

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

**Second Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament
(1994)**

Parliament, which adjourned on 18 May, was prorogued by proclamation dated 16 June. By proclamation dated 16 June, it was summoned to meet on Tuesday 2 August, and the second session began on that date.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 August 1994

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. G.M. Gunn) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.14 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of Her Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.43 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

PLUNKETT, MR K.H., DEATH

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr K.H. Plunkett, a former member of this House for the seat of Peake, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the House be suspended until 2.30 p.m.

I am one of those members who had the honour to know Keith Plunkett. When he was here, Keith would have been regarded by most, if not all, members of the House as a friend. He was what I would describe as a true salt-of-the-earth Australian, a shearer, a realistic person who cared about people and who worked very hard for his electorate. I certainly recall with fond memories the speeches Keith gave in this House. They were very down to earth, and they dealt with the real issues affecting people. I also recall the very cheery and happy smile from Keith if you ever met him either in the corridors of the Parliament or outside the Parliament altogether.

Keith was one of those people who tried to bring happiness wherever he went, and he effectively did that. He was elected the member for Peake in 1979 and served in this House for approximately 10 years before he retired. He was born a Victorian back in the 1920s and became a member of

the union movement and a shearer. Of course, as a shearer, he was a member of the Australian Workers Union and eventually became a union organiser in the 1960s. He was elected President of the union in 1976 and held that position until 1979, when he won the preselection for Peake and was elected as a member of Parliament.

Keith was a member of the Public Works Standing Committee during the three-year period that I was Minister for Public Works. I have very fond memories of all the members of that committee. Keith Russack was the chairman of the committee and all the members worked very effectively in ensuring that, as a committee, they protected the interests of the people of South Australia. We have just re-established that committee and I am sure that the new chairman and members will learn a lot from the way Keith Russack, Keith Plunkett and others served on that committee and the role that they played, because I thought it was a very constructive role.

I can recall having had a number of discussions with Keith about particular matters that came up during the hearings of the committee. Keith wanted to ensure that the taxpayers' dollar was being protected and that, at the same time, the best was being done for the community, whatever public work was being constructed.

As I said, Keith was a colourful character and one whom we all enjoyed in this House. I enjoyed his interjections across the Chamber, but equally I loved having Keith on his feet and throwing the occasional interjection across to him. He always came back with an earthy reply. He died all too soon, at the age of 67. Of course, particular condolences go to his wife Betty, to his children, Linda, Sue and John, and to his grandchildren. They should all be proud of the role that their father and grandfather played here in the Parliament of South Australia and also for the broader South Australian community.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): I second the motion moved by the Premier and in doing so indicate my own very personal strong feelings and those of my Party on the passing of Keith Plunkett, because Keith had been a great friend to all of us and a great supporter of us

individually and collectively as a Party in this Parliament and as part of the Labor movement in this State.

Keith Plunkett was born on Christmas Eve 1926. As the Premier said, sadly his life finished too soon, when he died on 10 June this year. He had not been in good health for some time and, for those of us who had the privilege and pleasure of seeing Keith after he left Parliament, it was very sad indeed to see that his health had not held up well and that he had many health problems.

Keith Plunkett had a long and distinguished career in the union movement and the Parliament, and the Premier detailed some of that history just a few movements ago. Right from the very first moment of taking up work in the shearing industry, he realised the great importance of those involved in the industry working together to look after their own interests. His involvement in union type activities took place right from those earliest days. He was no reluctant contributor to the union movement but, rather, an enthusiastic contributor, because he recognised the great importance of the union movement to the lives of working people in this State.

In those earliest days he took up positions of shed representative in the shearing industry. He was then a supporter of the establishment of the local committee system and he held positions in that system as well, particularly in Broken Hill and Wentworth. His natural skills within those arenas soon became evident and he was selected by his colleagues within the Australian Workers Union to serve from 1969 in the position of organiser in the South Australian Branch. He cherished this appointment, for it had been a quiet goal of his. However, his achievement in that position was to see that goal being exceeded.

He was appointed in 1975 as the branch president of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Workers Union. As has been mentioned, in 1979 he was elected to this place. In fact, he and I were in the 1979 group elected to this Parliament, so I guess I had a particular affinity with him in that regard. I certainly appreciated his earlier support for my preselection and his speaking up on behalf of my candidacy within his own union. As I said, we entered this place together and we had a camaraderie—one that involved all members of the class of 1979. We went through the travails and successes together.

Keith brought a particularly strong, emotive and heart-felt contribution to this place. It was a contribution based upon the problems of people in our community about which he wanted to speak; he wanted to be their voice in this Parliament and I believe he did that with particular skill.

I know that Keith's contributions in this House are known to all members. However, I can tell all members that, likewise, he was a significant contributor in the Party fora, particularly in the Labor Party caucus room, where time and again he would remind us of many of the important issues and principles upon which our decisions had to be based. He could do that in a very real, human way by linking them to real life experiences—his own, those of people he knew and those of others about whom he had heard through his contacts in industry.

He was, as the Premier mentioned, born in Hamilton. We noted on many occasions the number of experiences he could relate from not only his childhood but also his young adulthood in the Hamilton area—an area that he revisited many times during his life.

He was a member of the parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee, as has been mentioned by the Premier, serving as its chair. I feel particularly pleased to have known

Keith Plunkett in that capacity, having also worked for Reg Groth, the former chair of that committee. I was able to share vicariously some of the experiences that Keith Plunkett and Reg Groth had shared. Keith's support for me personally was consistent, and I very much appreciated that. However, more importantly, his friendship was something that I strongly appreciated and I could always enjoy good company with him. He was not large in stature, but he was a fighter—a fighter for the things he believed in. Sometimes that burning energy and zeal for the things he believed in would actually take him into more physical expressions of fighting, and there were occasions in his career when he was not to be deterred by the size of his opponents. I understand that the size of his opponents did not defeat him either. However, it all came from the same strong heart, which was very large.

Keith died as a result of health problems, as I said. A few hours before his death he spoke with his very good, lifelong friend, Jack Wright, who related at his funeral the last message of Keith Plunkett. That message was: 'Don't smoke.' Keith's health problems came from smoking, and he knew and regretted that, because it took away years of his life, years of opportunity in which to enjoy his retirement with his wife, children and grandchildren. He left that message to those who were present at his funeral, and I think it is appropriate that that message be conveyed here today so that it can be heard further.

In the obituary that was published by his union (the Australian Workers Union) one paragraph I believe in many ways sums up Keith Plunkett, as follows:

For all the success this man enjoyed, he remained totally working class, and one of his very last requests was to be remembered as a shearer. The one thing that is certain is that Australia is a better place for Keith Plunkett having been a part of it.

On behalf of my colleagues and on my own behalf, I join with the Premier in conveying our sincerest condolences to his wife Betty, his daughters Susan and Lin, his son John, his eight grandchildren and the many relatives of the Plunkett family.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I, too, wish to join in the expressions of sympathy. I shared this Parliament with Keith for six years. To me, he was an honourable and caring man, a person who could keep a confidence, and one who shared in the good and bad times with all members of Parliament irrespective from which side of the House they came.

It is interesting to reflect on people's lives, and I suppose that Keith actually taught me a good lesson. When I first joined the Parliament and we were debating a particular matter across the floor—I cannot remember what the motion or the debate was about—Keith made a comment, and I made a rejoinder along the lines, 'That wasn't expressed in particularly good English.' Keith came back at me. I reflected on the matter afterwards and apologised to Keith saying, 'Look, I was picking up a point at the time.'

Keith spoke as he thought—directly. He did not necessarily put together his words in the way in which I would have put them together, but he was very effective. The great thing that I liked about Keith was that, if there was a fight to be had, he was in it. Members on this side quite often copped the wrath of Keith on a number of occasions when he was fighting for his beliefs. The one time that we always knew Keith would have a go was when we attacked the trade union movement. My colleagues who did that on the odd occasion would be assured that Keith would join the fray.

I respected the man, mainly because he fought for what he believed in. He did not stop, he did not fall back; he went straight at the issues. He expressed himself succinctly, and did not waste the time of the Parliament by making long speeches; he simply put a very strong point of view and, for that, his contributions were more than welcome.

Keith was a shearer, and I guess he had a pretty rough and tough life, which was reflected in the way he approached certain aspects of his parliamentary duties. Again, outside the Chamber, Keith was a person for whom I had a great deal of time; a person who offered true friendship, who was always asking, 'How's your wife and family?' or about aspects of life away from politics, which was quite rare when I joined the Parliament.

He was a very caring and very genuine person, and I remember him for some of the interesting times we had when we were debating issues and also for the warmth and friendship that he gave to me and to colleagues on my side of the House, as well as the very strong friendships that he enjoyed on his side of the House. To Betty and family I join in expressing my condolences in their sad loss.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I was keen to rise to support this motion. I was introduced to Keith Plunkett by his great friend Jack Wright and by Mick Young shortly after I arrived in Australia from New Zealand in 1977. At that stage he was a union official with the AWU and got to know me because I lived for a time in Thebarton as a candidate and then member of Parliament and eventually, of course, as a colleague and his deputy on the Public Works Standing Committee. Keith was one of the great and colourful characters of this Parliament. He was one of the old school of union officials who told it as it was, who said things in plain speaking, and who was also one of the great characters of the Labor movement generally. He was a decent, kind man and a very strong person who cared deeply about people, particularly caring about workers, their problems and their opportunities.

He had a very deep commitment to the union movement and to the Labor movement throughout his life. There was nothing fake or phoney about Keith Plunkett: what you saw was what you got. It is true that Keith was often celebrated for his famous anger in the Parliament, but we must always remember what he was angry about: he was angry about injustice, falsehood and double talk, and angry when working people were put down or taken for granted. During the four years that I was his deputy on the Public Works Standing Committee we got to travel around the State with Ted Chapman, Murray Hill and other great characters. Keith would entertain us late into the night, telling us stories of his very rich past as a shearer and union official when, as the Leader of the Opposition said, he literally had to fight sometimes with his hands against injustice and for a fair go for working people.

He also represented this Parliament in a distinguished way at the CPA conference in London and later on a tour of China. He will be remembered—as he wanted to be remembered—as a shearer; as a union and Labor person; as a good bloke; and as a committed family man. Certainly, health problems stalked him during his period in Parliament, particularly during the last couple of years when he was Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, with emphysema and asthma. All of us hoped that in retirement and without the stresses of this place Keith would recover and enjoy a full retirement. So, my deepest sympathy goes to

Betty, Linda, Sue, John and the entire family. He will be remembered here.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I would also like to pay tribute to the late Keith Plunkett. As has been stated, he was member for Peake between 1979 and 1989, having come up through the ranks as a shearer, a trade union official and then into this place. He was a proud and faithful representative of the working classes and a very friendly person, as has been noted: very polite and compassionate with a real sense of justice and great sense of humour.

I well remember accompanying Keith, together with certain members opposite and former members of this House and the other place, on many parliamentary bowling carnival trips interstate. I had a very enjoyable time playing on the bowling greens with him.

As has been mentioned, Keith's funeral was very moving. I feel privileged to have known Keith and to have served with him in this place for four years, and with other members I extend my condolences to Betty and her family.

