there backing this return to the status quo from which we should never move, is an absolute furphy, and everyone here knows it.

On Tuesday we saw the Premier getting rolled in his Caucus. There were people standing outside talking to advisers and asking, 'How can we put a spin on this? How can we pretend that Dean has had to do a belly flip?' He does not have the guts to come in here today and tell us. Where is he? Didn't he set his watch right?

Members interjecting:

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

Mr MEIER: My point of order is, as the Deputy Leader would well know, that an arrangement was made between the two Whips, and Standing Orders were suspended to allow the debate to occur with four speakers. For him suddenly to make political capital out of this—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr BASS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition actually named the Premier by his Christian name and did not refer to him as the Premier or by the seat he represents.

The SPEAKER: Order! I was about to draw to the Deputy Leader's attention the fact that, in the view of the Chair, his remarks were not helpful, and I was going to ask him not to continue in that vein. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I always try to be helpful and I will—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Deputy Leader further impugned the character of the Premier by implying that he was absent for reasons other than parliamentary business.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold that point of order. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: But he is not on time. There are some distinct advantages for the time changes. One is a vital improvement in our competitive position both actual and symbolic, and symbolic actions are important in terms of marketing our State as being relevant to the national economy. We have made a great deal of noise about micro-economic reform, and the fact is that we have not proceeded.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, approximately 80 per cent of the nation's population lives in that region, making it our principal market for consumer goods industries. It will allow improved communications for firms with interstate branch offices, particularly for South Australian companies that source their supplies or raw materials from other States, and time or cost disadvantages for Adelaide money market operators and the Stock Exchange, which the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, would be removed. There is a whole range of real as well as symbolic benefits.

In closing, I remind the House of the Premier's advertisements for the last election. We had a number of scenes staged and filmed of people looking at watches and clocks, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw trying to look calm and decisive, the Minister for Industry trying to look loyal, and the Premier saying over the phone, 'Don't worry. A decision will be made at 9 o'clock in the morning on which time zone.' But he squibbed, he was rolled, and they know it.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Mr Speaker—

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CAUDELL: I have listened to the debate today and tried—

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, the member for Peake accused the Deputy Leader of telling lies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 'Lies' was the word that was used.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Peake accused the Deputy Leader of telling lies, that is unparliamentary and he must withdraw it.

Mr BECKER: I didn't say that at all.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I did not say that at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair heard other comments by way of interjection from the member for Peake. If the Chair had been aware that the word 'lie' was used, the Chair would have intervened of its own volition. As the member has denied using it, I call the member for Mitchell.

Mr CAUDELL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. During the debate today we have heard a number of statements from the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. One could wonder whether we have Christopher Columbus revisited. We have the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition making statements to the effect, 'The world is flat, and unless we tie this State to Victoria it will fall off the map.'

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the world is not flat. It is definitely round, and there are 24 time zones throughout this globe which are all 15 degrees apart. One wonders why the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to tie us to Victoria. We can understand why: he is in favour of regional Government and he is only the patsy for the Prime Minister. He has already achieved his first objective. The first objective of the Australian Labor Party associated with tying us to Victoria was to hand the Grand Prix to Victoria. That he has done successfully; he has already achieved his first objective.

His second objective was then to tie us to Victorian times. One wonders about the inferiority complex of Government members. Why do they want to tie themselves to Jeff Kennett's apron strings? One wonders why they, for some unknown reason, stand up in this Chamber day after day criticising Jeff Kennett but they still wish to tie themselves to his apron strings. They obviously have an inferiority complex. They do not believe that this State has enough gumption to make its way in the Commonwealth on its own, to stand on its own two feet. Maybe they should take a lesson from Queensland, which is an hour behind the rest of the Commonwealth during daylight saving time, because it stands on its own two feet when it says, 'Perfect one day, magnificent the next.'

Maybe we should look at our tourism industry which was so criticised and so run down by the Deputy Opposition Leader when he was the Minister of Tourism. I could say a lot more about his very poor efforts in Los Angeles, but I will save that for a later date. When we talk about tourism, we should talk about people coming to South Australia to wine, dine and travel. The honourable member criticised the situation and said, 'Without Eastern Standard Time our tourism industry will suffer.' I remind him that, when tourists come to this State, they go by the sun; they do not worry about the clock. They use all the daylight time they can to experience the magnificent wonders of this State.

On a number of occasions it has been said that business is suffering because we are a half an hour behind the eastern seaboard. I remind the Opposition that prior to this debate I made a number of phone calls to businesses in this State to ascertain whether they had a problem with staying at the time zone we have, moving back to Central Standard Time or moving forward to Eastern Standard Time. I rang up Gerard Industries, but unfortunately the Managing Director was

unavailable for comment. One of the staff members said that it did not worry them in the least.

I rang up one of the leading manufacturers of motor vehicles in South Australia who said that most of its dealings were with a country that runs on the 135 degree meridian. It felt that going to Eastern Standard Time could be going backwards, but it said that it would make no difference to that company if we moved to Central Standard Time. I spoke to one of the large white goods manufacturers in this State, who said, 'No, generally speaking the half hour time difference is not a problem, and we doubt whether the hour difference will be a problem.' It felt that most of the overseas clients dealt directly with Sydney and Melbourne, and it did not have a problem with that. I then rang up one of the largest steel manufacturers in this country to speak to its representatives, but unfortunately they asked me to fax my questions to them, and they said that they would fax back their answers.

Then I looked at the experience overseas and at a country which has four time zones. I looked at Chicago and Detroit, which are 330 kms apart and which are two very large industrial towns in the United States. Those two towns have an hour's time difference. None of those towns has a problem in operating with the rest of their country. They do not want set up—as the Opposition appears to want to do—a weather map of times throughout the Commonwealth.

They do not have a problem with operating under those circumstances; in fact no business I have contacted to date has a problem in this respect. The Opposition has destroyed the State's economy in the past and we will allow that to continue if we have the same time as Victoria and New South Wales. When it comes to competitive edge with those particular States, overseas countries looking to invest in Australia and looking to relocate their business put all the factors down on paper. They say, 'Why go to South Australia when they are the same time as Victoria and New South Wales, which are where the population is and where the markets are? There are no benefits to be gained by going to South Australia; we may as well go to Victoria and New South Wales.'

It is once more another part of the hidden agenda of the regional Government, as set out by the Labor Party, whereby it wants to make us a part of Victoria. One wonders what future name it would suggest for this part of the world—'the Great Southern ALP Area', 'Southern Victoria', 'South-western Arnold Land' or any one of a variety of names.

The tourism industry has an opportunity to prosper within South Australia. We have an opportunity to prosper with regard to having our own identity. We have in the market place for discussion at the moment the establishment of the Adelaide-Darwin rail link. Can you imagine when the train arrives at the Northern Territory border the passengers being asked to turn their clocks back? That would bemuse the overseas visitors on that train, who realise that we are on the same longitude with Darwin but for some unknown reason we have a different time zone within the winter period. I am not talking about daylight saving, but about the bubble in the middle of the time zone which looks like a weather map.

We have an opportunity to develop something which is of great excitement and which has potential for this State and region. We should not be discussing the setting up of the same time zone as Victoria and New South Wales: we should be negotiating to have consistent time zones with the Northern Territory. Three areas of longitude run through the map of the world, and they are 15 degrees apart. Therefore we should have three time zones in Australia. The Opposition wants to establish four time zones within this part of the world. We should be heading towards three time zones in this part of the world, our time zone being consistent with that of the Northern Territory.

Let us market this State; let us be proud of this State; let us stand on our own two feet and stand up and be counted, not as Victorians but as South Australians who are proud that we are South Australians.

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STIRLING SIGNS

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I move:

That by-law No. 42 of the District Council of Stirling relating to moveable signs made on 20 December 1993 and laid on the table of this House on 10 February 1994 be disallowed.

This by-law, as the name suggests, is in relation to moveable signs. It appears that section 370 of the Local Government Act provides that councils are empowered to impose regulations in relation to the manner of placing signs, the compliance with standards and the prohibition of signs in various places, but there is no provision in that Act to license signs. The Local Government Association of South Australia also holds that view.

The Legislative Review Committee has considered this issue and has taken the view that no power for licensing signs exists and that the appropriate action to be taken if councils wish to have power to license signs is the amendment of the Act. I therefore commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURAT BAY SIGNS

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I move:

That by-law No. 16 of the District Council of Murat Bay relating to moveable signs, made on 12 January 1994 and laid on the table of this House on 15 February 1994, be disallowed.

I have already addressed this issue in relation to the previous motion to which the same matters apply. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BREAST CANCER

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I move:

That this House calls upon the Prime Minister and the Federal Health Minister to increase research funds to help combat breast cancer from $1.4 million to $14 million in the 1994-95 budget and to consider initiatives through the tax system to encourage donations for breast cancer research.

In moving this motion, I must admit to a feeling of *deja vu*. On 16 August 1990, I moved a motion that, in the opinion of this House, the Government should continue funding for free mammograms for women aged 50 to 64 years and include women aged 40 to 50 years. While a member of the Opposition at that time, the motion was debated in this House. I was extremely pleased for women and their families in this State that all Opposition members and the Government of the day

voted unanimously to accept that motion and that the State Government matched Federal funding that was offered to provide a national breast cancer screening program. The South Australian program was then initiated, and it included women aged 40 to 64 years.

The South Australian Breast X-ray Service began in late 1988 and offered breast cancer screening at three metropolitan hospitals. The pilot program was aimed at women aged 50 to 64 years, and in its first full year of operation (1989-90) it screened 7 873 women. The pilot program was set up to provide the experience to develop a full-scale State-wide mammography screening program, which would include service delivery and, most importantly, program evaluation.

The original pilot program was funded by the State Government. In June 1990, the Australian Health Ministers agreed, in principle, to a national program for the early detection of breast cancer with screenings to be made available for women aged 40 and over but with emphasis to be placed on the 50 to 69 year age group. Funding for the program was based on the Commonwealth's matching State funds dollar for dollar. South Australia, which signed an agreement to participate in the program in February 1991, was well placed, as the pilot program had then been going for over two years.

South Australia was the first State to submit a proposal to the Commonwealth to expand its existing screening services from the three original hospitals—Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre and Royal Adelaide Hospital. All processing of X-rays and interpretation of screens as well as administrative activities, such as bookings, recruitment and confinements, were done through a central coordinating unit located at Wayville. The service was extended to country women in 1991-92 when a mobile 13 metre semi-trailer unit housing X-ray and processing equipment became operational. With the Commonwealth funding for 1991-92, three more screening units were opened: one at Seacombe Gardens, opposite the Marion Shopping Centre; one at the ANZ Bank building in Rundle Mall; and one at the central coordinating unit at Wayville.

The South Australian funding proposal to the Federal Government involved a five year program beginning on 1 July 1991, with a progressive growth in screening capacity and throughput up to a maximum of 65 000 screens annually by year five of the program, as detailed in the South Australian Health Commission Annual Report for 1990-91. The program accepted was a three year program ending on 30 June 1994. Hence this motion today to bring to the attention of the House that negotiations will be under way to determine the budget that will affect South Australia's screening program.

A review of the funding arrangements is already being conducted now, and part of the process of the review is an inquiry by the Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs. South Australia's experience of setting up a service through the pilot program, and then early take-up of the Commonwealth's offer, meant that this State's scheme was well ahead of most other States. This meant that our program was very much a pilot for other States when in 1991-92 national accreditation guidelines were developed and South Australia was selected as one of the two States for a trial of the new guidelines. These guidelines were the means by which State schemes could be accredited for funding under the national program.

The South Australian Breast X-Ray Service Data Management System became the model for computing systems in other States, also in 1991-92, and the Commonwealth subsequently bought a copy of the source code with a view to offering it to the other States. South Australia served as a lead team in a series of workshops conducted at a three day national multi-disciplinary training symposium funded by the Commonwealth in 1992-93. The workshops dealt with practical ways of handling issues through all phases of the screening pathway from recruitment to the diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer.

The South Australian scheme's trail blazing was a disadvantage in one area: in the early days funding from the Commonwealth was slower than required, and that is explained in some detail in the South Australian Health Commission's Annual Report 1990-91. The number of women screened each year from 1988 to 1993 now totals 62 602. Because of the round two and round three screenings that are necessary to follow through on detection of breast cancer, the actual screening total in that time is 78 583, which is most commendable. The number of cases of breast cancer diagnosed in South Australian women has increased over the period during which the screening program has been in operation and I would now identify the years and the number of breast cancer patients detected in each of those years, as follows:

Year	No. of cases of breast cancer detected
1987	560
1988	552
1989	682
1990	663
1991	673
1992	743

These statistics are sourced from the South Australian Cancer Registry, the *Epidemiology of Cancer in South Australia*, through the South Australian Health Commission. The service concludes that the increase in the number of cases detected, which I have just outlined, is a direct result of the service's activities. It also estimates that the earlier detection of some cancers will show up in a smaller number of deaths from breast cancer from about 1994-95.

It is important that I put some cold hard facts about breast cancer statistics and facts as known. Breast cancer is the most common cause of cancer in women: 40 per cent of women who get breast cancer die from the disease. Breast cancer has no known cause and there has been a rising incidence of breast cancer and it is now the most common cause of death for Australian women aged between 35 and 54.

That in itself is a most telling fact. Breast cancer affects one in 12 Australian women. The national figures show that more than 6 000 women a year are diagnosed with breast cancer. One woman dies every four hours and six women die every day. Throughout Australia about 2 500 women every year die from breast cancer. On present trends over the next 10 years, another 30 000 Australian women will die of breast cancer. As well, there are concerns that many women are not getting access to the best standards of treatment and that if such treatment were provided the death rate could well be reduced within a decade. Only 5 per cent of women with breast cancer are currently part of the national clinical trials program established to research treatment practices. Australia's breast cancer research effort is very modest compared with Canada and the United States. Of the 1993-94 health research budget of $161 million, about $1.4 million has been allocated to breast cancer research, and that is a disgrace.

Despite the recognised deficiencies in breast cancer research, total health research funding is projected to decrease by 15 per cent over the next three years. The United States spends some $A9 000 per death on breast cancer research. The equivalent figure for Australia is less than $600. The equivalent figure for the female population of Australia is 20¢ per woman per year spent on breast cancer research. I would also point out that breast cancer does not strike only women, but men also die. However, I would also point out that the significant risk factors for breast cancer are indeed gender and age. A family history of breast cancer increases a woman's risk of developing the disease, and this was outlined in the submission to the Senate standing inquiry by the South Australian Breast X-ray Service, which stated:

> However, 85 to 90 per cent of women diagnosed with breast cancer have no close relative with the disease. Although a number of other factors have been linked to breast cancer, over 70 per cent of breast cancers occur in women with no known risk factors. . .

It is important to realise again that the cause of breast cancer is still not understood. Therefore, primary intervention which may assist women to prevent cancer from occurring or developing is not an immediate prospect. Breast screening through mammography is the only available technology which can be classed as a preventive measure for the early detection of breast cancer. It is particularly important to consider the breast cancer death rate statistics of women to gain a clear perspective on this issue: 2 500 women throughout Australia each year die from breast cancer. This is five times the number of deaths of women who die on our roads in any given year. It is greater than our national road toll, recording the deaths of both men and women.

In the nine months since its inception from March 1989 to December 1989, that is, before the national program was initiated, the South Australian pilot program had screened over 7 000 women, and 54 cases of cancer were detected. The significance of those statistics is that the 54 cases were asymptomatic women—those who were symptom free, who did not have a family history of breast cancer, who did not have a lump in the breast which could either be felt or seen or had any other associated symptoms. In this State alone, 500 new cases of breast cancer (and the updated figure is over 700) are now diagnosed every year, and these cancers result in the death of approximately 250 South Australian women.

With the little time that is left to me in this debate, there is a great deal to say about the issue of breast cancer and it is a shame that I do not have enough time to talk about the associated reasons why it is most definitely important to look at greater funding for the continuation of this program. The Commonwealth's terms of funding of mammography screening programs requires that the services should target all women aged 40 and over. The Commonwealth insists on including this age range as women in this age group are already demanding mammography service through private clinics. The demand is already established and the Commonwealth is paying heavily for this demand through Medibank and Medicare.

I find myself once again standing in this House and arguing for the inclusion of the 40 plus age range of women to be included in future mammography screening programs. As I say, there is a great deal more detail and argument that could be put on the record to support that age range inclusion. I think it is also important to point out that decisions taken to determine prevention of breast cancer through this new technology must not be diminished by decisions that are taken on financial grounds rather than that of informed medical opinion. Screening programs are relatively new in Australia and data collecting is indeed in its infancy.

For the time being I would like to again call upon the Federal Minister for Health to increase the allocation of funds for breast cancer research. I call upon the State Minister for Health to negotiate with the Federal Minister to ensure continued financial support, not only to maintain our existing mammography screening program, but to seek to increase the financial support necessary for the success of this program in reducing mortality rates by one third. I call upon all members of Parliament to support this motion by actively promoting, through their electorate offices and throughout their communities, a petition to present to the Federal Parliament to support this motion.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I support the motion. Many of the approximately 180 people who die from breast cancer each year in South Australia come from country regions. I understand that country women are dying at a greater rate than their city counterparts due, in part, to later detection and greater difficulty and expense in accessing appropriate treatment. An increase in research funds may help to identify an easier method of detection that could result in earlier detection. The single mobile unit that is presently traversing the country regions in South Australia is currently behind the expected schedule of screening all eligible women in the country regions over a two year period. One of the regions it is not expected to reach until much later this year is Kangaroo Island, after being launched two years ago this month. A two year period is the recommended screening interval for the target age group of 50 to 64 years. Many of the eligible women on Kangaroo Island have never been screened and many others will not be detected early enough. I urge the Government to get a second unit on the road as soon possible.

Those women who fall outside the 50 to 64 age group have no early detection method easily available to them other than manual examination by a doctor or themselves. Manual examination is not a solution. As one medical person said to me, 'If you can feel the lump it is probably too late.' Once detected, current treatment is often traumatic and accessed with great difficulty, particularly by country women who have to travel so far at great expense and major disruption to their families when they are away for long periods. Often country women will leave testing and even treatment so as not to disrupt the family at inconvenient times such as shearing, harvest, sowing, school terms or even for family holidays. The consequences of doing this can mean death, but many women misguidedly will not put themselves first.

Of course, prevention of breast cancer would be the most desired outcome and only research will help with that. However, less traumatic treatment and quicker, easier methods of detection than those currently used could improve the situation significantly. A simple blood test for detection of breast cancer is one method currently being trialled. Mr Speaker, on behalf of men and women all over the world whose lives may be saved as a result of increased funding for research into breast cancer, I support this motion.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I move:

That this House congratulates the Minister for Transport for her commitment to review the procedures which must be undertaken by

people living in rural areas more than 20 kms from a Motor Registration Division photo point for the purpose of obtaining a photograph for their driver's licence and urges the division to make the photo kit more readily available for use by accredited local photographers doing so, using very stringent subject identification criteria.

The motion is self explanatory. The background to the situation in which we find ourselves at present is that there are a number of places around South Australia at which it is possible for people to have their photo taken for attachment to their driver's licence. Frankly, I regard the practice as I have seen it in those circumstances as more likely to produce an abuse and a misidentification of the person on the driver's licence than the way in which I have known photo kits to be used in rural areas, where invariably the photographer knows the person being photographed, or the family of the subject, and is careful to make sure that the photograph they are taking is that of the person whose name will be on the licence to which that photo is to be attached.

The places around South Australia where it is possible to get photographs for licences, apart from Adelaide, are Elizabeth, Marion, Mitcham, Modbury, Noarlunga, Port Adelaide, Prospect and Tranmere. That is a fair coverage of the metropolitan area. You would not have to travel as much as 10 kms if you lived in the metropolitan area to get your photograph taken for your driver's licence by going to an office of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles where there is a photo point. You would not have to travel 10 kms, and what is more you could make the journey on public transport. That is a great saving to anyone in the metropolitan area. There is no public transport for folk in the country. The places in the country where there are photo points are Berri, Kadina, Mt Gambier, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie and Whyalla—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: No, there are other photo points that are not Motor Registration offices, and they are at Andamooka, Bordertown, Ceduna, Clare, Cleve, Coober Pedy, Cook, Hawker, Kimba, Kingscote, Kingston (S-E), Lameroo (on Railway Terrace), Leigh Creek, Lock, Marla, Millicent, Minlaton, Naracoorte, Peterborough, Roxby Downs, Streaky Bay, Tarcoola, Waikerie, Woomera, Wudinna and Yunta. Members will note that, for instance, in my own electorate, it is possible to have a photograph taken at Lameroo and Murray Bridge—

Mr Atkinson: But not Karoonda?

