

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 October 1994

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

**DENTISTS (CLINICAL DENTAL TECHNICIANS)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 8 September. Page 451.)

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health):** The Government's position is one of opposition to this matter. In 1983 a select committee of the Legislative Council considered the matter of the registration of dental prosthetists or, as they are now known, clinical dental technicians, dental technicians and dental laboratories. After the deliberations of the select committee, the only form of registration that came out of the committee was a limited form of registration for clinical dental technicians—limited in the sense that they were only to be permitted to construct and fit full upper and lower dentures, not partial dentures, directly to the public and, further, importantly it was limited in the sense that it was not meant to be an ongoing form of registration creating a new profession. I should like to quote from the select committee findings as follows:

It is stressed that these recommendations would not create a new class of practitioner as the technician operating in the area of clinical denture work is already in the work force. The recommendations merely seek to formalise the present situation based on proper standards.

At that stage the dental board arranged an assessment program to facilitate the registration under the grandfathering in accordance with the select committee recommendations. Two of those assessments were carried out in 1984 and 1985 and 24 practitioners at that stage were duly registered. A further assessment was conducted in late 1990/early 1991 and at that stage a further seven candidates were successful. The regulations were subsequently changed and now require satisfactory completion of a course of at least one academic year or the equivalent in clinical technical dentistry, conducted by a university or other body or by a State or Commonwealth Department and satisfactory completion of an examination in clinical technical dentistry conducted by or on behalf of the Dental Board.

At the moment the 1993-94 annual report of the Dental Board indicates that there are 29 clinical dental technicians on the register, so this is a small number in itself. I am led to believe that this may include about 10 who are retired or otherwise not in active or full-time practice. More recently dental technicians wishing to become registered as clinical dental technicians in South Australia (and some are people who have been unsuccessful at three previous assessment attempts) have gone to Queensland to take advantage of the grandfather assessments for dental prosthetists in Queensland. They then become registered and come back to South Australia to be registered under the mutual recognition terms.

Information I have from Queensland indicates that the assessment takes one week, as opposed to the five year full dental course at university. Clinical dental technicians in South Australia are not trained to provide partial dentures directly to the public. As I indicated, those who are registered

have had variable training, have qualified under grandfather assessments, and they have not had that experience. Importantly, in patients with some dentures missing, a partial denture is only one possible solution. It is only one option for treatment. Importantly, if we were to allow this Bill to pass, patients with a missing denture could go to a clinical dental technician, perhaps seeking a partial denture, and the only option they could offer the patient would be a partial denture. As has been made quite clear to me on numerous occasions, particularly with the advance of technology and modern techniques such as posts and bridges and all the other technical dental techniques (which I do not profess to fully understand), there is now improved care available, not necessarily through the option of having a partial denture. Indeed, it has also been made quite clear to me that often the only reason for filling the gap is aesthetics: there is nothing wrong with the gap in the first place.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** That is correct. As the member for Unley quite categorically indicates, what we would then potentially have are two standards of dentistry. In other words, we would have people seeing a dentist using modern technology, modern techniques, and who carries out a proper assessment of the other stresses and strains on the mouth from partial dentures, in comparison with people who have been offered one option only by the clinical dental technician. To fashion a satisfactory partial denture, natural teeth may often require adjustment or modification to their shape or dimension. In fact, to achieve optimal shaping present teeth may well need moulding by use of a handpiece or a drill, and this is quite clearly outside the scope and training of clinical dental technicians and, I believe, is certainly outside the scope of training as might be supplied by some of these other courses. The types of diseases that people are at risk of are, in many instances, literally fatal. I am not talking about diseases that might—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The member for Spence seems not to understand that there is indeed a disease called subacute bacterial endocarditis, which is a disease which directly occurs when teeth are drilled or filled and bacteria get through the mouth and are absorbed from the stomach into the bloodstream, and, if a person has diseased heart valves, it can well be fatal. It is as simple as that. The matter of the seriousness of the diseases for which dentists have been trained for five years certainly mitigates against the training programs which are provided. I should also say that as well as those sorts of diseases—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I do know, and I am correct. The honourable member should look at the dictionary. As well as that, dentists are trained to notice underlying disorders and diseases other than just in relation to the teeth. Certainly, oral cancer is one of the matters which is particularly important, certainly to the patients.

The risks of cross-infection are obviously relevant. I believe that can be covered with appropriate infection control mechanisms. For those extremely valid clinical reasons, for which dentists are able to provide alleviating factors, the Government believes that this Bill should not be supported. The other matter relates to people who wish to undergo a training program or do these sorts of things, and I have heard people say that no training course is available. A course is available called the Bachelor of Dental Surgery. In the light of opposition from the Australian Dental Association, the

Dental Board, the South Australian Dental Service, the Dental Advisory Committee of the South Australian Health Commission and the Australian Commercial Dental Laboratories Association, I believe there is considerable reason not to support this Bill.

In relation to the Dental Advisory Committee of the South Australian Health Commission, the Clinical Dental Technicians Association wrote to the then Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission late last year. Advice was sought from a number of people, some of whom I have mentioned—the ADA, SADS, the Australasian Dental Technicians Society, the Gilles Plains College of Technical and Further Education and the Australian Commercial Dental Laboratories Association. In a meeting held on 14 February 1994 the Dental Advisory Committee considered that matter, and the consensus of its members was that clinical dental technicians ought not be allowed to provide partial dentures. The then Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Dental Scheme stated categorically that in his position it would be professionally unsound to allow clinical dental technicians to provide partial dentures. To allow passage of this Bill would see the creation of two standards of dental care and, as the Government insists upon the provision of care with the highest standards, it intends to oppose the Bill.

**Mr De LAINE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon Frank Blevins:

That the regulations made under the Daylight Savings Act 1971 relating to summer time 1994-95, gazetted on 15 September 1994 and tabled in this House on 11 October 1994, be disallowed.

(Continued from 13 October. Page 611.)

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** It is a disappointment to have to contribute to this debate today. All members in this Chamber must wonder about the member for Giles because he came in here last night and made a very effective contribution—of course, not everyone agreed with his case—and yet only a few hours later we are dealing with this load of rubbish. If ever the member for Giles, who prides himself on his parliamentary consistency, were going to be accused of inconsistency and political cynicism it is over a motion such as this. Several months ago the honourable member strongly favoured and was a proponent of this State's shifting to eastern standard time. Yet, now he comes in here and complains about a trivial rearrangement of daylight saving.

In his contribution, the honourable member made some serious points. He said that this is a matter of great importance to his electorate. I am absolutely positive that the members for Flinders, Custance and Goyder would concur. I am a member of a Party which very strongly represents the views of people in rural South Australia and which has members who will never let urban electorates like mine forget that South Australia depends for its economic survival on those people.

Members opposite should one day change sides and enjoy the privilege of our Party room, because if ever they want to hear the views of rural people absolutely and assiduously protected then they should listen to the members for Eyre, Goyder, Flinders, Custance, Chaffey or Frome or any country member. They are absolutely scrupulous in their protection of the rights of their electors, especially because their electors are often disadvantaged by a whole host of factors, not the

least of which is geographic isolation. They do that and they do it consistently. Then we have the member for Gilles who has been more noted for his fearless representation of the urban—

**An honourable member:** Giles.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Yes, it is Giles. I am sorry to insult the honourable member; it is a huge insult and I am sorry to heap that on him. The member for Giles has been noted in the past for his fearless protection of Whyalla, which is more characterised as a decentralised, urban area of this State than it is for its rural constituency. However, things change and the honourable member gets up here and waxes lyrical about the needs of farmers and about how this two or three weeks will make all the difference in the world. As I said, there is the man who wanted to drag this State to eastern standard time; there is the man who already supports and condones a system where South Australia has an effective time zone that runs through Warrnambool.

A thing I learned quite early in life is that the course of the day is determined by the sun. Most of us, no matter how modern our society and how many amenities we have, still find our lives ruled basically by the sun—when the sun rises and when it sets. South Australia is already, even in a place like Adelaide, half an hour out of kilter. We have, by historical fact in the early 1900s, shifted our natural time a half an hour further forward than it should be. That has a profound effect, especially in areas in which I used to live in the west of the State: Ceduna and Cook. When daylight saving is in effect in South Australia one is just about getting up in the dark and going to bed in the light, because the difference is magnified as one goes across the State.

In that respect, the member for Giles's arguments have some compulsion and some merit. However, he is talking about two or three weeks of the year—a limited window of time—as if this were going to make his Party the absolute saviours of rural South Australia. So, I just say this to the member for Giles: if he is genuine and if, in another place, a select committee is established and then reports, the capacity of the member for Giles to support his rural electorate will be reflected more by whether he is prepared to move to a true Central Standard Time than by whether he is to come into this House with cheap political tricks to try to show up genuine members who argue absolutely consistently and rigorously for their electors, both in the public forum of the Parliament and in the more private forum of the Party room. Those electors are very concerned about this issue, in fact so concerned that they will take most seriously the contributions and deliberations of the Upper House and its select committee. If that select committee reports, and if it recommends any change towards Central Standard Time—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** This is the point I am making for the member for Giles: if the select committee reports that this State should change towards Central Standard Time, I expect—as all rural members would also expect—that the member for Giles would be the first on his feet to say that South Australia's clocks should not stay forward half an hour but that they should go backwards, and that will be the true test of the member for Giles's—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** It is a very interesting issue, but it is not relevant to this.

**Mr BRINDAL:** That will be the true test of consistency, because the point I am making in the context of the motion moved by the member for Giles is that it is inconsistent, and I cannot support it, because I have an admiration for a person

who comes into this House and is generally consistent. It is inconsistent for the member for Giles to come in here at one drop of the pen and move to have us shoved onto Central Standard Time—an illogical and stupid proposition—and then come in here days later, pleading for the rural people of South Australia and saying how dreadful and inconsiderate the Government is, how all the cows will stop producing milk and how everyone will be entirely inconvenienced unless we pass this proposition. I do not support—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** No; the member for Giles said that I am not sympathetic with his constituents. On the contrary, I am so sympathetic towards his constituents and other rural constituents that, when any proposition of merit comes before this House relating to time, I will consider it most seriously, and I am inclined to support a movement of South Australia to its true meridian time. I do not want—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Four months or four months and three weeks; that is the issue.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I do not want to be part of the tokenism that is shown when members come into this House and say, 'Four months or four months and three weeks; that is the issue.' The issue here is the true meridian time of this State, and the statement of whether it is four months or four months and three weeks is evidence of the same sort of tinkering that this House witnessed last night. It is tokenism; it is tinkering at the edges, and I do not think this House should support it. If this House wants to consider—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** If this House wants to consider—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** This House has given the honourable member the right to speak: it denies the right to speak by way of interjection by both the member for Giles and the member for Spence.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I thank the Deputy Speaker for his eloquence on the matter. If this House is to consider the true meridian time of this State, I am positive that every Liberal member—especially those who represent rural constituencies—will think about it. And, Mr Deputy Speaker, you are one of those members—I forgot to mention you earlier—who will think about it most carefully. However, this House cannot be expected to accede to the tokenism and the publicity stunts perpetrated by the member for Giles, or to be bludgeoned by the prattling of the member for Spence.

**Mr CLARKE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SHOP TRADING HOURS (EXEMPTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 8 September. Page 461.)

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I have great pleasure in supporting this Bill. The attempt to have the issue of shop trading hours bypass Parliament was a great disappointment to me. A number of members last night in the debate about scratchies said that they had consulted newsagents and small business people in their area and that their attitude reflected what those people had said.

I have consulted shop traders and small business people in my area. I am sure that, if Government members did the same, they would find overwhelming opposition to the extension of shop trading hours. Although I expected it, I was a bit taken aback by the vehemence with which they opposed

the extension of trading hours and any possibility of voluntary action on their part in determining shop trading hours. They were all of the opinion that shopping centre owners or the pressure of competition would force them to accede to the extended hours. Last night, and even this morning, much was said about consistency. If Liberal members are consistent about responding to small business people in their community, they will vote to support this Bill.

The extension of shop trading hours is so vigorously opposed by shop assistants and small business people that about 70 000 or 80 000 have signed a petition against it in a very short period of time. I understand that the shop assistants' union has had tremendous support from its members in opposing the extension of trading hours and taking the matter to court in order to take whatever action it could to block this situation. It disappoints me that we have not had the chance to debate this matter in Parliament. We spent all last night debating scratch tickets, yet an issue such as this, which will change the way in which society operates and the nature of family life for a large number of people who work in the retail industry, we have not had the chance to debate at all.

The only opportunity we have to debate this matter is through a private member's Bill introduced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Obviously, members opposite will use any opportunity they can not to vote on this issue or to show the small business people in their electorate where their loyalty and opinions lie. This action shows that this Government, far from being a strong Government that is committed to showing leadership in our community, is attempting to get away with whatever it can by stealth and bypassing the normal parliamentary procedures.

It is claimed that shop assistants can work on a voluntary basis and that they do not need to work on Sundays or extended hours. If members opposite talked to the shop assistants in their electorate, they would rapidly be disabused of any concept of voluntary work. Shop assistants already feel that they work hours that are not of their choosing and that they have no choice in the matter. Most junior shop assistants in my electorate are young people working in their first job. They are desperate to gain the experience that is required in today's job market. They are unable to stand up to their managers or employers. They work appalling hours, often for several hours at a time, and they then come back later in the day when it is busy, or for a couple of hours on one day and a couple of hours on another, and they are on stand-by for the rest of the week.

There is no voluntary situation in which shop assistants can work the hours they choose. The situation will not be any different with extended trading. They will be told that if they want to work on Sundays a job will be available for them but if they do not the hours they work will probably be reduced. There is nothing voluntary about the situation for either shop assistants or small business people who may not want to open during the extended hours.

I ask members opposite to support this Bill so that Parliament can have the opportunity to have some say in the regulation of shopping hours. To leave it to the discretion of the Minister to take a backdoor route by way of regulation is unfair to the Parliament and members of the community who elect members of Parliament to represent them. The people in my electorate are disappointed that after our conversations on this issue I have not had the chance to represent them in Parliament and vote for or against the extension of shop trading hours. This is an outrageous situation in which members of Parliament cannot have a say and represent the

community in this Parliament. We need consistency on this issue; we need to be able to have our say; and I commend the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for giving us this small opportunity to oppose the extension of shop trading hours.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I support the Bill introduced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition which seeks to allow the Parliament to debate the extension of shop trading hours to include Sundays. The underhand way in which the Government has sought to deregulate shopping hours is disgraceful. The Minister gave an absolute assurance on several occasions before the 11 December election that if the Liberal Party came to office and he became the Minister for Industrial Affairs he would not extend shopping hours. The Liberal Party did come to office and the honourable member did become the Minister, but it has backtracked on the assurances that were given in a wide range of areas prior to that election. In a complete about face, the Minister now wants to do just that, and because he fears he does not have the numbers in either House—and he has got good reason to fear that because of election promises by certain Government members on the other side—he wants to use a backdoor method to achieve his aims.

It is true that the previous Labor Government used the regulations to grant exemptions to allow shopping hour extensions, but this was done judiciously to cater for specific events such as the Grand Prix, Christmas, Easter, etc., and those exemptions were granted for only limited periods of time. What this Government through the Minister is seeking to do is abuse this provision to extend shopping hours by a measure which was considered perhaps to be illegal. However, events of the past few days have shown that it is not, although I still maintain that it is not appropriate. If it is not illegal, it is certainly not what the regulations were intended to do.

The judicious use of exemptions by the Minister is quite correct and quite appropriate, but the provision should not be abused, as this Minister wants to do, to bypass the democratically elected Parliament in this case. This is just another example of this Government's long list of broken election promises.

A survey commissioned by the Government found that 80 per cent of people were satisfied with the existing shopping hours or wanted reduced shopping hours. That means that only 20 per cent wanted extended hours. So, this Government is completely ignoring the wishes of the vast majority and pandering to the wishes and, indeed, the demands of the large shopping chains in this State.

The Liberal Party is always saying how much it supports small business in this State, but let them now show their support by supporting this Bill. This Bill will allow the Parliament to debate and decide the fate of shopping hours for the benefit of all of the people of this State. I support the Bill.

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** In the short time that I have been in this Parliament, I am absolutely amazed at the standard of debate of the few people in the opposite corner of this Chamber. They say that they represent the people but, from my recollection, the Labor Party was the Party that changed the opening hours for hotels from 6 o'clock to 10 o'clock. The Labor Party called a referendum on 19 September 1970 which asked:

Are you in favour of shops in the metropolitan planning area of the municipality of Gawler being permitted to remain open for trading until 9 p.m. on Fridays?