The SPEAKER: I ask members to support the motion by standing in their places in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 1.3 to 2.30 p.m.]

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from Her Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where Her Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

BLOOD ALCOHOL CONTENT

A petition signed by 27 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to set a blood alcohol level of zero for all South Australian drivers was presented by the Hon. J.W. Olsen.

Petition received.

WOODSIDE AMBULANCE

A petition signed by 2 654 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to diminish services provided by the Woodside St John Ambulance Service was presented by the Hon. J.W. Olsen.

Petition received.

MYLOR PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 338 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure that Mylor Primary School remains open and retains present staffing levels was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

STATE BANK

A petition signed by 225 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ask the

State Bank to reconsider the closure of its North Croydon Branch was presented by Mr Atkinson.

Petition received.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A petition signed by 51 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reintroduce capital punishment was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

BUS STOP 20

A petition signed by 77 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reinstate bus stop 20 on Valetta Road, Kidman Park was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

FILM AND VIDEO CENTRE

A petition signed by 44 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the South Australian Film and Video Centre was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER LEGISLATION

A petition signed by 25 380 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to extend the beverage container legislation was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

CHILD CARE

A petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to investigate the provision of child-care facilities at Hamilton senior campus was presented by Mr Caudell.

Petition received.

AUDIT COMMISSION

A petition signed by 212 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to implement the Audit Commission report recommendations on education was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

PORT LINCOLN PRISON

A petition signed by 2 482 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the Port Lincoln Prison was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

PAROLE

A petition signed by 3 675 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review the conditions of parole for convicted sexual offenders was presented by the Hon. M.D. Rann.

Petition received.

TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 930 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow extended retail trading hours was presented by Mrs Rosenberg.

Petition received.

SEAFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 347 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to cut education funding at Seaford Primary School was presented by Mrs Rosenberg.

Petition received.

EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by 643 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to cut education funding was presented by Mrs Rosenberg.

Petition received.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many audible interjections. Members are not starting off the session very well. I do not want to have to apply the Standing Orders rigidly on the first day.

COMMONWEALTH-STATE RELATIONS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I wish to inform the House of a number of recent and ongoing developments in relation to South Australia and the Commonwealth Government. Members will be aware that the Premiers and Chief Ministers met in Sydney last Friday. Earlier last week I had a two hour meeting with the Prime Minister. At both of these meetings I raised a number of issues about which I believe the House should be immediately informed.

As essential background to this statement, the House should recognise the commitment of the Premiers and Chief Ministers to rebuilding an effective Australian Federation by the year 2001. This is a bipartisan commitment of far-reaching importance. It is based on the concept of 'competitive Federalism'. This means each of the States and Territories having sufficient power and financial resources so that they can apply their regional, economic, social and other advantages to the advancement of the Australian nation.

It recognises and values regional differences within a strong federated nation. The adoption of this concept by the States and Territories underlies their determination to play a full part in the reform process to produce better services for our citizens and to improve the competitiveness of our regional and national economies.

However, the States and Territories cannot achieve this alone. The Commonwealth must recognise that the way in which it is exercising some of its powers is undermining Australia's ability to be competitive in a world region of rapidly growing economies. The Commonwealth's unwillingness to address the cost of the overlap and duplication of State and Commonwealth administrations and to clarify its national role is also burdening the national economy with unnecessary overheads. The Commonwealth has dealt with

this inefficiency in public sector arrangements by reducing funds to the States and Territories, which deliver the bulk of services to Australians.

I illustrate these points by listing for the information of the House the following issues I raised last week with the Prime Minister and the other Premiers and the Chief Ministers. First, I refer to State planning and Commonwealth Aboriginal heritage powers. The meeting of Premiers and Chief Ministers agreed with me that present arrangements were in need of improvement. The Hindmarsh Island bridge debacle has highlighted the need for change, and the Premiers and Chief Ministers agreed to support a review of this area.

The Prime Minister also recognised in his discussions with me that we have to find ways to avoid a repeat of the situation in which the Commonwealth can intervene in a development that has already been open to full public scrutiny under State laws for a very long period. To further this process, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Dr Michael Armitage) and I will be meeting South Australian Aboriginal community leaders next week.

I now refer to native title. On 21 April I advised the House that the South Australian Government would retain the option of challenging, in whole or in part, the Native Title Act with a view to seeking the agreement of the Federal Government to amendments to make the legislation workable and less complex. South Australia proposed to the Commonwealth a series of amendments to deal with providing certainty, making the Native Title Act more workable, removing unreasonable restrictions on the powers of our State, removing impediments to the economic development of our State, and removing uncertainty relating to responsibility for compensation payments to South Australia.

I now advise the House that the Commonwealth has informed the State Government that it is unwilling to reconsider those aspects of the Native Title Act which are of concern to this State, except as part of a review of the legislation after it has been in operation for some time. As a result, the South Australian Government will intervene in legal proceedings in the High Court to have sections of the Native Title Act declared invalid.

In announcing this decision, I make clear that South Australia is not mounting a constitutional challenge to the very existence of the Native Title Act. On the contrary, the Government accepts that it is within the Commonwealth's power to recognise and protect native title under Commonwealth law. South Australia's intervention will focus on several important constitutional points directed at the power of the Commonwealth to interfere with our State's ability to manage our own affairs in the manner that the Constitution clearly intends.

I also wish to make it quite clear that the Government's decision to take issue with the Commonwealth on aspects of the Native Title Act is in no way intended as an attack on the rights of Aboriginal Australians. The Government has consulted with representatives of the Aboriginal people and will continue to do so. The dialogue with them has been very constructive. The Government remains committed to achieving a result which represents their interests and those of all South Australians. In this matter, the Commonwealth has used its powers in a manner not previously seen. If the Commonwealth can use its powers in this way, it will have established a precedent upon which it will no doubt call on future occasions and in other contexts.

In taking this course of action, the Government has received eminent legal advice that, if South Australia's

intervention was successful, there would be a significant impact on the working of the Native Title Act such that the Commonwealth would be obliged to return the legislation to the Federal Parliament for amendment. Our challenge does not attempt to overturn the native title legislation. South Australia's objective is to get the Federal legislation amended and we are taking the High Court route now only because of the Commonwealth's inflexibility and refusal to negotiate.

I refer now to the Lake Eyre world heritage listing. As well as the native title legislation, the proposal by the Commonwealth for world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre region is also causing great economic uncertainty to the detriment of South Australia. The other Premiers and Chief Ministers have accepted my view that the Commonwealth's determination to proceed with assessment of the Lake Eyre Basin for world heritage listing is contrary to the Inter-governmental Agreement on the Environment. I have urged the Prime Minister to pursue other options which can result in real environmental outcomes for the region through a responsible exercise of existing State powers to protect the environment. Mr Keating assured me that the Commonwealth would not take action in regard to world heritage listing of Lake Eyre without full consideration of the economic impact on South Australia and only following full and detailed discussions with the State Government. However, this gives no comfort to me or to those who could be adversely affected.

Regarding the Hilmer report, the introduction of a national competition policy recommended in this report is to be discussed in full at the next meeting of heads of Government in Darwin on 19 August. South Australia strongly supports micro-economic reform and is vigorously pursuing this in its own right. I have made it clear to the Commonwealth that South Australia will participate in the proposed national competition scheme only if a number of concerns are addressed fully by the Commonwealth.

I refer now to Commonwealth-State financial relations. In a ministerial statement to this House in February before I attended my first heads of Government meeting, I said that a pre-condition for South Australia's participation in a national competition policy was the Commonwealth's willingness to participate in a genuinely cooperative way to achieve real progress in reforming Commonwealth-State financial relations. There are two basic issues. The States and Territories are seeking a guaranteed share of the tax revenue which the Commonwealth Government collects on behalf of all Australians. They are also seeking a reduction in the incidence of tied Commonwealth grants. South Australia will seek to raise this matter at the next heads of Government meeting in Darwin.

Our position is that a guaranteed share of tax revenue must be offered by the Commonwealth and that by the year 2001 we should seek to achieve a limit of 30 per cent, the proportion of total Commonwealth funding to the States which is tied grants. Currently, more than 50 per cent of our Commonwealth grants are tied, which leads to massive inefficiency and duplication in the delivery of services.

The House should also note four other matters raised in my discussions with the Prime Minister. In relation to drought relief the Prime Minister undertook to include, in a review of current arrangements, the scope for declaring a specific area instead of a whole State for drought relief purposes.

I emphasised to the Prime Minister my Government's determination to have the runway at Adelaide Airport extended, and it was agreed that such an extension should

proceed before any final decision on whether or not to privatise the airport. I also raised with Mr Keating the need for Commonwealth support for the proposed tioxide plant at Whyalla and for the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. The Prime Minister said that the Commonwealth would consider appropriate forms of assistance that may be proposed by the tioxide plant when it is decided to proceed with the project. In relation to the railway, the Commonwealth is awaiting the recommendations of the Wran committee.

I have made this statement to advise the House of the strong, positive and constructive role that South Australia is playing in seeking to establish more mature Commonwealth-State relations that build on the achievements of the first centenary of Federation. However, South Australia has a major concern over the determination of some Federal Ministers to hijack this work. It is time the Prime Minister recognised that some of his Ministers have an agenda which relegates the national interest to last and which puts their own narrow political interests first. Competitive federalism is all about improving the living standards of Australians and making our nation a more competitive one, able to take a leading role in the Asian/Pacific community of nations. My recent visit to Asia highlighted the opportunities at hand.

Competitive federalism will help to realise those opportunities by creating a dynamic environment in which Australia achieves world best practice across a whole range of sectors. In this, the States and Territories have a vital role. In many areas they can deliver better services through improving efficiency and eliminating duplication, rather than through raising more tax revenue or borrowing more money. I seek the support of all members for the role South Australia is taking in helping to build a new Australian Federation.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

- Magistrates Court Act—Magistrates Court—Rules—
 - Court Fees
 - Elect for Trial
 - Restraining Orders
- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Administration and Probate—Interest on Pecuniary Legacies
 - Associations Incorporation—Fees
 - Builders Licensing—Fees
 - Business Names—Fees
 - Commercial and Private Agents—Fees
 - Commercial Tribunal—Fees
 - Consumer Credit—Fees
 - Consumer Transactions—Fees
 - Co-operatives—Fees
 - Criminal Law (Sentencing)—Driver's Licence Disqualification Notice Fees
 - District Court—Court Fees
 - Environment, Resources and Development Court—
 - Transcript Fees
 - Fees Regulation—Appointment of Bank Managers/JPs
 - Gaming Machines—Fees
 - Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers—Fees
 - Liquor Licensing—
 - Dry Areas—Corporation of Noarlunga and Port Lincoln
 - Fees
 - Magistrates Court—
 - Court Fees
 - Elect for Trial
 - National Crime Authority (State Provisions)—Service of Summons
 - Places of Public Entertainment—
 - Cinematographers/Theatre Firemen

- Retirement Villages—Code of Conduct
- Second-Hand Motor Vehicles—Fees
- Sheriff's—Court Fees
- Supreme Court—
 - Court Fees
 - Probate Fees
- Travel Agents—Fees
- Domestic Violence—Foreign Domestic Violence
- Summary Procedure—Restraining Orders