Mr LEWIS: Definitely not Karoonda, for the benefit of the member for Spence. It is also possible to have a photograph taken just outside my electorate at places such as Waikerie and Berri. If you live at Salt Creek, Tintinara, Keith or Coonalpyn, no public transport is available. Indeed, if you live at Meningie, no public transport is available, and it will take you a journey in excess of 100 kilometres for the round trip; Salt Creek would be well over 100 kilometres, and Meningie likewise. That will cost you about $45 or $50. If you have what most people in country areas are driving now—a car older than 10 years that has to use leaded fuel—the fuel cost is likely to be well over $10 to travel to either a photo point or a Motor Registration Office to have your photograph taken.

It is possible under the photo kit program, which uses accredited photographers, for that charge to be as low as $5, as it is in Keith, for instance, as provided by Mr Peter Brookman. Therefore, it saves you not only three hours in travelling time and more than $10 in fuel costs but it also ensures that the person taking the photograph can vouch for the fact that the person being photographed is the person they claim to be. I do not think there is any risk to the security of the system by extending it to include accredited photographers scattered throughout South Australia but not within 20 kilometres of any of the places I have mentioned. They could take photographs using the photo kit and then supply them to the Motor Registration Division for attachment to the licence.

That is the kind of compassionate regard which this Government has for people in difficult locations and disadvantaged circumstances to ensure that they obtain their licence to drive a motor vehicle at reasonable expense. That is no mean accomplishment in their eyes because, as members will know, rural poverty at present is very serious indeed. The effects of it are horrendous when compared with the lifestyle and quality of life that people living in urban settings enjoy and certainly have the money to enjoy. Those people in urban settings who many members of this House would judge as being poor are nowhere near as poor as the poorest of our citizens who live elsewhere in the rural areas of the State.

It is on their behalf, as a member representing such people, that I rise to draw the attention of the House to the commitment made by the Minister, and to put on record the concerns expressed to me about this insensitive system which was introduced by the previous Government. If the previous Minister for Transport denies that she was in any way responsible for it—and I would expect her to; she denied a number of other things to which she applied her signature—I simply say to her and of the work she did as the Minister, 'You are incompetent, and it is about time you got out of the way'. The people of South Australia did not wait for her to resign and get out of the way to let somebody take over who could do the job—they simply swept the Government aside. It was that kind of indifference and irresponsible bureaucratic pettifogging which resulted in this State's getting into difficulties.

It is a symptom of the overall problem that the previous Government had with its attitude to the administration of affairs. I look forward eagerly to the review the Minister is undertaking, and reassure her of my continuing support for the good work she does in the belief that, as a consequence of that report, we will have a number of accredited photographers established throughout this State in those localities wherever they seek to be so established by application, placing them 20 kilometres or so farther afield from any other established Motor Registration Division office or photo point in post offices. Not only will that be more cost efficient for my constituents and those other people who live in more isolated circumstances in South Australia but it will actually save the department money, because at present it has to pay more than $5 for the people who operate the photo points in the post offices to which I have referred.

I end on this note: Sir, would you expect, or would you expect any other member of this Chamber, if they lived in the electorate of, say, Florey, Hart, Adelaide or Spence, to have to travel not on public transport but by private transport to Victor Harbor and back at your own expense to have your photograph taken to put on your licence to drive a motor vehicle? Mr Speaker, the outcry about that would be so great that I doubt if we would be able to address any other matter in this Chamber until such an outrageous situation were addressed. If the people in Adelaide are not prepared to drive to Victor Harbor and back to have their photograph taken or have someone else do it for them, push a push bike or hitch

a ride, if it is not fair and reasonable to expect them to do that, neither is it fair to expect the people that I represent to do likewise.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIREFIGHTING AIRCRAFT

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I move:

That this House requests the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of the Parliament to immediately examine the benefits to be derived by having access to the use of a Canadair CL 415 water-bombing, firefighting, amphibious aircraft or similar large capacity high performance aircraft and examine ways of financing and effectively sharing the costs associated with the purchase of such equipment, and report to the House before the end of October 1994.

In moving this motion, I am conscious of the fact that there is only approximately six months left from this date to the time by which the motion suggests the committee should have examined the proposition and reported back to the Parliament but, if we are to be sensible about the problems we have in dealing with wild fires and other types of fires right across our State, we need to recognise that the risk of such fires occurs with much greater incidence and is therefore much higher during the summer season. So, the date suggested in the motion of October will enable some decision to be taken before we get into the greatest risk period—next summer.

Nobody can know, relatively speaking, how serious that risk will be next summer, compared with any other summer on record or in the future, but we do at least know that it will be very much higher during that period because of the naturally drier air and higher temperatures we experience in our part of the world in the summertime than is the case in the winter. I do not think that six months is in any way a difficulty for this committee. It will find the information readily available on the record to enable it to come to a conclusion about both the cost benefits of such equipment and the relative merits of the Canadair CL 415 unit (called in the common vernacular the 'super scooper') and other similar aircraft.

To the present, we have simply ignored this option, for whatever reasons: the most important and sensible reason has been that we needed to establish ground crews and the equipment they needed to deal with small fires in the localities they served right across the State as a first priority, and we have in large measure accomplished that now. However, easily the greatest damage is done and the greatest destruction of property occurs when we have very high temperature days and very low humidity days during the summer, because it is in the circumstances of high temperature and low humidity that we get the lowest temperature at which the destructive distillation of organic substances produces a flammable gas which then reaches the spontaneous combustion flashpoint at a lower temperature.

The Hon. H. Allison: Such as pinenes and terpenes which are the main constituents of eucalyptus oils.

Mr LEWIS: Quite so. As the member for Gordon points out, those volatile flammable substances are found commonly in eucalypts and other *Myrtaceae* at much lower temperatures than in pine trees, again at lower temperatures than in deciduous trees and deciduous vegetation. Even though all of them are green and growing, the kinds of oils produced by those types of vegetation in their foliage and bark are more volatile, in the case of the native Australian *Myrtaceae*, than they are in the case of the broader family of *Pinus* and in the case of other deciduous trees that are exotic to our environment.

That brings me to the very important and pertinent point I want to make. These types of aircraft will be able to deal with the crown fires which move at high velocity on very hot dry days and which it is not possible for ground crews to deal with. It is not only not possible, but it is simply not safe or sensible; indeed, it is stupid to send ground crews into those conditions on such days. They invariably end up suffering damage and they run the serious risk of losing their lives and units. There was plenty of evidence of that on Ash Wednesday and in the recent bushfires on the worst days in New South Wales.

We cannot risk that equipment or the lives of the people who operate it by sending them in to fight fires on such days. We simply have to get out and let it go and, by taking preventive action and dampening down, try to save the most valuable assets that we have in the communities in the path of the fire. We must then get out of the way as the fire comes through in hope that the preventive action that has been taken will be adequate for the purpose.

Even though we have not said so and placed it on the record, you, Sir, and I know that there is a grave risk of a mega-death, in effect, across the foothills and the southern hills suburbs of the Adelaide metropolitan area. Had it not been for a change of wind direction on Ash Wednesday in 1983, within eight to 10 minutes thousands of people, their motor cars and homes would have been cooked in the suburbs of Belair, Blackwood, Upper Sturt and Hawthorndene. The fire was sweeping through the crown of the vegetation, to which I was referring earlier, without igniting the fuel layer closer to the ground. It was sweeping through the crown of eucalypts—gum trees, as they are called—and other volatile vegetation such as wattles and *Myrtaceae* generally, apart from the acacias. The crown is contiguous; it is complete. It is something that neither you, Mr Speaker, nor I would agree with, but the people who live there think that it is lovely—it is certainly good for the birds that live in the crowns of trees—but it will ultimately mean their death if we do not provide the means for putting out a fire on days when it gets to the point of spotting through the crown of vegetation.

Such an item of equipment will save not only tens of millions of dollars of valuable assets—homes, factories, shops, cars and business premises of one kind or another—but also hundreds, if not thousands, of lives. Neither you, Sir, nor I, who had the good fortune finally to serve on that select committee, would want those consequences for the people who live there, yet they do not wish to be denied the joy that they get from living beneath trees. Therefore, they should now accept that somehow or other the funds have to be found, with their significant contribution towards them, to protect them against the risk of literally being burnt alive and having their assets destroyed, as happened on Ash Wednesday in some places not so far south.

I well remember Murray Nicoll describing from the air in very emotional terms—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: He was on the ground next to his house.

Mr LEWIS: I am told that he was on the ground. In any case, I remember hearing him, a professional journalist, describe the destruction of his own home and how it exploded before his eyes. We lost only a few hundred homes across the

State on that occasion, but we could have lost thousands, and to my mind a few million dollars is not much to pay.

So I am saying that, for the benefit of members, a $24 million aircraft would save many times its value—at least 10 times its value—once every 20 to 50 years. A Canadair 415 would cost $24 million. A similar type of aircraft would have to be at least the Air Tractor AT802. I have some difficulties with those kinds of aircraft because they need airstrips, whereas the Canadair does not. It can simply fly over water, whether in the gulfs, the Coorong or the lakes. It is not far very far in air time from the gulf, the Coorong, the lakes, the Murray River, and so on, where water can be scooped off the surface of the water that is there into the aircraft and transported back to the scene of the fire very quickly not only to damp it down but to simply wipe it out.

If that did not wipe it out, you, Sir, and I both know that it would damp it down to the extent that the ground crews could get in and finish it off. That is the reason for my saying that we need this kind of aircraft and not these units we have at present that deliver a teaspoonful of the stuff—water or water with fire retardant in it—onto the fire before they have to waddle off again to get some more and come back. It is too little; it takes too long; and it cannot keep apace of the movement of the fire to enable ground crews to effectively get in and take control of the situation.

I have had details about the costs, the kinds of equipment that can be used, and so on, provided to me by a number of different people, and I could put that into *Hansard*. Time does not allow me that luxury. I am happy to provide it to members who may be interested to enable them to come to a clearer understanding of it. However, let me say that it would not take very long to bring a fire that looked serious under control. The other advantage of these aircraft is that they can land on surfaces which may be a composition of water and shoreline. Moreover, they can be used in the off-season quite sensibly for other purposes related to the various things the State must do in emergency services in rural or remote areas, as well as for hire purposes.

I am quite sure that the Canadair 415 is an item of equipment which will probably be more cost effective than some of the alternatives. However, I do not have a closed mind on that. I put it to the House that it ought to make the reference to the committee to collect all that data, to tabulate it, and then to come back to the House with a report and a recommendation as to how best to achieve fire control on those days which we know we will have again in the future but on which we at present cannot otherwise attempt fire control. It is for that reason that I have moved the motion and trust that members will give it complete support and swift passage.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House oppose the policy of withdrawing courses from, and the eventual closure of, the University of South Australia's Salisbury campus and call on the university to maintain its legislative commitment to access and equity by maintaining bachelor and higher degree courses at the campus.

In supporting this motion, I want to talk about an issue of considerable concern to my electorate in the northern suburbs. Indeed, when Parliament was opened, I was elected as the Opposition's representative on the Council of the University of South Australia. I was delighted to be given that privilege. I spent four years as a member of the council of the Institute of Technology and, of course, as Minister for Further Education for three years I played a major role in establishing that university by being involved in many months of negotiations, which brought about a series of amalgamations in the higher education sector. Those changes included the amalgamation of the Sturt campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education with Flinders University; the merger of the Roseworthy College and the Adelaide campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education with the University of Adelaide; and, most significantly, the merger of the former South Australian Institute of Technology with its Underdale, Magill and Salisbury campuses, with its Levels, city and Whyalla campuses and with the Underdale, Magill and Salisbury East campuses of the South Australian College of Advanced Education to create South Australia's third university, the University of South Australia.

In my view this was a unique opportunity to establish an outstanding new Australian university drawing on the different but complementary strengths of two organisations of higher education, whose roots went back to the previous century. Few Ministers receive the chance to be part of the process of establishing a new university. Following a great deal of consultation, I was personally involved in drawing up the legislation and the legislative charter of the new university. In doing that, I considered that the new university must have the strongest commitment to equal opportunity and to access and equity of any university in this nation, and that was achieved. In its charter and its processes, we believed that the new university must include rather than exclude; must invite rather than impede; and must reach out to women, working class kids, Aboriginal people and people in country areas. That decision was endorsed unanimously by this Parliament, and I was very pleased that we established the university through consultation between myself, the shadow Minister and the Democrats. So, when we moved those provisions to have the strongest commitment to access and equity of any university in the country, it was endorsed by all Parties and all members.

As Minister I asked my office of tertiary education to conduct a survey of the geographic distribution of university students in South Australia. The results, if not surprising, were stark in the story that they told. Within metropolitan Adelaide, the eastern suburbs were easily the most highly represented in higher education with 10 631 students (29.3 per cent), which equals a participation rate of 70.9 students per 1 000 population aged 16 to 64. The eastern suburbs were followed by the southern suburbs, which had 9 665 students (26.6 per cent) compared with 19.8 per cent students in the 16 to 64 population, which equals a participation rate of 49 students per 1 000 of population aged 16 to 64. The western suburbs had 5 679 students (15.6 per cent), making the participation rate considerably lower than the rates of the southern or eastern suburbs. The northern suburbs had 5 434 students (15 per cent), which equals a participation rate of around 25 students per 1 000.

So, almost three times as many people per thousand residing in the eastern suburbs of Adelaide go to university as go from the northern suburbs. The local government area with the highest participation rate was Burnside, where 103.8 per 1 000 attend university; the lowest participation rate in the metropolitan area was Munno Para. In other words, residents of Burnside attend university at eight times the rate of residents of Munno Para. Salisbury, which has the most

populous region in terms of its local government area and which has two university campuses within its area, has a participation rate of 15.8 per cent per 1 000, and that is less than one-sixth of that of Burnside. It was not just the northern suburbs that were under-represented. I know that non-metropolitan areas, including the Speaker's own electorate, are considerably under-represented in universities and these issues must be addressed.

On 15 November last year, I attended a University of South Australia social justice initiative called the University High School. At that function at the Salisbury East campus, University of South Australia officials mentioned with pride the university's legislative charter and mission to give disadvantaged people access to a university education. I shared that pride, but I was dismayed to learn three hours later that the University of South Australia had before it a proposal which involved closing down all educational programs at the Salisbury East campus. I wrote immediately to the Vice Chancellor, Professor David Robinson, for whom I have great respect, outlining my concerns and seeking an urgent meeting with him and his Chancellor, the Lieutenant-Governor, Dr Basil Hetzel, in order to discuss the serious consequences, both symbolic and real, of such a proposal for working and disadvantaged people in the northern suburbs.

No mention was made of the proposal to wind down the Salisbury East campus during that University High School ceremony. No mention was made of the proposal during discussions with the former South Australian Government and my own former department to secure funds for enterprise zone status for the proposed Ian Warke Institute. I pointed out to Professor Robinson that a number of studies had shown that the people in Salisbury and Elizabeth were under-represented in both TAFE and university studies. That is why I, as Minister for TAFE, signed with the Federal Government for the establishment of a $9.4 million TAFE complex, which was opened late last year in the Salisbury business district.

I am very disappointed. The university has an unfettered right of independence. No-one is arguing with that, but we, as members of Parliament, as members of the Government, as members of the Opposition, also have an unfettered right to give our opinion. The mealy mouthed press release from the hapless Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education talked about the university's independence. What about having the guts to say where he stood? I remember his press release, which was issued just a couple of days before the Elizabeth by-election, in which he said that he had been assured by the Vice Chancellor that there was no proposal to close the Salisbury campus. That was changed yesterday when the Minister, seeking to pre-empt this debate today, confirmed the move to have zero, nil courses offered at the Salisbury campus.

If you are not going to close the campus and if you are going to have zero courses, what are we talking about? What will be done there? That is what the people want to know. There has been some talk about access and equity programs. People keep asking me, 'What access and equity programs?'. I want the Minister today to outline the range of access and equity programs that will be issued and inaugurated by the university through its Salisbury campus. The Government says, too, that the Salisbury campus is a failure. It is interesting that the Deputy Premier described the courses in education, environment and Aboriginal studies as mickey mouse courses. That is the contempt that this Government has for people from a disadvantaged background and for access and equity. I want to hear the Minister have the guts to stand up today and condemn what the Deputy Premier said yesterday when he called those students, lecturers and courses mickey mouse. I think it is an absolute disgrace.

The other factor, of course, is why not think of some initiatives to expand the range of activities at the University of South Australia's Salisbury campus to make them more effective in bringing in people? The Minister had the assistance of a letter from the Vice Chancellor, a copy of which I have and which states:

> The areas near the campus—

wait for it—

> within walking distance are classified as middle to upper class by the Salisbury council.

He is talking about Brahma Lodge. I invite the Minister, the Vice Chancellor and the council, which I addressed on Monday, to come out and tell me whether Brahma Lodge and Salisbury East are upper class. What a lot of rot!

I wrote to the Vice-Chancellor expressing my concerns. I also spoke to the Chancellor and others. I went to a meeting at Salisbury on a Saturday night—and I do not remember seeing the then shadow Minister there. The Minister thinks the campus is at Salisbury North. That shows his contempt for the area: he does not even know where the campus was or is. While at the meeting I heard the pleas of women at the campus. They were saying how difficult it was to get there and how important it was to have that campus, with its child-care facilities. They challenged the Vice-Chancellor to get on the same buses with their kids and travel to Magill, because not all the courses are being relocated to The Levels—they are being relocated to Magill and the city campus, as well as The Levels. The Levels has a cultural problem in terms of inviting women and Aborigines to participate.

I want to hear straight talk from the Minister today. What we got from him before the by-election was that there would be no closure of the university, even though it will not have any courses. That is what we were told; that was his assurance to the people. What will be run out of that campus? What will be available? What access and equity programs will there be? What equal opportunity programs will be run there?

The decision to close the campus was made before any thought had been given to the sorts of programs that will be run. We were told that there will be plenty. But what are they? Where will they be run? How will those women who have to cart their kids to Magill and elsewhere be catered for? The decision was made before I was on council, but on my first day on council—within days of the decision being made—I spelt out my concerns as a local member and as the Minister who established the university. It was very interesting that, within days of making its final decision earlier this year, the Government announced the opening of a $70 million new campus at City West.

I want to work constructively with this university that I helped to create, but this has to be dinkum. When I asked to meet with the Vice-Chancellor, the response was, 'Yes, indeed, let's get together to discuss the university's enhanced role in the northern suburbs, both at our Levels and Salisbury campuses'—an enhanced role, but no courses. I believe that that is worthy of *Yes, Minister*. It is like the hospital that I mentioned yesterday that won awards for efficiency because it had no patients.

The fact is that we must work with the university to have some constructive outcomes from the Salisbury campus—not the mealy-mouthed, confused attitude of the Minister, who

does not give a damn about people from the North. He did not even know where the campus was; he said it would not be closed and gave an assurance that it would not be closed. Then, a week later, after the by-election he corrected the statement in Parliament, just in case he got caught out. That is how committed the Government is to access and equity.

I would like to arrange for the Minister to meet with the students and some of those women. He can then tell them about the access and equity courses and transport arrangements that he is keen to see. Unfettered independence does not mean that we all sit on our backside and say nothing. I commend this Bill to the House.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I suggest that the Deputy Leader just calm down a little. One of the characteristics of universities is supposed to involve rational and reasoned debate—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You're not telling fibs about closing a campus.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH:—based on fact and not hysteria. I point out to the honourable member that I have actually lectured at Salisbury East campus. I have been out there on many occasions, and even this week.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Was your course mickey mouse like they say these are?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was heard in silence. The Minister will be given the same opportunity.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Even as recently as this week I met with students, including many female students. So, the Deputy Leader is wrong on that count as well. As the Deputy Leader well knows, the University of South Australia is not subject to direct control by me or by the Parliament.

Nevertheless, there is a responsibility and an obligation on the part of the Government and myself to make the position clear to the university if we believe it is heading in an unacceptable direction in terms of the provision of educational opportunities. I have met with the university on many occasions, most recently last Friday, when I clearly indicated that the Government would be most displeased if there was a reduction in offerings in terms of education provision for people in the northern area and the hinterland.

We are not talking just about the people of Salisbury. The Deputy Leader is focusing on Salisbury, but this is the University of South Australia, whose charter is for the whole of South Australia and not just for Salisbury, as important as Salisbury may be as a district. There is also the question of the immediate hinterland, which geographically is close to the Salisbury East campus.

An honourable member: Where did he go?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I think he has gone to consult a UBD to find out where the campus is. We have no direct control over the university, which was established only a few years ago but which was not given the necessary funds to catch up with the already existing Adelaide and Flinders Universities. It started behind the eight ball in respect of financial funding from the Commonwealth and, as a result, the university is in a very difficult financial situation in terms of staff numbers, provision of resources, library facilities and so on. The university has inherited a financially difficult situation and it needs to manage its budget within the resources provided to it. We cannot criticise or condemn an institution that tries to be efficient and effective in terms of using its resources to meet its charter.