**Mr Atkinson:** What did they say?

**Mr ROSSI:** The answer was 'No.' The answer to the referendum held by the Labor Government on normal extended shopping hours was 'No,' yet it was the Labor Government that introduced extended shopping hours for Friday nights in the city and Thursday nights in the metropolitan area. It was also the Labor Government that introduced TAB, horseracing and football matches on Sundays, again against the wishes of the people. And they now stand here today saying that they are going to represent small business. They also say that it—

**Mr Atkinson:** Where do you stand on this?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ROSSI:** If you keep quiet I can express my views without interruptions and then you can have your say. It seems like your mouth is in gear, but your brain isn't. I can say that in my doorknocking and going through the electorate, in the first instance there was very little reaction to extended shopping hours. When the Liberal Government decided to extend shopping hours I did get an earbashing from some of the retailers in the West Lakes shopping centre. I sympathise with the views that were expressed to me by the shop owners of the electorate, and I have relayed that feeling to the Party room. However, I do not agree with members opposite, because all the country shops in the State have seven day trading already due to the incompetence of those members in not representing the electors. So, the only people who are affected are those in the metropolitan area.

Some arguments have been put forward to me about religion. If church on Sunday is disrupted for the metropolitan area, so it will be for the country. Their argument was, 'Well, the country can stay open on Sundays, but we want to stay closed on Sundays.' That is not a valid argument. There has to be consistency throughout the State. There should not be discrimination between different sectors of the community. We are trying to fix up the blunders and mistakes of members opposite; they have encouraged breakdowns in the community. The Government intends to do the best that it can given the mess we are in.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** I support the amendment of the Deputy Leader, the member for Ross Smith. What a Government we have! What a Liberal Party we have—a Party that was prepared prior to the last election to make all the promises in the world with every intention of breaking them one by one when it got into Government. With regard to this promise, the Minister for Industrial Affairs stood on the steps of this Parliament and told the small retailers of this State, 'We will defend the rights of small business and not extend shop trading hours.' Members throughout this Chamber—if not all members of the Liberal Party—went into their electorate before the State election and campaigned on that very fact. They knocked on the doors of small retailers in their electorate and said, 'We won't be supporting extended trading hours; we will be supporting small business.' Into Government they went and within weeks the Minister for Industrial Affairs bowed to the pressure of the big retailers—the big end of Rundle Mall, the big end of town—put pressure on this Government, and it buckled. It did not take one or two years for this Minister to buckle; it took a matter of weeks.

Then into his caucus room he went with this Bill. Suddenly he found that his caucus members had a bit of guts; some of them had the guts to tell this Minister that it was not on. He realised that, should he bring that Bill into this Chamber, he would suffer the almighty embarrassment of a loss, a loss determined by members from his own side who would cross the floor—members of this House who had integrity and the guts to stand up for their electorate. What did he do? He took the gutless route and decided not to bring the Bill into this Chamber. He decided not to risk putting this issue to a vote. What we now have is this Government letting down small business. Not only do we have that but we have a Minister, a Government and a Cabinet that says, 'Well, we'll get around the Parliament; the Parliament isn't that important. We have tricks; we'll use a trick to get around the Parliament, and we will open up shop trading simply by using other means than debating the issue in the Parliament.' If this is a Government about accountability, why does it not show the ultimate accountability in respect of this place and have the guts to bring the issue in here?

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have noticed over the past few weeks there has been an increasing tendency to use words like 'guts', 'gutless' and such terms which I do not think contribute to the debate. I ask you to rule that they, if not unparliamentary, are not conducive to good debate in this Chamber.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** They are robust Anglo-Saxon words which have been used over the decades that I have been in Parliament without points of order being taken. I suppose the real objection members have is the manner in which the words are used and the emphasis with which they are delivered, but such emphasis does not appear in *Hansard*; therefore, they tend to slip by relatively unnoticed by the general public. The honourable member's comments do not constitute a point of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** Thank you, Sir. You have not got the guts to take on your Party, your Ministers and your Leader and bring the measure into Parliament and stand up for your electors. At the end of the day an elector will not support a local member who has not got the guts to stand up for his or her rights. I have talked about it before and I will talk about it here: this Government has members who will not be coming back next time. The member for Lee just delivered such tripe that I will be interested at the reaction I get when I hand deliver *Hansard* to every shop owner at West Lakes, Trimmer Parade and Seaton. They will be interested to read the comments from the member for Lee. Mark my words, they will read them. I will make it my role in life over the course of the next few weeks to hand deliver that *Hansard* to those shops.

The member for Peake has made it clear that he cannot win his seat at the next election and I say to all those members here like the members for Hartley, Kaurna, Florey and Unley: what will you say to your shop traders when they mount a campaign to oppose you at the next election?

**Mr Meier:** They won't.

**Mr FOLEY:** They will, because you are showing poor judgment on this issue. You should have the strength of character to tell your Minister and the Premier, 'I'm not going to deceive the shop owners in my electorate through trickery; I want to debate this issue in this Chamber.' You should have the strength to take your Party leadership on and bring this issue into this place because your electors, your small shop traders, are telling you that they do not want an extension of hours. Yet again your Government is taking a decision and

I appeal to the member for Kaurna and other members, because the member for Lee is a lost cause, if you want to have a chance of winning your seats, do not let this Government dictate to you about how you will vote on this issue. Do not let this Government sell you down the river, because it is selling you down the river.

On this issue the Government is saying that the seats of Kaurna, Lee, Reynell, Florey, Peake and Hanson are expendable because the Government is willing to lose those seats, so that the Government will not have to face up to the tough issues. I say that Government members should show some strength of character and demand that their Minister brings the Bill into the Chamber. They should support the Deputy Leader's amendment and show some real guts.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I cannot believe what I am hearing. The Opposition has had a philosophical implant and members have changed their computer chips. They are now the Party of small business. They are the Party that brought in the extension of shopping hours before Christmas and the election by regulation without bringing it before Parliament and they are now complaining that the Government has introduced this measure without giving the House the opportunity to comment. I remind the Opposition of the court deliberations yesterday and the headline 'Court bid to stop Sunday trading fails'. If the Opposition had any respect for the court system, it would be honest about it knowing that due process has taken place and the attempt had failed.

The member for Napier said she consulted with small business and shopkeepers and it is great to see that the Labor Party has broadened its base and no longer just consults with the trade union movement. At last it knows that there are other people out there and it supports small business.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** I am pleased the Opposition has a broad view to look after the interests of the whole community. I did the same thing and consulted with small business. I did a letter drop in my area around Campbelltown, Erindale and Wattle Park. I listened and made myself available to people.

**Mr Brindal:** You always do; that's why you and your colleagues are so busy.

**Mr SCALZI:** That is what we are here for and I thank the member for Unley for keeping me on track. People put their views to us and we listened. We established an independent committee to find out where we should go with shopping hours and we took that into account; we took into account the problems of small business; and, unlike members opposite, when it was considered in the Party room we all had input and it was decided in a democratic way, not just by the Cabinet, as was the case before the election. I doubt whether members opposite had the same opportunity to put the case of their constituents as my colleagues and I had the opportunity to do. The overall compromise was decided by the Government, and if that is not democratic I do not know what is. After all, the Government was elected to make decisions. We decided in a democratic way, unlike the case with members opposite, where the Cabinet came up with the decree and I am sure many of them were not aware of what was going on.

Possibly because of that arrogance, they suffered at the last election. We had the opportunity to put our case and the compromise was the best that could be achieved for South Australia. It is not extended trading hours for the whole metropolitan area five days a week as the Labor Government had given us, and proposed Sunday trading for all the

metropolitan area; we came up with a compromise, which is good for the State, of Sunday trading in the city, to be in line with the rest of Australia, to assist tourism so that we can give a boost to the State but, at the same time, to protect small businesses throughout the State. And we are achieving that.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** 'Only the beginning,' says the member for Torrens. Unlike her Party, our whole parliamentary Party has an input, and that is how it was decided; it was not just decided by the Minister. That is how we work: we are a democratic Party. We went out there and listened and took into account the views of the various groups, unlike members opposite who suddenly today, for a political stunt, are born again small business supporters. I cannot believe that this Bill has been put before us after what has happened. The people have decided.

We are the Government: we consulted the community, we had an independent inquiry and took into account the various points of view. We have taken action to protect small businesses. Where two-thirds of small businesses do not want to open in major shopping centres, they will not be forced to. You have small business protection, which you never had in the past, and today members opposite come here and tell us that they are supporting small business. I find that very difficult to believe.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Shakespeare is alive and well in this Chamber. I suggest that the residents of South Australia flock in here on a Thursday morning to watch the performance of members opposite. The stage directions of *Macbeth* actually call for three weird sisters. But the Labor Party is a bit light on and it has the three weird brothers in the form of the members for Ross Smith, Hart and Giles, who sit there Thursday after Thursday screeching to this Chamber, 'Fair is foul and foul is fair, hover through fog and smoke filled air.' Every week they come in here and attempt to cover everything with fog and smoke, screech and preach prophecies of doom through the mist and, in short, do a better performance of *Macbeth* than even Shakespeare could have envisioned. If people want free entertainment of a Thursday morning there is no better place than the South Australian House of Assembly; it does not cost anything.

The hypocrisy of the Labor Opposition has to be seen to be believed. This matter was discussed in the Party room of the Liberal Party and an approach was determined. I can assure members opposite that it was democratically arrived at. It just so happens that over three quarters of this Chamber sits in the Liberal Party room. We might not have discussed it in this public forum, but it was exceptionally democratic, because the will of over half this Chamber—half the Parliament—was expressed. We are doing what the majority of this Parliament wants, so I do not know what members opposite are talking about. I am on the public record as saying I had a differing view from that of the Government on Sunday shop trading. I used the best of my endeavours, as did some of my colleagues. They were very dedicated in pursuing what they believed to be right, as were people who argued for the current Government Party position on the matter.

There was a fiery, lengthy debate and all points of view were put. In the end, the point of view that I represented lost the day. That does not mean that it was not democratically arrived at, nor that for the sake of Opposition members' blood lust we must bring things in here and exhibit in front of them what private differences on matters of policy we might legitimately have just so that they can examine the entrails

and screech with delight. We might be a democratic Party, but we are not masochistic and we will not succumb to the predilection for the vicarious pleasures that members opposite seem to want to foist on us and the people of South Australia. We will do it and we will do it properly.

The other point that needs to be made is that the Bill before the House does not affect the certificates of exemption which were issued by the former Government and which allowed Sunday trading. Before we took office, the Labor Government exempted 358 businesses from the ban on Sunday trading. It decided by regulation that those 358 businesses could trade on Sundays. Now members opposite come in here and say that this is abysmal, that it is dreadful, that we have this Minister subverting the Parliament and doing all these nasty things, when he is actually pursuing his legitimate right to issue certificates. Although it is the same right which their Ministers enjoyed, when a Liberal Government gets in it is undemocratic and cannot be done. So, they say, 'We did it, but you can't; and, what's more, we'll stop you doing it by introducing this Bill. Of course, any decisions we made were enlightened and informed and, therefore, we'll protect the decisions we made regarding Sunday trading', and they will attempt to do that by using this same insidious, undemocratic process they are now jumping up and down about. They say 'When we did it, it was all right so we are going to protect those businesses that we issued it for, but we are going to stop you doing it for your businesses.'

If there is anyone in this Chamber who can sustain that argument or if there is anybody in South Australia who does not think that that is hypocrisy in its ultimate form, I would like to meet them and debate them on the subject, because it is hypocrisy. Members of the former Government cannot say it was all right when they did it, but the minute they lose Government come in here and say it is all wrong and we have to do it this way because it is more democratic, still protecting the decisions they made by a process which they now consider to be wrong, and condemn the current Government for doing the same thing. All members on this side are here to contribute to the better government of South Australia. The Opposition has a most legitimate role to play in keeping this Government on its toes and in keeping this Government honest.

**Mr Clarke:** It's a big job.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Ross Smith says that it is a big job. I can assure him that, as somebody who has been here five minutes longer than him, that it is ne'er so big a job as the job we had in trying to keep the then Government honest when we were in Opposition. We must all be grateful that we at least had 23 members working day and night, as you know, Sir, to keep them honest. Even then there were times when it was difficult and when perhaps we could have done better. They have 11 members and luckily their task is not so great. They have 11 members, 9 of whom are still on holiday, and luckily there is not much to check up on. There is not much for them to do, so we welcome the fact that some of them need to recharge their batteries. They might have three years sort of coasting along nicely, and then they will crank up for the election, create the smoke and light machine and tell us how they are the solution to all the problems. They have started. We have seen this morning: friend of the farmer, friend of small business, friend of everybody.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Yes, champion of all causes, champion of all people. It is most apposite in the context of recent developments with the abattoir down at Tatiara, I believe it

was traditional for an abattoir to have a Judas dolt, which was the animal that led the rest of the flock into the slaughteryard for slaughter. The Party opposite might find itself cast, quite rightfully, in that sort of role. They lead people along, their bell ringing, saying 'Follow us, follow us.' If their path is to the slaughterhouse, they hope that nobody is around to complain afterwards. Well, the Opposition was not only around but was very vocally ringing the bell when the former Government led us down that path.

We are now in Government. We are seeking to do an honest and democratic job. We will not listen to the plaintive bell of people who know no better. If the Opposition wants to get on with the job of helping us govern this State and do it properly, every Minister and every member of the Government benches will welcome them. If on the other hand they want to create smoke, fog and mist, screech and cause fear amongst the populous, let them do so. It is a great sideshow. It might attract some publicity, but as the member for Ross Smith said earlier, 'Look what happened to us.' That was his interjection. Well, we have, and I assure him we will not go down the same path. The people of South Australia might enjoy a sideshow, but they will enjoy better good Government from the Liberal team, and it is good Government they will get despite, and not because of, it seems, the best efforts of the Opposition.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is the motion seconded?

**Mr Clarke:** No.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (30)

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

NOES (10)

Atkinson, M.J.	Blevins, F.T.
Clarke, R.D. (teller)	De Laine, M.R.
Foley, K.O.	Geraghty, R.K.
Hurley, A.K.	Quirke, J.A.
Rann, M.D.	Stevens, L.

Majority of 20 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING (TWO UP ON ANZAC DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 October. Page 615.)

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** I am surprised at the member for Spence for putting up this Bill again because it was defeated

only six months ago. Members opposite remind me of drug traffickers: they first entice someone with a small—

**Mr ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. The member for Lee just compared members of the Opposition to drug traffickers. I wonder whether that is parliamentary?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Yesterday, the Chair indicated that it was particularly concerned with language that may not be unparliamentary but certainly was unnecessary in the view of the Chair. I would suggest that members should not make comments which in any way reflect on the dignity of the House. I am of the view that the public expects its representatives to conduct themselves in a dignified manner. I therefore ask the member for Lee and all other members to bear that in mind. When the Standing Orders are transgressed, I will require withdrawal immediately.

**Mr ROSSI:** I do not know where I went wrong because I am being as factual as possible. If the action seems to be similar, then anything I express otherwise is contrary to honesty in this House. The member for Spence has said that two-up is just for Anzac Day. It is, of course, a form of gambling. On Anzac Day there will be publicity about two-up and, if we pass this Bill, it will become legal and two-up will be publicised through newspapers, such as the local rag, and through word of mouth as being an acceptable activity.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr ROSSI:** It does not matter who makes a profit out of it, it is still gambling. I feel that the Labor Party introduces mischievous legislation to encourage diversity within the family unit and the community, and then runs away from it.

**An honourable member:** You mean divergence, not diversity.

**Mr ROSSI:** Yes, it is splitting the community. Members can take that anyway they want, but it is splitting the community.

**Mr Atkinson:** Many of your colleagues are supporting you.

**Mr ROSSI:** I do not care whether many of my colleagues are supporting me. It is not Liberal Party policy. I have the right—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! The member for Spence will desist, and the member for Lee will address his remarks through the Chair.

**Mr ROSSI:** I have the right to express the views of my electorate and my own views, and I try to be as consistent as possible.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Is the member for Spence deaf? The Chair asked the member for Spence to desist.

**Mr ROSSI:** It may interest the member for Spence to know that my father-in-law served in the Second World War on the Australian side, and also my father served in the Second World War. I have talked to them and other friends, and in no way do they believe that two-up is necessary for Anzac Day. It was a game played during the war to kill boredom or to make players rich at the time, but there is no necessity for it to be introduced so long after the war. My fear is that, if this Bill passes, in years to come two-up will spread from Anzac Day to other days.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell.

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker.