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

- Summary Offences Act—Regulations—Traffic Infringement Notice Expiation Fees
- Superannuation Act—Regulations—
 - CAFHS Employees
 - STA Employees—Varying Contributions
- Financial Institutions Duty Act—Regulations—SA Produce Credit Pty Ltd

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Boilers and Pressure Vessels—Fees
 - Dangerous Substances—Fees
 - Explosives—Fees
 - Lifts and Cranes—Fees
 - Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare—
 - Asbestos—Fees
 - Construction Safety
 - Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—
 - Claims and Registration
 - Forwood Products Pty Ltd—Extension of Exemption
 - Medical Report Fees—Review and Appeals
 - Returns by Employers
 - Ship Workers—Exclusion from Coverage
 - Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to Members of Parliament Allowances

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Boating—Glenelg Foreshore—Jet Ski—Speed Limit
 - MFP Development—Extension of Core Site
 - Motor Vehicles—
 - Accident Towing Roster Scheme Fees
 - Fees and Charges
 - Lectures
 - Passenger Transport—
 - Conduct of Passengers
 - Fares and Charges
 - Accreditation—Vehicle Standards and Inspections
 - Road Traffic—
 - Inspection Fees
 - Omnibus

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Fees Regulation—Water and Sewerage Planning—
 - Fees
 - Sewerage—
 - Examination/Registration Fees
 - Fees
 - Waterworks—
 - Examination/Registration Fees
 - Fees

By the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Medical Practitioners—Qualification for Specialists
 - Occupational Therapists—Registration Fees
 - South Australian Health Commission—Recognised Hospitals/Health Care Centre Fees
 - South Australian Health Commission Act—By-laws—
 - Julia Farr Centre
 - Noarlunga Health Services Inc.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

South Australian Planning Commission and the Advisory Committee on Planning—Report, 1992-93

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission Act—Regulations—Persons/Bodies Prescribed as Councils

Corporation By-laws—

Noarlunga—No. 15—Moveable Signs

Salisbury—No. 2—Streets

Tea Tree Gully—No. 10—Moveable Signs on Streets and Roads

Unley—

No. 2—Traffic

No. 3—Bees

No. 5—Garbage Bins

No. 6—Gunpowder and Fireworks

No. 7—Inflammable Undergrowth

No. 8—Restaurants and Fish Shops

No. 9—Signboards

No. 10—Streets and Footways

No. 12—Recreation Area

No. 13—Soldiers' Memorial Garden of Honour

No. 14—Dogs

No. 15—Poultry

No. 16—Height of Hedges and Fences

No. 17—Caravans

No. 18—Keeping of Cattle

No. 20—Street Trader's Licence

No. 22—Removal of Garbage

No. 23—Permits and Penalties

Thebarton—No. 2—Streets and Public Places

District Council By-laws—

Millicent—No. 4—Garbage Containers

Port Elliot and Goolwa—No. 7—Building Sites

Stirling—No. 42—Moveable Signs

Yankalilla—

No. 33—Jet Skis

No. 34—Moveable Signs

Local Government Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Review, 30 June 1993

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Racing Act—Regulations—Statutory Deductions/Sports Betting

By the Minister for Mines and Energy (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Gas Act—Regulations—Gas fitters—Exam Fees

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Animal and Plant Control Commission—Report to 31 December 1993

Regulations under the following Acts—

Citrus Industry—Interest on Unpaid Contributions

Fisheries—

Abalone Fisheries—Licence Fees

General—Licence Fees

Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Licence Fees

Marine Scalefish Fisheries—Licence Fees

Miscellaneous Fishery—Licence Fees

Prawn Fisheries—Licence Fees

Processor Registration—Licence Fees

River Fishery—Licence Fees

Rock Lobster Fisheries—Licence Fees

Seeds—Fees

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Beverage Container—Exemption—Milk Containers

Bills of Sale—Fees

Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—

Consumption of Alcohol

Fees and Charges

Clean Air—Fees

Crown Lands—Fees

Marine Environment and Protection—

Fees

Licensing Guidelines

National Parks and Wildlife—

Emu Farming, Code of Management

Fees

Hunting Permit Fees

Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—Fees

Real Property—Fees

Registration of Deeds—Fees

Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fees

Strata Titles—Fees

Waste Management—Fees

Water Resources—Fees

Worker's Liens—Fees

By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—

Summary Offences Act—

Road Block Establishment Authorisations, 1/1/94 to 31/3/94

Dangerous Area Declarations, 1/1/94 to 31/3/94

By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—

Correctional Services Act—Regulations—Conduct of Prisoners

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. R.B. Such)—

Department for Education and Children's Services—Report, of the Chief Executive Officer, 1993

Industrial and Commercial Training Act—Regulations—

Declared Vocations—

Machine Operating (Plastics)

Machining and Cutting (Textiles)

Various.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Why has the Premier provided three different sets of figures on public sector job cuts in the past week? What is today's correct figure on the number of jobs that have been cut and the future targets for job cuts from the public sector? In Sydney last Friday the Premier said that the Government's June target of 5 000 job cuts had been exceeded by at least 1 350 positions, with 6 350 public servants going by the end of June. Then, in a TV interview yesterday, the Premier changed the figures. In fact, I will quote from a transcript of that interview.

The interviewer said, 'Premier Brown started with 5 000 jobs gone by last June'—not 6 350. Dean Brown said, 'And then on top of that, 3 500 in 1994-95, and 1 500 in 1995-96, and 500 in 1996-97.' The interviewer said, 'We calculated that to be 10 500 jobs.' Dean Brown replied, 'Well, it's 5 000, 3 000, ah eight, about 10 000.' The interviewer said, 'But now Mr Brown's office is saying that we are both wrong. The figure is 9 500, and those jobs are targeted to go from the Public Service by 1996-97.' In an interview on ABC radio this morning the Premier said:

There's been no confusion whatsoever. The figure is clearly put down in the Economic and Financial Statement brought down at the beginning of June, and that statement said there'd be 3 500 in 1994-95, and 1 500 in 1995-96, and 500 in 1996-97.

Keith Conlon said:

But yesterday you were obviously a bit confused. . . There seems to be an extra 1 000 that have come out.

In admitting that there was some confusion, Premier Brown said:

There were an additional 1 000 achieved in 1993-94.

If we combine the Premier's statements, including the 1 350 excess that he announced in Sydney last Friday, we get a total of 11 850 public servants who will leave the public sector by 1996-97.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I welcome back the Leader of the Opposition from long service leave, which—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yesterday the Leader acknowledged that being in Opposition was like being on long service leave. We understand, from the performance of the Opposition, that that is the way it is treating it. In fact, one could say that the Leader has become the Christopher Skase of South Australian politics. First, he bankrupt the State—or almost—and then he went on long service leave, never wanting to come back. There is one other very pertinent point. Why are we having to reduce the number of jobs in government in South Australia? Because Labor, over 11 years, virtually bankrupt this State. Labor created a debt of \$8.4 billion, and we spent \$970 million last financial year just on interest for Labor's debt.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They don't like the facts. On top of that, Labor had an underlying deficit in its budget of over \$300 million. As a result, a responsible Government—a Liberal Government—had to start to fix up the financial mess created by Labor over the past 11 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has risen to take a point of order. I point out to members that they will not receive the call of the Chair during Question Time if they continue to interject.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, my point of order relates to relevance on this matter. The question to the Premier was over his confusion in issuing three different sets of figures over five days, and I asked him to come out with some figures that make sense in light of his previous statements.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I assure the Leader that there is no confusion at all. People need to carefully assess the figures I am providing. I have said that up to the end of June we achieved a reduction of 5 000 jobs on the budget sector. Everyone knows that the figures we have put down are on the budget sector. However, over and above that you have the ETSA figures, which are not included in the budget sector. The reporter in Sydney clearly understood that, as I said at the time, 'Here are the figures to the end of July.'

Again, the Leader of the Opposition is wrong because he quoted figures out of the *Advertiser* that were up to the end of July and not to the end of June. I know that the Leader has been on long service leave, but I suggest that he snaps out of that for a while and looks at where the figures are up to. Up to the end of June the figure was 5 000 without ETSA, because it was for the budget sector only. Up to the end of July it was almost 7 000, as reported in the *Advertiser*, if you include ETSA. It was almost another 1 000 for ETSA and approximately another 1 000 for July—the final figures are not through yet, but we understand that it is just over 1 000. The figure in Saturday morning's *Advertiser* was absolutely spot on; and the figures I gave yesterday were absolutely spot

on, namely, 5 000 to the end of June and a further 5 500 over the next three years, made up of 3 500 in 1994-95, a further 1 500 in 1995-96 and another 500 in the third year.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Because the journalist who was telephoned by Channel 7 unfortunately made a mistake when spoken to. The figures I gave at the press conference were absolutely spot on for the budget sector—a total of 10 500 for the budget sector, without including ETSA. We have not included ETSA because all the figures we have given have been on that basis. In fact, the former Government specifically excluded ETSA in its very first financial statement back in 1992-93. So, our figures have been consistent on that basis. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that it is he who has failed to look carefully at the figures, because there is no discrepancy whatsoever in the figures.

I will repeat the figures so that he is clear: 5 000 to the end of June; and about 6 000 to the end of July for the budget sector, but if you include ETSA it is almost 7 000. For the next three years from 1 July it will be a further 5 500 on top of the 5 000 to the end of June. I would have thought that was pretty clear and that anyone who had any hope of handling figures could deal with those figures.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): After hearing the Premier's ministerial statement, I ask whether he will elaborate on what progress has been made in discussions with the Federal Government over the extension of the Adelaide Airport runway and future ownership of the airport.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government sees the extension of the Adelaide Airport runway and the introduction of possibly a new operator potentially from Asia as a key element in building up air services into South Australia. One reason for our having such a low level of international tourists into the State is the lack of international flights, which in part is contributed to by the short runway of 2 500 metres. By extending the runway by 500 metres we are more likely to be able to bring in international flights, and those flights will be able to take cargo available in South Australia out of the State. Importantly, we will find more international tourists and a greater capacity for our industries to export their goods.

I refer particularly to the tuna farms at Port Lincoln which this year expect to produce about 1 600 tonnes of tuna, largely for the Japanese market. We have had a real problem in this State in being able to achieve those exports. Members would be surprised at the high percentage of air freight that has to be trucked to Melbourne, Sydney or Brisbane before it can get on to an aircraft. The Government has taken a number of initiatives. First, a scoping study is being undertaken by the FAC at our request. That study will look at the design aspects of the runway, the work that will be needed and other impacts that it will have.

The second initiative is a study being undertaken by AIDC, paid for and commissioned by the State Government to look specifically at the ownership options available for the airport. In particular, we are looking at trying to attract an Asian airport operator—someone like HATS from Hong Kong or SATS from Singapore—to develop Adelaide into an airport hub going into either Singapore or Hong Kong, which is so important. Hong Kong is crucial because it provides ready access to the Japanese market, China, and other developing countries around Hong Kong.