We should applaud the university's efforts in trying to meet its obligations within the resources it has. If the university was going beyond its financial resources, I am sure the Deputy Leader would be the first one on his feet to criticise it. Yet here we have an attempt to be efficient, effective and to provide access and equity to students throughout the whole of South Australia, including students who live in the Salisbury area. I believe the Deputy Leader is suffering from what I call the Australian syndrome, holding the view that we must have a petrol station, a pharmacy and (in his case) a university on every street corner. It is absolute nonsense in a society as affluent as ours to believe we can afford to locate all of these facilities within walking distance of every person in the State.

In an ideal world that may be possible, but we cannot afford to have a university—just as we cannot afford to have a petrol station, a pharmacy or other facilities—on every street corner. The Deputy Leader has this view as part of the Australian syndrome of having every conceivable facility at the end of every street. I am not seeking to be an apologist for the university, but I do believe in being fair and reasonable. As I indicated, I have met with students at the Salisbury East campus and I have spoken to the women who expressed a view about access and geographical proximity to where they live, but the university cannot simply focus on the needs of a small group, as important as those individuals are. The university's action is based on a detailed study, which I notice the Deputy Leader now has access to, and some of the information is interesting, because less than 10 per cent of the students from the northern region who attend university go to the Salisbury East campus.

Less than 10 per cent of the total university population in that region attends the Salisbury East campus. We find that three-quarters of the total number of students enrolled in the University of South Australia attend other campuses. Of the quarter who attend, the university acknowledges that a number live in close proximity to the campus. However, further analysis reveals that many of those people moved to live next to the campus. Certainly, there is a fault in the Deputy Leader's logic, because students have moved to be close to the campus but they themselves do not actually come from the Salisbury area. We should base the argument and discussion on fact and not fiction. We should not use the debate in an attempt to get media coverage in a challenge for the leadership of the Labor Party.

That is exactly what the Deputy Leader is trying to do. He is trying to increase his profile so he can make a grab for the leadership. The reality is that The Levels campus, which will be significantly upgraded, will offer a wider range of courses than is currently available to students in the northern suburbs, including such courses as business studies. Nursing studies will be relocated, but not until the next century, as I understand from the university. My information is that the university is not somehow trying to do this underhandedly. The students of the northern area will get a far better range of programs at The Levels; there will be child-care facilities; there will be a better gender mix, which I know the Deputy Leader is interested in, because currently The Levels campus is over-represented by males in student and staff numbers; and the policy and direction of the university will allow for a greater mix of males and females on that site and a greater range of courses which are currently not available in the northern area.

There have been discussions with the Vice Chancellor and the Pro Vice Chancellor Equity. I should indicate that Eleanor

Ramsay, who is the Pro Vice Chancellor Equity and who has a strong commitment to equity issues, has thoroughly considered all aspects of equity and is of the strong view that the students of the northern area will be better served by a greater provision at The Levels, which after all is only 5 kilometres down the road from the Salisbury East campus. You would think that the Deputy Leader was talking about a campus on the other side of the State. We are talking about a relocation and an addition of courses 5 kilometres down the road on a main bus route, so improved transport facilities will be serving that campus. Once again we have a classic case of fabrication here: an attempt to create fear and apprehension in the minds of people living in the northern area that somehow they will lose out on access to university study—it is quite the opposite.

In respect of access to programs on other campuses, I have raised with the university the possibility of having a dedicated bus service which could operate directly from that region, for example to the Magill campus and possibly to the Underdale campus, and which could considerably reduce travelling time for those students who need access to courses not provided at the expanded Levels. With modern technology it is possible to provide programs through interactive video which are not readily available currently and which can easily be provided in the north and throughout South Australia.

The Deputy Leader asked whether I was suggesting that the Salisbury East campus be closed down. The university will be relocating some courses over at least a 10 year period, but, on the information given to me by the university, that campus will be used for educational purposes. The university should announce the details of that in the very near future, but on the information given to me it is not into business of flogging it off, getting rid of it or closing it down; so once again the Deputy Leader is in the business of trying to agitate and create mischief and unnecessary fear in the minds of people in the north.

The main points have been made and I now formally move the amendment (which I have circulated) to the Deputy Leader's motion. I move:

Leave out—

(a) 'opposes the policy of withdrawing courses from, and the eventual closure of, the University of South Australia's Salisbury campus and'

and

(b) 'at the campus'

and insert after 'University' the words 'of South Australia' and after 'courses' last occurring 'in the northern suburbs'.

I believe that amendment will truly reflect the legitimate concerns of this House which can be conveyed to the university. I ask members to support the amendment.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I support the amendment moved by the Minister. In doing so, I point out to this House that perhaps this House needs to carefully consider its endorsement of the Deputy Leader as a member of the Council of the University of South Australia. The Deputy Leader was elected by this House to represent the interests of the people of South Australia within the council of the university. It is my opinion that his contribution today demonstrates a clear conflict of interest between the duty that he owes this House, as a member of the council representing all the people of South Australia, and a duty which he seems mistakenly to think he owes to his local constituency as a local member.

The facts—and we should be dealing with facts and not emotion like the Deputy Leader seems to have been trading in—were put very succinctly and correctly by the Minister and they are these: of those people who attend higher education in the northern area—and I would point out to the Deputy Leader that the Salisbury campus has been in existence for over two decades—10 per cent attend the University of South Australia. Of that 10 per cent, 7.5 per cent actually attend other campuses. That leaves a total of 2.5 per cent of the university population from that area.

The Minister put the facts on the table, and they are these: 5 kilometres down the road from Salisbury campus is a very fine campus of the university, The Levels campus, with adequate space and facilities, with the addition of new facilities, to replicate every provision of the Salisbury campus and to do it in a more cost efficient manner and provide a better level of education for the people of the northern area. In the south there is one university at Flinders. I do not hear members from Noarlunga bleating about the fact that there needs to be a university at Noarlunga.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had the call. Please resist interjecting.

Mr BRINDAL: We have sitting at the table the same Minister who went around the world, quite rightly, selling this city as a wonderful venue for the Commonwealth Games on the grounds that it was a 20 minute city. Convenience—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I think the honourable member has reflected on me because I have never been around the world talking about the Commonwealth Games. He has got the wrong Minister. I think that was the Minister he ran against for the seat of Unley.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order and the member knows that he is being frivolous in raising it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Sir. I did not travel overseas spending taxpayers' money promoting the Commonwealth Games.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are other mechanisms in this House under which the member can raise the matter.

Mr BRINDAL: To save the member the obvious pain that it causes him, I apologise and withdraw the accusation that it was he who travelled overseas to represent our State in its bid for the Commonwealth Games. I was mistaken; I believed that the Cabinet shared a corporate responsibility for all decisions taken by Ministers and that therefore he was linked into that decision. I thought that I had heard him as Minister of Tourism stand up here and proclaim the virtues of Adelaide as a 20 minute city. If I am wrong, then I am wrong and I apologise unreservedly to the member.

The fact remains that 5 kms down the road there is a fine campus of the university. The fact also remains that, as the Minister said, the university is seeking under very difficult circumstances to consolidate its campuses and provide a better level of education for tertiary students in South Australia, and one component is the two campuses which currently exist within 5 kms of one another in the northern area. The Minister pointed out quite rightly that the University of South Australia was given unfettered independence to perform a very important task, and that was to provide quality education and to consider things which are unique: access and equity and principles of social justice.

For the Deputy Leader to come into this House and berate the very council of which he is a member and the integrity of people, some of whom were appointed by a previous

Government, is, I think, insulting in the extreme to those members. Until recently I was proud to be a member of that council, and I tried, as I know the member for Price did, to contribute, in the proper forum and in the proper manner, to the deliberations of that council, given that we were privileged to be members of that council. It appals me that a person who has been elected by this Parliament as its representative on that council cannot fight his arguments within the council but has to take cheap shots through the media, which he has done, and in this place. It seems that he does not have enough belief in his skills as a debater and as somebody who has been a leader in this community to make his point of view heard within the council of the university.

I am at one with the Minister on this. The Minister expressed the level to which he is appalled by the conduct of the Deputy Leader and the level to which he as Minister supports tertiary institutions, and their right to their own decision making processes. This former Minister, and the former Government, did not provide adequate funds to allow the university to run five libraries and five of everything else; and, of course, the Commonwealth Government provides money on a per student basis. The council of the university has tried in every possible way to see that the courses offered by the university are of international standing and reflect the pre-eminence of the university in certain faculties, and hopefully bring credit to this State in terms of its academic institutions. You cannot ask it to do more. I, with the Minister, am totally appalled that the honourable member stood in this place and acknowledged the unfettered right of the university to self determination, yet he chose to ignore the privilege given to him by the House of being a member of the university's council by coming in here and scoring cheap political shots.

In conclusion, I would say that there are others opposite who behave more responsibly, and I would point to the member for Giles who, incidentally, spoke about the possible closure of the Whyalla campus. He did it in a responsible, intelligent and contributory fashion. That stands in very stark contrast to the appalling carrying on of the member opposite who just spoke. I commend the Minister on his initiative and on his amendment, and I support him in that amendment.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUSHFIRES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Quirke:

That this House congratulates those members of the CFS and the MFS who recently fought bushfires in New South Wales and recognises the contribution of all those other firefighters who remained in South Australia during this period minding the 'fort'.

(Continued from 24 March. Page 538.)

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services): I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to members of the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service who fought the bushfires in New South Wales, and to recognise the contribution of those who remained in South Australia minding the 'fort'. The first week of January 1994, following several days of extraordinarily high fire danger, will no doubt be etched in the minds of many Australians. No sooner had the New South Wales Minister for Police and Emergency Services issued warnings of imminent fire danger, with at least 2 000 houses threatened, than his gravest fears were realised. Some 120 bushfires in eastern New South Wales quickly turned the threat of fire into horrific reality.

Early on 6 January the CFS offered assistance, if needed, to the New South Wales Department of Bushfire Services. Although that department advised that no immediate reaction was required, several South Australian CFS units were placed on 24 hour stand-by at 11.30 a.m. At 12.23 p.m. the CFS Chief Executive Officer was advised of the worsening situation and was requested by New South Wales to provide a 20 appliance task force to assist New South Wales as soon as possible. This was subsequently up-graded to 40 appliances and then later to 50. I take this opportunity to acknowledge to the House the expediency and high priority the Premier of South Australia gave to this crisis.

His response in giving quick passage to necessary procedures for the volunteers to leave our State and help in New South Wales substantially reduced the response time for the South Australian units to get to New South Wales. The first two South Australian task forces arrived at the New South Wales Department of Bushfire Services headquarters on Friday 7 January and the third on Sunday 9 January. On Saturday 8 January an additional task force, comprising 105 CFS volunteers and 40 MFS volunteer firefighters, was flown to Sydney as conditions deteriorated rapidly in New South Wales. This additional force, when combined with resources already present at the fires, gave a maximum strength on Sunday 9 January of 537 South Australian personnel, 51 South Australian appliances and 13 support vehicles.

It is a credit to our emergency services that such a force was able to be assembled and deployed to New South Wales at the very heart of the bushfires. During this maximum deployment and, indeed, throughout the entire exercise many more volunteers were minding the 'fort' at CFS headquarters at Keswick. These people were responsible for maintaining 24 hour information flow, ensuring that communication channels were maintained at all times, and constantly updating the positions of all those deployed in New South Wales.

Early deployments were at Wisemans Ferry, the Blue Mountains near Katoomba, and Sutherland, Wahroonga and Springwood. By Monday 10 January the CFS efforts were concentrated in the Blue Mountains, in the Bilpin, Winmalee and Katoomba areas. A critical incident stress management team, comprising four from the South Australian CFS and three from the South Australian MFS, to provide short-term counselling for South Australian firefighters arrived in Sydney on Monday 10 January 1994. On Tuesday 11 January all firefighters in New South Wales were relieved with fresh South Australian personnel, utilising two Boeing 747 shuttle flights.

The return of the first volunteers at Adelaide Airport was a moving experience. In fact, I would go so far as to say it was one of the most emotional scenes I have ever witnessed. Very few people who assembled to welcome their loved ones (and those of us who waited at the entrance of the terminal) were not moved by the realisation that these people had risked their lives to help other Australians in New South Wales. Each returning firefighter was presented with an appropriately stamped tee-shirt, which was proudly worn by the returning firefighters.

The entire operation—organising the collection of volunteers; transportation to and from the airport; flights and eventual arrival at Adelaide—was a logistical and management nightmare. All the more credit, then, to the personnel at CFS headquarters who shouldered the responsibility,

applied meticulous planning and provided the logistical answers when required. Incident management teams were established at CFS headquarters, Department of Bushfire Services, Rosehill, New South Wales, and later at Wilberforce in cooperation with the Country Fire Association. This effective amalgamation and cooperation between multi-agency management teams, both in Adelaide and in New South Wales, demonstrated the value of the Australian Interservice Incident Management System. There are valuable lessons in this exercise to be considered by other States.

Fortunately, a more favourable weather outlook provided the opportunity to gain control of some of the critical fires in New South Wales. This enabled our volunteers to be withdrawn from New South Wales on Saturday 15 January 1994. Once again, the logistical nightmare of physically relocating volunteers and equipment was overcome by the professionalism of our emergency services. The return of these volunteers was effected by utilising a Sydney to Adelaide air charter and by the provision of C130 aircraft provided by the RAAF Regions 5 and 6, direct from Richmond Air Base. These aircraft were used to transport personnel to Whyalla and to Mount Gambier.

I was privileged to have the opportunity to greet the returning convoy of fire appliances at Murray Bridge on Sunday 16 January. Again, as with the return of volunteers at Adelaide Airport, emotions were running high, with many people expressing sheer relief at the safe return of their loved ones. The total cost to the South Australian Government of the involvement of our volunteers was $512 770, with all these moneys refundable by New South Wales. To date, all these moneys bar some $70 000 have been refunded, the remaining moneys still owing due to some late returns lodged by various groups. This money is expected back from the New South Wales Government shortly. It certainly kept up its end of the bargain by promptly refunding moneys owing to South Australia.

I am pleased to advise this House that the exercise proved to be a valuable test of the standard of equipment used by our volunteers. Our equipment compared more than favourably with that of our counterparts in other States. In fact, it is fair to say that the policy of replacing vehicles after 20 years of service paid off handsomely. Many of those returning volunteers commented to me about the high standard of our equipment and its reliability, which were demonstrated when tested in these extremes.

Equipment failure was minimal and included one flat tyre; one gear box malfunction; two rear view mirrors broken; one muffler bracket broken; one pump filter malfunction; one clutch malfunction; and 13 auto-electrical repairs. In addition, one appliance broke down on the convoy to Sydney, while all other repairs to appliances were carried out at the fire scene or off line in Sydney. Those figures in themselves demonstrate the reliability and high standard of the equipment that we currently have in South Australia.

Personal injuries, I am also pleased to report, given the extremity and gravity of the situation, were kept to a minimum. In all, there were 21 notified injuries among South Australian volunteer personnel. Those included a sprained knee, a cut leg, a bruised leg, a sprained ankle, smoke inhalation, a cut finger, a sprained shoulder, a bruised back and minor chest burns. That the volunteers were able to come back with such a minor injury list is, I believe, a tribute to the professional training of CFS and MFS volunteers who gave their time to protect New South Wales in those dangerous circumstances.

During the emergency, and certainly when we had a maximum contingency of volunteers interstate, the effect on resources remaining in South Australia was raised. During the scaling down of operations on Thursday 13 January, there were no less than five fires in South Australia in the eastern Eyre Peninsula and more than 7 000 hectares was destroyed throughout the South-East. Legitimately, people were concerned that perhaps we had left our own cupboards too bare while supporting our colleagues interstate. Let me assure the House that that was not the case. CFS personnel committed 3 per cent of available human resources to the bushfire fighting in New South Wales. Appliances committed to New South Wales formed just 8 per cent of our available resources.

Obviously, this did not leave our resources in South Australia over-stretched and, furthermore, the weather during most of this period in our State was not conducive to the spread of major fires. The CFS was able to sustain its response in New South Wales due to moderate weather conditions here and significant intra-district and inter-district cooperation between the CFS and local government. Again, plaudits must be given to those who remained at home, putting in the extra effort to ensure that South Australian houses, properties and livestock were adequately protected.

Following the return of our volunteers, I was taken on an inspection by the CFS of our very own Adelaide Hills and environs, an area we know all too well is subject to similar tragedies. What I saw was a sad reflection of our inability to understand the enormity and harsh reality of the threat of bushfire in South Australia. Some residents had cleared around their homes; others had simply not bothered at all. One owner had diligently clearly around the property, only to neatly stack a pile of wood against the house.

It was only last Monday, 11 April, that the CFS advised that the fire danger season in the Flinders has been extended to the end of this month. Lack of rain in the very large areas of native vegetation has left the area with very high to extreme fire danger. This is the reality of our State. We have many lessons to learn, and now is the time to look carefully at our own backyard to ensure that the lessons of Ash Wednesday and those of New South Wales are remembered, and that those fires are never repeated.

So, I support the motion of thanks for all volunteers who left families and homes to fight the bushfires in New South Wales. Theirs was an unselfish and committed role, one which we should all be very proud of. Likewise, we should remember those who remained behind, providing the crucial support for those who travelled interstate. The volunteers who took on extra duties to cover for those firefighters in New South Wales are to be complimented as well. The MFS firefighters who volunteered in this manner to cover the duties for those who went interstate was a first for South Australia and, indeed, indicative of the attitude being displayed by MFS firefighters. Our ability to combine for the benefit of the wider community in the face of adverse conditions is a great indicator of South Australia's true nature. All South Australians have every reason to be proud of what was accomplished and how they achieved it.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): In the remaining brief time available in this debate, I take the opportunity to endorse the remarks made and to congratulate all the volunteers from the

CFS and the MFS. I support the motion.

I feel compelled to make this formal recognition for a couple of reasons, the first being my history of involvement in the local government arena, where one of my first committee positions was with the local CFS committee. I have followed its involvement and recognised its support to the local community in my district at Waikerie, as well as in other areas around the State. My remarks also complement the action I took in late January to provide a reception in my electorate office in recognition of local volunteers. It involved 35 or more from the electorate of Chaffey, but included others from Morgan, who volunteered to go interstate to assist New South Wales in its time of need. All those CFS volunteers can be proud of their commitment and involvement in the New South Wales bushfire dilemma.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

GULF ST VINCENT

A petition signed by 513 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to develop a strategy for the environmental protection of Gulf St Vincent was presented by Mr Condous.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

AUDIT COMMISSION

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier still stand by his promise not to cut health and education spending in light of public comments made by Professor Cliff Walsh, a key member of the Audit Commission, which claimed that South Australia faces no option but to significantly reduce spending on health, education and law and order, which will inevitably result in employment reductions? In a report issued by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies last year, Professor Cliff Walsh stated:

> If there is to be any hope of reducing the burden of taxation on businesses in the interests of stimulating investment in South Australia, significant reductions in existing areas of recurrent outlays will be essential. Politically, of course, these will be difficult to achieve. The big spending is in education and health, followed somewhat distantly by law and order. The search for increased productivity in these areas, which will inevitably involve employment reductions, will evoke resistance from both the suppliers and the consumers, but there is really no option. So, when it comes to the crunch, the weight of adjustment comes down to both a significant program of asset sales and reduced recurrent outlays on the big ticket items.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let us immediately analyse what the Leader of the Opposition has just said. He said that Professor Cliff Walsh gave the then Government of the day in South Australia several options, one of which was significant asset sales. Prior to the last election the Liberal Party decided to do just that and I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition would remember that one week before the election we put down a significant program of asset sales, listing assets with a market value of, we believed, around $1.3 billion, with the objective of achieving revenue from those sales of about $1 billion. In other words, we could pick and choose from the assets: not every one had to be sold to achieve our target.

That is the objective that the Liberal Government is now adopting, and that is why we have taken measures such as the one the Treasurer has just announced to set in place a board to supervise the sale of assets, and why we are now appointing specialist staff to oversee the sale of those assets. Anyone who understands the principles involving the simple domestic budget would realise that the choices are these: you can cut expenditure, increase your income (which, in the Government's case means increasing taxation, which we have said we will not do) or go out and reduce your debt by selling some of the assets, particularly where such assets are surplus to requirements. Let me make absolutely clear to everyone (and please read my lips)—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —that the Government of South Australia has made no decisions whatsoever to cut health or hospital expenditure in the areas in which the Leader of the Opposition is now trying to suggest. So, all members opposite are trying to do is create a scare campaign in the electorate prior to the release of the Audit Commission report. I do not know what is in the report; no member of the Government knows. The Audit Commission report has not been given to the Government. When it is, I have promised that I will table it in this House and make it available publicly.

We all know the sort of trouble the Labor Party got into prior to the election by going out and trying to create a scare campaign: in fact, it was such a grossly misleading election campaign that it has now ended up in the courts. I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition would learn his lesson from that. There is little to be gained from going out there and purely trying to speculate what might be in an Audit Commission report when that report has not yet even been given to the Government; it is shabby politics, and I only wish that the Leader of the Opposition and the other members of the Labor Party would refrain from doing so.