**Mr Becker:** Where did you win the tie?

**Mr CAUDELL:** At a two-up game at the Casino. I oppose this Bill as I did on the previous occasion it was debated. After watching and participating in last night's debate, it will be with great mirth that I watch this debate. Last night some members were overwhelmingly against gambling, yet the last time this Bill was debated it resulted in a very close vote of only one or two members. The reasons for my objection to this Bill are twofold. I also put on the record, for the sake of Mr Philip White who writes in the back page of the *Advertiser* and who criticised me last time, that I am a person who enjoys a flutter at both the Casino and the racecourse. That has nothing to do with this debate.

There are institutions where people can play two-up 364 days of the year. They can play two-up at the Casino any time they like and enjoy a good game. There also are the two-up games played in Broken Hill. Associated with two-up, Anzac Day and the Australian troops is a certain amount of tradition. Unfortunately, we are losing a lot of our traditions and the culture that comes from those traditions. This Bill is another issue that will undermine those traditions and part of that culture.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr CAUDELL:** The member for Spence should wait long enough to hear this. Traditionally, two-up was played by servicemen in war time, and it was illegal. The game of two-up was played at the back of a shed with a cockatoo watching proceedings in case the military police turned up. Part of the excitement of being involved in one of those games was knowing that it was illegal, and that is part of the tradition of our previous heritage that has been handed down. If this Bill passes it will take away the heritage, tradition and language that resulted from those games in the early part of this century. For those reasons alone I will be voting against this Bill, because I believe that those traditions should stand and that people on Anzac Day should be able to have their illegal game of two-up out the back of the RSL club with the cockatoo present. I know of no occasion in recent times where the police have arrested any person for engaging in a good game of two-up on Anzac Day.

If you happen to visit locations on Anzac Day or if you have served in the armed forces at any time, it is enjoyable to see the toss of the coins and the players enjoying the spirit and camaraderie that comes with it. As I said, I have not seen anyone locked up because they were playing two-up. If the cockatoo sights the military or civilian police coming along, the warning is given. Part of the tradition is the grab for the money and taking off. It is all part of that spirit, and I would hate to see the end of this part of our culture. I will be voting against the Bill.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I support the Bill introduced by the member for Spence.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** I can see one of my colleagues shaking his head in shame. This is a different category. As I have said on other occasions, the two-up Bill merely gives recognition to an Australian tradition. To say that it will encourage gambling and disrupt families for one out of 365 days of the year is ridiculous. You cannot put it in the same category as other forms of gambling.

As I have said on other occasions, if I had been here at the time I would have voted against the legislation to introduce poker machines. This is not in the same league. It is merely giving recognition to our returned servicemen and service-women who have contributed to this great country and, as

part of that tradition, they partake in two-up on one day of the year.

We are saying that we believe that activity should be legal; it should be given recognition and legitimacy. In other words, the Bill recognises that these people have made a contribution and that the activity will not disrupt families. Can members imagine people in their 70s and 80s being part of a corruption ring and making money out of gambling? I am well aware that many veterans are a lot younger and I acknowledge the contribution that other returned servicemen and service-women have made even as far as back as—

**Mr ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. Much as I appreciate the contribution of the member for Hartley, I believe he has spoken on the second reading of this Bill already.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I was about to draw to the honourable member's attention that he has spoken in this debate previously. Therefore, this contribution is not allowed.

**Mrs KOTZ** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## BERRI BRIDGE

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** I move:

That this House supports the need for a bridge over the River Murray near Berri and urges the Government to carry out its assessments of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies Report 'An Evaluation of a Proposal for a Bridge at Berri' so that a decision on the proposed bridge is made as soon as possible.

I move this motion with much conviction. I move it for a number of reasons but, most importantly, because the need is demonstrated not only for equity but because there has been, again, further financial justification for this bridge as a commuter bridge between the towns of Berri and Loxton.

Members of this House would be well aware that whenever possible since being elected to this place I have raised this issue in the Chamber and made reference to it whenever possible. It is the single most important issue of infrastructure development facing my electorate and I gave a very firm commitment prior to the election that I would do whatever I could to progress it. This motion continues that attempt.

While I do not want to dwell on the history of the potential bridge infrastructure project, it is appropriate that I give some background, because it brings into context and continues to justify the need for this bridge. Justifiably, the people of the Riverland feel cheated and betrayed over this important issue. Not once, but at least twice, this project was scuttled by the previous Labor Government under Premier Bannon, and the Riverland people feel let down and cheated in relation to the potential for this bridge. In 1982 the Tonkin Liberal Government gave a commitment regarding the bridge; an environmental impact statement was carried out in relation to the project; it had approval for the bridge; and it had approval from the Federal Government for funds to build the bridge under the bicentennial project. However, when the State Labor Government came into power in 1983 under Premier Bannon, it moved the funds to other projects.

I reiterate that, when Premier Bannon was elected in 1983, he gave an undertaking that the next bridge to be built over the Murray River would be at Berri. The case continued and, in 1985, the Berri and Loxton councils commissioned their own independent assessment by Denis Johnston and Associates, and that concluded that there was a strong overall case for the construction of a bridge. No further action was taken by the State Government. In 1991, another body blow was



dealt to the Riverland residents: Premier Bannon again reneged on his commitment to build a bridge over the river at Berri when he allocated funds for a bridge to be built from Goolwa to Hindmarsh Island.

My predecessor, the Hon. Peter Arnold, who was the member for Chaffey at the time, asked the Premier on 9 October 1991 a question in this House about why the Premier should break that promise, and the Premier replied that he considered that the proposed bridge between Hindmarsh Island and Goolwa was not a bridge over the Murray River. How ridiculous! In November 1992, the Federal Government announced that the Sturt Highway would be classified as a national highway, and this announcement brought with it the expectation that Federal funding would be available to replace the Paringa bridge and, in doing so, satisfy the needs of the Riverland people for a bridge near Berri.

However, there is no current likelihood that those Federal funds will be available for a bridge structure and, unfortunately for the people of the Riverland, it was publicly confirmed in the past week that the replacement of the Blanchetown bridge would be given priority in relation to Federal funding, and that is for safety reasons. In March this year I led a deputation to the State Minister for Transport, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw and, in the expectation of that Federal decision to which I have just alluded in relation to the Blanchetown bridge, she invited the district councils of Berri and Loxton to initiate their own up-to-date study in terms of the feasibility and economic justification for a bridge at Berri.

The district councils of Berri and Loxton, together with the Riverland Development Corporation, took up that initiative, and I congratulate them for that. By tendering, they initiated a study, which was conducted over the past three or four months by Professor Burns and Dr Delforce of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. That report was presented at a deputation I led to both the Premier and the Minister for Transport on 14 September. I acknowledge and note the very positive response given to that deputation by both the Premier and the Minister for Transport.

I want to use the available time today to give a summary of and special emphasis to this report, which is entitled 'An Evaluation of a Proposal for a Bridge at Berri' and which is mentioned in my motion. Although I will not have time to go into all the specific detail and analysis, I want to give an overview of the summary and the conclusions reached and, in the time available, give some analysis of the justification that has been provided in support of this bridge. The executive summary of this report states:

The bridge may be justified not only on the basis of a general cost benefit analysis but also in terms of a financial evaluation which indicates that the project would be nearly self-funding under a highly conservative no-growth scenario and almost certainly self-funding in a conservative low-growth scenario.

The case for the construction of a Berri bridge has been demonstrated only in terms of more easily quantifiable and uncontroversial measures of costs and benefits. No measures of flow-on effects or a wide range of hard to quantify further benefits have been formally included. The existence of these benefits is identified, however, and offers additional informal support to what is already a compelling case.

I want to concentrate on two of the major assessment criteria that have been presented in this report. The first is the cost benefit analysis. The consultants, in relation to the cost side of the ledger, did a detailed assessment of the expected cost of a bridge proposal. They did this by doing an indicative design with the associated costs of the required approaches

and established a cost, as presented in the report, of about \$11.64 million.

On the benefits side of the ledger, the report segregated this into a number of major areas. In terms of the value of time savings, considerable argument and justification were put on value at different but recognisable and reasonable rates for the time savings with respect to private cars, other private vehicles, business cars, trucks and semi-trailers and other business use. This was achieved by an extensive survey, which was carried out in consultation with officers from the Department of Transport. In fact, the consultants valued the time savings conservatively at about \$2.02 million per annum.

The other cost areas that were considered were the actual cost of a ferry service. This has been variable. For example, in 1989 it cost about \$841 000 to operate the two ferry services and in 1993 it cost about \$660 000. The cost taken in the assessment was \$700 000. There were also the costs of diverted traffic which would have passed the existing ferries. That was estimated at \$230 000 per annum. There were also a number of smaller costs, such as vehicle modification and damage from using the present ferry services.

The results of the cost benefit considerations were analysed and converted to present values under three different discount rates—4 per cent, 7 per cent and 10 per cent. These gave cost benefit ratios of 4.78 per cent, 3.45 per cent and 2.63 per cent. That is a significant and positive indication of the justification for the bridge in financial terms. Mr Acting Speaker, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* in tabular form the analysis of those cost benefit ratios.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Is it strictly statistical?

**Mr ANDREW:** It is strictly statistical, Mr Acting Speaker.

Leave granted.

Costs	Present value of costs and benefits, no-growth case (\$ millions)		
	Discount Rates		
	4 per cent	7 per cent	10 per cent
Construction	11.64	11.64	11.64
Maintenance	0.17	0.12	0.09
Total Costs	11.81	11.76	11.73
Benefits			
Time Saving to ferry users	39.48	28.33	21.52
Saving of ferry operating costs	12.11	8.69	6.60
Flood savings	3.90	2.82	2.14
Diverted traffic	0.47	0.34	0.26
Vehicle modifications and damage	0.50	0.36	0.27
Total benefits	56.46	40.54	30.80
Benefit-Cost ratio	4.78	3.45	2.63

**Mr ANDREW:** By the assessment of this no-growth scenario, even if the most pessimistic views regarding the waiting times and proportion of business travel were adopted, the cost benefit ratios would fall to only 3.81 per cent, 2.76 per cent and 2.13 per cent respectively.

It is most improbable that the next 30 years would see no growth in the unit values or quantities of benefits. It is most likely, as suggested by the report, that the unit values of time savings would increase in line with real wages while the operating costs of vehicles and ferries would increase accordingly to reflect the increase in the labour costs component of operating the ferries. Ferry use would increase as well, especially in the commercial categories, and waiting times would also increase. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard*

a purely statistical table depicting the increased assessment costs.

Leave granted.

Present value of costs and benefits, growth case  
(\$ millions)

Costs	Discount Rates		
	4 per cent	7 per cent	10 per cent
Construction	11.64	11.64	11.64
Maintenance	0.24	0.16	0.12
Total costs	11.88	11.86	11.76
Benefits			
Time saving to ferry users	55.11	37.67	27.44
Saving of ferry operating costs	16.75	11.95	8.41
Flood savings	5.49	3.75	2.73
Diverted traffic	0.66	0.45	0.33
Vehicle modifications and damage	0.70	0.49	0.35
Total benefits	78.88	53.91	39.27
Benefit-cost ratio	6.64	4.57	3.34

**Mr ANDREW:** With the conservative assumption of a growth rate of only 2.5 per cent, this analysis shows that there is an even more compelling case for the erection of a bridge as, with growth, both the cost of not having a bridge and the benefits of having a bridge become even larger. The financial analysis contains three relevant components: the cost of construction, maintenance and depreciation, and savings from the cost of ferry operations. The report clearly indicates that, if there is no increase in operating costs, current operating costs would fully fund the erection of a bridge at a real cost of 4.2 per cent or less.

There are many other issues, some of which are noted in the report and some publicly, which are continually put before me and the Minister. These relate to a spectrum of factors, including emergencies. Many letters have crossed my desk reflecting the inadequacies of ferries in an emergency. Another factor concerns productivity and development in the area. I note a recent report from the Monash University of August this year which indicates that the growth potential for the Riverland is one of the highest of 10 out of 80 regions in the State. The income generating influence of building a structure of this type is also significant. There is congestion during peak traffic flows into the commercial areas of Berri, and during special events this is exacerbated.

The case for erecting a bridge at Berri to replace the two ferries is exceptionally strong, not just emotively from the local community for fair treatment. Again, the case has been rigorously and professionally assessed. This recent analysis indicates clearly that the benefits outweigh the costs under a range of discount considerations. Even in a no growth situation the report indicates that the project is almost entirely self-financing. With the use of some highly conservative estimates of growth in real wages and operating costs as well as in the use of the ferries, the benefits are further increased, and it can be strongly argued that the overall financial implications for the State would disappear. I urge all members to support this motion in the interests of the Riverland community and the State of South Australia.

**Mr De LAINE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I move:

That this House welcomes and supports the call by the Premier and the other State Premiers for a new Australian Federation which would promote South Australia and prevent the abolition of the

Australian States and categorically rejects the Prime Minister's plans to abolish the States and make all people subservient to Canberra.

In moving this motion, I think I echo the views of many people in South Australia and probably in other States regarding the fear that has existed since the Prime Minister (Paul Keating) came into office about the future of the States. There is no doubt that the Prime Minister in pushing for a republic is quite content to ignore any concerns from the States. It also seems quite clear from some of the comments that he has made that he hopes that the States will literally disappear once we become a republic.

Some people might say, 'Well, do we really need the States?' In my opinion, there is absolutely no question that, we, in South Australia, need the State and that is starting to come through very clearly since the change of Government, where this State is able to do a lot to attract new business; it is able to do a lot in seeking to revitalise and regenerate the economy; and it is able to show, in many ways, how we are tackling the problems we, in this area of Australia, have.

There is no doubt that the States like New South Wales and Victoria probably could not care less if States disappeared because they are very much at the hub of the economic activity in Australia—and I guess you might be able to include Queensland in that—and if the States were abolished they would still continue to function well. But we here in South Australia and the Western Australians, and I believe the Tasmanians, would become the backwaters of this country. Who in Canberra would want to know about us? Who would want to know if we wanted to get our economy revitalised; if we wanted to attract new businesses here; if we wanted to make this area something special? They would say, 'Well, look, you do your own thing, but be aware of the fact that the Eastern States hold the majority of the purse strings, that is where the majority of the money comes from, and we are not going to distribute too much into your particular area.'

I believe it is very interesting to look back on how the States originated in the first place. I have to smile at some of the comments in a book by H.M. Suttor, entitled *Australian Milestones and Stories of the Past—1770-1941*, where on page 687 it states:

As the family of Australian children grew up, each one was keenly anxious to break away from the control of the mother colony, New South Wales. This was natural. We see it in families, and a nation is but a family magnified. It was far better that the colonies did launch out on their own account when young, as each of them, when pioneering, had to fight entirely different conditions.

The section on the steps towards Federation goes through quite a few of the events in the 1800s, which eventually led to federation. I was interested to be reminded of the fact that attempts had been made from time to time to bring about some measure of inter-colonial reciprocity, especially with regard to tariffs. Inter-colonial conferences occurred between 1863 and 1880 in an endeavour to secure uniform legislation.

At one of these in March 1867 the then Mr Henry Parkes (as we know later to become Sir Henry Parkes) came prominently forward as an advocate of federation. In the same book as I mentioned previously, at that time Mr Parkes is quoted as saying:

The time has arrived when these colonies should be united by the same Federal bond. There are questions projecting themselves which cannot be dealt with by individual Governments. I believe it will lead to a permanent Federal understanding.

In 1883 a convention met in Sydney at which the seven colonies and Fiji were represented. At that conference a Bill was drafted to establish a Federal Council of Australasia.

That Bill became law on 14 August 1885. The career of this council showed, however, that its purpose could not hope to be effected without the cooperation of New South Wales. Sir Henry Parkes desired to see a federation established and he suggested the necessity for a Federal Parliament and executive. This book later states:

Parkes reopened the Federal question in 1889. Politicians in other colonies, with whom he communicated, were still annoyed with him because they thought he had not treated the Federal Council fairly, and his leadership was opposed; but he persisted, and at length succeeded in bringing together the conference that was held in Melbourne on 6 February 1890 for the purpose of devising and reporting upon an adequate scheme of Federal Government.

A vote was taken on 20 June 1889, and in New South Wales a majority of some 24 000 were in favour. In Victoria, there was a majority of some 9 000; in South Australia, 48 000; in Tasmania, 12 000; and Queensland, 7 000. The total figure for those in favour of federation throughout Australia was 377 988; those against Federation, 141 386, which gave a majority of 236 602 people. As members would be aware, Western Australia did not vote until the last moment.

It is important to note that in July 1900 the Bill for federation passed both Houses of the Imperial Parliament, as it was then called, and became an Act on the ninth of that month, with Western Australia having decided to join the federation by referendum taken in July and, on 17 September 1900 by a proclamation issued by Queen Victoria, the Commonwealth of Australia was brought into being on 1 January 1901.