Whilst overseas I had preliminary discussions with respect to trying to attract either HATS or SATS or some other similar body to come in and at least look at the opportunities available as an international operator at Adelaide Airport. In terms of ownership, I agree with the position put down by the Federal Minister, if the Labor Party allows him to go ahead with privatisation, that some local equity should be maintained in the ownership of the airport. I had not envisaged at any stage ownership of the airport going entirely overseas. That would be inappropriate.

The Government itself should retain some ownership so that we have some say in who becomes the operator of the airport. As I indicated in my ministerial statement, the Government has now put the proposition that the runway be extended prior to privatisation. It is quite clear that the process of privatisation is likely to take at least 12 months and possibly up to 18 months. We cannot afford to wait that long. I commend the previous Government for offering \$10 million towards this end. We will continue to support that input.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That is another matter. On a number of occasions I have asked the Leader to stand up and tell the public of South Australia that he was in favour of privatising the airport. He has not yet taken up that challenge. Is he prepared to go to the Labor Party Convention in September and fight hard for privatisation? Will all members opposite do that? Will the left wing in South Australia take the same stance, or is it divided? Is it unsure whether or not to privatise? I was somewhat concerned to see the Federal Minister starting to shift ground in terms of where he stood on privatisation because, when in Adelaide recently, he no longer talked about privatisation; instead, he talked about the possibility of leasing out the airports. How serious is the Labor Party both here in South Australia and nationally about bringing about competition in the air services of Australia? How serious is it about allowing private operators to come into the airport?

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the Premier is giving lengthy responses to questions. I ask him to round off his answer.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will keep it short, Mr Speaker. It is time for the Labor Party to put down the position quite clearly here in South Australia and nationally that it is in favour of privatising rather than leasing the airport and that it will allow a private operator to come in so that we get international air services into South Australia. I assure the House that the Liberal Government of South Australia will continue to bring about these reforms to build up the infrastructure of this State.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): My question is supplementary to my first question. Given the Premier's announcement that the on budget employment cuts by 1996-97 will be 10 500, what is the target figure for off budget cuts by 1996-97 for all off budget agencies?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It depends how widely the Leader of the Opposition wants to cast that net. I stress in particular that at this stage I have figures only for ETSA and for no other Government agency.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, I have no targets at all.
An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, he's not: he is saying just the opposite. The Treasurer is saying that we have not, because we do not know the specific figures from either the Bank of South Australia or the SGIC boards. The former Premier would understand that, because he was not given figures either until a formal decision had been made by the boards of those bodies. As I understand it, until the end of July there has been a reduction from ETSA of about 820 or 850 people.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is now 900. As I said, it is just less than 1 000. I can assure the honourable member that, as new figures come through, we will continue to give them to this House. However, the important part that impacts on the budget is the budget sector, and they are the figures that we laid down in the financial statement at the beginning of June and also those that applied until the end of June 1994.

STATE BANK

Mr BECKER (Peake): Will the Treasurer explain the current situation with respect to the \$647 million Federal Government financial assistance package to the State? In April 1993, the previous Government gave a commitment to the Federal Government to sell the State Bank in return for progressive compensation payments totalling \$647 million over three years.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: In April 1993, an agreement was reached with the Commonwealth on the tax compensation package for the State Bank. It was \$600 million in real terms and, of course, that, projected forward on an assumed rate of inflation, worked out to \$647 million in current money values. The issue was in some doubt when we came into government because the Federal Government did not believe that the State Government was sticking to its agreement on reducing the size of government. Through the May statement, we convinced it that we were committed to that process, and we received the second instalment of the \$150 million for this year on about 29 June. But, on the basis of the previous Government's performance, it certainly was not willing to make that next instalment available. So, we received \$263 million in the previous financial year, which was set aside for separation packages. Unfortunately, the Treasurer put \$150 million straight into the budget this year rather than offsetting it against debt or for further separation packages to give the impression that the budget was actually a positive surplus budget.

We know that the Treasurer ripped \$300 million out of the State Bank, plus \$150 million of the State Bank package, to make the figures look positive in an election year. However, there has been some doubt about the payment next year, that is, the balance of \$234 million. That \$234 million was based on the final payment being for the sale of the bank. We have had negotiations with the Federal Treasury and with the Federal Treasurer. An agreement has been reached that the package will be preserved so that, if the final payment is to be made in the following year, 1995-96, the value will be preserved and, therefore, there will be an increase in the monetary value of the final payment. We have indicated to the Federal Treasurer, as we had to the Prime Minister, that with our preferred option to float the bank the sale will take place within that financial year. The value of the package will be preserved in real terms and, therefore, there will be no diminution in the support provided by the Federal Government to our budget.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister for Health rule out the removal of up to 150 public beds—almost one-third of the present number—at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as part of the Government's plan to downgrade the hospital and public health services in the western suburbs?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is really commenting, not asking a question.

Mr ATKINSON: Exactly how many public beds will go from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is a question that I am delighted to answer, because it is related to a prime example of how this Government is addressing matters—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I'll come to that—of health care in areas which traditionally do not vote for the Liberal Party. I am talking about the north and the west of Adelaide. As the member for Spence would realise, the Audit Commission recommended that we look at decommissioning the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as a teaching hospital. We believed that that was quite inappropriate, given the need that has been clearly demonstrated in the west of Adelaide via the social health atlas and every other possibility. Therefore, in addressing the obvious need in the north—and I am certain that the member for Elizabeth would be only too delighted to take issue with the honourable member if he is to be querying this plan—to identify a way of coping in the north, we have devised a system whereby a single teaching hospital will service the north-west of Adelaide with one administration. At present there are 480 or in that vicinity—

Mr Atkinson: Four hundred and ninety.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Spence may not realise that 480 is in the vicinity of 490—and I would accept 490—but let us not quibble; we will have 425 acute beds, both public and private, on the site of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, not including step down care beds. The member for Spence may also know that around the world, and particularly in Australia, the need for people to move from acute beds with high staffing ratios to step down care beds with lower ratios is an excellent method for both the patients as a halfway house before they are discharged home and for the budget. So there will be 425 acute beds and extra step down care beds.

People in the north-west—and by the north-west I refer to the area around the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital—can rest assured their services will be dramatically improved by our giving teaching status to the Lyell McEwin Hospital and retaining teaching status at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I should add that this plan has been discussed with the board of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and it got unanimous support. That includes both the medical staff representative and the elected staff representative. The member for Spence laughs, but he laughs in the face of the facts: it was unanimous support. Yesterday I spoke with the Chairman of the board of the Lyell McEwin, the Chairman of the Medical Staff Society, the Administrator and the Deputy Administrator; they understand this is a great opportunity for the Lyell McEwin which, unfortunately, the member for Spence seems to want to decimate.

DEFENCE CONTRACTS

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and

Regional Development and for Infrastructure. In the light of extensive media coverage about defence related industries contracts awarded to South Australian companies, can the Minister explain South Australia's standing in the defence industry in Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is no doubt that South Australia is now clearly the leading State in Australia for defence industry manufacturing. A recent survey by the Industry Commission, published in a draft report on defence procurement, indicated that South Australian industry attracted some 36 per cent compared with Victoria, 32 per cent, and New South Wales, 23 per cent. In addition, we have had a number of announcements in recent days and weeks—to be followed by more announcements, I might add—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, there are more on the way—clearly indicating that South Australia is moving ahead. For example, we have had AWA Defence Industries being awarded a \$60 million contract to modify an additional nine P3C Orions with electronic support measures equipment. We have had AWA Defence Industries last Friday acknowledged and getting the lion's share of the \$70 million contract for the refurbishment of the P3C Orions, leading to some 100 new jobs.

In addition, on Sunday AWA Defence Industries announced that it had accepted the support of the South Australian Government to relocate its facilities for Project Parakeet from Sydney, New South Wales, to South Australia. That is a \$105 million contract that will generate another 80 jobs in the defence related industries in South Australia. In addition, the Defence Science and Technology Organisation at Salisbury has just won a \$50 million contract to upgrade the laboratory complex. We also see the benefits of those contracts flowing out to the whole range of operators in the commercial sector and the electronics industry in South Australia.

This is dove-tailing into what the Government clearly put down in its pre-election commitments and what it is following through subsequent to the election in order to make South Australia the innovative State, the smart State, the State of information technology and telecommunications.

The Industrial Supplies Office at the Centre for Manufacturing is coordinating a whole range of these contracts to ensure that the subcontractors to the main or lead contracts are sourced from South Australian-based industry. We will get not only the 80 jobs created last Sunday by AWADI but also a flow-on effect of some 240 jobs in South Australia regarding suppliers to the main contract. That was one reason why the Government was able to attract companies such as Motorola and Australis to base their operations in South Australia.

This clearly adds up to hundreds of new jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars of investment. The Government set a target of \$500 million of new investment on top of the \$2 billion investment each year to the year 2000 to create jobs in South Australia over the remainder of this decade. In the first seven months of this Administration, it is more than on target: it is well over the halfway mark in meeting that \$500 million worth of new investment. This clearly underscores to everyone that South Australia is now open for business again.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I direct my question to the Minister for Health. Will the extra \$2 million allocated to the

Lyell McEwin Hospital in the amalgamation announced today be at the expense of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and can he guarantee that there will be no reduction in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital budget as a result of this move or his \$65 million health budget cut?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I have just clarified that the number of beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is 484—much closer to my figure than the honourable member's figure. This amalgamation for the north-west of—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: That is right; he is only the local member. This amalgamation for the north-west, which will provide teaching hospital status for an area of the north in much need—and I am looking forward to public acclamation for this plan from the member for Elizabeth—will see a great need addressed, one which has been recognised for a long time. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Health Services have in fact dipped their toes tentatively in the water regarding this process on a number of occasions but nothing has progressed. Now, faced with a number of alternatives, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital came to me—and let us not have any doubt about this: the board came to me on Friday and presented a submission—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: No, yesterday I saw the Lyell McEwin. The board presented me with a submission detailing what it wanted. As a gesture of goodwill to indicate to the Lyell McEwin Hospital that it was serious, it identified \$2 million worth of resources that it could apply, including associate professors, clinicians, and so on, so that the Lyell McEwin Hospital would benefit. What we have is one teaching hospital with two campuses, with the agreement of everyone.

CASEMIX FUNDING

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Can the Minister for Health inform the House what the Government will do to guard against casemix hospital funding leading to inappropriate and early discharge from hospital?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the honourable member for her question, which is about a very important issue in the most important cultural change in funding for health care in South Australia in the past 20 years, and I refer to casemix funding. There are people who believe this will lead to inappropriately quick discharge. I point out that discharge from a hospital bed is always the decision of the clinician. The clinician making the decision on 2 July is the same clinician who made the decision on 28 or 29 June. There has been absolutely no change as to who is making the decision to discharge the patients.

In addition, there are no financial gains for the hospital from discharging inappropriately quickly. I have to say that, if the hospital is able to discharge appropriately and if the taxpayers can save money, I defy the Opposition to say that that is a bad idea. However, there is no incentive—and there was no defiance in that—to discharge inappropriately, because there is an audit of inappropriate readmissions. If patients are readmitted too quickly, the discharging hospital will suffer financially. Casemix funding is based on the average length of stay and there are short and long stay patients. So, it is a perfectly fair system and one about which we have been perfectly open.