ASIA HOTEL AND HOSPITALITY FAIR

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development report on the success of South Australia's participation in the Asia Hotel and Hospitality Fair held in Singapore this week and provide any other news for South Australia on its link with Singapore? I understand that the Minister was in Singapore on Monday and Tuesday with a group of South Australian food and wine producers participating in this important fair.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The fair to which the honourable member refers is the largest food and hotel fair in the world. In Singapore, there are some 13 000 exhibitors at the Singapore World Trade Centre, which is the largest exhibition held in Singapore. It is particularly important for the development of South Australia's export market potential. The South Australian Government, through the Economic Development Authority, was able to assist some 20 small and medium sized South Australian companies to access that exhibition and, therefore, export markets—companies that might not otherwise have been able to access a fair and exhibition of that nature and size without tangible support from the Government.

A whole range of products were on display from South Australia, for example, from small wineries and the Swiss Hotels International College at Regency Park, concerning

which a lot of interest was shown in the South-East Asia region regarding students coming to South Australia. For example, Rio Coffee, with its chocolate-coated coffee beans, and Joe's Poultry, with smoked chicken and ham, were on display. Orders were taken in the first three hours from Taiwan for a number of products. Also, Mia Jane and Pan Forte Gourmet Cakes were there, and other products displayed included dried, fresh and glace fruit. In other words, 20 companies were there reflecting a whole range of produce from South Australia in terms of accessing a very important market.

From their involvement in this trade fair, one would hope that the exhibitors will be able to open up, on both a wholesale and a retail base, opportunities that they might not have had if the Government had not been prepared to support them. It is far more valuable and tangible support to give some underwriting cost for some of these companies to be able to get into an international marketplace to have contact with wholesalers and retailers, not just from Singapore but from the whole Asia-Pacific region. Also, there were people from the United Kingdom. Some 28 000 trade visitors are expected to attend over the four days of the fair, which will run through until Friday this week.

Of course, Singapore in its own right is a very important market for us, and this includes exporting. Some $200 million worth of exports are going to Singapore each year. In order to assist our small and medium sized companies in building up exports, and to achieve the 4 per cent growth that the Government has set as a target each year or the $500 million worth of investment needed each year to generate jobs for South Australians at the turn of the century, we need to have the infrastructure in place to enable our companies to access those markets.

One of the greatest impediments to that is the extent of the runway at Adelaide International Airport. The Federal Airports Corporation has consistently shown total disregard for supporting and providing infrastructure for South Australian exporters to enable them to access those markets. If the Federal Government is fair dinkum about Australia and South Australia being the regional headquarters to access the Asia-Pacific region, it must recognise that the infrastructure needs to be there for them to be able to do so.

I note that the Federal Airports Corporation is meeting in Adelaide today and tomorrow; in fact, there is a board meeting of the FAC in South Australia at the moment. If the FAC continues its intransigent view towards the needs of South Australia, which has the shortest runway of any capital city in Australia, where a fully laden jumbo 747 cannot take off and get to the markets in Singapore, Hong Kong and Bangkok, that will be a disadvantage for South Australian exporters. If you are exporting flowers, fruit, fish or other products from this State and you want to get them to their destination on time and in a good state, you cannot have a day where a hot northerly wind means the plane cannot take off with a full load and a full fuel tank, because it will divert via Perth to fill the cargo and load fuel in order to access those markets. That is destroying the quality of our products and disadvantaging our exporters by calling into question their reliability with respect to accessing those markets.

If the FAC will not move, the Federal Government ought to pick up the Kelty report and look at the options of other people owning and operating our airports. If the Federal Airports Corporation and the Federal Government will not give us support, perhaps the two private sector international consortiums which have shown an interest in owning, operating and setting up an appropriate facility for South Australia ought to be on the agenda. I hope that on 28 April or 10 May in the industry statement and the Federal budget we will be given some indication from the Federal Government that it will get out of the way and let South Australia get on with providing the infrastructure that will enable our exporters to access those markets.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be on the early plane back to Whyalla if he continues to interject.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure, and I welcome him back. Will the Minister advise the House as to why he has asked the Chief Executive Officer of the EWS to develop strategies to deal with the substantial reduction in staff and other changes in the department, including private sector involvement in the EWS, and does not such a request pre-empt the findings of the Audit Commission? The Chief Executive Officer and the Human Resources Division of the EWS are currently developing plans for a significant downsizing in the department from 2 900 to as few as 1 500 to be able to respond to the recommendations of the Audit Commission report. Executives from the EWS have had discussions with a French water company, Kinhill Engineering and other companies which are involved in the provision of private water and sewerage facilities in New South Wales and Victoria. These discussions have looked at issues such as contracting out and partial privatisation which will result in a substantial reduction in the EWS work force.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Internally, the EWS is exploring a range of options for the future. As to the reduction in numbers, there have been no discussions with me as Minister relating to the reduction of personnel in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and certainly not based on the Audit Commission report, because I have not seen the report and neither has any member of the Government, to my knowledge. In relation to exploring the option of private sector involvement in the provision of infrastructure by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I did ask the Chief Executive Officer of the EWS to explore a range of options, because I considered that it was untenable that the Barossa Valley and the Hills regions of South Australia should go without filtered water because of the previous Government's capital works program until the year 2002 plus. I said that was unacceptable. Given the budgetary position that we face in South Australia as a result of the former Government's total mismanagement of the budget in this State, only limited capital works funds are available.

If only limited Government capital funds are available for the provision of that infrastructure to filter the Barossa Valley water or the Hills water—the catchment area of South Australia—we will explore the option of the private sector being able to provide a build, own and operate scheme or a build, own and operate transfer scheme. That way we might get better services to South Australians earlier than would otherwise be the case.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr ROSSI (Lee): My question is to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional

Development. What outlook is there for manufacturing and other industries in South Australia from an analysis of the latest labour market figures?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: South Australia's manufacturing base does play an important role in this State, employing some 97 000 South Australians or 15 per cent of the work force. On recent figures it is showing continued signs of improvement in the generation of job opportunities over the next few years. There is a clear indication that the manufacturing base is rapidly becoming more internationally competitive and its contribution to the State's economy is sustainable for the long haul, particularly in elaborately transformed manufactured goods. It is a fast growing segment in the world, and South Australia is participating in that.

In the seven months to the end of January there has been a substantial growth in the export of high value-added manufactured goods, including cars and car components. For example, it is up 64 per cent or $234 million. The wine industry is up 47 per cent or $101 million. I refer to recent investment in this sector where the Premier opened the ACI expansion of $90 million, providing a bottling plant that will produce 160 million wine bottles in South Australia. This company was going offshore or interstate until the policies of this Government were put in place to ensure that that investment took place in South Australia. In addition to that, the Premier's recent visit to Japan secured a commitment of a $500 million tooling-up for the next model Magna.

It has been estimated that for 1993-94 overseas exports of wine from South Australia will total some $226 million, which is a 34 per cent increase. To enable that increase to continue there will have to be substantial investment in infrastructure in the wine industry in South Australia to ensure that we have the variety of wines being grown that will meet that export market demand and potential to the year 2000. To date, the industry in South Australia is showing great capacity to be able to meet that demand. There are early signs that the export-led growth is translating into employment growth. That will become more evident over the next few months and into next year. In fact, the Engineering Employers Association survey in February showed that some 60 per cent of respondents took on additional labour in that month alone.

In short, all of that means there are positive signs that the South Australian economy is turning the corner, that people are looking to take on more staff and are looking to chase additional turnover and new markets. Of course, the bottom line for that is that more jobs will be created for South Australians through a manufacturing industry that has shown some resilience and certainly the adaptability to meet new international competition and trends head on.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Can the Minister for Infrastructure advise the House what discussions he has had with Kinhill Engineering regarding private sector involvement in the activities of the EWS?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I have had countless meetings over the course of the past three months with a range of private sector people who are very keen to be involved in the build up of infrastructure for the benefit of South Australians. I have said to those private sector companies that I would be very pleased to see a range of options and proposals that they might want to work up and present to Government so that it can consider them. I will repeat part of my answer to an earlier question: the simple fact is that, if we as a State are to continue to meet our community service obligations and the provision of better infrastructure and support service to South Australians, and in particular South Australian industry (including greater water availability for the vineyards that I mentioned), we will have to have some $600 million worth of infrastructure available for vineyards to expand to meet the export market potential.

Government resources simply will not go that far because, as the honourable member would know, there is a debt that we have inherited from the former Government that restricts us in terms of a capital works program. If we can meet the demands of industry, in particular, and generate jobs through the provision of infrastructure by the private sector, I see that in the total interests of South Australians. I am more than happy to look at and pursue any proposal put forward by the private sector.

SCRIMBER

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): I direct my question to the Minister for Primary Industries.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am surprised at the reaction of the House. There has been considerable media speculation recently about the possibility of a joint venture taking place within the Scrimber operation in the South-East of South Australia—an operation with which members of the House will be familiar. Can the Minister advise the House whether any negotiations are current with regard to that project?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in this matter. Over the past five years he has been critical of the operation of Scrimber in Mount Gambier, as I have been. The honourable member saw a massive $66 million of taxpayers' money wasted on the development of Scrimber only to see it shut down and many people put out of work in the South-East.

However, I can assure the honourable member that there is absolutely no way that this Government will be entering into a joint venture agreement and putting any more money into the development of Scrimber. As everyone, especially members opposite, would know, this project was the second biggest financial disaster in this State's history. It was a $66 million disaster or debacle and it is the only time in the history of this State that a motion of no confidence in a Minister was not moved at the time: as I have explained to the House before, the only reason we did not move a motion at that stage was that it was better to keep the Minister there while he went on to make more bungles. Of course, we knew that the State Bank was about to become the biggest financial disaster in the State's history.

I agree with the honourable member: there is media speculation that this present Administration will be looking at a joint venture partner. That is absolutely incorrect. However, there is some interest in the purchase of the licence for the Scrimber operation and in developing it further. That is being looked at at present and negotiations are going on.

However, I would not want any of the media to speculate that this State is going to get into a joint venture agreement, because it will not. If it is possible for someone else to look at that technology, we will be very happy to talk to them. However, never will we recover the $66 million of taxpayers's money that was wasted by an incompetent Administration and incompetent management.

IBM

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Has the Premier received advice from Crown Law that expresses concerns about the memo of understanding signed between the then Opposition and IBM one week before the last State election, and will he table that advice?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The answer to the question is, 'No, I cannot recall any such memo.' If I cannot recall ever having received it, I cannot table it.

GULF ST VINCENT

Ms HURLEY (Napier): In view of the debt exceeding $3.5 million owed to the State by the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery, why did not the Minister for Primary Industries legislate for licence fees and surcharges before opening the fishery on 7 March 1994? On 23 March the Minister told this House that no licence fee or surcharge could be levied due to the gazettal of a zero dollar fee in September 1993. The zero fee had been set by the previous Minister, following his decision not to reopen the fishery during the fee period. However, as Parliament resumed on 10 February, there was opportunity for the Minister to legislate for these charges and to comply with the recommendations of the select committee before his decision to reverse the closure.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for her question and for her continued interest in the success of the management of this very fragile fishery under the new Administration. I know the honourable member is only a new member, but she should understand that you cannot get legislation through the Parliament in one day. I do not want to bore the House by going over this matter again: I seem to go over it every day, and the Opposition keeps bowling it up again. In the middle of December after the election, the independent management committee recommended an extended survey to see whether the fishery could open. As I said yesterday, the inaction of the previous Government in not making any decisions made it all the more difficult.

So, we had the extended survey. The recommendation of the management committee was that it should be looked at again in the next fishing period that was due in February and, if in early February that survey showed that there was still potential, it would then be opened. It was after that survey was held early in February that the management committee again recommended to me that I should open the fishery to start fishing. As I said yesterday, and as I have said on previous occasions, before that fishery was opened we went to Crown Law to make sure that arrangements were in place so that when the fishery opened the fishermen started paying the surcharge and the licence fees that were due and payable. Most decidedly, SAFA was keen to get some of its money back.

However, Crown Law said—and I explained this yesterday—that because of the bungle in September by the previous Administration in setting the licence fee at zero, we could not put on any surcharge. If we had gone against the recommendation of the independent management committee and taken perhaps another six weeks while we prepared legislation, brought it into this House, put it on the Notice Paper, debated it in this House—and we probably would have had the numbers to get it through this place—had it go up to the other place, be debated there and then be assented to, in the management committee's opinion we would have lost two months fishing.

So, we went ahead and got an agreement from the overwhelming majority of those fishermen to pay a voluntary levy based on the saleable catch they caught during each fishing period to get us through till September, when we will put in place a proper surcharge and a proper licence fee to pay back the money. So, for the third time, I reiterate to this House what happened. I thank the honourable member for her question. If she would like me to go on and explain it in words of one syllable, I will be very happy to do it, but I think this House has heard enough about how successful the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery is and how well it is being managed.

POLICE TRANSIT DIVISION

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Does the Minister for Emergency Services still have the same level of confidence in the transit police following recent press articles that question the squad's efficiency? The *Advertiser* of 8 April 1994, under the headline '$30 000 attack on new STA ticket units', reported that vandals had damaged six ticket vending machines, with three being ripped from their mountings and one thrown from a train. The *Advertiser* of 12 April, under the headline 'Vandals smash Gawler train', reported that extensive damage had been caused to a carriage, with windows being broken and a ticket validation machine damaged.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member represents an electorate where constituents often travel to work by both bus and train, needing the connecting buses to the Noarlunga railway station. He has expressed his concern to me and to the Minister for Transport on a number of occasions to help achieve a safe and efficient public transport system in this State.

Yes, I have every confidence in the Police Transit Division in this State. I previously reported to the House that the STA Transit Squad is being progressively transferred to the new Police Transit Division. Ex STA transit officers have first to be trained as police and that requires, as I have previously explained to the House, intensive training at the Fort Largs Police Academy. To date 19 officers—those 19 being former police officers—have been trained and transferred to the division, and 20 further officers are presently undergoing training at Fort Largs and will be transferred to the Police Transit Division after successful completion of their six month training course. While that training is under way, as previously reported, extra police have been deployed to the Transit Division. In all, there are presently 44 police riding our buses, trains and trams in Adelaide. Those officers are there together with existing transit officers who are awaiting their training. Within 14 months there will be 80 police riding our public transport system.

The incidents to which my colleague refers highlight an inadequacy that the train system in particular has experienced through the implementation of the previous Labor Government's driver-only train policy: a policy it implemented without proper regard to the systematic development of rail security. My colleague the Minister for Transport has already stated publicly that she wants to reintroduce guards onto our trains in this State.

In looking at the incidents that occurred in turn, I wish to report that what actually happened was as follows: the first incident occurred on 30 March 1994, when damage occurred to one ticket validator and other items of STA property on rail car No. 3008 and totalled approximately $6 500; secondly,

on 31 March 1994 there was damage in a separate incident to two ticket validators and other items of STA property in rail car No. 3102, at a total value of $10 200; and a third incident occurred on 3 April 1994 with damage amounting to $280 to a ticket validator and other items of STA property on rail car No. 3007, which brought about a total damage value of $10 000. Those three separate incidents on three separate days were referred to by the *Advertiser* as one incident with the value of those damages being totalled. Further, there of course was a separate incident that has been reported at Gawler.

I am pleased to report that subsequent to those events the following has occurred: on Monday 4 April, transit police arrested one juvenile aged 17 years for damage and larceny in relation to the first three offence incidents I listed. That individual declined to nominate co-offenders in relation to two of those incidents. One other juvenile aged 15 years has been arrested for damage and larceny in relation to one of the incidents, and one adult aged 18 years has been arrested for damage and larceny in relation to one incident. Further, on 12 April 1994 the transit police arrested a 15 year old youth and charged him with property damage relating to the Gawler incident. The youth charged has not implicated other offenders. Police believe others are involved and investigations are continuing.

All of those arrests were made by the Police Transit Division. Those arrests follow the 204 arrests and reports for the month of March 1994 made by the Police Transit Division. Those arrests are in addition to the 199 arrests and reports made in February, making a combined total of 403 arrests and reports over the two months, compared to January and February 1993, when there were 19 and 15 arrests and reports respectively. That has not occurred as a result of an increase in vandalism or crime on trains but, as the police tell me, because of the fact that they now have the power to act. People who offend on our public transport are being arrested and reported and brought to justice so that we can make public transport in this State much safer.

FISHERY LICENCES

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Will the Minister for Primary Industries say, following his answer to my previous question, how much of the $100 000 the Government had received by Saturday 9 April, when the second round of trawling commenced, by way of *ex gratia* payments of $1 per kilogram for 14 days fishing in March, and what action will be taken to recover the outstanding moneys? While the Minister extolled the offer of an *ex gratia* payment from the Boat Owners Association, the Opposition has been informed that this offer was not unanimously agreed by owners, not all payments have been made and some owners are refusing to pay.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I honestly do not know whether or not Maurice has paid, but he must have your telephone number. The agreement was signed with the independent management committee. It was nothing to do with the Minister. I have all the documentation in place, and I was very pleased that the independent management committee handed it on. The moneys are due and payable, because it has been agreed to. I do not know whether or not Maurice has paid, but I will check up for the honourable member and let her know as soon as possible.

INFLUENZA

Ms GREIG (Reynell): With the arrival of cold weather, will the Minister for Health say what measures the Government is taking to protect the public of South Australia from influenza virus activity? It was reported in the media last weekend that only one-third of Australians at risk seek vaccination against influenza. An estimated 200 000 South Australians aged-65 plus, and those suffering with chronic respiratory illnesses and other medical problems, are at risk of contracting this life threatening virus. During 1993 the number of people seeking vaccination was significantly low. The article in the weekend paper has raised concern in my electorate, particularly among the elderly whose worry is not only the primary effect of influenza but their vulnerability to secondary complications such as pneumonia.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Reynell for her question, which is of vital importance to people overtly susceptible to the influenza virus. By that I mean our ageing community (people over 65 years), people with low immunisation status or people who have compromised resistance. Although susceptibility varies with age and immunisation history, those people are particularly at risk. Annual influenza vaccination may certainly reduce the risk of infection but, most importantly, it decreases the severity of the disease. If one is, in medical terms, immuno-compromised or old, it is much better to avoid the ravages of the influenza virus which healthy young people tend to shrug off but which immuno-compromised people cannot do.

Immunisation against influenza does not stop all coughs and colds. It is a common assumption that, if you have an influenza injection, you will not get any further diseases. That is not true. However, you will not get as severely the three particular virus strains in the injection. The strategy for 1994 to help those people who are aged over 65 years or who are immuno-compromised is to glean experience from past campaigns. Last year a group was coordinated and drawn from the Royal Australian College of GPs, the Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing, the Pharmacy Guild of South Australia, the AMA (with whom the member for Giles is so friendly), community medical specialists, virologists and the manufacturers of the vaccine. This group devised a very effective low key program which boosted immunisation rates within the target group from about 35 per cent to about 60 per cent: in other words a significant boost in immunisation rates which, of course, has a dramatic effect on those people and, thankfully, on hospital budgets as they do not end up with nasty cases of pneumonia and so on.

Next week, 18 to 22 April, has been designated Influenza Awareness Week, and a similar grouping of people has been put together for 1994 who will repeat the same promotional campaign. I suggest that all people might have noticed this campaign with Dairy Vale milk cartons carrying a promotional message over the past month. I would hope that the effects of the influenza vaccination programs will be successful, with less disease and fewer immuno-compromised and aged people at risk.

ASTROPHYSICAL TELESCOPE

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development advise how confident he is of securing the go ahead in South Australia for the proposal to build a 100 square kilometre astrophysical telescope at a cost of $200 million, and will he

tell the House who is proposing the project and what discussions he has had personally to secure the project for South Australia? Plans for this $200 million telescope were announced by the Minister on 21 March when he released a list of major projects.

In the Minister's announcement the world high energy astrophysical telescope is described as comprising 10 000 separate particle detectors, each the size of a small room and established at one kilometre intervals across South Australia. The Minister also announced his plans for a second telescope in the Flinders Ranges to cost $140 million and involving a main mirror size of 10 to 15 metres in diameter. The Minister, who I am keen to assist, said that this and other exciting projects given front page coverage in the *Advertiser* will provide an exciting launch pad for further developments. Given his personal role in the negotiations, how confident is the Minister of bringing off these giant telescope projects so important for South Australia's future?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This Government is determined to change the economic direction of South Australia and rebuild the economic base. I mentioned earlier today that one of the Government's key objectives is the 4 per cent growth factor each year, which will require some $500 million worth of new investment each year. The Government is determined that it will pursue vigorously every sector of industry that it can to ensure that we snare for South Australia better than the share we have obtained over the past decade or two in major infrastructure projects. I am sure that in due course members opposite will see the benefit of the hard work that has been put in over the course of the past three months as it relates to that project and many others on the list.