I went through that history because, whilst I have been able to give only a few minutes to it, years and years of solid thought were given to uniting the colonies to form a federation of States. I wonder what the people involved in those early days would have thought in the last few years, and months particularly, when the current Prime Minister was hellbent on getting rid of the States and on wanting to centralise all power in Canberra. He is not interested in the regionalisation and the decentralisation our States have provided, or in the fact that Australia is a vast country: it is huge. He is also not interested in the fact that a country such as ours has to have a decentralised system of Government through the States such as the one we have portrayed so excellently. Australia can be equated mostly with America which has some 51 States—

**Mr Wade:** Fifty-two.

**Mr MEIER:**—some 52 States, thank you. If we try to equate ourselves with some small European countries and say, 'You don't really need states because such and such a country does not have states', we should be very careful. Even a country such as Germany has states. Again it has a very similar parliamentary system from the point of view of Federal and State parliaments. We should look at the way its economy is going. Is it below the level of good economies? No; it is right up near the top. It makes a lot of sense when people are being represented at virtually every level. I know that those of us who have been to Canberra occasionally can understand the criticism sometimes pointed at Federal parliamentarians—that they can become lost in the ivory tower in Canberra and that they are in a different world there. This State is starting to take on challenges to revitalise itself by bringing new companies here, and we have created some 15 000 or 18 000 jobs, either permanent or part-time, in the short 10 months that we have been in power. It shows how the States are being used to the maximum extent.

I will refer briefly to some of the things mentioned in a communique signed by the eight Premiers and chief Ministers of Australia, which states:

Premiers and Chief Ministers of all States and Territories commit themselves to building a new Australian Federation based on the following principles:

This communique was put out on 29 July 1994, not long ago at all, and it incorporates a decision by these Premiers and Chief Ministers in the decade leading up to the centenary of Federation to commit themselves to the reshaping of a new Australian Federation by the year 2001. They recognise that changes in the economy, technology and legal interpretation have led to a need to define the roles and responsibilities of the various levels of government. The need to reshape the Federation arises in their estimation irrespective of the continuing debate about constitutional reform by the year 2001, because of the positive and dynamic role the States play in the Federation, whether it is based on a constitutional monarchy or a republic. That is recognised as well. The principles are as follows:

1. That the Federation enables Government to be close to the people and responsive to local and regional needs.

I have dwelt on that already; those at the grass roots level need to be represented, and State Governments do that better than any Federal Government. The principles continue:

2. That the Federation enhance the cohesiveness of the Australian nation by being responsive to the needs of regional diversity, rather than being dismissive of that diversity.

Again, this Government is seeking to implement regionalisation and is seeking to use regions to help develop this State. We would all want to do that. Continuing:

3. A Federation in which the States are dedicated to the delivery of quality services to the Australian people—

Hear, hear!

4. A Federation which delivers cost effective services for our taxpayers and which removes duplication between the various levels of Government.

We know only too well that cost effectiveness is so important. We have seen that States that have suffered from maladministration over the past decade cannot be cost effective, but now we are seeing massive cost effective measures being put into place, and they will continue to be put in place in the coming years. The principles continue:

5. A Federation that fosters a competitive national economy based on the fundamental principle of 'competitive federalism'.

We have seen Victoria get very jealous of South Australia in the past few months. It has accused South Australia of using inappropriate tactics to get new business here. Of course, we rebutted that accusation straight away and said—

*The Hon. D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** As the previous Government did not go into bat for the Grand Prix, what could we do? But I am talking about other businesses such as Motorola, Australis and Sabco, and the like, establishing or re-establishing themselves here. We have put our cards on the table and they have recognised the importance of working with the State Government. The next principle states:

6. A Federation in which there is a guaranteed revenue base for the States and Territories that matches their expenditure responsibilities—

again, a very important matter—

7. A Federation which continues to be accountable to the people through their Parliaments.

I cannot overemphasise that matter. What has the Federal Government's reaction been to all of this? Yesterday the member for Reynell asked a question.

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

**Mr De LAINE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### COMMONWEALTH CHAMPIONSHIP REGATTA

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I move:

That this House congratulates the Australian rowing team and, in particular, the South Australian Sports Institute representatives, for their performance at the Commonwealth Championship Regatta in Canada in August.

The success of our teams in the Commonwealth Games was a source of joy and amazement (in the best sense of that word) to all Australians. Those of us who follow sport in its various forms and who are given to barracking for our country in sporting events are always anxious to see our nation do well, especially overseas in the forum of international competition. But, when the sports commentators and pundits were predicting before the games the number of medals that we might win, the most optimistic predictions fell well below those that we finally obtained, and our achievements at the Commonwealth Games surpassed all expectation. I note the presence of the member for Price, who has long been keenly associated with cycling, and I am quite sure that, whereas I might well have been surprised at the results in cycling, the member for Price would not have been, having such a keen interest in and being aware of what is happening at the Velodrome. He is aware of the training, of the standards being maintained and of the work that goes on behind the scenes.

I suppose that, if you were the trainer of a race horse, everyone else might be surprised that your horse won the Melbourne Cup but, hopefully, you are not surprised, because you have been there, you have done the training, put in the work, and you know whether or not the capacity to win exists. As regards cycling, I suspect that those who really knew about Australian sport had no surprise at all. One thing which is now being said quite widely and which I heard reported from one of the Ministers in New Zealand is that the rest of the Commonwealth and much of the world is actually standing up and looking at the sports infrastructure of this country.

In the time in which any person in this Chamber grew up, we have always been very proud of our sporting achievements. We have had a series of outstanding sportspeople, both men and women (Dawn Fraser and Betty Cuthbert come to mind, but the list could go on and on). They are the heroes of our childhood, as our contemporaries will be heroes to our children. We have always had this fine tradition—I believe it is true to say that in years past it was the best English tradition—of the amateur sportsman. I remember as a young lad going to the Adelaide City Baths, which some members here (I think the member for Price, again, and the member for Wright) would remember, as would you, Sir, were located directly where we now park our cars. I went in there as a 12 or 13-year-old and there, with everyone else in Adelaide, was Dawn Fraser training. The Minister is here: he was probably in the same pool training with Dawn Fraser, although I have never seen his records in the record books. I am sure I have missed that page.

In those days sport was basically amateur. Our country has wonderful natural facilities in open spaces, climate and beaches and, in an era when sport was less professional, those attributes and I believe an Australian love of leisure activities and sporting life in general were enough to keep us pre-eminent. But there was another stage, which came later. The Minister reminds me that I was about 14 before I realised that the Davis Cup was not some sort of Australian tennis competition. I remember that in my early years the final of the Davis Cup was played in Australia every year, and we won it every year, too. I always remember feeling somewhat of a shock—and I was not all that young—as I suddenly realised that the Davis Cup was not some sort of Australian competition; it was an international competition and we did not win it automatically, because it just was not ours to win. It was our absolute dominance of the sport that made me and others think that was so.

We went then to a stage where other nations of the world, perhaps for patriotic reasons or true reasons of sport development (one will never know), went in and did all sorts of things and Australia lost a little of that which we had traditionally enjoyed. It came as a bit of a shock to some of us that we had thought it was almost our right to enjoy some sort of pre-eminence in the sporting arenas of the world and all of a sudden we did not. To the credit of the sportspeople of this nation, it was not seen as something which would defeat and crush us. Instead of saying, 'Well, the USSR, East Germany (as it was then) and the United States of America have the population, the resources and the money to pour into these things' and saying that now we would only ever be a second rung nation, our sportspeople and, to our credit, politicians and the nation generally got together and asked, 'How can we do better?' and institutes such as the Institute of Sport were established. Almost the catalyst at the time was the challenge for the America's Cup which reaffirmed for us the fact that, despite the money that was pitted against us by probably the most powerful and technologically advanced nation on earth, as a small nation we could go out there with our own design and ingenuity and we could win. That was about the time when other developments were occurring in the institute and among sportspeople generally.

Lest people think that in this motion I am saying it is all because of professional training, it is not. I think the member for Price would be the first to agree that this revolution that has taken place within sport in Australia is not just because of Government and the institutes; time and time again it is because the administrators of particular sports have been dedicated to their sports and have approached that dedication in an absolutely professional manner. So, it was not only the institutes that were established and not only the dedication of a new breed of sportspeople that was encouraged and flourished; it was the sports administrators, the people who were the champions of the past and who have been the champion administrators, who have led our sportspeople to a golden present with respect to the Commonwealth Games and, we hope, to a future equal to that which we enjoy.

In particular, because this motion deals with the Australian rowing team, I would like to highlight for the House a few facts. A total of 21 Australian crews raced in this regatta with the Australian rowing medal tally accounting for seven gold, eleven silver and two bronze. That in one sport is a total of 20 medals. That is an extraordinary feat by any standard. Of course, Australia finished on top of the medal tally, and South Australian Sports Institute athletes rowed in eight Australian crews, winning five gold medals and three silver medals.

There again is the tie up between the excellent work done by our sports institutes around this nation, and the sportspeople and administrators. It is a unique combination and one which serves this nation well, and I hope will continue to serve it in the future.

Might I say it is a combination that, if it were taken out of sport and applied to other aspects of our community, whether it be legislation or all sorts of aspects, and if we could get that same sort of cooperation, focus and dedication that our sports people show, this nation would be a much better place for it. I think it was Sir Donald Bradman who said, 'If you translate into life what you learn on the field, you are bound to succeed.' Somebody asked him, 'Why is it that some people are not only extraordinary athletes but they become successful people in life?' He said that it is the discipline learnt on the sporting fields that often makes the difference in life. That is a lesson we could well learn.

Nine countries participated in the events, and special mention should be made of South Australian rower Amy Safe, a member of the women's quad skulls. In July, Amy displayed enormous courage and won the women's single skulls at the world junior championships in Munich. There we have an example of the individual athlete whose excellence in performance is to be commended. In September she became the first rower ever to represent Australia at both junior and senior world championships in the same year, by competing at the world championships in Indianapolis in the United States. She is an example of the future which hopefully we might enjoy in sport. Here she is as a legitimate junior competing not only in the junior events, in which she is obviously of world class, but being of sufficient class to compete at the same time in the senior events as well. Whilst we have people of that extraordinary ability in those young age groups, it will be many years before Australia has to rethink its sports strategy.

The biggest commendation that this country can have is the fact that the New Zealand Government has come over here and offered to work cooperatively with Australia. They have seen our sporting facilities, our methods of sports training, our sports doctors and coaches and said, 'If you cannot win the medals, we would like to win the medals, so let us train together and share as people with many common bonds. Let us share the training and the techniques. We will pay our way. If Australia is not winning gold, hopefully there is a New Zealander up there or vice versa.' I do not think you can get a much more genuine compliment than that. That compliment paid to this nation by the New Zealand Government is a reflection of what prompts this motion. I am sure from the presence of the member for Price that the Opposition will join in supporting this motion. I commend the motion to the House.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I agree with the member for Unley that the results gained at the recent Commonwealth Games were tremendous. Most people generally knew that results would be good at these games, but the sheer number of medals won and the performances of some of our athletes took nearly everyone by surprise. It was an absolutely outstanding effort by our athletes, coaches, technical people and administrators.

Their commitment was tremendous in terms of dedication and professionalism, as the honourable member mentioned. The point made by the member for Unley about the administration of sports these days in Australia, particularly in South Australia, is quite correct. In previous times many administra-

tors did not have much involvement in sport but came along and did an excellent job, and they are to be commended. However, in many cases they lacked the necessary knowledge because they were not former top athletes. That situation has changed and we now see people in coaching, administrative and technical positions in sport with technical knowledge and experience as top athletes at State, national or international level.

The member for Unley was correct when he mentioned the way the new surge of improvement has evolved. After the Second World War Australia had some very good results in a whole range of sports, mainly because we were in the southern hemisphere and isolated from the Second World War. Therefore our climate, food and all other conditions were uninterrupted to a great extent by the war. Our athletes performed on natural ability, which carried us over for probably a decade after the war finished, until such time that the European countries in particular were able to get on their feet, re-establish themselves in terms of sporting organisations and so on. They started to come back and went on from there and developed new technologies and new methods of training and for a few years left Australia behind.

Our medal tallies and performances internationally suffered somewhat. In the past 20 years we have recognised this as a nation and a State, and Governments have funded such places as the South Australian Sports Institute and, as a result, we have seen vast improvements. We are sending coaches and athletes overseas for experience and to learn new techniques. In many cases we now lead the world.

I mention also the cycling, which was my old sport. Many youngsters who were trained and put through the institute in South Australia have shown a gradual improvement in their performance, and now the Australian track cycling team is number one in the world. They are based in Adelaide and most of the young riders are native South Australians. The value of the Sports Institute has really come home. I congratulate and commend the institute for the excellent job it has done in producing outstanding athletes, coaches, technical people and administrators for the sport in general.

The member for Unley went through the results of the recent games in relation to rowing, and I congratulate members of the rowing team on their efforts. He mentioned 21 rowing events, in which Australia won 7 gold, 11 silver and two bronze medals—a total of 20 medals—and Australia finished on top of the international medal tally for that sport. He also mentioned that South Australian rowers took part in events that gained five gold and three silver medals—a fantastic effort from South Australia's viewpoint. It highlights what I have said and what the honourable member said about the work done by the South Australian Sports Institute over the years.

Many other sports have benefited enormously from the involvement of the South Australian Sports Institute and money put in by Governments (too numerous to go into), but two sports have really benefited, namely, cycling and rowing. I join with the member for Unley in publicly congratulating the Australian rowing team and the South Australian Sports Institute representatives for their performances at the Commonwealth Games regatta in Canada in August.

Motion carried.

## WOMEN, POWER AND POLITICS CONFERENCE

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** I move:

That this House congratulates the Women's Suffrage Centenary Steering Committee and, in particular, its subcommittee on staging the Women, Power and Politics Conference held in Adelaide from 8 to 11 October; recognises the value to South Australia of the national and international media coverage of the conference; and acknowledges the importance of the issues raised at the conference, in particular, the need to ensure that women are provided with the opportunity to participate fully and equally in all spheres of society.

As we are all aware, 1994 marks the centenary of the vote for women in South Australia. The major event celebrating women's suffrage in South Australia was the international conference examining the rights of women and their role in business, politics and the economy. The conference was organised by a subcommittee of the Women's Suffrage Centenary Steering Committee, and it brought together women from all over the world and from all walks of life. Over four days many of us had the opportunity to hear leading Australian and international speakers such as Glenda Jackson MP, Dame Margaret Guilfoyle, Susan Ryan, Gemma Hussey, Dr Marilyn Waring, Professor Catherine Stimpson, Berhane Ras-Work and, of course, many other learned women who have all excelled in their field.

The objectives of the conference were to educate and inform participants about the role of women in society; to make recommendations to Governments on policies and strategies which can be adopted to improve the status of women and enable full gender equality to be reached; to empower and energise women to make long-term changes in their lives as individuals and as members of the community to work towards full gender equality; and for participants from all walks of life to enjoy coming together and sharing their experiences and exchanging ideas. Women have made considerable inroads into the halls of power and politics world wide, but the number of women in major political and decision-making positions remains minimal.

The struggle is continuing to break through the glass ceiling and into the world's power bases. In paying tribute to the Women, Power and Politics Conference, I would also like to acknowledge and commend the team behind the event that made the four days a resounding success: Mrs Josephine Tiddy, conference committee Chairperson; Carolyn Pickles, Leader of the Opposition in the other place; Jennifer Cashmore, the member for Coles until December 1993; Joan Hall, the member for Coles; Joanne Holland, General Manager, IOOF Australia Trustees Limited; Mary Beasley, Chief Executive Officer, Department for Industrial Affairs; Sue Vardon, Chief Executive Officer, Department for Correctional Services; Ann Drohan, the Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union, South Australia; and, Helen Menzies, South Australian Equal Opportunities Commission.

The conference committee's achievements highlighted over those four short days are a major landmark in South Australian history. Our keynote speakers addressed the areas of women in Government, women in the economy, women in learning and women's rights are human rights. I would particularly like to mention Berhane Ras-Work, President of the Inter-African Committee on Traditional Practices Affecting the Health of Women and Children. This committee implements programs of education and information aimed at valorising the female person. The program covers 24 African countries, including Ethiopia. Ms Ras-Work is also the coordinator of the Geneva based NGO working party on traditional practices.

Her commitment to the IAC stems from her personal convictions as an African, as a woman and as a mother.