Perhaps the Opposition does not recognise that medicine has changed. My daughter had a total knee reconstruction on

Wednesday. The operation started at 6 p.m. on Wednesday and I picked her up from hospital at midday on Saturday—66 hours after a total knee reconstruction. I know that this dates me, but I can remember when those undergoing a total knee reconstruction were in hospital for a month. So technology has advanced. Clearly, it is in everyone's interests, not the least of whom is the South Australian taxpayer, for us to take advantage of that.

Hospitals can shorten length of stay without prematurely discharging people by using a number of mechanisms. First, they can reduce unnecessary admissions, which is obviously very important, and they can reduce delays in procedures, tests or doctors' visits while the patient is in hospital. Obviously, this has no effect on the outcome for the patient. They can also deal with discharge issues in pre-admission clinics so that it is all planned, rather than people having to wait another day while the discharge planning is done. They can also research or implement more effective procedures to reduce the amount of trauma. That is what I meant when I referred to taking advantage of modern technology.

When we are talking in particular about decreasing the length of stay, hospitals can obviously use day surgery more appropriately. That is what patients want: they do not want to be in hospital any longer than they have to be. They want to be at home with their family and to be able to get back to work. If we are able to provide those technological advances so that the length of stay can be shortened, everyone will benefit.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Have the decisions made by Flinders Medical Centre administrators since 1 July been unlawful because of the Minister's failure to appoint a board? Has the Minister sought legal advice about the implications of his failure to appoint a board; if not, why not? The term of Flinders Medical Centre board members expired on 30 June. The Minister has not announced replacements. Section 29(1) of the South Australian Health Commission Act provides:

An incorporated hospital will be administered by a board of directors constituted in accordance with the approved constitution of that hospital.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is a joke, coming as it does from a Party which, prior to the last election, put out a green paper which had as its prime focus the getting rid of hospital boards. That was the number one objective around South Australia: to get rid of hospital boards. If the member for Spence's stool pigeon had kept him up to date, he would realise that as at the start of business today seven of the nine members of the board were appointed. Obviously, that gives the Flinders Medical Centre board a clear working quorum. There are in the constitution—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Wait a minute. There are in the constitution some matters which have caused one technical difficulty with one appointee because, for some unknown reason, it states that only a certain number of medical practitioners are allowed to be on the board. One person who wanted to become a member of the board was a medical practitioner. Professor John Chalmers from the university has been appointed, and he is a doctor; and Dr Peter Marshall has been appointed as the staff representative. So, already there are two doctors. As far as the interregnum between 30 June and today is concerned, the position is

exactly the same as that in any other period between board meetings. Obviously, boards meet and ratify decisions that have been taken in the preceding month, and that is what will happen.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Minister for Mines and Energy. To what extent is the Minister's department involved in mineral exploration across that part of the State which both he and I represent (the Lower Murray, the Mallee and the Upper and Lower South-East), and will he provide the House with any details of discovery of deposits made during the course of that work?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Before the interjectors on the other side start, I will pay tribute to the previous Administration for the work it has done in beginning the aeromagnetic surveys that have occurred in South Australia. I have paid tribute publicly to that Administration previously. We have carried on that work since coming to Government and, in fact, have allocated an extra \$7.5 million towards it. As we travel around and talk to the major mining companies in the world, we are told that it is of immense benefit to them. Exploration is now starting to pick up quite dramatically in South Australia.

Recently, an aeromagnetic program started in the South-East of South Australia in an area between Tailem Bend and Naracoorte. The department was seeking to identify minerals including copper, lead, zinc and gold. The results of that program were very promising, so the department undertook a further drilling program to ascertain exactly what was there and, of course, to establish that by assay. To date, 31 holes have been drilled, and they are extremely encouraging. They show assays of up to .93 per cent of copper; about the same for zinc; 900 parts per million of lead; just on 800 parts per million of cobalt; and 10 parts per billion of gold.

All this does not, as yet, indicate that this is another Roxby Downs, that mirage in the desert that those people talk about; however, it is very encouraging, and explorers are already financing a further and more intense aeromagnetic survey to get this exploration initiative up to the stage where further drilling can be done. Of the exploration initiatives that have taken place, it is one of the most exciting things that have happened in the mining area in the South-East for some time. I acknowledge the work done by the Victorian Government, which will carry out surveys on its side of the border with South Australia to see whether this area extends into Victoria and coordinate the whole project to see whether there is room for greater exploration and potential for mining within South Australia.

NATIVE TITLE

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Does the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs support the intention of the Federal Liberal Leader (Mr Alexander Downer) to repeal the Commonwealth Native Title Act under a Federal Liberal Government?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Opposition has finally found—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Ross Smith to order.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Opposition has finally found Aboriginal Affairs. This is the 31st sitting day of the year. There have been 500 questions—280 from members

opposite. We have had issues such as Mabo, the Barnagarla problem and the Hindmarsh Island bridge and, finally, they have discovered Aboriginal Affairs and are going to ask us a question. May I say as someone who is particularly interested in increasing economic opportunities for the Aboriginal community—because, as the former Minister would know, that is what the Aboriginal people want—I am delighted that the Opposition is at last taking an interest in Aboriginal people. It is quite clear from everything we have said in relation to the Premier's ministerial statement that the attitude of the South Australian Government is that native title has been determined by the High Court.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TOURISM, REGIONAL

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Minister for Tourism provide information to the House on Government grants to boost the marketing and promotion of regional tourist areas? During the parliamentary recess, the Minister and the Premier visited Asia to investigate opportunities to boost the South Australian tourism industry. The results of the visit included the announcement of plans by a Malaysian group to invest \$200 million in the Wirrina Cove resort and a reported strong interest from Asian investors wanting to put their money into other regional tourist developments in South Australia.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: One of the most exciting parts of our recent visit to Asia was the interest that Asians showed in South Australia, in particular, in our regional economy, the most important part of our regional economy being the wine industry. In response to the excellent discussions that we had in Asia, the Tourism Commission in South Australia has restructured the whole of its regional development procedures so that we can now place in the hands of regional areas matters involving their opportunities and ideas on how their region should be developed as far as tourism is concerned.

To ensure that they have sufficient funds to do this, on 1 July the Government gave \$850 000 in grants to nine new regions. With those grants, for the first time goes responsibility: those regions now need to sit down and decide what they wish to promote within the context of a national and international program. This is the most exciting development that has occurred in regional tourism since this Government came to office.

The important part is that it started, even though it was a trickle, with the previous Government and the previous Minister. Ecotourism, the wine industry and grants to the regions provide the best opportunities for South Australia to ensure that its regions and the State generally are put on the Asian map.

TAFE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Following the legislative commitment to TAFE announced in the Governor's speech today, and the Premier's own commitment to competitive federalism, will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the House whether the Government can now categorically rule out any handing over of responsibility to the Commonwealth for TAFE and all State labour market programs? The Minister would be aware of a proposal by New South Wales Premier John Fahey for the States to relinquish to the Commonwealth

all responsibility for TAFE, higher education and labour programs in return for the consolidation of State powers over school education and home and community care.

I understand that the proposal was discussed at the meeting of Premiers on Friday. The Minister will be aware that in 1992 the States, led by South Australia and with the support of both the Government and the Opposition, opposed a total takeover of TAFE by the Commonwealth and opted instead for the creation of the Australian National Training Authority, a joint State/Territory/Commonwealth funded initiative. The view then was that further education and training must take into account regional needs and be driven by industry and not by Commonwealth bureaucrats.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: That is a move initiated by Premier Fahey: it is not an issue that has been debated or discussed here at length, and at this stage we have no intention of taking that path. It is a very important issue and not something that deserves an off-the-cuff response by this Government, but there are no plans at this stage to hand over TAFE or any other further education responsibility to the Commonwealth.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Family and Community Services provide information to the House on the appointment of a new Chief Executive Officer for the Department for Family and Community Services?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am delighted to be able to inform this House that the new Chief Executive Officer of the Department for Family and Community Services, Mr Richard Deyell, will be taking up his position on the 29th of this month. Coming from New Zealand and bringing with him a number of very significant strengths, Mr Deyell is a senior management officer who has had significant experience in the area of social welfare. Also, he has proven ability to manage family and community services in the area of direct service delivery. He has been the manager of a region in New Zealand of similar size and complexity to the State of South Australia.

He has considerable experience and knowledge of the implementation of new legislation in New Zealand in youth justice and protection. Of course, the New Zealand legislation was a forerunner to the involvement of families in decision making for young offenders and the protection of children that we now have in South Australia. The New Zealand legislation is now some five years old, and Mr Deyell will be bringing a wealth of experience to the implementation of similar legislation passed in this State late last year. Also, he has had experience in the development of new structures and funding mechanisms on which the partnership between Government and the non-government sector in the provision of family and community services can be based.

As members on both sides would realise, we acknowledge the importance of being able to work very closely in partnership with the non-government sector. I look forward very much to working with Mr Deyell. I know that he will be able to contribute a great deal to social welfare in this State.

WOMEN, HEALTH

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Does the Minister for Health recognise the need for stand-alone centres for women's health services?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Napier for this very important question, particularly representing the area that she does. It is important that the facts be known. A number of community health centres and women's health centres are based in Adelaide. There is a campaign at the moment based on the belief that the Government is pushing the amalgamation line. The fact is that a number of the women's health centres in the immediate vicinity of the Napier area believe they can provide more services by amalgamating administration. That is an effort that is coming from the bottom up, not proposed by me or by the commission; it was a movement from within the women's health centres and the community health centres.

I tell all South Australians that, if people come to me with innovative plans for cutting administrative costs and allowing the provision of more services to people in South Australia, as the Minister for Health, obviously, I am interested in that.

MOBILE TELEPHONES

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Emergency Services inform the House what action the police will take against motorists using hand-held mobile telephones while driving?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Mitchell is one of many members of Parliament and of the community to have expressed concerns about the danger presented to other motorists by those drivers who choose to drive their vehicle while holding a mobile telephone to their ear. The police advise me that section 45 of the Road Traffic Act provides that a person must not drive a car without due care and attention. Hand held phones, police advise, used when driving could be illegal under this section of the Act, which can result in the imposition of a fine not exceeding \$1 000.

As well as in the community at large, there is growing concern within the Police Force, the Office of Road Safety and the RAA regarding the danger caused to other motorists by users of mobile telephones. For that reason, those three groups are working together to develop methods for advising the community about the dangers presented by using those telephones in an inappropriate manner. As part of their deliberations, that group has looked at what other States do regarding mobile telephones.

Victoria, for example, has addressed the problem under section 1505 of its road safety traffic regulations whereby (a) the driver of a motor vehicle must not, while driving the vehicle, use a hand-held telephone, microphone or similar instrument or apparatus; and (b) the penalty for this offence is the imposition of two penalty points and an on the spot fine of \$135. New South Wales has similar legislation prohibiting the use of hand-held phones whilst driving. At this stage, South Australian authorities have not determined that it is necessary to introduce legislative or regulatory changes to the same extent as our eastern State neighbours have done, but at this time the RAA has developed a code of practice that it is promoting in an effort to educate drivers.