The honourable member would be well aware of the list because it has been released consistently now over an extended period. It is an important list for the commercial sector in South Australia which wants to forward plan for construction projects in this State, open up dialogue and have discussions with people who want to be part of the construction process in South Australia. So, to that extent, the release of that list is an important aid for industry in this State and interstate. We pursued some specifics on that list with the Federal Government.

In relation to Woomera and the future for that project, as well as seeing Senator Ray in relation to the P3C Orion contract, as well as Senator Schacht and other Federal Ministers in recent times (three or four weeks ago), I raised with them the need for us to jointly develop a plan for the long term security of Woomera, given the suggested change of the American Government relating to Nurrungar.

Senator Ray of the Federal Government has agreed to a joint working party between his department and the Economic Development Authority in South Australia, the purpose of which is to develop a joint plan to ensure that we target, for example, Woomera and industry development. I mention that simply to indicate that we are pursuing every one of those objectives. Some of them will be obtained in the short term, some in the medium term and others in the long term. Let the member not hold his breath, because in the not too distant future projects will come to the fore in South Australia that will well and truly sit the honourable member back in his seat, because they will demonstrate how this Government can generate jobs in new industry in South Australia—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Deputy Leader was making signs across the House, which is unacceptable behaviour. The member will be named if he continues.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me just summarise by saying that the honourable member will well and truly sit back in his seat with the announcements that will come forward from this Government in due course. They will demonstrate that we can deliver new projects and new jobs for South Australia in the future, compared with the honourable member's track record as Minister.

NORTH HAVEN

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Housing and Urban Development advise the House why the supplementary development plan proposed for North Haven and Outer Harbor within my electorate has not been released by the Government? An agreement between the Port Adelaide council, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Marine and Harbors Division was reached nearly five months ago but, despite advice to me from the Government over this period that its release is imminent, we are yet to see the plan.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the honourable member for his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The draft plan prepared within the Department of Housing and Urban and Development for the North Haven area last year has been subject to further discussion and review with Government agencies during the past couple of months. The Marine and Harbors Division within the Department of Transport has undertaken additional work to identify more accurately its future requirements in the port area, including the Outer Harbor area, in light of the Government's commitment to economic development in the State.

These discussions have resulted in a redefinition of the boundary between the port operations and the existing golf course, and the honourable member will be pleased to know that additional land has been identified for future golf course development. The plan also required reworking to satisfy requirements under the new Development Act. The Development Policy Advisory Committee (DPAC) is scheduled to consider a statement of intent for this plan, as required under the Development Act. It is meeting this month, and it is anticipated that the proposed plan amendment will be ready for public release by the end of June this year.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGES

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education assure the House that the Government will take no action to reduce the profile of the South Australian Institute of Languages by excluding it from the proposed Vocational Education Employment and Training Act? Will he undertake to maintain funding to this important statutory body and ensure its continuing protection in legislation? The South Australian Institute of Languages is enshrined in legislation through the Tertiary Education Act, and it has developed an enviable reputation throughout Australia for the promotion of the teaching of languages in South Australian schools and universities. Indeed, it has the very strong backing of South Australia's multicultural community, following its establishment by the Leader of the Opposition. Concern has been expressed to me that, at a time when

enrolments in language courses in secondary schools and in tertiary institutions are declining, the excellent work of the South Australian Institute of Languages may be threatened by removing its statutory protection. I ask the Minister to be a bit more specific in replying to this question.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I assure the honourable member that we will have a much better provision of languages in the tertiary area as a result of some changes that will occur in the near future. The South Australian Institute of Languages, unfortunately, has not delivered to the level that was expected of it, and the universities are currently preparing a proposal to cover the area that should have been covered by that body. In fact, some unusual aspects in relation to SAIL have been investigated by my department, and some matters have given rise to grave concern. Members should be aware that the current Leader of the Opposition, the day before the State election of last year, wrote cheques in order to influence the outcome of the election. He wrote cheques on behalf of the Government to try to win votes in the ethnic community, and he acted in a most outrageous and irresponsible manner.

When I asked about one of the funding proposals in respect of disappearing languages—because I thought it might be in relation to Aboriginal languages, about which there is a concern—I was told that the languages to be investigated were Friesian and other languages in Canada. We have Aboriginal languages at the point of being lost, and we had this funny business involving the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Premier, the day before the election, sending cheques on behalf of the Government in a most disgraceful way, and we have photocopied evidence of that. Perhaps the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition might like to explain to the House and to the people of South Australia their cheque writing activity—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has a point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, my point of order involves the question of relevance, in respect of whether the South Australian Institute of Languages will be abolished. It is quite clear it will be, but the question is: will we be told that that is the case?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Question Time is moving on.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The matter of languages and the teaching of languages is a very serious issue, because in South Australia it has not been addressed satisfactorily. It is a great concern of this Government that, if we are to export and be internationally involved in trade, we must have people trained at the highest levels in foreign languages, and that has not been happening. As a result, I have taken up the matter with the vice chancellors, who have agreed with me. They will come back with a proposal to enable a better delivery of languages at the tertiary level so that South Australia can be internationally competitive in terms of trade. I give no assurance about the future of SAIL, because I am not at all impressed with the record of that organisation. This Government will make sure that, in terms of languages, we have proper delivery and effective presentation of those languages.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr BECKER (Peake): I direct my question to the Minister for Infrastructure. What are the holdings of our reservoirs at present, and how do the water levels for this time of the year compare with the average for past years?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: Is the pumping of water from the Murray River necessary? What is the likelihood of water restrictions?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I have been waiting for some time to be able to inform the House of the capacity of our reservoirs. Adelaide reservoirs currently hold 80 000 megalitres, which is 41 per cent of capacity. This compares with an average holding of 47 per cent of capacity at this time of the year over the past 10 years. On average, 41 per cent of Adelaide's water supply is pumped from the Murray River; however, this can be as high as 90 per cent in some drought years. The expectation in the Engineering and Water Supply Department is that pumping will be about 50 per cent of Adelaide's requirements this current financial year.

In response to the honourable member's second question, we do not expect to impose water restrictions. In fact, water restrictions were last imposed in South Australia in 1967. This State better manages water supply and pumping from the Murray River than many other States of Australia which have experienced water restrictions when, in fact, South Australia has not.

The overall strategy is to minimise the volume of water pumped and maximise the volume of natural run-off into our reservoirs. In broad terms, that is achieved by allowing reservoirs to become near empty by the beginning of winter. Winter rains and natural run-off, when sufficient—and things might change this year—can fill the reservoirs over the winter period. The pumping program is regularly updated and refined throughout the year as forecast inflow and demand data is replaced with actual figures. The holdings in our reservoirs as at this time are just below the average of the past 10 years with pumping being kept to a minimum to reduce the cost of operation of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in order to ensure that we maintain that the cost of the delivery of water to South Australians is the cheapest and most efficient.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Ms HURLEY (Napier): My question is directed to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HURLEY: Will the Minister ensure that the Northern Adelaide Development Board (NADB) is made more answerable and accountable to the communities it serves? Doubts have been raised about the NADB's auditing and accounting procedures involving a $1.3 million Government funded project. Difficulties encountered by the public in getting answers to their questions have arisen because the NADB charter makes it responsible only to its member councils; it has no responsibility under the Local Government Act to be accountable to the wider community.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: That matter comes more within my province because the board has been financed to a large extent by my department. There are some matters of concern

relating to what has happened. I do not wish to pass judgment on any of the members of the board, past or present, or to reflect on anyone within my department until I have full details, but an interim report by a firm of auditors, Pannell Kerr Forster, reveals and raises many questions which have been referred to the Crown Solicitor. Following receipt of the Crown Solicitor's advice, I have now asked the Auditor-General to investigate matters relating to unaccounted funds and the payment of money to various individuals.

As I say, I am not in the business of passing judgment on people until I have the full facts. Regarding officers within my department, I am not in a position to pass judgment on their past behaviour, but I can tell the House that these matters occurred over some time, and the initial report by the auditors was conducted in January of this year. Some matters need to be clarified. We must try to get a balance between flexibility and innovation by development boards and accountability for taxpayers' funds. It is my responsibility to make sure that those funds are accounted for, and that is exactly what I will do. If there has been any inappropriate behaviour by anyone, either within or without the department, action will be taken.

CRICKET MATCH

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Deputy Premier advise the House of the result of the recent cricket match between the media and the State's politicians? Despite the fact that all Adelaide's major media outlets participated in this match, no media outlet saw fit to report the result. Indeed, given that the captain of the media's team was Mr Chris Kenny of Channel 10, could this lack of reporting be a state of denial?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: There was comment in the question, but obviously the reason it was not reported was that the press lost. We were waiting with bated breath to see, as the first item on the television news, the lead item on radio or the front page of the *Advertiser*, the reporting of the outstanding one run victory by the combined State Parliament side. It was all the more meritorious because it was an outstanding effort of bipartisan cooperation. I should mention that two outstanding efforts from this House came from the member for Hart and the member for Davenport who top scored for our side. I will not delay the House any longer, but I did expect some reporting of that match in a positive vein. Even the umpires participated in a very cooperative fashion. On an important note, at the end of the match the members decided to dedicate the trophy to the memory of Joe Tiernan—a fitting result to a very exciting match.

WINE INDUSTRY

Mr BUCKBY (Light): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Is the expansion in the wine industry being reflected in the demand for wine courses at the TAFE institute in the Barossa Valley?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Light for his interest not only in his area but, in particular, in the wine industry and the training that is provided by TAFE. The Murray Institute of TAFE, which encompasses the Nuriootpa campus, is actively involved in providing courses for the wine industry. As we know, the wine industry is booming; therefore, it is appropriate that the training effort matches that growth. I am pleased to report that at the Nuriootpa campus, which also services other winegrowing areas besides the Barossa, a new course in bottling and packaging has been fully subscribed; a course on cellar operations, which has been operating for the past 12 years with an average of 20 students, currently has 60 students; the program of viticulture, which has been operating for four years with an average student enrolment of 20, currently has 60 students; and a new program in product knowledge, which is due to start in May, has 60 enrolments already.

That is an indication of the growth in training for the wine industry. It is important that, if the wine industry grows and we are to maintain our excellent reputation for quality wines, we have excellent training to match that. As the Minister responsible for TAFE, I am committed to doing all in my power to ensure that the wine industry is supported by training which meets its needs, and that is clearly reflected in the current demand for courses that match the boom in the wine industry.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr De LAINE (Price): In the few minutes I have today I wish to follow up a matter that I raised during the Address-in-Reply debate regarding Hugh Davies, the Director of the Special Projects Unit in the Premier's Department. In the light of the job that Hugh Davies has done over the years on the upgrading and redevelopment in and around Port Adelaide, I am firmly convinced that his tenure should be extended so that he can continue to plan, organise and oversee the last stages of the inner harbor development in Port Adelaide. The unfortunate fact is that Hugh Davies' tenure is about to be terminated on 29 April 1994. I believe this termination will severely disrupt the continuity of redevelopment work in the Port Adelaide area.

The excellent work done in the earlier stages of the Port redevelopment was carried out by Hugh Davies in cooperation with the Port Joint Centre Committee, which was set up to do this work, with representatives from the State Government and the Port Adelaide City Council and chaired by Hugh Davies himself. Most of this marvellous work was carried out in the early to late 1980s.

Unfortunately, to some extent the emphasis was lost in the late 1980s, but through no fault of Mr Davies. The effects of the recession hit and there were a couple of problems with the harbour side key development in Port Adelaide where developers had been stitched up to develop this new housing estate but, because of liquidation problems and other problems, no doubt brought about by the recession, those developers failed and the project was put on hold.

Mr Davies was also involved in other projects around South Australia. That, of course, took him away from the Port Adelaide area. Work stopped pretty well for some years until now, when the project has been resurrected. His contribution to the Port Adelaide area redevelopment has been enormous and this contribution is even more meritorious when account is taken of the fact that all this redevelopment was achieved at little cost to the State or the Port Adelaide city council. There was an initial, relatively small injection of funds by the State Government and the Port Adelaide city council in the

early 1980s. Since that time, Mr Hugh Davies has generated the necessary funds to continue with the redevelopment at no further cost to the State and the Port Adelaide city council. Even the special projects unit has been self funded because of the outstanding abilities of Hugh Davies.

As I said in my Address in Reply speech, Hugh Davies was a magician and with the powers vested in him he was able to sell, exchange and buy Government owned land in the Port Adelaide area. He was also able, in cooperation with developers, to increase the value of land in certain areas in order to make more profits to continue the redevelopment and to fund his own department. There is no other area that I know of that has achieved so much for so little cost as far as taxpayers and ratepayers of these areas are concerned. Hugh Davies is a true professional in this area.

In view of the Government's decision to proceed with the MFP, albeit in a refocussed form—whatever that means—the ongoing Port Adelaide redevelopment is even more important and must be handled professionally. Hugh Davies has the contacts, the know-how, the ability, the energy and the vision to oversee the last stages of the Port Adelaide redevelopment. For these reasons, I appeal to the Premier and the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations to extend the tenure of Hugh Davies so that the final stages of the Port Adelaide redevelopment can be achieved to the same high standard as that of the previous stages.

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): One of the greatest problems facing our society now, and certainly in the future, is the use of illegal drugs. I refer to hydroponic cultivation and pushing of drugs by people from all walks of life, especially involving our young people. For many years there has been a strong move to legalise cannabis in our society. I am against such a move and will strive to the best of my ability to see that it never occurs.

An article in the ABCI (Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence) *Intelligence Digest* of 1994 records that a new strain of cannabis known as 'skunk', originating in Europe, is now being cultivated in Australia. Although the drug has not been found in South Australia, there are fears that it could soon arrive. I believe it is our job to see that this potent form of cannabis is outlawed and never cultivated in South Australia. If it is, strict penalties must be enforced as a deterrent. I refer to the article, which states:

> Recent reports in various newspapers have talked of a new strain of cannabis known as skunk or skunk weed. Skunk is a particularly potent strain of the sinsemilla (cannabis) plant originating in the Netherlands. It is usually grown covertly under artificial light and mainly hydroponically (without soil) as this results in higher crop yields. A skilled indoor grower can produce up to six crops a year using a shift system to separate the cloning, growing and blossoming stages, with different sections of the plantation for each phase. This method can produce up to .5 kilograms of the plant per square metre per year.
>
> The availability of skunk in the United Kingdom (UK) is rapidly increasing in an attempt to keep up with demand. The great demand for skunk is mainly due to its strength. It is a hybrid of various plants from Afghanistan, Morocco and Thailand and has been specifically bred to have a high content of the active ingredient, tetrahydrocannabinol (THC). Ordinary herbal cannabis would be expected to have a THC content of between 1 per cent and 5 per cent. Skunk has a THC content up to 30 per cent. This high THC content means that rather than inducing euphoria, as with normal cannabis, smoking skunk can induce a powerful hallucinogenic trip.

The UK health drug agency, Lifeline, has reported that this is causing problems with mental health. Users are reportedly suffering intense paranoia. Some experienced smokers have called skunk 'madweed.' Further information from these agencies suggests that skunk is challenging ecstasy on the dance and club scenes. There have been a number of large indoor plantations in Australia growing cannabis alleged to be skunk. To date, these plantations have generally been found in metropolitan regions along the east coast. The plant is reported to be smaller than traditional cannabis, standing about one metre high, bushier than usual, and has many tight bunches of heads. This is a very serious matter. It is our responsibility to stop skunk, and other dangerous plants like it, from ever coming into South Australia before it causes any more devastation and chaos to our community.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Yesterday, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources tabled the first comprehensive review of the area of national parks and wildlife since the proclamation of the National Parks and Wildlife Act in 1972. I believe it is important for this issue to be recorded in *Hansard*, because the member for Ross Smith constantly informs this House that members of Parliament do not read Acts, Bills and reports. Since he mixes with the Opposition and hence only sees the example of members opposite, for their benefit I make these remarks. In 1972, parks and reserves in South Australia covered 3.63 per cent of the State. They now cover 21 per cent of the State under the title of parks and reserves. In addition, 600 000 hectares are preserved under heritage agreements.

The previous Government was very good at adding parks to the register but not so good at funding their upkeep. There has been a steady reduction in staff levels per hectare of parks over this time, with national parks management required to phase down programs and simply not attend to the necessary infrastructure requirements. It is intended that this review highlight, for the public consultation process, this problem and recommend possible solutions. The bottom line will be funds, and it is important that any discussion should cover all possible remedies.

As a member of the environment backbench committee, I am disappointed that the *Advertiser* in an unbalanced article chose to highlight three lines from a comprehensive 251 page report. Nevertheless, those who are genuinely concerned with our environment will dig deeper than the media and get the facts: 135 written submissions and 14 verbal submissions were made to this review committee. The terms of reference were broad and all encompassing. I put on record that this report was instigated by the previous Government and I commend it for that activity. The review lists 27 key recommendations. The task for the Government now is to work through these recommendations with the community and allow implementation of relevant reforms as quickly as possible.

Naturally, one of the first recommendations of the review committee relates to the allocation of an improved level of resources. I say 'naturally' not because the committee would be expected automatically to make a grab for money but because of the lack of adequate attention to this area by the previous Labor Government. The Arthur D. Little report emphasised the value of eco-tourism. In line with this, the review recommends capital works in key reserves identified as important to tourism, such as Kangaroo Island, the Flinders Ranges, the Barossa, Clare, the Fleurieu Peninsula and the Riverland.

Nature based tourism is particularly important as a potential for South Australia because of the percentage of non-populated, semi-arid regions. The review recommends

that reserve areas with minimal biological, cultural or recreational value should be sold. It is sensible to consider methods of tightening up the process of concentration of funds to the conservation areas of true value to South Australia and not spread the funds ever more thinly to achieve nothing in conservation overall.

It was further recommended that a structured land acquisition program be developed based on solid biological value, with the aim of broadening the representative basis of our parks. This is an important factor in the overall conservation value of South Australia. High priority is placed on endangered species research, and I would support strongly our seeking scientific research funds nationally. The visible and invasive weed and feral animal problem in our conservation areas is huge and must be accepted as a total community problem and funded accordingly.

The report also recommends land use decisions based on conservation value. I must support most strongly the recommendation of the review that the Government set up a program to identify fire management needs. I would be suggesting that we set aside a small part of each conservation area as a trial site to investigate the long-term benefits of cold burns. The review suggests investigations be undertaken to identify our most outstanding national and internationally significant areas in terms of needed preservation. Again, this is in line with the Arthur D. Little report and the evidence that we do not do well regionally with international tourists, and this needs to be addressed. As a member of the environment backbench committee, I encourage the community to obtain a copy of the review and make comment.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): As a southern member, I have been disappointed in the past couple of weeks once again to see the southern areas missing out. I will cite two examples. The first occurred after the very successful Oakbank race meeting, which I was fortunate enough to attend on Monday. Along with many other people, I realised that there are some huge benefits to be gained from that race meeting for South Australia to offset the unfortunate loss of the Grand Prix—and we all know why we lost the Grand Prix. One suggestion that has emerged is that we capitalise and expand on Oakbank, and I endorse that. However, immediately everyone gets behind the Barossa Valley and says, 'We will incorporate the Barossa Valley music festival with Oakbank and capitalise on that for the Barossa Valley.'

An article in the *Advertiser* of Monday 11 April (page 5) by Nicole Lloyd was entitled 'Federal cash boost for South Australian tourism'. I was delighted to see that heading until I read the contents of the article, which stated that the Federal Government had given $400 000 to the Barossa Valley for a wine interpretation centre, as it was identified as a high priority for the State. A $100 000 grant was made to another area at Port Augusta and a further $40 000 was allocated to the Fleurieu Peninsula. That has been happening for years and years.

It is about time the people who allocate these grant funds and those who market South Australia started to work on a much fairer and equitable basis. They should consider the long-term potential for this State through capitalisation of tourism development in the southern area. At least in the State arena we now have a Government in power that recognises the importance of the southern region. That is evidenced by the $750 000 that this State has generously granted to the southern areas to capitalise on the wonderful employment opportunities.

We have to implement important policies to achieve additional plantings of vines and to deal with the environmentally sensitive issues of the southern area. It is about time we had the support of all people to help us get those policies through. I cannot understand why the Federal Government is allowed to make grants to individual regions of the State. It would be much better if the Federal Government gave grant funding to the State Government—as it is supposed to—and then let the State Government do what is best for the whole of South Australia.

In the past couple of months in the Southern Vales we have seen $23 to $25 million come into the economy as a result of an excellent grape harvest. If we can get more people coming to the southern areas, we could fully value add that, as I have already said in this House. We would then start to generate the jobs to offset the highest youth unemployment in Australia that we have in the southern areas.

It is about time all of us got together and said that the southern parts of Adelaide are part of South Australia. They have been neglected severely over the past 10 years. The Barossa Valley has done quite well. Because it has been slightly squeaky, it continues to get oiled, to the point where I think it is probably almost over-oiled. It is about time the people making these decisions came down to our areas and at least started to give us a small amount of oil.