Berhane Ras-Work's contribution to our conference was, for want of a better description, moving. As the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 11 October stated:

Ms Ras-Work visibly shocked the audience with evidence of the suffering caused by practices such as female genital mutilation in some Muslim communities, and the enforced early marriages of girls in parts of Africa.

Ms Ras-Work told the conference that the World Health Organisation has estimated 85 million to 115 million females have been genitally mutilated. Most of these females live in 26 African countries, Asia and, increasingly, in Europe, Canada, Australia and the United States. The operation is performed on girls as young as seven days and women as old as 20 years. These operations are usually conducted in unhygienic conditions by village women and without anaesthetic, and they lead to horrific health problems and difficulties in childbirth. Such practices are used by men to control women's independence and fertility.

Traditional teachings and values teach these women to accept violence as part of their life. Women continue to submit themselves and their daughters to mutilation so that men will accept them as wives, these being women's only choice for economic security. Berhane Ras-Work's address led to conference delegates moving recommendations that sought to eliminate traditional practices which harm women, including female genital mutilation. The age of marriage also was addressed given that in some countries girls as young as eight years are taken as brides. All speakers were of an extremely high calibre but unfortunately I do not have the time to report on each session that I attended.

The conference had many spin-offs for Adelaide. Optional tours and events were arranged to offer delegates and their partners the opportunity of experiencing a taste of what South Australia has to offer including our parklands, the Jam Factory and the Central Market. The member for Mawson will be pleased to note that a leisurely afternoon in the Southern Vales admiring scenery and sampling a selection of the best boutique wines in the region and an informal dinner at Hardy's Reynella Winery were main features of the program. There also was a bush walk along the Heysen Trail and a visit to Cleland Wildlife Park. Information on a wide range of *Short Holidays* was available on request, and it would be remiss of me not to mention the two day tour of the Barossa Valley. Rundle Mall, our theatres, restaurants, motels and hotels would all have felt the boost of 900 delegates making Adelaide their home for four days.

I also mention the Adelaide Convention Centre and staff. The centre was an ideal location for hosting an event such as this. The staff managed to facilitate all requirements of delegates, and members would agree that any facility that comfortably seats 900 people for lunch and has its guests fed and happy in one short hour deserves to be commended. I commend the work of all members of the Women, Power and Politics Committee.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I, too, was able to attend some sessions of the conference. It was an opportunity to meet a number of important women from around the world who have had a strong voice not only in the women's movement in this country and overseas but in other important social changes that we have seen around the world. It was good to see, talk and chat to them informally in person. They were all generous with their time and very helpful. It gave us the opportunity to have a wider scope of the debate to place ourselves in a larger philosophical picture of where women

are in our society. This was not a uniform philosophy by any means. There were a lot of conflicting views expressed at the conference, and this provoked some very stimulating and interesting debate and an opportunity for us to sit back and re-evaluate our own opinions and perceptions.

As the member for Reynell said, one of the most striking speakers was Ms Ras-Work, who spoke about the conditions faced by women in countries which vary in their culture significantly from our own. She highlighted a number of features of that culture which suppressed women and which, as the member for Reynell said, shocked us all greatly. It made me reflect once again how fortunate we are in this country. It made a lot of the issues that we get concerned about look very small in comparison, and made me realise that we have to remember that there is a wider debate and that we need to lend solidarity and support to women overseas, perhaps even as a priority over women in our own country.

I also was very moved because here were a small group of enlightened women in Africa and Asian countries who had rebelled and banded together against their own heritage and culture in many respects, and fought in very difficult circumstances against the prevailing culture and hierarchy in their countries in order to help their fellow women. I was extremely impressed by their dedication to that task. There was a number of women at the conference from my own area—the outer northern suburbs—which I was very pleased to see. I do not think it was unique to the northern suburbs, but we did not have many functions out our way to celebrate women's suffrage. I attended one held by the Country Women's Association—

**Mr Becker:** A good group.

**Ms HURLEY:** An excellent group of women who put on an excellent function that was attended by a number of women in our area. I was pleased to see that a number of women were able to come into the conference. There was some criticism about the cost, which I believe was unavoidable. I believe the conference organisers did a very good job of organising the conference within the cost that was—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** I believe that the women who went to that conference—the women who were able to afford to go or who were sponsored to go—will be able to take back the messages to their own groups and networks. I believe that women do that very effectively and that that will happen over the next few months. It is very important that this does happen, because people do get isolated in the outer suburbs, particularly women. It is good to have the reinforcement and encouragement of other women from around the State, around Australia and around the world.

I would like to mention where we are going. The presence at the conference of the Prime Minister of Australia, the Premier of South Australia and a number of Government dignitaries highlighted to me how far away we are from the days in the 1960s, when women's rights were a matter of protest and struggle. It is a much more accepted and mainstream movement than it was 20 or 30 years ago. We are now exploring ways in which women are functioning in a changed society and one in which women have a different status, that is, a different status in all walks of life—in the home, in business and in politics.

Although we are still looking at any barriers that exist to stop women achieving what they want to and what they choose to, I think there is now a more mature phase of the movement where we are looking at men and women together, how they interact within our society and how we can make

that go more smoothly for the benefit of family and society in general. In conclusion, I reiterate the comments of the member for Reynell in relation to the smooth functioning of the conference. That is in large measure due to the hard work of the steering committee and the willingness of everyone to cooperate. I certainly add my congratulations to hers.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I support the motion. However, I would like to add one comment in relation to an issue raised by the member for Napier, that is, the cost of the conference. If we are truly to represent women in Australia, we need to think very seriously about how these conferences are held and get the message to the people who really matter: the average man and woman in Australia—not to the elite, those who can afford to go to conferences. I could not afford to go and I do not consider myself to be poor.

I really have to stress that these sorts of conferences are a terrific idea but let us ensure that we keep the balance and that we actually get the message to those people who really need it—those people who are looking for the information. In terms of true representation, I do not believe that this is the way that we do it successfully. I really want us to start considering very seriously in the future how to get that message to those people who need it. We have a long way to go yet, but this is another example of the way that we are not taking the message to the people who really need help to raise themselves above that standard.

Debate adjourned.

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

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1993-94

South Australian Urban Land Trust—Report, 1993-94.

## FORESTRY

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Primary Industries):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** South Australia's publicly owned forests have traditionally supplied sawlogs to its sawmilling operations for processing and eventual sale. Since the decision last year to establish Forwood Products, the forestry and sawmilling enterprises have become entities in their own right with Forwood Products now a customer of Primary Industries South Australia forestry. Earlier this year, an independent assessment of the forests recommended that Primary Industries South Australia's forest operations review its product mix and volume objectives to reflect more accurately the demands of the marketplace and its changing role.

The industry in the region does not believe growing large diameter sawlogs to be appropriate, and there has been considerable pressure to have more wood released from the Government's forests. Careful analysis of likely timber availability has confirmed that extra logs could be made available without jeopardising forest sustainability by lowering the age at which trees can be harvested from the

current 47 year average to 37 years and by increasing fertiliser applications and, of course, plantings.

The Government is now in a position to announce that in excess of 1.1 million cubic metres of round wood each year for the next decade will now be allocated to the forest industries from the South-East forests. This decision will greatly enhance existing arrangements for the overall management of the total forest resources of the South-East and South-Western Victoria. While, of course, some of this total allocation is already committed under existing contracts with commercial processing companies, some 220 000 cubic metres will be offered for sale through a competitive tendering process. This excess log will be made available in discrete packages in varying volumes and diameters, which will include, for example, four parcels each of 50 000 cubic metres ranging in sawlog diameter from 15cm to greater than 35cm.

There will also be two groups of 10 000 cubic metres of between 15cm and 40cm in diameter. Tenderers will be required to nominate a mill door price for each 5cm size class within a diameter range, and these tenders will be accepted from any organisation that will value add in Australia. Of course, the Government will protect the interests of existing smaller operators, including spot millers and preservation cutters, who will be given continued access under the current arrangements. However, these operators can, if they wish, tender for additional timber along with other larger companies.

The Government of South Australia expects to raise \$10 million per year in extra royalties as a result of today's announcement. Furthermore, harvesting and transport contractors will earn an additional \$3 million per year, and I am confident that the processing sector will generate a further \$40 million per year as a result of today's decision. That is a total of at least \$50 million per year—\$500 million over the next decade—in new income from our forest resources. This announcement represents a significant cultural change for South Australian forest industries. It will mean more jobs and, equally importantly, new opportunities for value adding for these industries in the South-East.

#### ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** I bring up the twelfth report of the committee, being the annual report for the period 1993-94, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

### QUESTION TIME

#### WORKCOVER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Why has the Government put out a discussion paper regarding further changes to aspects of WorkCover when it has already prepared a draft Bill some weeks ago which proposes a complete restructuring of benefits, changes to decisions

relating to exempt employers and changes to review mechanisms?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The reason that we have put out an option paper is pretty simple: we want the community, the UTLC representing the workers, and the employers to put—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Would you like to take that a bit further? You have actually seen an index paper of the document that the police are currently investigating with a view to ascertaining who took it from Parliamentary Counsel. That report will be before Parliament next week, and you might need to duck when you see that one of your union mates might have a real problem to worry about. If you want to bring that up, I am very happy to discuss it, but that is a side issue. The reason we put out the option paper is that we want the community to be able to have an input into how the WorkCover scheme should run in the future.

On 11 October, eight submissions on that document were returned. Do you know from whom one of the documents came? A group called the UTLC. It was one of the first groups to return the details of its point of view on the options paper. I wonder why it did that: because it wants its view—whilst it is not in the same terms as we believe it ought to be—considered when the draft Bill is brought before this Parliament. Since that time, we have received submissions on that options paper from another 12 groups. Do you know what this is all about?

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I will take up that question, if the Deputy Leader wants to keep on interjecting. The Liberal Party and the Liberal Government made a promise to this Parliament that we would bring in a Bill on workers' compensation changes at the end of November this year, and we would let it sit from November through to February so that the whole community could examine and discuss the measure. As the Deputy Leader would not know, as he has not had the experience in this place yet, first, there is a one month requirement to go to the advisory committee, there is a requirement to go to IRAC and there is a requirement for Parliamentary Counsel to draft it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** If the Deputy Leader would be patient, he would understand that there was a period of only two months between the time the options paper went out and when we promised to introduce the legislation.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I wish the Deputy Leader would listen. What I have said is that we will bring in a draft Bill, let it sit in the House during December (one month), January (two months) and into February. That is nearly three months for the Deputy Leader, his cronies and the UTLC (which has genuinely looked at making a serious contribution to this change) to discuss it in the community. We are going through the process of community consultation—something that the previous Labor Government never did. Let us have a look at why we put out this options paper.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is out of order making those comments, and the Deputy Premier is not helping the situation by making provocative comments across the Chamber. I warn them both.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The obvious questions that members opposite would like to have answered are: why



would we put out an option paper and why would we want change? In the period before the election, in November and December last year, I was advised by the previous Minister that the unfunded liability for workers compensation in this State was non-existent; in fact, it had a surplus of \$5 million; and therefore there was no unfunded liability. I was guaranteed by the Minister in late November that that was the position. It is fascinating that, on 12 December when I asked what was the projected unfunded liability at that stage, it was minus \$25 million. In a matter of 10 days after asking the previous Minister it had deteriorated, in essence, by \$25 million.

The reality is that I was misled by the previous Government on this issue, as was the whole of South Australia. At the time he advised me, the previous Minister knew that we were already on the skids. In the past nine months under this Liberal Government, because this Parliament was not prepared to accept the changes we put forward, it has blown out by a further \$95 million. So, we are now in an unfunded position of \$111 million. To make it worse, the actuary said the other day that if we stay in this condition for the next five years we will have an unfunded liability of \$250 million. In other words, the scheme will be bankrupt.

What we need to do, so that the workers of South Australia have a scheme from which they will get benefits if they are injured at work, is to make a change. That is the reason why the option paper has gone out. I know the Deputy Leader would not understand that you have to consult with the community and try to make suggestions, but that is the reason why we have done it.

### FOOD EXPORTS

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** Will the Premier advise the House of the latest efforts being undertaken to promote South Australia's quality food products to overseas markets, particularly in the Asian region?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The member for Chaffey represents one of the main food producing areas in South Australia. I am delighted to say that today a very significant publication called 'The Australian Food Finder' was released. It is the first such publication to be produced across Australia and is a huge volume which identifies, across almost all categories of food, the key suppliers throughout Australia. The South Australian Government (together with the State Governments of New South Wales and Victoria and the Federal Government) is a major sponsor of the publication. There has been very good cooperation between South Australian food producers and the publishers of the book.

The publisher, Weldon Information Enterprises, has produced this book that lists the suppliers from South Australia for each food category. In fact, the South Australian Government had two people telephone each of the suppliers in South Australia to make sure they responded to the possibility of free entry in the publication. It is the type of publication that virtually every restaurant, every major caterer, every exporter and every person who deals in any food products would need; the sort of publication that we will have in our South Australian Government offices throughout the world, and certainly in the EDA at the International Trade Centre on Greenhill Road. I am delighted to say that there has been a very significant response to this initiative by South Australian participants.

It is all part of developing a much stronger food industry in this State. The other good news with the publication

produced today is that it was printed here in South Australia, and all the graphic plates were produced in South Australia. There was an injection of \$750 000 into South Australia from the production of this publication. To look at the high quality of the publication, knowing that this will become Australia's official guide for the sourcing of food products throughout the whole of Australia, and knowing that it was produced here in South Australia, is a tribute to the printing and plate industries of this State. Members of this Parliament and the public who may want any information on the sourcing of foods or the wide range and availability of foods in South Australia should ensure that they use this publication. I highlight the significant contribution South Australia makes to the seafood section of the publication.

### WORKCOVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Is the Minister for Industrial Affairs aware that a member of the WorkCover Advisory Committee, appointed by the Liberal Government, was interviewed by the Police Anti-Corruption Squad for possessing an extract of an advance copy of the Government's proposed Bill to amend legislation affecting aspects of workers compensation?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Yes.

### TRADESWOMEN ON THE MOVE PROGRAM

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide information outlining developments in regard to young women entering the trade and technical vocations area?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I thank the member for Flinders for her question. Yesterday I had the privilege of presenting certificates to a large number of South Australian employers who have been supporting the 'Tradeswomen on the Move' program, which is designed to encourage young women to consider careers in non-traditional areas. It has been going for eight years and is an important program. This year 10 workshops were held covering areas such as electronics, optical mechanics, carpentry and joinery, and they were held with the support of employers and TAFE Institutes. About 104 young women took part and about half expressed an interest in taking up an apprenticeship or traineeship program. There was special targeting of young country women and we also had nine Aboriginal young women in the program.

It is a very important step towards encouraging young women to consider the range of careers available today. That is particularly pertinent when you focus on the developments of Motorola, Australis, EDS and the PC Orion upgrade, as there will be significant opportunities in the electronics area in the future. It is important that young women focus on the educational options available so that they can access employment opportunities in future. That means considering and maintaining their study in areas such as maths and physics.

While we have made a lot of progress, we have a long way to go, as illustrated by the most recent figures from the Industrial Commercial Training Commission. For example, in the electrical area, in terms of trainees or apprenticeships, we have only 10 women and 428 men. In the furniture area we have eight women and 539 men. In the vehicle industry we have 37 women and 1 544 men. Working in terms of trades assistants as trainees or apprentices, we have 31

women and 118 men. Whilst there has been some progress, and programs such as 'Tradeswomen on the Move' are important, we still have a long way to go to encourage more young women to go into the technical and trades areas. This initiative is strongly supported by this Government because we believe we should not waste the talent of women, who comprise slightly more than half of our population. We are doing all we can to encourage young women to focus on a range of non-traditional areas, particularly in electronics and areas such as the wine industry.

#### UNION OFFICIALS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Was the Minister for Emergency Services involved in or informed of the decision to order members of the police Anti-Corruption Squad to interrogate trade union officials on Friday 23 September and Saturday 24 September in relation to disclosure of the Government's plans for changes to WorkCover? On Friday 23 September, members of the police Anti-Corruption Squad pulled over a trade union official on his way to Trades Hall and questioned him in relation to his identity. I have been advised that it was a case of mistaken identity, but nevertheless the officers waited outside Trades Hall while the official attended his business.

The next morning the Anti-Corruption Squad interrogated the person they had been seeking the day before at his home in relation to the disclosure of the Government's plans to change WorkCover. Will the Minister guarantee that there was no attempt by this Government to involve the State's excellent Police Force in Party political action?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** What a finishing statement from the Leader who claims that he wants to see integrity restored to politics in this House. What a disgraceful statement by the person who purports to be a Leader. The short answer to the honourable member's question, who as usual is in the gutter, is 'No.'