Essentially, its code of practice advises of potential penalties under the Road Traffic Act, and also reminds drivers that their ability to safely control a car and their general awareness of traffic conditions will decrease if they are distracted by concentrating on telephone calls at the same time as driving. I commend the RAA for its article in the July-August *SA Motor* magazine, the front cover of which depicts the caption 'Don't phone and drive'. It is most important that drivers behave properly on the road, and that

includes using mobile telephones safely by pulling to the side of the road and using the phone in that manner.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's broken promise not to increase public sector job cuts and his ever shifting, not to say increasing, jobs reduction target, what assurance can the Premier give that he will not go beyond the target he has announced today? The Premier told a Liberal Party function in Sydney last Friday:

We make no secret of the fact that as—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call. There are too many interjections to my right.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I want to quote the words he used at the Liberal Party function in Sydney last Friday. He said:

We make no secret of the fact that as part of that process we have already taken almost 7 000 Government employees out of Government and we've got a target for at least another 3 to 4000—

that is, a total of 10 000 to 11 000—

in the next couple of years, and we probably have to go further than that.

That is how the Premier finished his statement to the Liberal Party function in Sydney.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I come back to the figures I have already given to the House. If you look at those figures, you will see that they are absolutely consistent with what I said in Sydney, and that is our target—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That's right. In fact, if you take ETSA we will go further than that. If you take the budget sector, a figure of 10 500 has been quite clearly stated. The financial statement quite clearly indicated that, if there is a significant wage push within the public sector, we may have to go further. In fact, at present some employees are out there pushing for very substantial increases in salary. I come back to the crux of the matter: who created the need to even reduce the size of the public sector in South Australia? The Labor Party. Who almost bankrupted the State? Who created the loss of \$3 000 million in the State Bank? Who lost hundreds of millions of dollars in SGIC? Who ran a State budget with a \$300 million underlying deficit? The Labor Party. The Labor Party of South Australia must bear the responsibility for this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The other point I make, which is quite clear, is that these are voluntary separation packages. Who introduced them? The then Labor Government of South Australia. Two years ago the Labor Government said, 'We have huge financial problems. We will have to start slashing the numbers in the public sector.' The one other interesting and pertinent point is that it did not meet its targets and it could not even get near the targets that it put down because of its poor economic management.

EMPLOYMENT BROKER SCHEME

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education outline recent developments concerning the Government's Employment Broker Scheme?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair's attention was somewhat distracted. I understand that the member for Hartley has not completed asking his question. I am aware of the time.

Mr SCALZI: I will repeat the question. Will the Minister outline recent developments concerning the Government's Employment Broker Scheme?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Employment Broker Scheme was part of our election commitment, and we have just honoured the first part of that by announcing that three organisations have been selected to run the first pilots. The scheme is intended to convert part-time work into full-time work with a particular focus on young people. The organisations that have been awarded the pilots include: Retail Training South Australia Incorporated, which will employ 42 people for full-time retail work with small and medium sized retailers; the Mid North Regional Group Training Scheme Incorporated, which will employ 30 full-time and part-time workers mainly in the area of engineering, clerical and office work with some outside employment as well; and the Regency Computer Bureau, which will provide employment for 30 physically disabled people to work in graphic design, marketing, administration, programming and secretarial areas. The second phase of the project will be announced shortly, but this is the first round of a very exciting program to create work for South Australians.

TRAMS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport whether the Government's redundancy policy has resulted in reduced maintenance on the 64-year old Glenelg trams? Can he assure the House that the tram's electrical brakes and water proofing are in a safe condition? Motormen on the Glenelg tram tell me that the maintenance check of about 100 points has been reduced to a check of about 30 points. They say that the Government's redundancy policy has resulted in tram maintenance men taking targeted separation packages and either not being replaced or being replaced by tradesmen who are unfamiliar with trams. The motormen say that trams have lost their brakes in King William Street and that one went through a red light owing to brake failure at the corner of Jetty and Brighton Roads. They say that, during recent rains, water seeped into tram No. 365 exposing the motormen to the risk of an electric shock.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can assure the House that the Minister for Transport is concerned about the well being and safety of passengers travelling on our transport system in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. As to the specifics of the questions asked by the honourable member, I will refer them to the Minister and obtain a detailed reply in due course.

SEPARATION PACKAGES

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I lay on the table the ministerial statement relating to District Court judge's separation packages made in another place by the Attorney-General.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That for the remainder of the session Standing Orders be so far suspended as to provide that—

- (a) At the conclusion of the period for questions without notice the Speaker may propose the question 'That the House note grievances.' Up to six members may speak for a maximum of five minutes each before the Speaker puts the question.
- (b) The motion for adjournment of the House on Tuesdays and Wednesdays may be debated for up to 20 minutes provided it is moved before 10 p.m.
- (c) The motion for adjournment of the House on Thursdays—
 - (i) May be moved later than 5 p.m.
 - (ii) May not be debated.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Liberal Party today has punished the western suburbs for failing to vote Liberal in recent elections.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation and noise in the Chamber.

Mr ATKINSON: The Minister for Health has today announced a retreat from responsibility for providing public health services in the western suburbs. His news release and statements on this matter carefully disguise that he will be removing between 100 and 150 public beds from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and, therefore, from the western suburbs. In doing so, he has failed to give the people of the western suburbs due process. There has been no public consultation with the people affected by this decision; the decision has been most secretive.

The Minister for Health trumpets that the board of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital agreed to this plan—indeed, put it to him—and that the medical staff of the hospital also agreed. During 1993 we saw the politics of the Medical Staff Association at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In particular, we saw Dr Horowitz of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital depart from his duty of treating and healing people and use his position as a doctor to campaign for the Liberal Party in that election and throughout 1993. I wonder what Dr Horowitz has to say now that the Liberal Party has put the carving knife through the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. His silence is ominous.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: That Dr Horowitz and his like would agree to this plan shows nothing more than that they are faithful supporters of their Party—the Liberal Party of South Australia. There was no consultation with the North Western Suburbs Health and Social Welfare Council or with the people who are the subject of these cuts.

Looking momentarily at the overall situation of the health budget in South Australia, it is astonishing that health, which is the second biggest item in the State budget, is about to bear the heaviest cut. Education is the biggest item in the State budget, and that will bear a cut of at least \$40 million; and health, the second biggest item, will bear a cut of at least \$65 million. That shows that the Minister for Health has

received a caning from his Cabinet colleagues: around the Cabinet table he has failed the health portfolio.

The Minister says that private beds will be installed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in substitution for public beds. This means the part privatisation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Yet the west already has many private beds. In fact, it has more than it currently needs; it has an over-capacity in private beds. There are private beds at the Ashford Community Hospital, the Western Community Hospital and the Le Fevre and Port Adelaide Community Hospital, and there are other private beds at Hindmarsh and Glenelg. Yet, faced with that overcapacity, the Minister, driven as he is doctrinally towards fee for service medicine, puts more private beds into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at the expense of public beds. So now we have fewer than 350 public hospital beds in the western region—an extraordinary insult to the people of the western suburbs.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Those of us with a house or business mortgage would know that in the past 90 days the variable interest rate has increased by about .625 to .7 per cent. When we think about the State debt of \$8.5 billion that we are funding, it equates to an increase of 1 per cent on that scale, creating another \$85 million a year in interest commitment to the State. When we think about that and the size of our population, it shows the vulnerability of this State as a result of the massive debt that we are currently funding. In fact, \$85 million by an increase of only 1 per cent per annum in repayments of the interest on that debt means that it is equivalent to 50 per cent of the \$170 million of savings that we are trying to make in the first 12 months of this Government's term.

The fact is, if you think about it, that it equates, with an increase of 3 per cent projected over the next two or three years, to a quarter of a billion dollars, or \$250 million more per annum being added to the interest commitment of this State. Obviously we realise that cuts are inevitable if we are to restore the economy of this State, particularly when one considers that vulnerability. The history is there. We know that members opposite, particularly the member who was advising the former Premier in the Labor Government, detest the truth coming out, but the clear fact is that the history is there. We know who caused those problems and we will, unfortunately, have to remember and bear those problems for many years to come. However, that is the history.

The important thing today is that the people of South Australia are expecting—and have clearly told me during the winter recess when I have been getting around my electorate—and are now demanding a bipartisan effort in this House to get this State going again. That is what I am grieving about today.

Obviously, when Opposition members pick up the paper each morning they are quite jealous about the magnificent achievements of the Brown Government in this State in just a short time. We all know about the new investment and development and about the restructuring. You only have to go over to Western Australia and talk to people in Government there to hear from people like Richard Court that Brown is the most admired Premier in the whole of Australia at the moment. That comes from the Deputy President of the Legislative Council in that State. The Premier has managed, through his articulate and businesslike nature and ability to work with, listen to and consider the people of this State,

enormous restructuring to occur without the major difficulties that we saw in States such as Victoria.

This State is too valuable to be used any longer as a monopoly board. It has been used that way by all politicians off and on over the past four or five years, and it is about time we really came together, supported, acted and worked in the interests of this State. Our targets for the future are on track. We all know that we have already 7 200 more full-time jobs than when we came to Government. Sure, the unemployment figures are increasing. If we look at Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia we see that the same thing happened there when they restructured and were prepared to stop the bleeding and take a bit of pain. Look at their unemployment now, look at their GSP and where they are headed for the future. If we stick together and work together that is where we will head as a State.

The benefits of what other Liberal States have done is clearly shown. We are reforming better and have a better business plan than they. On behalf of all my constituents I appeal in this session of Parliament for us to be bipartisan. The important and major factor in continuing that major fundamental restructuring is to ensure that, as in the late 1970s and early 1980s, this State can once again be SA, the great State that we all know. We are ready for the bipartisan agreements. The question is clearly whether the Opposition is ready. My electorate demands that it must be. I look forward to working in a bipartisan manner in the best interests of this State in the coming session.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I look forward to the continuation of a bipartisan commitment to the future of TAFE in South Australia. I am very concerned by the answer to my question on TAFE given earlier today. The fact is that in 1992 John Dawkins announced what amounted to a Commonwealth push to take over TAFE nationally. TAFE was to be totally Commonwealth funded and controlled. That was opposed by me as the then Minister of Further Education. It was also opposed by my colleagues in Western Australia such as the Hon. Kay Hallahan and by the Liberal Minister in the Northern Territory, Shane Stone, by the Liberal Government in Tasmania and by the Queensland Goss Government. By working for nine months we were able to defeat a proposal to totally take over TAFE that would have left the States as mere janitors for the TAFE system.

I categorised it as the 'East German' model for the future of TAFE. We tried to defeat the Commonwealth on this issue over the period of a year and were successful. In the end, only the Victorian Government supported the Commonwealth's position. South Australia put up an alternative model for the future of TAFE: a national partnership model as opposed to a Commonwealth controlled model. That national partnership model, which was later endorsed, involved the States, Territories and the Commonwealth having joint funding and control of TAFE through the Australian National Training Authority. This was considered to be a major defeat of the Commonwealth and, if you like, an example of federalism in action where States, Territories and the Commonwealth shared funding and control.