With respect to the $750 000 that this State Government has put forward, I am delighted to say that the Minister now has the working party up and running. The first meeting will be on 26 April. A recent public meeting in McLaren Vale attracted 200 people. That is an enormous number of people attending a public meeting and it reinforces and substantiates just how the people of the whole southern area—the Fleurieu Peninsula and, in particular, the magnificent wine growing area of the McLaren Vale district—view the importance of the South Australian Government's getting behind them and giving them an opportunity. I call on members in this House in the future to support me in my endeavours to ensure not only that the Barossa Valley gets kowtowed to by Government bodies but equally that the southern areas receive their fair share.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I wish to raise an issue to which I referred in Question Time about the Northern Adelaide Development Board (NADB). The board serves four councils in the northern area: Gawler, Elizabeth, Salisbury and Munno Para. It is principally funded by the member councils and is therefore ratepayer-funded. The NADB is the conduit for a considerable amount of both State and Federal Government money, as well as ratepayers' funds.

Recently the NADB was involved with the Department of Training and Further Education in the Northern Employment Training Project. This was an innovative three year pilot program, which was designed to cut red tape and directly establish an employment scheme in the northern suburbs. It involved DETAFE working with the NADB and the board was responsible for establishing and promoting the programs.

Following the establishment of this program, an audit was undertaken and it indicated that $160 000 of the total $1.3 million funding still could not be satisfactorily accounted for. That is obviously a serious problem in the northern areas. The NADB is responsible for a number of programs in the north: it has been very active and has produced a number of excellent initiatives in a wide variety of areas, including this employment program, which I understand was very successful.

However, there are unanswered questions about the administration of the NADB. As well as the problems associated with the audit, there have also been a couple of key changes to the senior management and board that, I believe, have not been satisfactorily explained to the community. Under the current system, the NADB really does not have to report back to the community that it serves: it merely needs to report back to its member councils, and can do so in a totally private way. So its decisions and meetings cannot be accessed by members of the public.

It is time to have another look at how the NADB operates and the way it represents the community it serves. The overwhelming message that I get from people in my area is that they want more input and more explanations about the things done in their area. There are a number of activists and people constantly asking questions wanting to know what is happening. They no longer want projects and programs dropped on them with no questions asked—just a bundle of projects. There are, indeed, benefits from public input into programs being implemented in the area: they are usually better accepted and often more appropriate.

I believe that these problems with the Northern Adelaide Development Board would probably not have arisen had there been wider public involvement in its management, or had there been a more representative group from the public. The Minister said that he would deal with any transgressions that arose out of this audit and would make sure that anyone who was held responsible in any illegal or irresponsible way would be brought to book. What I am calling for is a wide approach, which will not merely act as a bandaid over this situation but which will limit further problems that might arise as a result of the activities of the NADB.

I also believe it would produce positive benefits in terms of a greater willingness by people in the community to get behind the projects put forward by the NADB. Any board that is producing projects will run into criticisms, which one hears generally around the northern areas. If there were wider community involvement in the NADB these criticisms would be minimised, and I call upon the Government to look at the way the NADB has been set up and to make changes in accordance with what the community wants.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): My grievance speech today relates to the aged health care of South Australians, and I am concerned that the people in question appear to be getting a very shoddy deal from the Federal Labor Government. A constituent of mine came into my electorate office and expressed concern over her mother, who has dementia, stating that she wished to place her in a nursing home. At present the mother, who is 91 years of age, has been in Adelaide Clinic for seven weeks and hostel accommodation prior to that. My constituent cannot believe how difficult it is to try to place her mother, with the lack of availability of beds in nursing homes at present. She feels very strongly about the state of health care and the unavailability of nursing home facilities.

With my constituent still in the electorate office, I contacted a number of nursing homes. I contacted one at Glenelg that said that, because the lady lived at Warradale, she was out of the area, even though you can throw a cricket ball to Glenelg from Warradale on a windy day. But she said it was out of the area, there were 56 on the waiting list and no indication of when a bed would be available, and that it would be better for her to go elsewhere. So, then I telephoned a nursing home at Hove, which is just as far a cricket throw from Warradale, and that place had six beds, there was a waiting list and they suggested not to bother about putting her name on the waiting list because there was a very slim chance that the mother would ever be able to enter.

I then contacted a nursing home at Kingswood, which is a good cover drive from Warradale, and I was told that no beds were available, and there was a click on the telephone. Then I tried a nursing home in the Marion area and was told there were no bed vacancies, not even for respite, but that I could put the mother on the waiting list. However, they could not tell us how long that list was, or for how long. That was four nursing homes I contacted in the immediate vicinity, and at this stage my constituent's mother has no chance of being put into nursing home care. So, for the past seven weeks at the Adelaide Clinic the bill has been $1 950 per week, which raises another subject; that is, that funds are being paid by private health insurance, because this lady has private health cover, yet during yesterday's grievance debate the member for Giles, and I quote from *Hansard*, said:

> One of the reasons why people are leaving health funds in droves is that doctors and hospitals are charging these very high fees to a degree that anybody who is left in a health fund is wasting their money, because if you are not in a health fund and you go and have your appendix out, or whatever—

which I assume would also mean if you are in a clinic such as the Adelaide Clinic, waiting for nursing home availability; that would be 'whatever'—

> you do not get a bill. If you are in a health fund you are seen as a milking cow for doctors and the hospitals. Not only do you pay your $50 a week to your health fund but you also get a huge bill—hundreds of dollars—for this procedure. So, I would recommend to anybody who is in a health fund that unless they want to waste their dough—and I do; I admit that I am wasting my money—they should get out of the health fund until the doctors, in particular, and the hospitals come to their senses.

I found that totally irresponsible, and if that comment were to get out and influence some elderly people within my electorate they would be faced with a situation of nowhere to go, with no funds to cover health care, and they would be having to contend with a bill of $1 950 a week whilst they waited for a nursing home. So, there is a need for the Federal Government, when it is framing—

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

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the motion for limitation of debate adopted on Tuesday 12 April be rescinded.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 13 April. Page 734.)

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr CLARKE: Was any advice sought in relation to the drawing up of this Bill from any legal firm operating in the private sector either in South Australia or elsewhere?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: No; legal advice has not been sought. As is normal for those in Government, we go to Parliamentary Counsel and, in the normal procedure of drawing up the Bill, they give us the advice.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Objects of Act.'

The CHAIRMAN: There are two amendments to this clause, one of which indicates that the clause will be opposed and amended subsequently by the insertion of what I assume will be a completely new clause. Therefore, I will take the Minister's amendment first, since the Minister's amendment amends the original clause as it stands at present.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

Page 1, after line 24—insert new paragraph as follows:

(ea) to provide a framework for making enterprise agreements, awards and determinations affecting industrial matters that is fair and equitable to both employers and employees;

The purpose of this amendment is to recognise that during the consultation process an argument was put by the union movement to the Government that there appeared to be a lack of equity and fairness expressed in the objects of the Bill. We pointed out to the union advisers that we believed that there was adequate reference to that in further sections of the Bill, but it is the Government's view that, because there has never been any question about fairness and equity in the attitude to this Bill, we would include this amendment.

Mr CLARKE: Mr Chairman, as you pointed out, the Opposition will be moving a total rewrite with respect to the objects of the Bill. However, for the purposes of the Minister's amendment, and our substantive amendment to be debated shortly, I do not propose to address this matter at this stage.

Amendment carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the clause as amended be agreed to. The honourable member has to move his amendment and also speak to the amendment.

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Insert new clause as follows:

Objects of Act

3. The principal object of this Act is to provide a framework for the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes which promotes the economic prosperity and welfare of the people of the State by—

(a) encouraging and facilitating the making of agreements, between the parties involved in industrial relations, to determine matters pertaining to the relationship between employers and employees, particularly at the workplace or enterprise level;

(b) providing the means for—

(i) establishing and maintaining an effective framework for protecting wages and conditions of employment through awards; and

(ii) ensuring that labour standards meet Australia's international obligations;

(c) providing a framework of rights and responsibilities for the parties involved in industrial relations which encourages fair and effective bargaining and ensures that those parties abide by agreements between them;

(d) enabling the Commission to prevent and settle industrial disputes—

(i) so far as possible, by conciliation; and

(ii) where necessary, by arbitration;

(e) encouraging the organisation of representative bodies of employers and employees and their registration under this Act;

(f) encouraging and facilitating the development of organisations, particularly by reducing the number of organisations in an industry or enterprise; and

(g) helping to prevent and eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, colour, sex, sexual preference, age, physical or mental disability, marital status, family responsibilities, pregnancy, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin.

The Opposition's amendment seeks to reproduce in the South Australian Industrial Relations Act, or what will be known as the Industrial and Employee Relations Act, a new clause 3 in its entirety setting out the objects of the Act. The objects of the Bill are very important. They are referred to frequently, not simply by the practitioners or the advocates before the Industrial Commission: they provide the essential guidepost for members of the commission, particularly the Enterprise Commissioner, who will be dealing with a substantial number of matters involving enterprise agreements that will be made, and it is important that those guideposts are clearly understood by all.

This Bill also provides for a rationalisation within our industrial relations system, in that these objects duplicate that which is contained in the Australian Industrial Relations Commission provisions, the Australian Industrial Relations Act 1988 and the Reform Act that was passed by the Federal Labor Government and came into force on 30 March this year. Very often employer organisations have called for a greater degree of uniformity between Federal and State industrial relations systems. Too often they have cried out that, because of the inconsistencies at times between the Federal and State systems, they are operating under two different systems, two different sets of ground rules, which can affect their employees, some of whom are covered by Federal systems, others by State systems.

In addition, the Government's provision with respect to the objects of the Act is generally to reduce the role of unions in relation to facilitating amalgamations of registered associations and encouraging the growth of employee and employer organisations representative of their respective classes. The amendment also sets out very clearly that there is an obligation under the State Act, as one of our objectives, to ensure that the labour standards in South Australia meet Australia's international obligations with respect to these matters. For all of those reasons, I commend the amendment to members.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government rejects these objects. We did believe that the Opposition would at least have had a look at the South Australian situation and been a little innovative, but we look at this and we find that it is almost a mirror image of the Federal Act, which only continues to highlight the Opposition's aim in that all it wants to do, obviously, is maintain union power in this State, because the Federal Act is all about union domination and getting rid of the States. We find it amazing that there is no innovation and no sense of being as far as South Australia is concerned—it is an absolute sell-out—and this is the first of many amendments indicating that the Opposition does not seem to be at all interested in the matter as it relates to South Australia.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (7)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	

NOES (33)

Andrew, K. A.	Armitage, M. H.
Ashenden, E. S.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Cummins, J. G.	Evans, I. F.
Greig, J. M.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A. (teller)
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Leggett, S. R.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Oswald, J. K. G.	Penfold, E. M.
Rosenberg, L. F.	Rossi, J. P.
Scalzi, G.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Wade, D. E.
Wotton, D. C.	

PAIRS

Quirke, J. A.	Lewis, I. P.

Majority of 26 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Committee divided on the clause as amended:

AYES (32)

Andrew, K. A.	Armitage, M. H.
Ashenden, E. S.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Cummins, J. G.	Evans, I. F.
Greig, J. M.	Hall, J. L.
Ingerson, G. A. (teller)	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Leggett, S. R.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Penfold, E. M.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (7)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	

PAIRS

Lewis, I. P.	Quirke, J. A.

Majority of 25 for the Ayes.

Clause as amended thus passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 2, line 25—Leave out 'Industrial Relations Commission' and insert 'Industrial Commission'.

Essentially, the amendment relates to a more substantive matter, which will be debated in Committee later and which deals with what we would term the independence of the judiciary and of the commission, and the current Industrial Commission continuing under this new legislation.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government opposes the amendment. We believe that the structures of the existing industrial tribunals require alteration through the introduction of new objects, new jurisdictions and new powers, with a primary focus on enterprise bargaining. We believe it is a new direction and, consequently, we oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 2, line 33—leave out definition of 'contract of employment' and insert—

'contract of employment' means—

(a) a contract under which a person is employed for remuneration in an industry; or

(b) a contract under which a person (the 'employer') engages another (the 'employee') to drive a vehicle that is not registered in the employee's name to provide a public passenger service (even though the contract would not be recognised at common law as a contract of employment); or

(c) a contract under which a person engages another to carry out personally the work of cleaning premises (even though the contract would not be recognised at common law as a contract of employment); or

(d) a contract under which a person (the 'employer') engages another (the 'employee') to carry out work as an outworker (even though the contract would not be recognised at common law as a contract of employment);.

This amendment replaces the definition of 'contract of employment' as set out in the Government's Bill. Also, it quite expressly seeks to cover what we already have within our State industrial relations system, namely, that persons who are independent contractors and the like and who have a job that involves driving a vehicle which is not registered in the employer's name to provide a passenger transport service are covered for the purpose of this legislation if they are incapable of being covered by an award of the Industrial Commission.

The Government's position is basically to restrict the Bill's definition of 'employee' and 'employer' to the strict common law definition with respect to employee relationships. That defies what is happening in the work force, where more and more workers are being made subcontractors, not necessarily of their own volition but simply because employers have decided that they believe that is a more economical way for them to conduct their business. For example, not so long ago we heard of the dispute in other States which involved the contracting out of the driving work of brewery workers from Carlton United Breweries when it was taken over by Linfox. Similar examples have occurred with respect to retail stores who had their trucks and motor vehicles contracted out to their employees. They told their employees that they would no longer be required by the stores unless they wished to continue under some form of contractual arrangement. They were still required to carry out all the functions of an employee but without any of the benefits, such as guaranteed award minimum wages, workers' compensation and a range of other benefits.

It took the union movement and the former Labor Government many years to improve the definition of 'contract of employment' and expand the scope of the current Industrial Relations Act to take into account the fact that these types of working arrangements have been entered into. It is likely that those arrangements will continue to grow. It is an area which is ripe for exploitation; indeed, it has been significantly an area of exploitation. It is an area which should be brought under the jurisdiction of the commission, as is the case with the current Act.

We do not believe the Government has put forward any substantial or sane reason whatsoever to restrict the definition to its common law meaning. That would assist only those who want to exploit those persons who are regularly being told by their employers, 'We are no longer going to hire you as employees; we want you to be independent contractors.'

For all intents and purposes they are workers without any of the protections that apply.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government opposes the amendment. Clearly, we do not accept the argument that subcontractors should be part of the employer/employee relationship. The contracting out option is available to individuals. I was fascinated that, when the member for Ross Smith spoke, he forgot to talk about Lion Nathan, because it was at Lion Nathan that the contracting out of the drivers, the gardeners and the carpenters was agreed to by the Liquor and Allied Trades Union. It agreed to contracting out because it was in the best interests of the employees. They were excellent contracts.

Mr Clarke: They are covered by this Act.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: They are not covered by this Act and they were not covered in the previous Act.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: They are not protected by their union, because they have all gone out as private sector individuals. They have now entered into contracts quite separate from the employer/employee relationship with Lion Nathan in Adelaide. We prefer to use the employee ombudsman in relation to outworkers, and our position is very clear as it relates to contracting out. We oppose the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (7)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	

NOES (30)

Andrew, K. A.	Armitage, M. H.
Ashenden, E. S.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Cummins, J. G.	Evans, I. F.
Greig, J. M.	Hall, J. L.
Ingerson, G. A. (teller)	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Leggett, S. R.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Oswald, J. K. G.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	Wotton, D. C.

PAIRS

Quirke, J. A.	Lewis, I. P. (teller)

Majority of 23 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 3, line 1—Leave out 'Industrial Relations Court' and insert 'Industrial Court'.

I move this amendment for much the same reasons as I have stated with respect to the Industrial Commission. It provides for the continuum of office holders and the independence of the judiciary following enactment. I will have more to say on that in relation to more substantive amendments.

Amendment negatived.

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 3, after line 2—Insert—

'demarcation dispute' includes—

(a) a dispute within a registered association or between registered associations about the rights, status or functions of members of the association or associations in relation to employment;

(b) a dispute between employers and employees, or between members of different registered associations, about the demarcation of functions of employees or classes of employees;

(c) a dispute about the representation under this Act of the industrial interests of employees by a registered association of employees;.

This amendment seeks to reinsert into the Bill the provisions of the existing Act with respect to demarcations. I am absolutely amazed that this Government wants to take away from the Industrial Commission the power to demark disputes between unions. I spent nearly 20 years as a union official, and on just about every day of that period I spoke either to an employer or read in a newspaper, in a parliamentary debate or papers presented by employer organisations, both here and interstate, that there were too many unions and too many disputes, whether they be on a building site or in a manufacturing industry or between tradespersons and non-tradespersons as to who should carry out certain work.

I have served on the committees of the Industrial Commercial and Training Commission. Employer representatives on those bodies would debate why the Electrical Trades Union reserved to itself a certain class of work. A fitter could not carry out that sort of work in the same factory, even though the fitter may well have been qualified to do that work, because the electrician had the formal ticket. I am absolutely amazed that this Government would want to take from the commission something which employers at an individual and national level for as long as I can remember over the past nearly 20 years have wanted.

I have read about those same sorts of complaints in past cases before the commission dealing with various matters with which I was involved where employer advocate after employer advocate said that demarcation disputes constantly disrupt industry and that something must be done about resolving them. If the trade union movement could not do it through the forums of the ACTU or the local labour council, some sort of authoritative body such as, in particular, the Industrial Commission should have the power to demark. If as a last resort there had to be a resolution of these disputes between tradespersons and non-tradespersons with different unions covering the same class of workers, if there were contests on site, in the interests of efficiency and productivity there had to be some body—by 'body' I mean a tribunal—that could take those decisions and authoritatively demark the work between competing organisations.

If the Minister and the Government exclude this power from the commission, they will be opening it up again. I am amazed. The Labor Party had real problems within its ranks which caused it to seek to have such powers inserted into the Act in the first place. Obviously, its union constituents all feared losing certain of their membership coverage rights in certain industries if the State commission had these powers. So the Labor Government got it through the Parliament and it was applauded by employer organisations, yet we now have this Government being so gung ho about it that it wants to remove this power from the commission, for reasons I can only suspect—something along the lines: 'We want to be able to encourage these scab employee staff type associations to form enterprise agreements.'

That might be their wish, but I can well imagine the view of the engineering employers of South Australia and many of the members of the Employers Chamber of South Australia. I am talking not about their political potentates who might

happen to be the general managers of particular organisations who obviously have a political line to push but about individual members who have to deal on the shop floor with competing unions. Some of these major manufacturing places fall under State awards—and many of them fall under Federal awards—so perhaps that might not be an issue in some of the larger establishments.

I could well imagine those front line managers pulling their hair out because, in some of these industries, no little scab staff associations will be created. The established, registered union will be firmly in place. The members want them. They will stay in place, and those employers will be faced from time to time with competition between unions covering the same class of work and the same type of people. There will be industrial disputes. When they go to the Industrial Commission to try to seek assistance, the union that does not want to be ruled out of the scene will simply be able to turn up and say, 'Mr President of the commission, you have no power to hear this matter. It is not an industrial matter. You have no power to do it. See you later. We will sort it out on the job and have a fight.'

It will be very interesting when those members of the employer organisations then contact the Minister for Industrial Affairs and say, 'My God, you did us a great favour. You were wonderful, Minister. You brought in something that we fought for years to have the Labor Government introduce.' At a national level, again, these powers are available to the Federal commission. I must say I have a considerable amount of reserve with respect to the Federal Act, section 118A, which gives the Industrial Commission the power to amend the rules of registered associations. I have never been keen on that and I opposed any such moves within the State forum to duplicate the powers of the Federal Commission. However, with respect to the powers under the State Act, as introduced under successive State Labor Governments, they are a sensible compromise whereby the commission does not amend the rules of organisations but is able to demark the work between classes of employees performing the same sort of work where there is overlapping competition between registered associations. For those reasons, the Opposition has moved the amendment.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government opposes this amendment, because it believes that the demarcation jurisdiction for the commission may cut across the principles of freedom of association which we have established for the first time under this Bill. The Government also has the view that, if factional groups within the union movement take their hassles into the workplace, this is not the way these sorts of disputes ought to be resolved. If union officials want to play games with employees, they ought to be playing games in their own associations and not in the workplaces. Having said that, we recognise some of the comments made by the honourable member opposite and the employer associations. Between now and when the Bill is debated in another place, we will be considering our position on these issues. We oppose this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 4, lines 8 to 15—Leave out the definition of 'industrial action'.

I will go into this matter further when I move the substantive amendment. Basically, our opposition is based on the fact that the State Government is seeking to introduce into this measure secondary boycotts and to remove the current protections that exist in the legislation for limitation in respect to action in tort by employers pending a hearing by a full bench of the commission and the certification of the problems that may arise as a result of any such industrial action before any action in tort can take place. For those reasons, we will deal with that matter in more substance later in Committee, but this is a consequential amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 5, lines 26 to 30—Leave out the definition of 'outworker' and substitute the following definition:

'outworker'—see section 4A;.