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Minister will not make those types of comments. The Chair has already warned Ministers and members that that sort of behaviour is unacceptable. The Minister will withdraw that comment.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Mr Speaker, he is not in the gutter at present then.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Minister. That is a direct attempt to defy the Chair and the Chair will not tolerate it. Without qualification the Minister will withdraw those comments. The Chair's tolerance of members in this House who make remarks that are not in keeping with the standards that the public expects of its representatives will no longer be tolerated.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Mr Speaker, I withdraw. The simple answer to the honourable member's question is 'No.' The honourable member also should be aware that in this State we have the Police Complaints Authority. If he has information that has been presented to him by people who believe they have been inappropriately dealt with by officers of the law, he is in a position to advise those people of the existence of the Police Complaints Authority. I encourage those people, through the Leader, to register such a complaint if their allegations are correct.

#### FORWOOD PRODUCTS

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon):** Following the statement of the Minister for Primary Industries about the availability of additional forestry soil resources from Government forests in the South-East, will the Minister also advise the House of the current situation regarding those employees of Forwood Products who are still attached to the Department of Primary Industries but who have been made available to Forwood Products for transfer?

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is a most important one for his electorate. As the ministerial statement explained today, there will be a considerable amount of extra timber to be processed in the South-East and that ensures that all milling operations, whether commercial or those presently conducted by Forwood Products, will be stretched to the capacity as they value add that timber. There will be some room for some new investment in the South-East to make sure that this increased timber is processed. Of course, there will be a greatly increased level of employment.

However, Forwood Products, which is the value adding arm of Primary Industries, has a turnover of \$150 million. At present it is in the unique situation that about half its employees are under the appropriate awards and the remainder are still employed by Primary Industries South Australia under the GME Act. It makes it very difficult to manage when there are two different types of employment. After consultation with management, the Government has offered a package to those persons employed by Primary Industries South Australia under the GME Act to move from being employed under that Act to being employed under the appropriate awards, as many of their work mates are.

That package was communicated to the employees some two weeks ago. I had a meeting with the unions last Monday and they asked whether there could be an extension of time. In a spirit of conciliation, I was very happy to say that Cabinet was prepared to give them another week to talk to their employees. I have also offered a briefing to the Opposition on this matter, because I think it is most important for the future development of South Australia.

Part of that package is an incentive of between \$2 500 and \$10 000, depending on the length of service of the Primary Industries employees under the GME Act, to go over to this other award. While the negotiations have been going on, it has been confirmed that that incentive, in this case, is tax free. So, it is a very good incentive.

I have had a briefing from management this morning. Already many people have indicated whether they want to take a TSP or to join Forwood Products. Is it going very well. Management is very confident that it will be wrapped up quickly and, in fact, before the deadline, which is next Monday week—31 October.

As I said, I have offered a briefing to the Opposition because I think this is important. I know that the Opposition will get behind this whole operation, because it is in the interests of having a very viable Forwood Products in the South-East that will return many extra dollars to the taxpayers of South Australia. So, I thank the honourable member for his question. It is proceeding well, I am told by management today, and we look forward to its completion before the appointed time of 31 October.

## UNION OFFICIALS

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I direct my question to the Minister for Industrial Affairs.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Peake.

**Mr CLARKE:** In light of his answer to my second question, can the Minister clarify whether he as Minister called in the police Anti-Corruption Squad to interrogate union officials for allegedly possessing an extract of an advance copy of the Government's proposed Bill to amend the WorkCover legislation?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** No.

## WATER RESTRICTIONS

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** I direct my question to the Minister for Infrastructure. There have been reports of water restrictions being put in place in New South Wales, and I understand that Western Australia will be making a decision today. What is the current situation in South Australia and will we be facing water restrictions?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As everyone is aware, South Australia, like other States of Australia, has had a very dry winter. In fact, the winter run-off was equivalent to the sixth lowest in the past 100 years. That situation has affected not only the metropolitan but also our country reservoirs.

The holding capacity within the Adelaide reservoir system is currently 49 per cent, despite the fact that some reservoirs look substantially lower than that. I think the lowest is about 23 per cent. However, on average, it is 49 per cent. It will require consistent pumping by the EWS from the Murray River system right through to March 1995, at least. We expect this year to pump something like 75 per cent of Adelaide's water requirements for the 1994-95 year whereas, on average, we pump 40 per cent into the metropolitan reservoir system.

Nine of the 10 reservoirs are connected to the pumping system. Myponga reservoir is the only one relying totally on natural flow. However, the flexibility of the supply system means that, in dry years such as this, we by-pass the Myponga reservoir and use the Happy Valley reservoir to meet the demand in that region.

The two country areas not connected to the mains system—Eyre Peninsula and the South-East of South Australia—rely substantially on ground water supplies. There will be sufficient ground water supply to meet the demands as identified by EWS both on Eyre Peninsula and in the South-East. South Australia, under the Murray River agreement, has an entitlement flow. We are guaranteed that flow this year. In fact, the capacity of the dam system, which feeds into the Murray River, is good.

For example, currently Dartmouth has a capacity of 86 per cent, Hume 70 per cent and Lake Victoria 91 per cent. The last occasion water restrictions were imposed in South Australia was 1954, when the pipeline was built between Mannum and Adelaide. Since then we have not had to apply water restrictions in South Australia. The advice I have had from the Engineering and Water Supply Department is that there will be no water restrictions in South Australia this summer.

## UNION OFFICIALS

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Can the Minister for Industrial Affairs say who called in the police Anti-Corruption Squad to interrogate unionists for allegedly possessing an advanced copy of the Bill to amend the WorkCover law?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Before I answer that question, I think I ought to put on the public record, so that everybody is aware of the hypocrisy of this whole exercise, that I have been informed that the previous chief of staff of the Liberal Party, Richard Yeeles, was interrogated with regard to the Casino by the Anti-Corruption Squad on an instruction of the previous Labor Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I put that on the record so that everybody is aware of it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Don't you worry about the answer because you will get it as it is.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, both the Deputy Leader and the Deputy Premier were warned very early in proceedings. I have heard this person interject on at least 10 occasions since that time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier is correct. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has taken it upon himself to continue to interject across the Chamber. The Chair will not tolerate any more of this unruly behaviour, and the warning is given. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Let me restate: I have had no involvement whatsoever.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Don't get excited, just listen. I have had no involvement. No Minister of this Government has had any involvement. It is my clear understanding that a senior Government official instigated it, and I want to make another point.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! One question at a time. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I said that it was a senior Government official who has a direct involvement with WorkCover. I think that another point also needs to be put on the record: this particular senior Government official has no political affiliation with either Party that I am aware of.

## BUSHFIRES

**Mrs HALL (Coles):** My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. With the bushfire season fast approaching, can the Minister advise the House of the fire prevention measures that are being taken within the State's reserves? A number of my constituents have contacted me about the potential fire danger this year, in particular because of the lethal combination of heavy undergrowth and extremely dry conditions. I am pleased that several months ago the Minister was able to inspect an area adjacent to the Black Hill conservation park.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I do not need to remind members of this House of the severe fire danger potential existing this year in many parts of South Australia. I was pleased that the member for Coles invited me to see first-hand some of the concerns that were expressed by her

constituents who live adjacent to Black Hill. I was able to gain from that opportunity. Last week I also spent half a day looking at the urban parks and saw some of the problems we have regarding the need for fire prevention measures in those areas.

I will go on to answer the honourable member's question, but I also wish to express concern, particularly in regard to parts of a new housing development which I saw in the vicinity of the Black Hill conservation park. I was appalled to see that brand new homes are being built very close to the boundaries of the park, and that gives me concern. I am also very much aware of the concern being expressed by people who have lived adjacent to parks for a period of time.

Although the fire statistics concerning reserves for the decade to 1993 show that only 1.5 per cent of all South Australian rural fires started in a reserve, the national parks review highlighted the lack of funds and equipment given to the fire management of these important parts of the South Australian landscape. I am keen to respond to the concerns expressed in the review. The Government has allocated over \$300 000 above the budgeted \$150 000 for fire works for the replacement of worn out and unsafe fire units and practical fire prevention works: more than twice the amount of funding that has been provided in recent years for this cause. Fuel management measures across the State are being targeted for strategic and clearly identified zones that will reduce the intensity of fires and protect valuable assets.

However, as it is not feasible to implement all the fire prevention works in one year, a long-term program is to be put in place to achieve the required levels of protection. I recognise the urgency of achieving this. The Government has ensured that large fire units will be located in Adelaide Hills parks to support other CFS units and has provided funds for three more fire appliances to be added to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources fleet. The department now has nine fire appliances, 14 water tankers, 33 slip-on units, three bulldozers, one grader and one aircraft for fire management; 195 trained agency staff are available to fight fires; and other Government departments also supply resources for fires when requested.

I will ensure that the department works closely with the CFS through the Prevention and Suppression Committee's structures and has a significant input into the bushfire prevention planning process. The Director, Natural Resources Group, who has statutory responsibility for the National Parks and Wildlife Service, has recently been appointed to the CFS Board, and I am delighted that has happened. The department as a member of the CFS shares the CFS radio network and works with the remainder of the CFS on fire management as part of the incident command structure at fires involving reserves.

Ngarkat reserve was one of the first places in South Australia to use the Australian incident management system years ago largely through the efforts of firefighters in the area and as a result of the efforts of the member for Ridley, who also had a strong involvement. I can also inform the House that all Government firefighters are trained by the CFS.

I, as the Minister responsible, recognise the need to ensure that reserves are properly treated to cater for any fire dangers. I understand and respect the concerns that have been expressed by those who live adjacent to parks, and I accept the responsibility that we have for ensuring that adequate work is carried out in our parks to cater for the needs of those people.

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may ask one question and not a series of follow-up questions when he resumes his seat. The Deputy Leader.

#### WORKCOVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** In the light of the Minister for Industrial Affairs' answer to the question asked by the member for Spence, who was the senior Government official who called in the police Anti-Corruption Squad and when was the Minister informed of the involvement of the Anti-Corruption Squad—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is substantially the same as a previous question asked by the member for Spence. I rule it out of order. The member for Peake.

**Mr CLARKE:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it is a quite different question. You need only recall the question that was raised by the member for Spence. The Minister denied that he had any involvement—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat.

**Mr CLARKE:** This Parliament is entitled to have an answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I name the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for continuing to defy the ruling of the Chair. Does the honourable member wish to be heard in explanation or apology?

**Mr CLARKE:** Yes, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr CLARKE:** I apologise for any defiance of the Chair. I merely point out that this is a very serious matter. Ministers of the Crown have an obligation to answer straightforward questions in a straightforward manner, and it is a matter of public interest.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Deputy Leader's behaviour is outrageous. He has continued to flout the Chair—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

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

That the Deputy Leader's explanation be not accepted.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the motion seconded?

**An honourable member:** Yes.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition believes that this process is outrageous, because quite simply this is a different question. I have just given the Speaker an example of the question, and I invite the Speaker with the assistance of the Clerks to examine it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question before the Chair is the motion moved by the Deputy Premier that the Deputy Leader's explanation not be accepted. Therefore, the Leader of the Opposition's remarks must be confined to that motion.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** For the Government to support such a motion would be a political cover-up designed to gag the Opposition's legitimate inquiries and questions on a serious subject. If the Government wants to gag the Opposition, that is fine, because the debate will go on outside this Chamber. I assure members of the Government that it will go on outside this Chamber.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the Deputy Premier speaks he closes the debate.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The issue is not about a question but about the behaviour of the Deputy Leader. It has nothing

to do with whether the question was legitimate; it concerns the Deputy Leader's behaviour. This Parliament has been subjected to abuse by the Deputy Leader since the day he was appointed. Compounding the problems created by the Deputy Leader, the Leader of the Opposition said, 'We will take the fight out into the street.' Again, that is irrelevant. He is supposed to protect his colleague, but he can think only about where he is going to take the fight. The issue—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition—  
*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Those comments are out of order and not helpful to the debate. The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition stated publicly that he was going to repair his and the Parliament's image. He has done nothing on his own behalf or on behalf of his Party to achieve that end. We all want to achieve that end. We want the Parliament to function effectively. We do not mind spirited debate, Mr Speaker, and you have allowed spirited debate in this Parliament. Parliament is the place for putting a point of view. However, there are some rules which apply in this Parliament. Those rules have been breached by the Deputy Leader on numerous occasions, and he must learn a lesson. That lesson has nothing to do with the issue that was being debated. My colleague was ready to stand and answer the question, but it was substantially the same question. However, that is not the point. Quite clearly, the point is that the Deputy Leader's behaviour is intolerable to this Parliament. I ask the Parliament to agree to the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (32)

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

NOES (8)

Atkinson, M. J.	Clarke, R. D.
De Laine, M. R. (teller)	Foley, K. O.
Geraghty, R. K.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	Stevens, L.

Majority of 24 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to withdraw from the Chamber.

*The Deputy Leader of the Opposition having withdrawn from the Chamber:*

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

That the honourable member be suspended from the service of the House.

Motion carried.

## WORKCOVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** Will the Minister for Industrial Relations further clarify the issue relating to the Anti-Corruption Squad as it relates to the report of the senior Government official that he previously mentioned?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I will put on record a couple of things. First, as I understand it, there has been no report from the police to this senior public official. Secondly, this Government will not allow senior public officials to be intimidated by the thuggery of members opposite or by any union member—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I would like you to determine whether that is unparliamentary language—calling members thugs.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! My attention was distracted but, if the Minister called members opposite 'thugs', I ask him to withdraw it. I have already spoken to members. Earlier in Question Time I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition make a similar comment. I ask the Minister to withdraw that comment.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I withdraw my comment, Sir. Whilst a police investigation is being carried out independently of any Minister of this Government, the Government has no intention of getting involved in that investigation. I am not prepared to put a senior public servant in a position where they may be intimidated by anybody, whether they are a member of this House or the union movement.

## UNION OFFICIALS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** When was the Minister for Industrial Affairs informed of the investigation of union officials by Anti-Corruption Branch police, and did he discuss the matter with the Minister for Emergency Services and, if so, when?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I cannot remember the exact date that I was informed. It is important that the House is aware that I have not been informed by the Anti-Corruption Branch and have had no discussion at all with the Anti-Corruption Branch on this issue. I have had no discussions with the Minister for Emergency Services, and I am not aware of any discussions that the Anti-Corruption Branch might have had with him.

## COLLEX WASTE MANAGEMENT

**Mr ASHENDEN (Wright):** Is the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development aware of public statements and allegations made in another place that Collex Waste Management Pty Ltd and the State Government have reached agreement in return for Collex's parent company Onyx gaining some advantage in running South Australia's water supply, and can the Minister explain the actual position?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I can give an absolute assurance to the honourable member that no arrangement has been put in place, and no discussions have been held or agreement reached with Collex.

*The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, the Democrats are recycling this issue—

**The Hon. H. Allison:** They are still six months ahead of the Labor Party.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes. I can assure members that no arrangement has been made. In relation to the outsourcing of Engineering and Water Supply Department activities, at the infrastructure forum only three days ago, with the CEO of the EWS Department, I had the opportunity to speak with both a French and a UK company who have shown interest in becoming involved in the water industry in South Australia. A number of national and State-based organisations also indicated their interest in the provision of services to South Australia and, further, the provision of those services nationally and internationally.

The objective of the Government, as with the EDS, is the outsourcing of data processing, information technology and telecommunications. We have been able to lever a very significant industry development factor with the EDS deal; a pacesetter agreement. The Government is intent on getting economic activity and industrial development in South Australia, which is the principle put forward by the Premier last year and which has been implemented by the Government during this year: leveraging the purchasing power of Government to achieve industry and economic development and the repositioning of South Australia. So, too, with the water industry in this State. We have purchasing power and it is the intent of the Government and the CEO of the EWS Department to use that purchasing power for industry development and economic activity.

The principle implemented with EDS is the same sort of principle we are attempting to put forward as it relates to the water industry in South Australia. There are enormous opportunities overseas. Over the next 20 years Indonesia, which currently has a population of 190 million, will grow by a further 90 million people. The city of Jakarta has 10 million official residents (it is something like 17 million all up, but 10 million officially). It has a sewerage system designed for 500 000, so you do not need to be Einstein to work out the enormous opportunities, potential and challenges that exist in such areas. The Indonesian Minister for Public Works will visit South Australia at the end of November, when we hope to put forward the expertise that we have in South Australia and the intellectual property that is within the EWS Department. With joint venturing in the private sector, we hope to be able to access those international markets for industry and economic development in South Australia.