My point was that it would be fatal for our TAFE system to be run by bureaucrats remotely located in Canberra. The whole point of TAFE training is that TAFE and training should be industry driven. That is what the Australian National Training Authority involves. I know that discussions have taken place at officer and Premier levels about handing

over TAFE to the Commonwealth once more. Certainly, I believe that I was right in fighting a Commonwealth takeover of TAFE. I was very pleased at that stage that the then Liberal Opposition strongly supported that position. TAFE training is too important in this State to be run by faceless Commonwealth bureaucrats.

We fought hard and we won. It would be silly indeed for the future of industry in this State to turn back the clock and allow industry to be put out. If that happens local industry will have little input into the training of its own future work force. TAFE must be industry run and industry driven with a strong local concept. The Brown Government should categorically reject the New South Wales plan by Premier Fahey—and supported, I might say, by the New South Wales Opposition—to sell off TAFE to the Commonwealth. I am concerned that the Minister today gave a wishy-washy 'no plans at this stage' response to my question.

On a lighter note, when I came into the House earlier today I noted a change in the seating arrangements. I thought that the member for Lee had been promoted, as he had been placed close to three Ministers. However, according to corridor gossip, I am wrong. He has been placed under the political equivalent of 'house arrest', having been placed next to my very good friend and colleague, the member for Ridley, the 'Dirty Harry' of the Liberal Party, who has no doubt been given the instruction to 'shoot now and ask questions later' if the member for Lee opens his mouth. To be fair to the member for Lee, perhaps the member for Ridley has been asked to take him for a long walk.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Imagine if somebody seeking to become a dairy farmer was first required to join not only the AWU but also, probably, the Food Processors Union or the Liquor Trades Employees' Union because, in the first instance, they would be doing work covered by the Pastoral Award, presumably, and, in the second instance, work which involved handling drink or foodstuffs, namely, milk. Imagine also then, notwithstanding their having joined a union and then perhaps undertaken a course on farm training through TAFE, that they were precluded from becoming dairy farmers because the Dairy Farmers Employees Licensing Board advised that it had allocated enough dairy farmers' assistants and refused to issue them a licence to become dairy farmers.

We would, quite properly, stand in this place and express our outrage at such unnecessary bureaucratic Government interference. Yet that is precisely the situation which confronts people who work in maintenance occupations in factories and yards around this State at the present time, where the work relates to the disconnection or reconnection of some minor electrical appliances of one kind or another.

The analogous situation obtains. To my mind, then, it is about time we simply set out to abolish the board involved, that is, the Licensing Advisory Committee. What it has done is simply to carve out a responsibility for itself, post the era of the adoption of Australian standards for the training of people who are to be involved in that kind of work. That committee is an unnecessary bureaucratic burden on the industry and an unnecessary cost on the individual. It restricts work practices and limits the capacity of an individual worker to become multi-skilled and to engage in flexible, beneficial workplace activity which enriches their work.

It leads to demarcation disputes and increases costs to South Australian industry quite unnecessarily, whether it is in a factory or in any other location in which you might need to disconnect a broken down piece of equipment, pull it out

of the way and reconnect another piece of equipment. It will not be long before you will have to get a licence from it to change light bulbs. In many places that is the case and the arrangement: you simply cannot do anything with any piece of electrical equipment unless you have a B class licence from this ruddy committee. I am not the least bit impressed by the way in which it carries on.

We all know that its attitude is working against notions such as multi-skilling workers to maximise workplace flexibility and productivity. I do not know why the secretary of the Electrical Licensing Advisory Committee of South Australia, Mr Rob Hill, cannot answer questions put to him factually, simply, succinctly and honestly or why people from certain trades backgrounds and non-trades backgrounds could not get approval from the Licensing Advisory Committee to obtain a restricted licence and then undertake the necessary training to enable them subsequently to discharge the disconnect/reconnect work that this licence permits them to do.

It has been pointed out that the relevant Australian standard requires no specific trade background as a prerequisite to one's undertaking these national restricted electrical licence training modules 1 and 2, but the Licensing Advisory Committee in South Australia selectively interprets those requirements on the national scene to suit its own survival. It is about time we committed it to the history books. This stance is working against the option of true workplace flexibility and against the interests of enterprise bargaining and the efficiency of South Australia's industries in general. I know the Minister wishes to get together with the industry and work out, quite simply, how best to commit that committee to the history books where it belongs.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I refer to an incident involving the State Government Insurance Commission (SGIC). It is very disappointing that I have to put on the public record that I have not found SGIC to be professional and competent in the way it conducts its business, and perhaps that has a bit more to do with its past record. This matter was brought to my attention by a constituent not from my electorate but from the neighbouring electorate of Lee. But, fortunately for the constituent, I am quite happy to help her out. This is one of a number of constituents who are now coming to see me as a neighbouring MP due to the recent remarks of the present member for Lee, but that is for him worry to about.

I bring this matter to public attention, and it concerns a lady by the name of Mrs Buttle of Military Road, West Lakes Shore, in the electorate of Lee. Nearly three years ago, this constituent went to see her member of Parliament, Kevin Hamilton, the former member for Albert Park, concerning the use of her private silent telephone number by a private marketing company doing market research on behalf of SGIC. This lady had had a number of phone calls from the private marketing company canvassing a whole range of issues with her, and her silent number had been provided by the State Government Insurance Commission.

The then member for Albert Park wrote to the then Treasurer, Frank Blevins, and I have a copy of the response that the Minister received from the current Chief General Manager of SGIC, Malcolm Jones, who apologised. He said it was an unfortunate incident, that it should not have happened, that it would never happen again and that he had taken appropriate steps to ensure that.

That was back in 1992. Since that time, she has been receiving a number of phone calls from private marketing

firms that are still using her silent telephone number. The lady came to see me and I wrote to the Chief General Manager of SGIC, Mr Malcolm Jones, expressing my concern on behalf of the member for Lee's constituent. I received a reply from Malcolm Jones, which states, in part—and this is two years after the first complaint:

Regrettably it seems that we at SGIC have unintentionally caused a great deal of concern for Mrs Buttle by divulging her number to our market research company. . . This can only be put down to human error as a result of a number of changes to our computer records. . .

Blame the old computer. The letter continues:

Considering the worry and concern we have caused Mrs Buttle we would be pleased to pay for a new silent telephone number.

As it was, Mrs Buttle did not want a new telephone number: she simply wanted SGIC to desist from the practice of giving out her private, silent telephone number. To illustrate how contemptuously Malcolm Jones and SGIC treat parliamentarians, he had the gall to give me a draft letter to send back to Mrs Buttle. I did not do that. Mr Jones's Customer Relations Officer, Natalie Lilburn, wrote back saying that she acknowledged SGIC's mistake and that it would not happen again. In fact, she assured me that SGIC would not allow it to happen again and that it was the commission's mistake.

The constituent has since been to see me. Last Friday night at 7.40 p.m. she got another telephone call from a private marketing firm on behalf of SGIC. This lady has since cancelled three policies with SGIC because she is so annoyed and distressed by this. SGIC has publicly apologised and admitted its error on three occasions, but this practice continues.

This is disgraceful behaviour on the part of SGIC; it is absolutely abhorrent. When a member of this place receives a reply from the General Manager of SGIC admitting to an error and giving an assurance that such an incident will not happen again, that should be the end of the story. However, within one week of my receiving that response it has happened again.

I say to Malcolm Jones and to SGIC that it is not good enough. You have misled me as a member of Parliament; you have, indeed, told me an untruth. I call on the Treasurer today in this House to instruct SGIC to stop immediately the practice of giving out private telephone numbers and silent telephone numbers to private marketing firms. It is an invasion of privacy; it is disgraceful behaviour by a *quasi*-Government owned institution; and it is a case of a general manager who has lied to a member of State Parliament. I find that unacceptable and I call on every single member to back me here today in calling on SGIC to desist from this behaviour and to act responsibly. If I ever get misled again by SGIC, I will publicly campaign for the removal of this general manager.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. In his remarks, the member for Hart used the word 'lie' and I believe that is unparliamentary. I ask you to rule on that.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will deal with the honourable member's point of order. It is unparliamentary to use the word 'lie'. I must admit that I have generally assumed that it would be in reference to another member. Does the honourable member have a point of order to take in relation to this?

Mr QUIRKE: I was going to point out that the member for Hart was not talking about another member of Parliament:

he was talking about someone outside this Chamber. I do not believe that in this instance it is an unparliamentary remark.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point I would make in continuation of my ruling in response to the member for Goyder is that, when we take to task individuals who are outside Parliament and who are unable to defend themselves, it is probably better, as a matter of principle, to err on the side of temperate language. However, that is at the honourable member's discretion and I assume that he was very heated when he used the term. The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): While I accept the seriousness of the point raised by the member for Hart, I would like to start this grievance contribution by pointing out that he is on a very slippery pole. In my four or five years here it has not been the practice for any member to poke their nose into another member's electorate. If they are not satisfied with the response of their Lower House member, constituents can approach an Upper House member.

If that is the line the member for Hart wants to take, that is fine. If he wants to establish a new practice we can all go poking in other people's cupboards. I just give him a friendly piece of advice. Economic rationalism became the political catchcry of the 1980s. It found its expression as 'Reaganomics' in the United States and 'Thatcherism' in the United Kingdom. Indeed, it has percolated its way into all the Parliaments in Australia. However, economic rationalism carries with it some inherent dangers. Just as rising damp threatens the structural soundness of many of our heritage buildings so economic rationalism, when it is unchannelled and unquestioned, might undermine the integrity of the community well-being in South Australia. It is important that the bean counters who sit in splendid isolation and often offer theoretical advice to the Executive Government realise that this Government must bring its budget into this place and that it should not pass here unless it is the opinion of this House that it reflects the best interests for the management of the contemporary as well as the future well-being of all South Australians.

In this place we are all elected as representatives to speak and act honestly and fearlessly in the best interests of those who have elected us to their service. To balance a budget might indeed be a good thing, but before members opposite get too smug I would remind them that it was once a tradition in the mother of Parliaments that it was considered immoral, if not bordering on dishonest, for an outgoing Government not to pass its successor a balanced public purse. That is a lesson which unfortunately was not heeded by the previous Administration. However, balancing a budget for its own sake is neither necessarily a means nor an end to future prosperity. We must never lose sight of the fact that behind the lists of figures are services and people. I support the Premier and his Ministers in the daunting legacy foisted upon this Government by the maladministration of the previous regime.

I am heartened to note that while talking about fewer resources the Premier continues to promise better quality and more relevant services. However, it is for every member of this House, not least the members of the Government Party, to ensure that such laudable objectives are not distorted and diluted as they are translated into the real world of our electorates.

To illustrate the inherent danger of which I was speaking earlier, I draw the attention of this House to a valuable initiative which offers a State-wide service from the Clarence Park Community Centre in the electorate of Unley. It goes by

the acronym TOYS and is a collection of largely retired, unemployed and often, because of their age, unemployable people. At minimal cost this group repairs toys and teaching aids for play groups, child care centres, kindergartens and schools from as far afield as Millicent and Woomera. These people repair equipment which nobody else will repair, and they do it for very little cost and in so doing they save this State tens of thousands of dollars. They work in a most cost effective way and they provide a service, which gives them a feeling of some worth. In the process they are making some contribution to the community. Yet, when the instruction goes out from Executive Government to save money bureaucracy decides that the first way to save that money is to go to organisations such as this, which do not quite fit into any mould and which, however valuable they are, cannot be categorised and fitted neatly into some bureaucrat's box, and to say that the \$16 000 to \$20 000 needed for an administrator has to be cut.