The reason for this amendment is that the Government's Bill weakens the definition of 'outworker'. I commend the Minister for including within the Bill the definition of 'clerical work', which the former Labor Government tried to have inserted in the Act through an amendment some 12 or 18 months ago. It wanted the definition of 'clerical work' to include people who work from home. This arose as a result of a survey that was undertaken by the Working Women's Centre, which had received a grant from the then Minister for Labour. The survey established that there were many women, in particular, working from home with remuneration rates well below any comparable award. The rates of remuneration did not adequately take into account the costs of equipment that they were purchasing to do their work or the running costs associated with such an enterprise, such as lighting, heating, power, personal accident insurance and the like.

In addition, the Government's Bill deletes the very vital words 'work on' which exist in the Act. From the legal advice we have received, that would leave out those persons in the clothing industry, which was subject to a front page article in the *Advertiser* I think two or three weeks ago. There were massive claims by the journalist reporting on the area of 'sweat workshops'. These were people who put garments together. The Government's Bill talks about 'process or pack articles or materials'. It does not include the critical words 'work on'. If the Minister and I are talking about the same thing, that is terrific. If that is the case, he can remove any doubt by inserting the words 'work on' in the Bill and we will have agreement. It is our legal advice that, if that is the intention of the Government, the fact that those two words are left out does leave the situation fraught with danger for the very people whom both the Minister and I want to see protected by awards of the State commission.

This is an area, particularly in the clothing and textile industry, of considerable exploitation of women workers from non-English speaking backgrounds who are working for as little as 50¢ a garment. Those garments are then selling for anything up to $50 in the retail trade. I do not think any member in this House on either side supports that type of stance. If the Minister believes that his Bill covers that point, I must say that our legal advice is to the contrary. I do not see any problems with incorporating those essential two words, as we see it, if we are talking about the same thing. If it is a super abundance of caution on my part, there is no damage done except for a little bit of extra ink used in the printing of the Act. If I am right and the Minister is wrong, we are potentially exposing thousands of migrant women, in the main, who work in sweat shops and who would not be covered by proper awards of this commission. For those reasons, the Opposition moves this amendment.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government is opposed to this amendment. In answer to the last comments

of the member for Ross Smith, the reason for change is not a deliberate change by the Government. As I explained in my second reading explanation, 75 per cent of the Bill was redrafted in terms of common language. The professional advice given to us is that these words mean exactly the same as the previous words.

Consequently, if that is the case, there is no point in inserting those words, because the common English legal interpretation would cover those words. We also believe that there are better avenues through which to supply relief for grievances involving outworkers. This Bill specifically establishes the Office of the Employee Ombudsman. Clause 60 provides that the ombudsman has the ability to assist outworkers and investigate their claims. We believe that these provisions are much simpler and more effective. Consequently, we do not see any point in further amending this clause. We oppose the amendment.

Mr CLARKE: As clarification, am I in order to ask the Minister a question now that the amendment has been defeated?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can speak to his amendment to clause 4, page 5, lines 26 to 30. If his amendment is negated, his proposed new clause 7 will automatically lapse. If the honourable member wishes to ask questions about his amendment to clause 4, page 5, lines 26 to 30 and his proposal to insert a new clause, I would accept questions on either of those. If his clause lapses, it will automatically be obviated from questioning.

Mr CLARKE: In the event that ultimately process workers—these textile clothing people that I described earlier—are found not to be covered by the Bill as it is currently drafted and therefore are ineligible to obtain an award of the State commission, would the Minister guarantee that the Government would be prepared, in the light of any such a ruling from a judicial authority, to make the necessary amendments to the Act to ensure that the people we both want to protect are capable of being protected?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I note with interest that the member for Ross Smith used the term 'process workers'. The Government's definition talks about processing and packaging of articles and materials, and I put that on the record. If any legislation the Government enacted proved in the long term to be unworkable, of course it would consider amending it at that time.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's amendment to insert a new clause 7 lapses, that amendment having been lost.

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 7, lines 11 to 19—Leave out subclauses (2) and (3) and insert—

(2) A group of employees consists of two or more employees employed in a single business or at a particular workplace or particular workplaces in a particular occupation or particular occupations but the group must include all the employees employed in the business or at the workplace or workplaces (as the case requires) in the relevant occupation or occupations.

This is a particularly important amendment, because the definition of 'group of employees' currently in the Bill does not prevent individual contracts. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, I believe, or certainly in some public utterances, said that enterprise agreements could not be made on an individual contract basis: it was either an award or an enterprise agreement, and enterprise agreements could not apply on a one-on-one basis.

The definition does not contain any minimum number of employees to constitute a 'group of employees'. One can have, and there is a number of employers who have, only one employee. To enter into an enterprise agreement with that person would effectively bring about individual contracts, as is the case in Victoria. It would be the same situation and it would involve even further distortion of bargaining power between employer and employee. One employee, on his or her own, has very little or, I would suggest, negligible or non-existent bargaining power with their employer, particularly in places where there may be high unemployment or in regional areas of South Australia.

I am not aware of any complaints from those employees working in very small offices, where there is only one employee, that they are unhappy with the award system. One clerk working in an office under our State system would be covered by the Clerks SA Award, which provides for the minimum rates of pay and conditions. If the employer wishes to pay that person more than is in the award, they are perfectly free to do so and many do just that. Employers are perfectly free to offer and the employee to accept and negotiate conditions far superior to those which exist in those common rule minimum rates awards. They are free to do it and many do just that.

However, at all times, that individual is protected by the award minimum structure and they are not left in the extremely vulnerable position of being such a small unit size in negotiations with their employer that their conditions of employment could be severely jeopardised. I would therefore urge the Committee to support the Opposition's definition and, in particular, not only with respect to the two or more employees.

This amendment also provides that, in terms of the workplace itself, one cannot keep subdividing down through the different occupational groups. If you are an employer and you have clerks, drivers and storemen and packers and you want an enterprise agreement with the clerks, you do it for all the clerks, not just one, two or three of them. The current Bill allows that sort of subdivision of occupational groups.

The Opposition is saying that if the Government is genuine about enterprise bargaining and providing for improvements across the board for employees, leading to higher wages and improved conditions, this should apply across the whole of that occupational class of workers rather than just allowing different groups within the same occupational group employed by the same employer being either picked off or favoured by the employer, depending on the situation. If you want the enterprise agreement for clerks, yes, you can have it, but it is for all clerks. This does not stop an employer from having an enterprise agreement with just the truck drivers or the storemen and packers and not giving it to the clerks; they can still do that.

I think that my amendment is quite moderate in that area, because I am aware of a number of manufacturing concerns where enterprise agreements have been struck with—if I can use the generic term—blue-collar workers in a factory. Wage increases have been granted to those people and the clerks have been excluded because the employers have not seen any need for an agreement to apply to those clerks. Yet, those clerks perform a very valuable function in keeping that business going, but they miss out on the benefits of enterprise bargaining because the employers are able to say that they want to give it only to the drivers or the storemen and packers, or whatever.

What would be worse is where many people are employed as clerks and the boss says that he wants an agreement only with those in the accounts department; all the other sections in the clerical area can be excluded from enterprise bargaining. That would be grossly unfair.

On the other hand, the Bill would also allow for a situation where the employer could put pressure on one group of workers—not coercive pressure, but moral or persuasive pressure. Everyone knows that there is 11 per cent unemployment; there is a big queue of people out there. They might want to target a particular group of workers who regularly work shift work or overtime.

They will say, 'We want to reduce your penalty rates but we do not want to antagonise the rest of the work force by bringing them into it as well', and do the divide and rule exercise. The definition of 'group of employees' is far too broad and allows for manipulation. If the Government is true to its word in wanting to facilitate enterprise bargaining, at the same time doing it on a fear basis, it will accept our amendment.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The honourable member referred to splitting classes. The Government position is very clear. It says:

A group of employees consists of—
(a) the employees employed, or a particular class of the employees employed, in a single business; or
. . . at a particular workplace or workplaces;

There is no question about the splitting of classes. If there is a group of clerks in a business, they can enter into an agreement with the employer quite separate from that of truck drivers or anyone else, and there is no intention to split that class. That is a nonsense argument by the honourable member. We oppose the amendment, principally because it will inhibit agreements being reached in terms agreed by employers and employees at a particular workplace. It fails to acknowledge that distinctions exist between particular occupations such that there may be a desire of employees of a particular occupation to seek an agreement that is peculiar to their circumstances.

In relation to the single employee, I would have thought that the union movement, through the honourable member opposite, would recognise that, where one person is employed by a company or by a partnership, he or she ought to have the same sorts of rights as if 10 people were employed. All we are saying is that, in the situation of one person, he can have a contract. It is just absurd to say, with all those small businesses that employ just one person, that this system is about individual contracts. It is about the fact that individual businesses employ only one person; it is nothing to do with this individual contract nonsense.

If two people are involved, you need to have a collective agreement between two people, but if there is only one person there, surely you will not say that the legislation should eliminate that whole range of small businesses. And surely you are not saying that the relationship between an employer and one person, because it is a small business, is guaranteed to be corrupt and people are not prepared to sit down and negotiate fairly and reasonably. After all, if it is only one, if they want to register an agreement they still have to go to the commission with exactly the same set of rules as if 100 people are involved . So, there is protection for everyone.

But, so that everyone is clear as to what happens with one person, we thought it only right that the Government should spell that out in the legislation so that even members opposite would not be able to run around and say 'Here we have this individual agreement, contract, arrangement that was heralded in the Federal election, and here we have them again doing this.' It is a typical opportunity for fear, scaremongering, innuendo, lies and the whole range of tactics used by the Opposition.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The honourable member is the greatest misleader that I have known in this area. In Victoria individual contracts were specifically set up as part of their legislation. There are no individual contracts specifically set up in this legislation. It is purely and simply saying that, if a business happens to employ one person, it has as much right to enter into an agreement as it has to be covered by the award. As the member for Ross Smith would know, since there is a safety net in this system, if the agreement and safety net do not correspond, the commission has to ask whether there has been coercion, whether there is an agreement specifically between the two parties.

So, there is protection in our Bill that was not in the Victorian Bill. Do not mislead the community and do not attempt to put a furphy before this House, because it is very clear that we have put that in specifically to enable many small businesses to be part of a very important industrial relations initiative of this Government.

Amendment negatived.

The Committee divided on the clause.

AYES (27)

Andrew, K. A.	Armitage, M. H.
Ashenden, E. S.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A. (teller)
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Leggett, S. R.	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	

NOES (7)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	

PAIRS

Lewis, I. P.	Quirke, J. A.

Majority of 20 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Industrial authorities.'

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 8—
Line 7—Leave out 'Relations'.
Line 8—Leave out 'Relations'.

This amendment is basically consequential on arguments I have already put with respect to the establishment of the Industrial Court and Commission.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 7—'Establishment of the court.'

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 9, after line 4—Insert new clause as follows:
Continuation of the court

7. The Industrial Court of South Australia continues in existence.

This is a very important amendment, even though it appears quite small to the untutored eye. Members will note that the clause provides:

The Industrial Relations Court of South Australia is established.

However, my amendment provides:

The Industrial Court of South Australia continues in existence.

This is particularly important. It may seem small in so far as the number of words are concerned, but the principle is extremely important. My amendment, if carried, would provide for the continued existence of the Industrial Court of South Australia rather than the establishment of a new court. It will ensure, because of other amendments that I am proposing with respect to the transitional provisions within the Government's Bill, that the existing judicial office holders of the Industrial Court of South Australia remain in their current position and automatically transfer across to the new court once the Bill has been proclaimed.

There would then be no suggestion that any judicial office holder of the Industrial Court of South Australia could be sacked at the Government's pleasure. It would maintain the integrity and independence of the Industrial Court. It is a course that should be favoured by the Government, because it allows that certainty to be known, not only to members of the Industrial Court but, more particularly, to the thousands of citizens of South Australia who benefit or in some way are affected by decisions of the Industrial Court of South Australia. The amendment provides for the maintenance of the independence of the court and the smooth transition of the existing office holders; and it will prevent the possible emptying out of existing Industrial Court personnel and the appointment of new persons, which may create some speculation in the mind of the community that those who were not transferred over to the new court were out of favour with the Government of the day and that their replacements would be more favourably disposed to the Government of the day.

The amendment will remove that suggestion from the mind of citizens. It is a principle which I believe is fundamental—not one that can be casually dismissed but one which must be addressed and is best addressed in the form that I have outlined. If the Industrial Court personnel are not going to change upon the proclamation of this new Bill when it becomes an Act of Parliament, the Minister need only say so and indeed support my amendment. Whilst he continues not to say anything about that matter, community speculation will continue that the court will be stacked with friends of the Minister and those who have a similar political persuasion to him and the Government. I commend the amendment.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government opposes the amendment. We are introducing a totally new structure as far as the court is concerned, and the Government believes that the court should be established with the passing of this Bill. We understand the comments made by the member opposite. As I said in my second reading contribution last night, I find it absolutely incredible that there might be any suggestion that the integrity or independence of individuals of the court could be brought into question in any way by this Bill. It is the usual scuttlebutt by the Opposition, which is trying to put fear into all members of the existing court. This procedure is often included in legislation, particularly when there is a total rewrite. The Government proposes to continue with the process.

Amendment negatived.

Mr CLARKE: Will the Government appoint all existing judicial office holders of the Industrial Court of South Australia to the new court upon proclamation?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The transitional clauses explain clearly what the Government will do.

Mr CLARKE: Does the Minister know that the transitional provisions indicate that a judicial office holder will transfer to a similar judicial office under this new Act only at the Governor's pleasure? The Minister's answer begs the question, which he could answer now, of whether the current judicial office holders of the Industrial Court of South Australia will be transferred. It is no use referring back to the transitional provisions, because they do not tell us anything. They simply say that it may or may not be done, depending on the Government's disposition at the time. Before the Bill is debated in the other place, the community must be told whether the current judicial office holders will be transferred to their equivalent positions under this Bill when it becomes a new Act of Parliament.

It is not something that the Minister can lightly dismiss by referring to the schedule or transitional provisions because they simply provide that they may or may not be transferred, at the Governor's pleasure. That is not good enough when 300 000 workers and their families come under the State system. Public interest demands to know whether the principle of judicial independence and the integrity of the court will remain. The Minister can end speculation by answering now.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I find it good and encouraging that the member for Ross Smith can read the transitional clauses. It is my view that they are very clear.

The Committee divided on the clause:

AYES (28)

Andrew, K. A.	Armitage, M. H.
Ashenden, E. S.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A. (teller)
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Leggett, S. R.	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (7)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	

PAIRS

Lewis, I. P.	Quirke, J. A.

Majority of 21 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Jurisdiction to interpret awards and enterprise agreements.'

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 9, lines 15 to 17—Leave out subclause (2).

The subclause provides:

(2) In exercising its interpretive jurisdiction, the court should give effect as far as practicable to the intention of the parties to the relevant award or agreement as at the time the award or enterprise agreement was made.

In interpreting awards of the Industrial Commission in the past, the Industrial Court has sought to look at the intentions of the original award makers. That is not the only reason it might look at them, because the intention of the award makers might be quite clear. However, the consequences that flow from time to time might produce a very unjust result for the person who is complaining about a particular award or its interpretation before the Industrial Court.

There are plenty of legal precedents already on this matter with respect to the Industrial Court. In one sense, it is superfluous to put subclause (2) into a new Act and, in any event, it can do an injustice, because the intention might be very clear as to the parties but the court may find, for very good and substantial reasons, that the effect is very unjust and, for a variety of other reasons, it may find for the complainant, even though it may seem on the surface that it is against the intention of the parties who made the award or agreement. As I said earlier, the fact of the matter is that the Industrial Court, over many years, has drawn up a body of principles on this matter which are well established and which are well known in the industrial community. It has a continuity about it, from judgment to judgment. To put in subclause (2) in certain instances would probably produce an unjust result. It is best left for the courts to determine.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We oppose the amendment. We believe that, if two groups of individuals sit down, namely, employers and employees, clearly with the intent to enter into an agreement, that jurisdiction ought to be covered purely and simply by the court. We would have thought that the intention of those parties ought to be given particular effect by the court. That is the reason why it is there, and that is the reason why we oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—'Establishment of the commission.'

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 13, line 5—Leave out 'is established' and insert 'continues in existence'.

This clause is very simple. Again, my arguments are very similar to those with respect to the Industrial Court. Just because a new Act of Parliament comes into force does not mean that you cannot continue in force as a continuum the members of the commission in this case—in the previous case, the members of the Industrial Court—two comparable positions within the newly established Industrial Relations Commission that the Government is proposing to establish under this Bill.

My amendment provides for the independence and integrity of the Industrial Commission. For those members of the Parliament who are not familiar with the Industrial Commission, let me explain: it consists of some judicial office holders who are also members of the commission. The President and the Deputy President of the commission are also Deputy President and President of the Industrial Court and have judicial office, as well as holding a commission in the Industrial Commission. There are four lay industrial commissioners. They are not judicial office holders. Again, for the same reasons I advanced with respect to the Industrial Court, it is imperative that the community as a whole have confidence that the industrial commissioners who are currently members of the commission under the existing Act will continue, if they wish to continue, as commissioners under this new legislation.

Again, there is no point in the Minister's simply saying, 'Look at the transitional provisions.' The transitional provisions relate to the fact that commissioners may or may not, at the Government's pleasure, be transferred to their current positions in the new commission. They do not have a safety net such as judicial office holders, because the judicial office holders of the Industrial Court and Commission, if they are not transferred across to their respective positions in the new organisation, must be found a judicial office of similar status elsewhere in the system. The lay commissioners have no such safety net. They are not provided for in the transitional provisions, and we will deal with that matter in more detail later.

The Industrial Commission, as I pointed out in my speech yesterday, deals with some 300 000 employees and their families, including public servants and the private sector. It is involved with a myriad of State awards and industrial agreements. Their pay packet and their standard of living for them and their families are determined by those members of the Industrial Commission. As I said yesterday, the Industrial Commission is more relevant and more important for average wage and salary earners in this State than is the Supreme Court, because its orders and decisions affect the livelihood of so many citizens in this State. The decisions also have a significant impact on the Government of the day, because so many of the Government's own employees are covered by State awards, and agreements and decisions with respect to wage claims or allowances and the like have significant budgetary outcomes with respect to the Government of the day.

It is not reasonable to expect the ordinary citizen in the street to look at the Industrial Commission and ask, 'Will I get a fair go'—and I will ask the Minister this question later—'if the current commissioners and the judicial office holders are not transferred across to corresponding positions?' We should know that before this legislation is carried. That is very relevant to the 300 000 workers and their families in this State who rely on that State commission for their protection. The Minister is asking us to accept the old adage: 'Trust me.'

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Frankly, as far as the member for Mitchell is concerned, if I were the Minister for Labour and asking for this sort of *carte blanche* approach, I would think he was quite right in saying that he did not trust me. That is the whole point: I do not trust the Minister not to empty out members of the Industrial Commission and stack it with persons who are of his political persuasion or who will be tame cat commissioners, and that is the whole point. It traduces the integrity of that commission. I have appeared before the commission many times over almost 20 years. I have won and lost cases and I have had enormous growls with the commission.

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Yes, and as the Minister quite rightly points out, I was had up for contempt of the commission on two or perhaps three occasions, I am not sure. Notwithstanding the fact that I had strong views concerning those members of the commission who took decisions which I did not think were particularly flash or wise, nonetheless I respect the institution.

Mr Venning: Did you win?

Mr CLARKE: No, I didn't. The member for Mitchell thought he was being funny, but he touched on the nub of it because, unlike the Minister, notwithstanding the fact that I was had up for contempt on two or perhaps three occasions—I cannot remember which, but not too many over 20 years, although more than I probably should have been—I have respect for that institution. I have admiration and respect for the persons who comprise the commission. At various times, those persons have been appointed by Governments of different political persuasions, but I have never believed that their decisions have been based on anything other than the facts of the case as presented to them. From time to time, I have felt that they have not read the facts correctly and have come to a decision that I would not have come to, but that is just the ebb and flow of life.

If I were the Minister sitting on this Bill today I would ensure that the current members of the commission were reappointed—not this 'trust me' cry. I would make sure that it was mentioned in the Bill that they would be slotted across to their respective positions, because if some of those persons were not reappointed the average person in the street could rightly believe that the Minister had interfered with the commission, and whoever replaced that commissioner would never be respected. Even if they should deserve respect, they would not receive respect from the parties that appeared before them, because they would be seen purely as a play thing appointed by the Minister of the day to do his bidding in the commission.