For the Hon. Mr Elliott in another place to suggest that a deal has been done is arrant, fabricated nonsense. When the Government this weekend advertises for an expression of interest for the Ottoway workshops of the EWS Department and the outsourcing functions of that department, it will give the lie to the suggestion that there is a deal, an agreement, with Collex. With the visitors here from interstate and overseas discussing with the Government options for economic and industry development by the outsourcing functions of the EWS Department, he will certainly see that what we are on about will bring major benefits to South Australia.

### CRICKET, JUNIOR

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing confirm that the Government has rejected a proposal by the South Australian Cricket Association to establish three special interest schools for junior cricket development to complement the work undertaken by the SACA and the Commonwealth Cricket Academy? The

Opposition understands that the Government has refused to provide a grant of \$25 000 to the South Australian Cricket Association to match the SACA contribution of \$100 000 that would have enabled Norwood, Marryatville and Urrbrae Secondary Schools to provide specialist advanced cricket coaching.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** I am not familiar with the alleged refusal of that grant. I will seek information from my officers, and when Parliament resumes next Tuesday I will be very happy to provide a report to the honourable member and to the House as to the circumstances.

### MOBIL SCRATCH TICKETS

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** My question is directed to the Treasurer. Are public servants who purchase petrol for Government motor vehicles entitled to keep scratch ticket prizes won through a special promotional offer currently conducted by Mobil service stations?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am only sorry that the Leader of the Opposition has spat the dummy and is not here to listen to the answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** There is nothing unparliamentary about that. When the Government purchases goods, it is a dilemma how any incentives attached to those goods should be handled. If a Government employee purchases Mobil petrol and receives scratch tickets, where should the benefit lie? I have pondered this matter since it was first raised by the member for Peake. There are some unworkable solutions. One would be to say to each employee, 'We want only the winning tickets back.' We know that is unworkable. Another unworkable solution would be to say, 'Bring your tickets in and the manager and you can scratch them together.' Both those options were discarded as being impractical. The third one, and this is also slightly impractical, was to get Mobil to send us the bulk of Government cards and get the member for Peake to scratch them on behalf of the Government.

It does have a very important underlying point: what is Government ownership, what is Government property? It is the intention of the Government to write to Mobil and suggest that this incentive should not flow to Government employees as such, because the incentive should be to the benefit of the Crown. We believe that if this is a program that is costing Mobil, it is a discount, if you like, on petrol, which is not being received by the Government. We would ask Mobil to provide that element of discount, which is equivalent to the cost that would accrue for the incentives that would flow to Government as a result of its participating. We will be writing to Mobil and asking it not to distribute scratch tickets to employees but to return the benefit to the Government and to the Treasurer.

### ANGAS-BREMER REGION

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Why did the Government allocate 6 000 million litres of water from the Murray River to the Angas-Bremer region of the Premier's electorate without complying with section 46 of the Murray Darling Basin Agreement, and what action has the Minister taken to minimise the adverse effects of this decision on South Australia's outcomes from the Murray Darling agreement? On 26 September the President of the Murray Darling Basin Commission wrote to the Minister criticising

this allocation of water and requesting discussions on the effects this would have on the continuing operation of the Murray Darling Basin Agreement.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is currently in the Press Gallery rather than being in the Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** This is the Question Time of the Parliament, when I expect the Leader of the Opposition to be present.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. As I understand it, brief periods may be spent in the Press Gallery to hand out press releases, but the press box should not be occupied by assistants or by members for any extended period.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** First, the advice that I have been given, which has been reiterated, is that it was not necessary for me to provide this allocation under section 46 of the Murray Darling agreement. As lead Minister for the Murray River in this State, I am very much aware of the responsibilities that I have in accordance with that agreement. The honourable member has suggested that this matter relates to the electorate of the Premier. I can assure the House that this matter has been under consideration since the mid-1980s. The allocation has been sought and the matter has been dealt with on an ongoing basis by the responsible departments.

The advice I have is that section 46 was not necessary. I take this opportunity to say that I certainly recognise again the responsibility I have in ensuring an appropriate environment flow in the Murray River and I will always ensure, wherever I can, that that is the case, particularly given the problems we have in this State with blue-green algae and other issues. That environment flow is absolutely essential, but in this case we are dealing with the bottom end of the Murray-Darling system, with the Angas and Bremer Rivers and with the lake system.

I cannot recall exactly the amount of water lost from that lake system on a yearly basis through evaporation, but it is quite extensive. We are losing a considerable amount of water through evaporation as well as through the barrage going out to the sea. It is at the bottom end of the system. It is a very complicated situation and I would be happy to provide to the honourable member a copy of my response that I prepared for the Chairman of the Murray-Darling Commission. That response spells out clearly where the Government stands and where I stand as the responsible Minister.

I reiterate that it was not necessary for me to use section 46. I do not like the implications being made that something has happened because it is in the Premier's electorate. That is not the case; it has nothing to do with it. This matter has been dealt with since the early to mid-1980s and I have no difficulty whatsoever with the decision made in this regard.

---

#### MEMBERS, TRAVEL

**The SPEAKER:** I table a schedule of members of Parliament travel entitlement rules for 1993-94.

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** What we have witnessed in this House today is nothing short of disgraceful.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** We have seen a political Party abuse the process of Parliament. We have seen, ever since this Government was elected, an absolute display of arrogance.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I know that grievances are wide ranging, but is the member entitled to reflect on the Chair? The content of his speech is a direct reflection on the Chair and on a vote taken by this House, therefore he is out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Any reflection on the Chair is out of order. I have been listening carefully to what the honourable member has had to say. I suggest that he is quite within his rights to be critical of a Government for its actions and I therefore call the member for Hart.

**Mr FOLEY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** On a point of order, Sir, the member for Hart in his opening remarks was attributing improper motives to members of the Liberal Party and I reject that. I believe he has transgressed.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is contrary to Standing Orders for any member to impute improper motives. The member for Hart.

**Mr FOLEY:** What we have witnessed today has been brewing for months. This Government's majority has given it a method of dealing with this Parliament which is arrogant and which abuses the process. We debated earlier in this place the way this Government refused the proper parliamentary process to debate a Bill on shopping hours because it did not suit your political purpose. The minute you get under pressure, when you were put under political pressure, when your Minister is in the hot seat, when the Minister cannot contain himself, when the Minister is not capable of defending himself, you close down the Parliament. That is what you did: you closed down the Parliament. That is a Party which, when it cannot get its own way, when it finds itself with an issue that is too sensitive to be debated in the Parliament, closes down the Parliament.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** On a point of order, Sir, I draw your attention to Standing Order 127 relating to personal reflection on members. The honourable member through his statements is attributing improper motives to members on this side of the House for the vote they cast on a matter earlier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair cannot uphold the point of order. The member for Hart is entitled to be critical of the way in which the Government manages the affairs of the House. He cannot personally reflect on members or on the Chair. The member for Hart.

**Mr FOLEY:** Over the past six years I have watched from the gallery this Parliament operate, and I have never seen such abuse of power as I saw today. If you cannot handle tough questions, get out of this Parliament. Do not stay in this Parliament and close down the process when you are put under pressure.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Newland.

**Mrs KOTZ:** Sir, my point of order relates to Standing Order 127. The honourable member has reflected on me as an individual because I asked a further question. When this member says that we closed down the Parliament, I asked a further question on the same issue. That is a reflection on me.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The member for Newland's point of order is not valid.

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it is an offence against Standing Orders to reflect on a vote of this House. I believe that the member is reflecting on a vote of this House and I ask you to rule on that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley is correct. No member can reflect on a vote of the House. However, the member for Hart has been making his comments generally in relation to the conduct of the Government, and that is why the Chair has allowed him to continue. The member for Hart.

**Mr FOLEY:** We will not be intimidated by this Government and we will not lie down and refrain from hard questions because you abuse the process.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence is most unwise to make those sorts of comments across the Chamber. I suggest to him that already today the House has not distinguished itself. The Chair has reminded members that the public expects members of Parliament to conduct themselves in a responsible manner.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** On a point of order, Sir, it should be pointed out to the House that today members of the Opposition have been accused of being thugs, in the gutter, hypocrites and other things. It is appropriate for the member for Spence to draw some historical analogies.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will be aware that the Chair has intervened on each occasion when inappropriate comments have been made, from whichever side of the House they have been made. The member for Wright.

**Mr ASHENDEN (Wright):** I address my remarks at the commencement of my five minutes on the behaviour of the Opposition today: we have seen deliberate flouting of the authority of the Chair by the Deputy Leader, and that is what this matter is all about. Actions speak much louder than words. We had the Leader of the Opposition writing to the Archbishop of Adelaide, talking about the behaviour of members of Parliament and all of that sort of thing and what have we seen today and ever since that letter was written to the Archbishop? We have seen nothing but behaviour from the Leader of the Opposition which brings the whole repute of this place down as low as you can get.

The Leader of the Opposition was purely and simply seeking publicity. He forwarded a copy of his letter to the Archbishop to the press to say, 'Look what a good guy I am.' If only the Archbishop had been here ever since, he would have seen the true colours of the Leader of the Opposition. Again, the Leader of the Opposition is not here. He was hardly here at all through Question Time: he is hardly ever here through Question Time. He is out doing goodness knows what. He spends more time in the press gallery than in the Parliament and when Question Time started today, there were only six members of the Opposition in their seats for the first five minutes. Who is taking this Parliament seriously?

The member for Hart stands up and says that we are abusing our privileges and squashing members opposite. They are not even here to be squashed. The behaviour of the Opposition today demonstrates that it has no respect for this

Parliament. In the Opposition's tactics meeting today they probably said, 'Let's make sure we get the Deputy Leader thrown out so we get some publicity.' I have never seen a more glaring example of a member's trying to get thrown out of the House than I saw today when the Deputy Leader stood up and flouted the Chair.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** The honourable member who interjects did not have the stomach to repeat what he said about the Chair during the division, either. I wish he would, because he would then join his mate. That is the sort of disgusting behaviour that the Opposition is bringing into this House.

I now refer to a matter of extreme importance in my electorate where I have seen one of the worst examples of corporate abuse and deliberate flouting of an operating licence. In my electorate there are two manufacturers of bricks and some years ago there was a problem with pollutants coming from the operations. The Environmental Protection Authority spoke to those two manufacturers and said that it required that pollution levels be reduced. One of those manufacturers, PGH, complied immediately and installed what is called a 'scrubber' to ensure that the pollution that came from its operation was well below the levels under its licence.

Unfortunately, three years ago Hallett Nubrick did not do that and since that time has caused tremendous pollution problems to the residents of my electorate. Not only has Hallett Nubrick caused pollution problems but it has caused tremendous damage to the primary production of some of the persons living in close proximity. Those primary producers of orchids and other flowers have had horrendous losses because Hallett Nubrick was putting out emissions of fluorides three to four times in excess of its licence agreement. At the same time, it has been emitting sulphur dioxide and sulphur trioxide, as the member for Newland points out, which is having a serious impact on the health of local residents. I have been called out on a Saturday morning to experience this. A constituent rang me and asked, 'Please Scott, can you come down?' I went down there and the pollution was so bad that my eyes ran and my throat choked. The pollution was just unbelievable.

When my constituent contacted the General Manager of that company requesting that the pollution be stopped, the General Manager suggested to her that if she had a problem she should shut the windows of her house. I spoke with the General Manager, who acknowledged that for three years his company has been allowing emissions well in excess of his licence agreement to exude from that factory. The matter is so serious that the Government is now awaiting advice from the Crown Solicitor on whether legal action should be commenced against that company.

I have never seen a more obvious abuse of a licence than that situation. Despite the knowledge that the company was operating outside its licence, polluting the atmosphere and causing these problems, the pollution continued. I have reached the stage where my patience has run out. This Government has done a fantastic job. It has pressured that company and at long last action has been taken. As from tomorrow, the pollution will stop, because this Government has forced the company to install—

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

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

*A quorum having been formed:*



**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I intended to refer today only to interest rates and the appalling representation that the electorate of Kingston has from its Federal member, but before I get into that I will talk about the appalling representation that the State of South Australia has from its Opposition. While on the issue of the Opposition, I draw to the attention of the House that there is no member from the Opposition present. Since the appointment of the new Leader of the Opposition, he has not once remained in this House for an entire Question Time. He is the person who says that he wants the standard of Parliament to increase. And he is the person who says that he wants the proportion of females in this Parliament to be 50 per cent.

As a member of the female sex, I can tell members that we do not want to be part of a Parliament that carries on in that way: the Leader of the Opposition has made an example of the South Australian Parliament, and it has been an absolute and utter disgrace. I feel extremely sorry for the other women members of Parliament who are forced to sit on the same side of Parliament as the Leader of the Opposition and follow the example that he has set here today. It is an absolute and utter disgrace.

I refer now to the profile of people who are struggling financially in the southern area, in particular the average family with a house mortgage, a car to be paid off and a couple of children either in school or in some sort of formal training. I refer to those people who are lucky enough to be in a job, notwithstanding those in the southern areas who are going through this recession that we had to have, thanks to Mr Keating, without employment.

A recent Messenger Press article referred to groups who are losing their jobs and their homes when banks foreclose. It is estimated that this year alone there will be an extra 50 per cent demand on financial counselling in that area. Owning one's home is still the great Australian dream. In some circles, it is still a measure of success. Many parents now feel that they are failures because they cannot provide a home for their children. The mental pressure that that puts on families results in family breakdowns, domestic violence and abuse.

I add to that the stress of not having a job or the fear of losing a job. In the electorate with small businesses under extra pressure, consumer hardship inevitably impacts on business confidence. We could enter into this already disastrous formula the Federal Government's obsession with interest rate increases. The recent interest rate increases which were fuelled by the Federal Government caused another downgrade in the economy throughout Australia.

The Liberal State Governments are getting the economy going but the Federal Government is doing the opposite: it is destroying all the successes of the State Governments by increasing interest rates. Keating then deems that interest rates have to increase to stop overheating of the economy. South Australia went into the recession more slowly and will come out of it more slowly. Increased interest rates will have a devastating effect on business confidence and jobs.

In the south we have felt the influence of this recession badly, with above average unemployment, particularly amongst the young. Today's *Advertiser* has a front page article which warns that interest rates are on the rise again. It states that home owners have been given strong warning today that interest rates will be increased again before Christmas. The Reserve Bank Governor, Mr Bernie Fraser, said yesterday that rates would have to rise soon to keep a lid on inflation and to ensure the rising Current Account deficit did not spiral out of control.

The fact that on 17 August banks lifted their interest rates by .75 per cent did absolutely nothing to give confidence to industry to take on people to increase employment. Because of this, it is very disappointing that the Federal member for Kingston was silent on the decision and on the effect of these interest rate increases on his constituents. Clearly, the people in the south expect and deserve a more vocal voice raised in their defence. This lack of representation, coupled with the financial disasters of the previous Labor Government in this State, have imposed unacceptable burdens on my constituents.

I call on the Federal member for Kingston (Gordon Bilney) to do the job he was elected to do—to speak against Keating's thirst for further interest rate increases and to support his constituents against this reduction in living standards and loss of business confidence. Some genuine representation would be a breath of fresh air in the electorate of Kingston.

**Mrs HALL (Coles):** I refer to arts funding and the Federal Government's Creative Nation package announced earlier this week. First, I will refer to the \$252 million under the Federal Government's package as its impacts on the cultural life of the country and then deal with the implications for Adelaide and South Australia. The Federal shadow Minister for the Arts, Senator Richard Alston, put it in a nutshell when he said that Creative Nation is much more like a cobbled together nation. This statement was two years in the making and has occupied four Ministers. There is very little evidence of a coherent plan. It is obvious that chunks of the policy were written in and out of the script in the past fortnight in response to various lobbies and power plays. It appears that Mr Murdoch's Twentieth-Century Fox involvement was turned into a major initiative only on the weekend.

I refer members to the front page of yesterday's *Sydney Morning Herald*. The establishment of the major organisation board is a sensible move, but why have such a body yet exclude the Australian Opera. Of course, the reason is that the Australian Opera is an organisation accountable to no-one with very effective lobbyists. In spite of its name, it exists principally to serve Sydney audiences. Sydney audiences and New South Wales electors generally are being given a grotesquely disproportionate share of the arts dollar. It has been widely reported that Creative Nation is about locking in the arts vote for the next Federal election, but it is at least as much about the New South Wales State election and a shameless transparent exercise in pork-barrelling.

As Ken Davidson pointed out in yesterday's *Age*, the elevation of the Sydney Symphony Orchestra at the expense of Melbourne's orchestra, which is at least as good, is irrational as arts policy but will go down well in Sydney. It is also another affront to the ABC, which has appallingly been otherwise completely neglected. At the very least, the ABC's film making capacities and its distinguished record of innovative commissioning should have been recognised. The additional funding for SBS is certainly welcome, as is the Brisbane based Institute for Indigenous Performing Arts and the National Academy of Music to be based in Melbourne. But our own Helpmann Academy, the board of which was announced yesterday, as yet does not appear to get any support.