I acknowledge the valuable contribution of the Minister for Education and Children's Services in providing ongoing funding for six months for this coordinated service, but the fact remains that at the end of December this service might be lost. It is a valuable service which provides nothing but good and which provides economic benefit to South Australia. When economic rationalism gets to the point of stupidity and when it ignores good and valuable service being provided by the Government I say, as the member for Unley, to hell with economic rationalism.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs Atkinson, Brindal, De Laine and Lewis.

Printing: Messrs Ashenden, Blevins, Brokenshire Clarke and Rossi.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I nominate the member for Chaffey to move an Address in Reply to Her Excellency's Opening Speech, and move:

That consideration of the Address in Reply be made an order of the day for tomorrow.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANS FOR TRANSPLANTATION

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I move:

That the committee have leave to continue its sittings during the current session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Thursday 27 October.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT

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

That the committee have leave to continue its considerations during this session.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIVING RESOURCES

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

That the committee have leave to continue its considerations during this session.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Community health services in this State are in a state of confusion and disarray in the absence of any direction from this Government or any firm indication of their status and what will happen to them. Community health services in the northern suburbs do not know from day to day what is to happen to them. For example, the Tea Tree Gully Community Health Service thinks one week that its services will be done away with altogether and its premises sold, but the next thing it hears is that it may be continued somewhere as a shopfront service. This state of confusion has gone on for some months, but I want to talk particularly about the Elizabeth Women's Community Health Centre, which serves the area that I represent.

I know quite a lot about this service, and I have a long standing commitment to it as both a private individual and now as a member of Parliament. This Government is trying to disguise its cost-cutting measures with allegations that certain services have approached the Minister to suggest their own demise or that their services be cut. This is absolute nonsense. I assure the House that there is no truth in the statement, in particular, that the Elizabeth Women's Community Health Centre has suggested that it become amalgamated with other health services in the area.

This is a very important service in this area. The users of this service, its board and its friends totally support it as a stand alone community health centre. For the Minister to say that anyone in that centre has suggested that it amalgamate with other community health services and lose its women's focus is completely wrong, and I reject it. I think the Minister will be surprised over the next few weeks and months by the strength of resistance to these proposals to amalgamate women's health services with other community health centres.

A survey conducted at the Elizabeth Women's Community Health Centre shows that the women who use that service value the privacy and, in particular, the security afforded to them by having a women's only health centre.

Mr Lewis: Wouldn't they get that from a woman GP?

Ms HURLEY: If women GPs were available, that would be so, but they also get support and security from being with other women and seeing women counsellors and women GPs

at the same service. This has been proved again and again by the people who use this service. It is very valuable for them; it provides the community health service that they cannot get at other centres. Its value is shown in the numbers of people who use the service, and it is extremely well used on a very small budget. I emphasise that the Elizabeth and surrounding community got together more than 10 years ago to lobby for this centre. It is an area where women are stressed for a number of reasons. There are multiple disadvantages in the area, including poverty, domestic violence, sexual abuse and social isolation. Those factors particularly hit the women in the area who are in charge of families and who are very often single mothers. We should not overlook the fact that these women are the centre of their family, by and large, and that what affects them affects their family and the community. We are talking not only about women but also about the health of the whole community.

Casemix funding, for example, will put more stress on community health. It will result in women and their families—perhaps their elderly relatives and children—leaving hospital earlier, and this puts further stress on women and women's health. To suggest at this stage that these services be cut while hospital funding is cut is absolutely ludicrous. This is an example of haphazard policy formation by this Government. What it is doing is seizing on any opportunity to attack and cut costs where it sees the weakest link. It has no long range policy—none that has been revealed to the board of Elizabeth Women's Health, in any case. It seems to have no policy for women's community health; it is just looking for wherever it is possible to make cuts. It seizes upon any excuse to say that the services have agreed to these cuts when that is patently untrue.

There is no real policy on health, particularly community health; people will be left to fend for themselves. In the case of women's health we really have to restate the reasons why women have been focused on for health in the past and remember that it has been for very good reasons. If people want to amalgamate with other services, those other services must be present, and there is no indication from this Government that community services will be assisted further. So, even if women's services were amalgamated into the community health services, we would like to know out in the Elizabeth-Smithfield area where those services will be placed. There is no indication that our community health services will be upgraded to cope with this influx.

This measure is abandoning a large sector of the community. We are not talking about a small interest group here: we are talking about women, who comprise over half the population. It is abandoning them and their families and it is a very short-sighted way to treat that sector of the community. This Government has paid lip service to preventive health but has really shown no commitment to it whatsoever. Commitment to the provision of women's health has come from previous Governments. It is much more important that the health and social problems of women and other people in the community are addressed before they get to the stage where they are hospitalised. So, no matter how efficient this Government thinks it will make its hospitals, it is more important that the overall health of the community is maintained and improved rather than allowing it to get to the stage where hospitalisation occurs.

Women's health services will command a great deal of support, and this Government will be surprised by that level of support. I am not sure that the Government has a policy on

this, as I said previously. I do not think it has a policy on women's health or on community health—

Mr Meier: Yes, we do. I am happy to give you a copy if you want it.

Ms HURLEY: If the Government has a policy, it is not being adhered to or demonstrated to people in any way, not only in health services but in a number of other areas. People are relying on what bureaucrats tell them and on the rumours abounding in the halls of hospitals or of the Health Commission, and they get a different story from each bureaucrat they speak to. They are casting around trying to find out exactly what will happen. No-one will tell them, particularly not the Minister, who also tells a different story from day to day. So, they are left trying to find a proposal that will fit in with a nebulous policy that the Government does not really seem to have—a proposal that would provide a minimal level of service to their clients.

This is not an exercise in maintaining their own jobs—people who work in these centres are qualified: this is an exercise in trying to maintain a minimal service for their clients whom they care about and whom they see every day. They realise the extent of their problems and the sort of help they need but cannot get from other services, and there is no indication that help will be improved in any other areas. I hope that I will see a great deal of lobbying from members opposite on behalf of other women's services, particularly the Southern Women's Community Health Centre. I hope that some of the women opposite—and the men—will lobby in favour of that and make sure that none of those four women's health services disappears.

Mr WADE (Elder): I refer today to the human catastrophe surrounding silicone gel breast implants. First, I would like to give an encapsulated view of the history of silicone gel implants, and then move on to the modern day. Silicone gel breast implants have been available for supply and use in Australia since the early 1960s. On 8 January 1992 the supply and use of silicone gel breast implants was subject to a moratorium in Australia while investigation into their safety, quality and efficacy continued. Subsequently, they were removed from the Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods (ARTG) and, therefore, could no longer be supplied in Australia. At the same time, the United States Federal Drug Administration banned the use of silicone gel breast implants on the basis that Dow Corning had ignored its own and other scientists' suspicions that the silicone gel could create health problems.

The Therapeutic Goods Act 1989 requires all medical devices and drugs to be entered onto the ARTG prior to marketing. This means that the Therapeutic Devices Branch undertakes pre-market evaluation, standards compliance and post-market surveillance. Unfortunately for Australian women, the silicone gel breast implants were 'grandfathered' onto the ARTG without testing and without evaluation. Approximately 50 000 Australian women had received silicone gel breast implants as at January 1992. About one million American women and about half a million British women have had silicone gel breast implants. A year later, on 6 May 1993, Senator Jones of the Australian Senate asked the Minister for Family Services a question regarding the results of Australian research into the effects of silicone gel breast implants on the women who had received them. The Minister replied:

I am not aware of any research on this issue in Australia.

Unfortunately, that again leaves us with research carried out overseas of which there is a copious amount that has recorded a plethora of physical and mental complaints from women who have developed complications due to leakage and/or rupturing of implants. It is of great concern that documents released by Dow Corning in early 1992 show that the company had known for more than 50 years that the silicone gel breast implants could rupture and it had been aware since 1974 that silicones could trigger powerful reactions in the human immune system. It chose to ignore or cover up the evidence according to the American *AM* current affairs program.

In fact, all mammary implants continuously release a small amount of silicone over time, and this is known as 'bleeding'. The effects of such bleeding and ruptures have been researched. For example, Britta Shoab of the Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas, presented a paper to the 87th Annual Scientific Assembly in October 1993 that described the following symptoms:

Weakness, fatigue, myalgia, morning stiffness, arthralgia, memory loss, sensory loss, severe headaches, hair loss, fever, allergies, rashes and sensitivity to sunlight, plus dry mouth and eyes.

Many women developed a multiple sclerosis like syndrome. Many of these women are in continuous and debilitating pain. In May 1994 I was approached by a female constituent who had had silicone gel breast implants. She had had them removed following complications and ruptures. This woman showed me a letter from Bleakly and McKeen, attorneys at law, representing American sufferers of silicone gel implants. These lawyers stated:

The claimants in the United States can participate in the settlement even if they have not experienced any medical difficulties (that is, they can receive settlement moneys for merely having implants inside their bodies). Foreign claimants [which includes Australians] must have one of the disease processes in order to participate.

What did the American law firm think of this? It stated:

The foreign claims have been treated very much differently, and in our view unfairly, from the claims of the United States' citizens.

What disease processes must Australians have and be identified as having before they can make any claims on the Americans. The schedule includes some of the following:

Sclerosis, Lupus, Atypical Neurological Disease Syndrome, Mixed Connective Tissue Disease, Polymyositis, Dermatomyositis, Primary Sjogren's Syndrome, Atypical Connective Tissue Disease and Atypical Rheumatic Syndrome. . .

And there are others. The schedule stated:

The claimant must attach all medical records that might affect this determination.

That is why this woman came to see me. Her doctor had refused and still refuses to give her access to her records which she needs to prove her case in the American litigation. Why is that? The AMA recommended to the doctor that he provide the information so that the woman could actually support her case for compensation. The doctor agreed but only on the condition that at no time in the future would my constituent bring a negligence case against him. The Freedom of Information Act applies to public institutions, not private ones, so she had no recourse under the FOI Act to insist on being given the information. The constituent declined the offer and thereby, by default one might say, did not participate in the Americans' generous offer of sharing about \$50 million out of the total of \$5.4 billion with hundreds of thousands of non-American women worldwide.

However, the issue did not stop there. My constituent had previously sought the Federal Government's views on the offer made by Dow Corning to Australian women. She had no response. Another letter was prepared and sent to Carmen Lawrence on 24 May 1994 asking her to respond to this basic question:

I need to know whether I have to fight for my rights with or without your support.

On 8 June 1994 Carmen Lawrence's senior adviser responded on behalf of the Minister as follows:

I regret that the Government is unable to assist you.

Therefore, as of 8 June this year, the Federal Labor Government would not publicly give its support for Australian women in their fight for a fair deal: support that has been given without any request by the American legal firm. I find this intolerable. This human catastrophe that has been foisted on Australian women is unacceptable.

Motion carried.

At 4.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 3 August at 2 p.m.