The parties appearing before that commissioner or full bench would say, 'We will get no justice from this commission, because clearly the Minister has axed those he does not like or those whom his employer mates have told him to get rid of and appointed persons more sympathetic to the employer class.' That would be the end result. I am very distressed about this point, because I admire the commission. I have worked all my adult life with the Federal and State Industrial Relations Commissions, and I respect those institutions and the personnel who work within them and the processes that are followed. Because I have that respect and because unions, employers and the general community have that respect for these independent umpires, the industrial relations system within this State has been able to go forward. Disputes have been resolved because both sides (the employer and the union representatives) have been able to appear before the commission knowing that the commissioners or the judges in the Industrial Court deal with a matter without fear or favour. Occasionally, you must cop the rough with the smooth.

In this, that is absolutely vital. If you want to retain any vestige of respect for this body, you will review your view—and remember, Minister, you will need it one day. You may be riding high, but every dog has its day, and when there is a blue in your own work force and you have been caught by the private parts for all that it is worth and you are trying to worm or squirm your way out of it so as not to lose face, you will look for a member of the Industrial Commission to lead you out, to get you off the hook, to assist you. If you demean the commission, if you traduce it to the extent that employee and union representatives regard the commission as no more than a play thing of the Government, they will not go near it.

They will not accept recommendations from the commission, they will say that that group of persons in the commission has no credit, and they will battle it out on the field. As I say, Minister, you are riding high—enjoy it while you can; honeymoons do not last for ever. Remember my words, Minister, because when you are caught by the proverbials and looking for a way out, you will find yourself in all sorts of strife, and you will rue the day you reduced the standing of this commission in the eyes of the community.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Perhaps we ought to remind the member for Ross Smith how commissioners are currently appointed: they are recommended to the Governor by the Government of the day. All currently appointed commissioners have been recommended by the Labor Government to the Governor. I hope that the honourable member opposite is not suggesting that his colleagues were corrupt, misleading or not prepared to put people of integrity into those positions. I hope he is not saying that, because the clear inference from his statement is that the members of the commission, if not appointed, would obviously be seen as not being appointed because they did not have integrity. That was the clear inference of the honourable member opposite.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. In terms of trying to put words into my mouth, I am more than happy to stand by what I have said, but at no time did I say what is being imputed by the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will have an opportunity to take up this issue in debate. He still has questions on his amendment. It certainly is not a point of order but a dispute as to interpretation.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I respect and support the existing commissioners. They were appointed to their positions by the previous Labor Government via the Governor. I respect that. This legislation does not change that situation in any way whatsoever. The transitional clauses clearly spell out our view relating to the commissioners.

I would like to take up the point I made last night. Obviously, the member for Ross Smith did not understand the position of Equal Opportunity Commissioner, a person who is respected in this State and who, in many instances, occupies exactly the same role as the commissioners in the Industrial Court. The honourable member opposite is suggesting that, because they are appointed for a term, in essence they do not have any integrity, that the Equal Opportunity Commissioner half way through her term could decide that, because she may not be reappointed, she will suddenly bow to the wishes of the Government. I point out to the honourable member opposite that the current commissioner was appointed by both Liberal and Labor Governments. I hope that in no way whatsoever he is suggesting that. Each and every WorkCover review officer has been appointed for a term—I make the point again—by a Labor Government.

Is the honourable member opposite suggesting that, when review officers get towards the end of their term and employees come before them, all of a sudden they will take notice of the Government of the day or the employers involved and that it will not be fair and reasonable? I hope the honourable member is not attempting in any way to question the integrity of review officers appointed by a Labor Government. What about the position of the Chairman of the Remuneration Tribunal appointed on a term basis by the Labor Government? I hope there is no suggestion that Mr Dahlenberg's integrity may be questioned halfway through his appointment when he is looking at judges' or commissioners' salaries, or that the Government of the day may be able to influence him because he is in the second year of his four year appointment?

The member for Ross Smith is talking nonsense. I also refer to the Police Complaints Authority appointee involving a five year term. Surely the honourable member is not

suggesting that that officer's integrity would be questioned three or four years into the term of the appointment. What about the Federal Trade Practices Commissioner, who was appointed by another Labor Government and supported by a Liberal Government: is the honourable member suggesting that that person's integrity is questioned at any time?

Let us get down to the real human issues involving the appointments, for instance, of the Federal Sex Discrimination Commissioner and the Federal Human Rights Commissioner: all of these people are appointed on similar terms and with roles very similar to that of the existing commissioners in the Industrial Commission. I hope he is not suggesting that any Government, once those people have been appointed and taken the oath of office, could not only wish to but actually could question their integrity. Again, I find this to be part of the traditional scare campaign typical of members opposite. The Opposition is not interested in change and has a 'stay as we are attitude' which has caused the mess we have in this State. As part and parcel of the Bill, this Government will appoint commissioners to carry out the job that this measure requires them to do, and the transitional clauses clearly provide for the method in which that will be done.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (7)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	

NOES (27)

Andrew, K. A.	Armitage, M. H.
Ashenden, E. S.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Evans, I. F.
Greig, J. M.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A. (teller)
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Oswald, J. K. G.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	

PAIRS

Quirke, J. A.	Lewis, I. P.

Majority of 20 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 25 and 26 passed.

Clause 27—'Jurisdiction of the commission.'

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 12, after line 22—Insert paragraph as follows:

(ca) jurisdiction to hear and determine any question arising from or relating to an industrial matter; and

This is a very important amendment. It deals with the jurisdiction of the commission and sets out what the commission has power to do in relation to employees. The jurisdiction of the commission as identified in clause 27 is narrower, and I would argue significantly narrower, than the definitions contained in the existing legislation, in particular, clauses 25 and 28 of the existing Act. We believe that our concerns can be considerably alleviated by the inclusion of our amendment, which enables the commission to hear and determine any question arising from or relating to an industrial matter. Anyone who has not practised in the Industrial Commission may not be aware of the significance of that wording. It expands the commissions's range of activities, in terms of determining the rights and obligations between employers and employees.

Regrettably, as a result of the passage of clause 4, we have the Government's definition of 'industrial matter'. What 'industrial matter' means is anyone's guess, because for the first time an industrial matter can be affected by regulation by the Minister of the day. That does not appear in the existing legislation. The amazing part about this is that an industrial matter dealing with a basic issue such as wages can be affected. If the Minister, by regulation, says that wages cannot be dealt with, they are no longer an industrial matter; that is it. One could be half-way through a case in the commission on a matter affecting penalty rates or some new form of technology, and one of the Minister's mates gets hold of him and says that he does not want an award on this matter: the Minister can delete it as an industrial matter by regulation; it cannot be dealt with. In any event, what it does provide—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: No, I do not have a vivid imagination. I have practised in this field long enough to know what sort of skulduggery advocates for employers get up to, including representatives of the Retail Traders Association. Unfortunately, this definition does not overcome the Minister's dictatorial powers at whim to exclude by regulation what is an industrial matter, but it does provide a broader interpretation. It refers to determining any question arising from or relating to an industrial matter to encapsulate as broad a range of activities between employers and employees as is conceivable at this stage. It also gives the commission power.

What we have to take into account is that the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission has been steadily expanded over time—it has been evolutionary. This has occurred in some cases as a result of the fact that the Industrial Court—upheld by Full Supreme Court and High Court decisions—has said that certain matters are industrial matters and capable of being dealt with by the Industrial Commission. Not that long ago, for example, the issue of superannuation would not have been capable of being dealt with by the Federal or, indeed, State commission; it was not deemed to be an industrial matter.

Since 1986, 1987, or thereabouts, as a result of the High Court decision, the High Court justices have expanded their view of the world in line with changing practices that occur in industry and what is really at the heart of employer and employee relationships. They are not dealing with a narrow confine of matters: this covers a broad range of matters that impinge on employer/employee relationships.

The Opposition's amendment allows that to continue, whereas the jurisdiction of the commission as set out in the clause is deliberate. I do not believe what the Minister is likely to say: that this is just rehashing in clearer English the jurisdiction of the commission under the existing legislation. He has his marching orders from the employer organisations. I know what their marching orders are in relation to this matter because I have had them complain to me often enough on various matters and about wanting to narrow the field of what the Industrial Commission can deal with in terms of setting awards and agreements. Notwithstanding that, the world marches on, but they want to go back further and further into the last century.

The Opposition's amendments will at least seek to maintain the position to which employers and employees have become accustomed in South Australia with respect to

the range of the commissions's powers to regulate the affairs of employers and employees. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government opposes the amendment for the simple reason that, if the honourable member happened to read the definition of 'industrial dispute', he would understand the situation. I will say it again so that he understands it. 'Industrial dispute' means:

a dispute or a threatened, pending or probable dispute about an industrial matter.

The honourable member is moving an amendment suggesting that we have to cover industrial matters. If he were to look at the Bill he would see that the jurisdiction is such as to include the resolving of industrial disputes. The definition he is attempting to insert is already covered by the existing definitions and by the Bill. It is a pity that the honourable member has not read some of the definitions. If he had he would have seen quite clearly that the clause as printed and the amendment he is moving will achieve one and the same thing.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (7)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	

NOES (26)

Andrew, K. A.	Armitage, M. H.
Ashenden, E. S.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Evans, I. F.
Greig, J. M.	Hall, J. L.
Ingerson, G. A. (teller)	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Leggett, S. R.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Rosenberg, L. F.	Rossi, J. P.
Scalzi, G.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Wade, D. E.

PAIRS

Quirke, J. A.	Lewis, I. P.

Majority of 19 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr CLARKE: From the Minister's explanation during debate on the amendment do I take it that the intention of the Government is that the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission is no greater and no less than that which the commission currently enjoys?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Because the definition of 'demarcation dispute' has been removed, obviously the jurisdiction is less. As I said to the honourable member earlier, we will consider the situation before the Bill is debated in the other place, but in all other senses it is the same.

Clause passed.

Clauses 28 and 29 passed.

Clause 30—'The President.'

Mr CLARKE: I move:

Page 14, lines 4 to 7—Leave out subclauses (1) and (2) and insert—

(1) The President of the court is the President of the commission.

In this matter the Opposition is seeking to afford economies of scale. My amendment combines the office of President of both the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission, whereby the one person holds both offices. That system has operated in South Australia for many years, and it applies likewise to the Deputy Presidents of the commission. The President of the court and commission here in South Australia has expressed no views either to me or, as far as I am aware, publicly that he is unable to carry out both tasks. I am not aware of any complaints from any registered association or employer organisation that there is a need for two Presidents to handle the work that one does quite effectively.

I would have thought that the last thing this Government, which is allegedly committed to smaller government, to reducing the cost to the taxpayers of the public purse and to trying to reduce the numbers in the public sector, would want to do is have a separate President in the Industrial Court and in the Industrial Commission, each with the status of a Supreme Court judge, which includes all their remuneration and other benefits—a considerable sum of money at a time when Ministers in this House daily give responses to questions from the Opposition about the need to economise and the like.

Here is a classic opportunity to keep the monetary savings that we have enjoyed in this State over many years by having one person do both jobs. The current President has been in office for some time. From my personal experience of appearing before him, he seems to thrive on the work. He has demonstrated that he is certainly more than capable of doing the job, and if he were not to be the President I have no doubt that his successor would be able to do both jobs rather than having to create two. I will correct my last statement: the Bill does not say we must create two; it creates the possibility of there being two.

I could understand it if the President of the court was saying, 'This workload is getting too much for me and perhaps you could relieve some of my burden of office.' I am not aware that that is the case. As a regular practitioner in the Industrial Commission I was not aware that there were any complaints from the parties appearing before the court and commission that there were such gross inefficiencies that matters were not being dealt with. We could all do things faster, if we would like to, but I thought that members opposite believed in small government.

If you leave the possibility of opening it up for a separate President of the court and the commission, it would involve significant costs. If that is the case, the Minister should say so now, because this Parliament will be voting on a provision that allows the Minister to fill a position with all the concurrent costs. We are probably talking, in terms of salaries, car, superannuation and all the expenses of an associate, separate office accommodation and the like, in excess of $200 000. There would not be a member here who would not like that $200 000 to be spent on a school in his or her electorate or on a nursing home or some other community project.

I suspect that this is a device to add someone to the Industrial Court or commission who meets the Minister's pleasure; basically to put in someone who may be more in tune with the Minister's own views on the world. That is what I suspect, because there is no point in doing it when the current President and the President before him have held joint office for so many years without complaint. If there is more work to be done, such as in the Industrial Commission with awards and agreements, you do not appoint persons with the equivalent standing of Supreme Court justices to do much of the unfair dismissal work and things of this nature; you appoint lay commissioners to those jobs. They are cheaper.

You do not waste the time of a talented legal person in a very senior position, with the same status as a Supreme Court judge, to handle what in many cases is work which, if it were in the civil jurisdiction, would be handled by stipendiary magistrates. You would not appoint another justice of the Supreme Court to handle the work of a stipendiary magistrate; you would appoint another stipendiary magistrate. So, the rationale is all in favour of the Opposition's amendment and, if the President of the court and commission believes that the workload is too much, the current Minister or a future Minister can always come back to the Parliament to seek to amend the legislation to provide specifically for that additional position, with full costings and with full justification as to why that extra person is needed.

What members opposite will do if they pass this is give the Government *carte blanche* to appoint another person of Supreme Court justice status with all the associated costs.

If that occurs, members opposite should not whinge to me or to the Opposition about the lack of funds to do community good in their electorate, because they will have been profligate just by carrying this Bill and the costs associated with it.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We oppose the amendment for two very fundamental reasons. First, there is no suggestion in the Bill that we have to appoint two people—it simply provides that option. I would have thought that, with all the honourable member's talent, he might have the opportunity to be appointed President of the commission because, under our Bill, the President does not have to have a legal qualification . In other words, we are saying that the President does not have to be a lawyer, and we think that is a very important issue. If the commissioners do not have to be lawyers, why should the President? We believe those options ought to be available. This legislation is set up to give options, and that is the way the Government believes it should be. We oppose the amendment. Amendment negatived.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (RECOVERY OF TAXES AND SUBSTANTIVE LAW) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 19 April at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 April 1994

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

64. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQN-113 attending to on Monday 14 February 1994 at approximately 5.30 p.m. when observed driving along Coromandel Parade and Murray Hill Road, Coromandel Valley in a reckless manner including overtaking on a road marked with a single unbroken line, sounding the horn at cars whilst overtaking, tailgating, speeding and overtaking on corners?

2. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

3. Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30 being observed by the driver of this vehicle and, if not, why not and what action does the Government propose to take?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:

1 and 2. The Government vehicle with registration number VQN-113 is assigned to an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who is responsible for the controlling and monitoring of water operations within a defined district. At 5.30 pm on Monday 14 February, the officer was travelling to Aberfoyle Park to commence a series of operations to augment the normal water supply to the Belair and Blackwood area. The car horn was sounded during an overtaking manoeuvre on this journey and was being used as a warning to a car approaching a 'T' junction on the terminating leg of the junction to prevent a potentially dangerous situation from occurring. The manoeuvre was carried out safely without the vehicle crossing barrier lines.

3. The vehicle is assigned to the officer in accordance with the Government Management Board Circular 90/30 due to the mobile nature of the work and the requirement to be available after hours.

MILK BOTTLES

74. **Mr BECKER:** Are the guidelines concerning the sale and recycling of plastic milk bottles being followed and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Two litre plastic milk containers were introduced onto the market in December 1993. In negotiations with the then Government a number of undertakings were made by the milk industry to ensure that a satisfactory means was available for the recovery and reprocessing of the high density polyethylene plastic (HDPE).

Dairy Vale Co-operative Limited and National Dairies (SA) Ltd proposed through a joint venture agreement to contribute funds to be spent in implementing a plan for the collection and recycling of plastic milk bottles and its promotion. A commitment over a period of three years for funding of $400,000 was given. Budgeted expenditure of $250,000 was allowed for in the first year.

An undertaking was made to purchase post-consumer HDPE milk bottles at a price of up to $400 per tonne in Adelaide for baled material meeting a specification. Since the introduction of the plastic milk containers, considerable progress has been made in implementing a collection network.

The kerbside recycling system remains the preferred method of collection and 15 councils are currently collecting the containers. However as an interim step, arrangements are being put into place for the establishment of collection depots. These include recycling depots, council depots, community groups and schools. Some difficulties did emerge in negotiations between the dairy industry and the recycling depots (Recyclers of SA) with regard to handling fees, however it is understood that this issue has now been resolved and that a broader network can be anticipated.

One baler has been made available to local government to assist in handling the material and a further two bailers are on order. Through the Beverage Industry Recycling Fund, support has been given to industry training, promotion programs and the supply of equipment to local government to assist with kerbside collection. At this stage, I am satisfied that the industry is meeting its commitment.

GRAVES

80. **Mr ATKINSON:** What is the policy on meeting the increased demand for graves in Metropolitan Adelaide, and will re-use of graves be permitted?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: In South Australia local councils are responsible under the Local Government Act 1934 for ensuring that adequate provisions are made for the burial of people who die in their areas. Cemetery and crematoria facilities, however, are owned and managed by State and Local Government authorities, religious denominations and private interests. Responsibility for planning and development of new facilities is not clearly defined within this system, and from an overall State perspective the Government is interested in ensuring that there is a coordinated approach to these issues so that future demand for burial spaces can be met.

The Government is working with local government to better define the responsibilities of each sphere of Government, and State and Local Government officers have been asked to work towards the development of an agreed position on future arrangements for cemetery planning and management by the end of June this year. The Local Government Association is currently consulting metropolitan councils about a range of options proposed in order to improve the current situation, and this will be the subject of negotiation in the near future. Any proposals for putting new arrangements in place will then be the subject of consultation with industry and community groups before a final position is determined.

With respect to grave re-use, it is already possible to re-use graves, and this has been the case and practice for some time. The major cemetery authorities such as Centennial Park and Enfield General Cemetery at their Cheltenham Cemetery site currently re-use graves. Such cemetery authorities often facilitate requests by families for additional burials in their leased grave sites and for renewal of their leases in order to allow for additional burials in the future. At the Cheltenham Cemetery if leases have expired and no relatives can be found to effect renewal then the graves are re-leased and re-used.

While I have no reason to doubt that cemetery authorities within this State act responsibly and sensitively in relation to grave re-use and that the system is operating reasonably well at present, this Government is concerned that there is no statutory minimum period for the issue of leases or any guaranteed rights of renewal for leaseholders. One option which will be considered by the Government is the provision in statute of a minimum 25 year lease period, an automatic right of renewal for specified periods after this and conditions relating to grave re-use which will protect the rights of individuals.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

84. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Which areas of land at Adelaide Railway Station have been tested for soil contamination and what were the findings?

2. Were asbestos brake linings buried in the railway yards near the Torrens River and, if so, why and when?

3. To what extent is the area considered contaminated and at what estimated cost can the site be cleared?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. The State Transport Authority (STA) has advised that the area of the Adelaide Railway Station yard which has been tested for soil contamination comprises 3.36 hectares and is bounded by the Torrens River reserve to the north, Montefiore Road to the east and the railway tracks to the south. It is also uniquely identified as allotment 101 of Deposited Plan 33772. The tests revealed that some contamination existed which is detailed below.

The STA has not been the sole occupant of the Adelaide railway yards. The South Australian Railways occupied the site until the formation of the STA in 1974 and from 1978 it was jointly used by Australian National (AN) and the STA until AN's withdrawal to Keswick in 1983.

AN utilised the northern side of the site in the North Car Shed, which has since been demolished, for the servicing of Bluebird Railcars between approximately 1980 and 1983. During this time the STA serviced its railcars on the southern side of the site whilst undertaking the construction of the Adelaide Railcar Depot.

2. Since 1988 there has been no asbestos content in composition brake blocks used by the STA. It has always been the practice of the STA to dispose of its brake blocks through the provision of contracted waste bin services. The STA is not aware of brake blocks being buried in the Adelaide railway yards.

3. This 3.36 hectare site is considered to contain contamination which is above recommended levels.

These soil contaminants comprise:

a. polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH's) which are believed to occur due to the remains of a former bitumen surface and burnt fossil fuels;
b. arsenic (As) associated with a former weedicide;
c. lead (Pb) believed to arise from a former battery store.

To render the land safe for parkland purposes the South Australian Health Commission has indicated that a minimum surface topping of 300mm of clean fill will be adequate for most of the site and a 450mm topping for the balance. Costings for the remedial work have not been undertaken.

WARBURTON MEDIA MONITORING

89. **Mr ATKINSON:** What was the cost of orders from the Minister to Warburton Media Monitoring on 14 March 1994 for transcripts of three items on ABC Radio, in what capacity did the Minister order these transcripts, how do they relate to any of his duties and will the Minister repay the cost?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Neither myself, nor any of my ministerial office or electorate office staff ordered any transcripts from Warburton Media Monitoring on 14 March 1994. Furthermore, my office does not have an account with Warburton Media Monitoring. Also, to my knowledge, the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education did not order any transcripts on my behalf from Warburton Media Monitoring on that date.