The South Australian Museum will get no significant funding, although it is the most rational choice of home for Canberra's Aboriginal collections and which, because of existing internationally recognised Aboriginal questions, is

urgently in need of the next stage of its redevelopment program. While there is some hope that the Museum's innovative, interactive technology pilot programs will attract some additional funding and there is some scope for South Australia to get some film funding, these are very much the crumbs which have fallen from the master's table. South Australia was not invited to the banquet. We have had nothing specifically earmarked in funding terms and Tandanya, which had a reasonable expectation of a significant boost, has once again been passed over by the Federal Government.

Even with an outstanding company of national importance like Meryl Tankard's ADT, there has been no special recognition of this South Australian-based company with a national and international dimension. Ken Davidson summed it up when he said:

The cultural statement is elitist, Sydney-centric, gee-whiz ignorant about multi-media and a triumph for cultural bureaucracies. Perhaps it is in this area that South Australia could get more of the \$84 million loaf than just the crumb to which I have referred.

Our Government has set in train developments in the computer and so-called information super highway areas that will make our State a national leader in this field. Perhaps an approach from this State in the form of a joint venture proposal may create a base for a CD-ROM multi-media production enterprise here in South Australia.

As I said, it is an irrational and hastily flung together document. In short, it is outrageous that we have a 'Creative Nation' statement passing itself off as a vision which, like many of the Keating Government's policies, is designed to buy the approval of a cheer squad and sectional interest groups, which is short term in its thinking and is blithely indifferent to the national interest. Clearly it is punitive in its consequences for this State. South Australia and our arts community is being punished for voting Liberal, at both Federal and State elections, where electors have rebuffed the Australian Labor Party.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** It is interesting that the House has returned to its normal tranquillity and rationality, and that return to the even kilter for which this House is normally noted has been accompanied by a general exodus of members of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is present—just for the *Hansard* record.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The member for Unley was simply pointing out historical fact rather than the current situation.

**Mr BRINDAL:** There is a tendency in some Parliaments for Leaders of those Parliaments, whether they be Premier or, apparently, Leader of the Opposition, to consider themselves so important that they attend only on certain days of the week. I notice that in Canberra we have a Prime Minister who, of course, is so far above the ordinary people of Australia and the Parliament to which he must answer that he wafts in and out of the Parliament, apparently by divine fiat, and chooses to answer the people of Australia as represented in the Parliament—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The honourable member is clearly reflecting on the Premier, who is not present in this Chamber.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member was in fact referring to the Prime Minister and not to the Premier. I am not sure what is the point of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Just in case the Leader of the Opposition did not understand: I was quite clearly reflecting on the Prime Minister, who believes that he is so far above the people who elect him to their governance that he does not have to answer to them through the Parliament.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Is it usual for the Chair to interpret members' speeches to other members?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Spence does not have a point of order. His hearing is also bad. The Chair simply said that the member for Unley was in fact referring to the Prime Minister, and he actually used that term during the course of his remarks. A perusal of *Hansard* will demonstrate that the Chair is not interpreting but is, in fact, simply repeating what was heard. The member for Unley.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Today, through a chain of circumstances that all of us would have wished otherwise, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition joined a rather small group of people who have had the distinction, good or otherwise, of having it decided by this Chamber—by their peers—that it could dispense with their services for a period of time. I am one of those people in relation to whom the House has made a similar decision. What disappoints me is that when my friend and colleague the previous member for Coles was sent from the Chamber it was in relation to a matter on which she felt very strongly.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** Does that make a difference?

**Mr BRINDAL:** I would say that it does. The Leader of the Opposition has come in here in the wake of the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide—flowing in his wake—and has trumpeted 'good parliamentary debate', 'getting out of the gutter', and all those sorts of things. I accept what he says; I accept his word at face value. However, when it comes to the standards—and his Deputy Leader obviously transgressed those standards—we have the member for Hart standing up and howling like a dervish and making all sorts of unsubstantiated allegations about the character of the Parliament.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: 'howling like a dervish' is clearly not parliamentary but racist.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. A dervish is simply a clan whose practice of howling is commonly known across the world. The member for Unley is simply drawing attention to the fact that the member for Hart's behaviour resembled that.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I apologise to the dervishes for comparing them unfavourably with the member for Hart. I am quite sure all dervishes would be upset by such an odious comparison. It is no light matter when we take a situation so seriously that we get thrown out, and nobody in this Parliament likes doing that. Therefore, it is disappointing when members opposite use it as a vehicle for political grandstanding. If this Parliament is to be taken seriously, it falls on us all to behave responsibly. The Opposition is not behaving responsibly—

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

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** It is obvious that the Opposition has finished with its filibustering. Members opposite have obviously been found with their pants down around their ankles and are sheepishly hiding somewhere in the building. No longer are they prepared to face the criticism that has been

levelled at them for their utter disrespect of the Chair and for expressing it the way they did during Question Time.

At times we may not agree with the rulings of the Chair but we do not show that disagreement by way of disrespect. If a member shows disrespect to the Chair, no matter what their culture may be, they should be prepared to take their punishment quietly and properly. It does not matter whether that be in this Parliament, the schools, the courts or wherever else: all of us at some time have to show respect for those who are conducting a meeting or, in this case, the Parliament.

Opposition members have been guilty of intellectual chicanery in their activities here today. The member for Playford was not here; he was obviously out the back sharpening the knives ready to stick them into the member for Ross Smith to improve his air-conditioning. It is obvious that the member for Playford, knowing that the member for Ross Smith had acted improperly, saw his opportunity. The member for Ross Smith no longer had his respect—

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, can you confirm that the member for Playford has the leave of this House owing to illness?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That can be notified at the end of the honourable member's address. The matter will be taken care of. The member for Mitchell.

**Mr CAUPELL:** The member for Playford was seen sharpening the knives getting ready for the action that was to follow. The member for Giles, the numbers man for the member for Ross Smith in the recent election for the Deputy Leader's position, was not present, either, and he also had lost confidence in the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Obviously the two of them are ready to tap the member for Ross Smith on the shoulder, because his actions in this Parliament both today and on previous occasions have been totally unparliamentary and unacceptable and have set a very poor standard for the community to follow.

It is little wonder that the member for Playford sharpened the knives for the member for Ross Smith. I doubt whether we will see the member for Ross Smith on the front bench in the future. His position will be taken, quite rightly, by the member for Playford, who obviously commands greater respect in this House and who, in turn, has greater respect for the Speaker and abides by his rulings. I have seen the member for Playford many times, when he has had a problem with a ruling, approach the Chair and discuss it in a civil manner—a manner in which the member for Ross Smith is not prepared to conduct himself. The member for Ross Smith would rather stand in his place and argue over the top of the Speaker and show disrespect for the Speaker.

When people show disrespect for authority they must bear the punishment. The punishment for the member for Ross Smith today was that he was suspended from the Chamber. The member for Ross Smith has to take his punishment. But, no, the member for Ross Smith stands on the steps of Parliament House and gives a completely different picture from the real reason for his being turfed out of the Chamber, namely, his disrespect for authority. No wonder the member for Playford is sharpening the knives and the air-conditioning is about to affect the member for Ross Smith. It is no wonder, either, that the member for Giles, the numbers man of the ALP, has lost confidence in the member for Ross Smith. The numbers man is right now going around the corridors checking to see who the new Deputy Leader will be.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member's

time has expired.

## POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL AND NOXIOUS SUBSTANCES (CONSISTENCY WITH COMMONWEALTH) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

The *Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act 1987* incorporates into State legislation, Annexes I and II of the International Maritime Organisation's, International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (commonly referred to as MARPOL 73/78). The Act mirrors similar Commonwealth legislation and applies to the territorial seas adjacent the State and waters within the limits of the State. Similar amendments to the Commonwealth *Protection of the Sea (Prevention of Pollution from Ships) Act 1983* were brought into operation on 6 July 1993.

The Bill has four objectives. First, to remove the definition of and references to "harbor master" in sections 3, 6 and 35 of the Act and to substitute references to "port manager", a title now used throughout the State.

Second, to reduce the allowable instantaneous rate of discharge from cargo spaces of oil tankers from 60 litres per nautical mile to 30 litres per nautical mile when oil tanker's comply with certain requirements and are not within a special area and are more than 50 miles from the nearest land. The oil content of effluent from machinery spaces of ships will be reduced from 100 parts per million to 15 parts per million even if the discharge is made more than 12 miles from the coast. Ships are to be fitted with 15 parts per million filtering equipment instead of 100 parts per million oily water separators presently required. Filtering equipment on ships of 10 000 gross tons and above is to be provided with alarm arrangements and automatic stopping devices when the oil content exceeds 15 parts per million instead of the recording device presently required. Ships delivered before July 1993 have until July 1998 to comply with these provisions.

Third, to require Australian ships of 400 gross tons or more and Australian tankers with a gross tonnage of less than 400 but not less than 150 to keep on board a shipboard oil pollution emergency plan. The shipboard emergency plan must be in the prescribed form and will include procedures to be followed in notifying a prescribed incident, a list of authorities or persons to be notified, a detailed description of the action to be taken to reduce or control any discharge from the ship and the procedures to be followed for co-ordinating with the Authorities that have been contacted any action taken in combating the pollution and the person on board the ship through whom all communications are to be made. The master of the ship and the owner of the ship are both guilty of an offence if a ship, to which this section applies, does not have on board a shipboard oil pollution emergency plan. The maximum penalty is \$50 000.

Fourth, to expand existing requirements for the evidence of an analyst and clarify the details to be included on an analysts certificate for it to be admissible as evidence in any proceeding for an offence against a provision of the Act. The required notice which must be given to a prosecutor when an analyst is required to be called is also stated.

The Bill also makes a minor amendment to the manner in which permission may be given to transfer oil at night by allowing that permission to be given in individual cases or generally in specified circumstances (without restriction).

I commend the Bill to the house.

Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation*

The definition of "harbor master" is deleted. A definition of "port manager" is inserted instead and cross references updated.

*Clause 4: Amendment of s. 6—Delegation*

The references to harbor master are updated to port manager.

*Clause 5: Amendment of s. 8—Prohibition of discharge of oil or oily mixtures into State waters*

The exemption given in section 8(4)(a) to certain oil tankers more than 50 nautical miles from land with an instantaneous rate of discharge of oil content from cargo spaces of not more than 60 litres per nautical mile is limited to such tankers with a discharge of not more than 30 litres per nautical mile.

The exemption given in section 8(4)(b) to certain ships other than oil tankers more than 12 nautical miles from land discharging oil or oily mixture with an oil content less than 100 parts per million is limited to ships with a discharge with an oil content of 15 parts per million and is applied to ships within 12 nautical miles of land. Such ships are required to carry equipment as specified in certain regulations. The nature of the equipment that can be required to be carried is currently limited to an oil discharge monitoring and control system, oily water separating equipment, oil filtering equipment or other installation. This limitation is removed.

Ships delivered before 6 July 1993 have until 6 July 1998 to comply with these more stringent requirements.

*Clause 6: Insertion of s. 10A—Shipboard oil pollution emergency plan*

The new section requires Australian ships of 400 tonnes or more and Australian oil tankers of 150 tonnes or more to keep on board a shipboard oil pollution emergency plan in the form required by the regulations.

*Clause 7: Amendment of s. 35—Transfer of oil at night*

The references to harbor master are updated to port manager. New subsection (2) allows a permission to transfer oil at night to be given generally in specified circumstances and not just, as currently provided, where transfer happens at the same place on a frequent and regular basis.

*Clause 8: Amendment of s. 39—Evidence of analyst*

Section 39 is an evidentiary provision relating to evidence of analysts appointed by the Minister. The amendment expands the matters that may be certified by an analyst. The amendment also requires 5 days notice to the prosecution if the defence requires the personal attendance of an analyst at court.

**Mr ATKINSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (LEARNERS' PERMITS AND PROBATIONARY LICENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 129.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The Opposition has studied the Bill, thinks that it is reasonable and supports it. At present a person who has a probationary licence or learner's permit and who drives without the licence or permit in their possession loses that licence or permit if they are caught: the penalty is licence or permit disqualification. In this Bill the Government wants to change that penalty from disqualification to a fine. The Opposition thinks that that is reasonable and that disqualification is possibly too draconian a penalty.

This Bill not only applies to young people, as the Minister for Transport said in another place—and perhaps the Minister in this Chamber will comment on this—but to adults who are disqualified from holding a licence for some reason and return to driving with a probationary licence. A couple of weeks ago I was speaking at a function and the person who introduced me said that four members of Parliament did not have drivers' licences—three were under suspension and the other was about to speak. I support the Bill.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development):** I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill. The honourable member raised one or two points and requested clarification. I will obtain that information and provide it to him in writing.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 3.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 25 October at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 October 1994

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

##### 4. Mr BECKER:

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQM-775 attending to whilst travelling east on Henley Beach Road on Monday, 11 July at approximately 7.05pm and who was the young girl in the front passenger seat?

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

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

##### The Hon. S.J. BAKER:

1. The vehicle was not on Government business. It was being used in connection with the business of a youth agency which works with young people aged 12 to 25 years. The agency is often involved in after hours work which may require the transport of clients.

The hire of Government vehicles to non Government organisations such as this is to be examined as part of a complete review of the use of Government vehicles by the Fleet Management Task Force.

2. State Fleet.

3. Not applicable.

#### IChemE SCIENCE BOX

40. Mr LEWIS: In how many Education Department schools is the IChemE science box kit currently being used, in how many could it be used and why can it not be used in others?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The science box is manufactured by DECS through the Technology Education Centre for and on behalf of IChemE in NSW and has resulted in highly favourable interstate publicity for DECS as a national provider of educational resources.

Since I launched the IChem science box in South Australia, six schools have obtained the science box and another 30 schools have contacted IChemE regarding details of obtaining a science box. It is intended that schools seek sponsorship in obtaining the science box.

The IChemE science box is available to any primary school with a cohort of 5-7 year old children; approximately 500 government schools.

The kits are attractive and well presented. They are in a format that suits the methodology of many junior primary classes as they encourage children to investigate a variety of problems and would be readily incorporated as an activity base in junior primary.

The science boxes are valid as a starting point but are not a total curriculum package. Schools using them would need to undertake science at greater depth than that introduced in the kit to fulfil a balanced curriculum.

The materials are a good starting point for teachers who do not have much experience organising or teaching science activities.

The links the scheme creates between schools and industry is to be applauded. It is a constructive way for industries to show their support for schools and to encourage students in the pursuit of science in a tangible way.

Wider use of the kit is hindered by the current cost (\$450) and this is the reason for DECS seeking industry sponsorship in this area.

#### HOSPITALS, COUNTRY

47. Mr ATKINSON: What adjustments have been made for country hospitals in the application of casemix funding?

##### The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1. In 1994-95 a minimum budget has been set for hospitals with low activity levels and those small rural hospitals with a gap between the casemix budget and their low activity level budget have been given a Rural Access Grant to make up the difference.

2. South Australian Health Commission Industrial Circular 1.18 recognises the cost differential, in terms of salaries and wages, of working in remote areas and provides for the payment of locality allowances to staff. Hospitals located within the geographical areas identified by this circular will continue to receive a remote area allowance to recognise the higher wages.

3. The Multi Purpose Services Program (MPS) is a three year joint Commonwealth/State Agreement which applies to the hospitals and health services in the towns of Streaky Bay/Elliston/Wudinna and Ceduna. Under this agreement, the two MPS programs are guaranteed Commonwealth and State funding to a predetermined level. The MPS program will be excluded from casemix funding for at least for the term of the current agreement.

4. Non-admitted patients in country hospitals will be paid for on an activity basis rather than the weighted benchmark price established for metropolitan hospitals.

In 1994/95:

- \$35 will be paid for casualty and private non-admitted cases in the country regional hospitals and \$20 in the country community hospitals.
- \$10 will be paid for all public non-admitted cases, and these payments will be made per occasion of service reported.

#### HEALTH REGIONS

48. Mr ATKINSON: What maximum tolerance (expressed as a percentage) is the Minister prepared to allow between the population numbers of Adelaide's proposed health regions?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: On 19 September 1994, I released a discussion paper 'A Proposed Structure for the Management of the State Health System'. This paper refers to the proposal to create two purchasing regions in South Australia: one covering Metropolitan Adelaide, and the other covering rural and remote South Australia. Under this proposal there will be no specific 'geographic' regions within metropolitan Adelaide.