

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 December 1996

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

NAILSWORTH HIGH SCHOOL OVAL

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to set aside the Eastern Oval of the former Nailsworth High School as a recreational facility was presented by Mr Clarke.

Petition received.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

A petition signed by 146 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure that the Environment Protection Authority exercises its full authority in the prosecution for environmental damage caused by the chemical leak from the Bridgestone site at Edwards-town was presented by Mr Wade.

Petition received.

WINE AND TOURISM COUNCIL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: On 12 November the member for Taylor asked a number of questions in this House regarding the appointment of Ms Anne Ruston to the position of Manager of the South Australian Wine and Tourism Council. At the time I indicated that I would further inform the House on the appointment of Ms Ruston. Let me make it clear, as I said to the House on 12 November, that I had no role to play in the appointment process. This process was controlled and managed by the former South Australian Tourism Commission Chief Executive, Mr Michael Gleeson. A selection panel was formed comprising Mr Gleeson, Mr John Lamb (Chairman of the South Australian Tourism Commission board) and Mr Phillip Styles (Deputy Chairman, South Australian Tourism Commission board).

I have been advised that Ms Ruston met with Mr Gleeson on 9 August to discuss the position. She then met with Mr Lamb on 14 August to discuss the position. At this meeting Ms Ruston indicated that she wanted to be considered for the position, and Mr Lamb accepted this as an application for the position.

As a result of that meeting, Ms Ruston wrote to Mr Lamb on 19 August, formally registering her interest for the position, and submitted a *curriculum vitae* on 7 September. Once Ms Ruston advised me that she was an applicant for the position, I rang Mr Lamb and advised him that I expected the appointment process to be fair. I did not want Ms Ruston to be advantaged or disadvantaged because she was a ministerial adviser in my office. Mr Lamb and Mr Styles agree that I had no influence in, nor did I interfere in, the selection and appointment process. I reiterate that Mr Gleeson managed the process; he controlled the process. He short-listed the candidates, reducing them to a list of 10, which he split into two lists of five applicants—an A list and a B list. At all stages, Ms Ruston was a short-listed candidate and Ms Ruston was placed on the A list by Mr Gleeson. Ms Ruston

has advised me that at no stage during the appointment process was she made aware of the names of the other short-listed candidates.

Mr Lamb and Mr Styles have advised me that, at the conclusion of the interviews, Ms Ruston was the preferred candidate. The reason why no second interviews or reference checking were carried out is because Mr Gleeson contacted first Mr Styles and then Mr Lamb, advising that he wanted to make an appointment before the weekend. Discussions occurred with each of them individually, and they agreed that Ms Ruston was the preferred candidate. Mr Lamb has released a statement today detailing his position.

As to the question of salary, the position was advertised in the *Advertiser* on 3 August stating, 'An attractive salary will be negotiated, depending on the skills and experience of the applicant.' Further, I have been advised that, during the interview process, two of the short-listed candidates raised the question of salary level and stated that they believed that the suggested salary level of \$46 000 was inadequate. The Wine and Tourism Council was advised that two candidates were under review and the possibility of increasing the salary was under investigation. Mr Lamb and Mr Gleeson negotiated the final salary package with the successful applicant.

I have been advised that Ms Ruston's salary package is \$66 940. This includes a salary of \$60 000, use of a vehicle to be leased by the South Australian Wine and Tourism Council at a cost of \$4 600 per annum, and the use of a car park at \$2 340 per annum, together with the oncosts. I repeat that I was not involved in the appointment process. It was managed by Mr Gleeson.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As a result of the recent leadership change, I inform the House that the State Government's Bill to amalgamate six Government agencies to form one body with a tourism, events, sport and recreation focus will be withdrawn. The Premier has requested that the Bill be withdrawn pending a review—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Premier has requested that the Bill be withdrawn pending a review of Cabinet positions and Government directions. It is likely that in the New Year the Government will seek to bring together the South Australian Tourism Commission, Australian Major Events, the Adelaide Entertainment Centre—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—and the Convention Centre. The Premier envisages keeping the Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing as a separate entity to retain flexibility. The work that has already been done on the original restructure proposal will be used as a basis for these changes.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is warned for the first time.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is warned for the second time. He knows the consequences.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Today, on the International Day of Disabled Persons, it gives me great pleasure to announce the distribution of the first stage of the 1996-97 increased resources for services to people with a disability. This involves \$1.3 million in recurrent funding. This Government inherited an unmet need for disability services, and it is increasing exponentially as the baby boomers generation moves into care. The former Government failed to address this growing demand.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As one indicator, the IDSC clients-in-crisis list had increased from about 10 in 1989 to 141 when we came to Government (a 14-fold increase in four years). In contrast, during the past three years this Government has minimised growth in this group. This has been achieved by a number of initiatives including the disability sector wide efficiency dividend, which led to \$6.4 million being freed up and put into intellectual disability and other services. However, the Government remains concerned about the level of unmet need.

In response, the Government committed \$3 million of fresh money in the 1996-97 budget to provide disability services. Let us be clear: this \$3 million allocation includes the first fresh State allocation for disability services in five years. This funding is being allocated to the areas of greatest need. I hope these allocations will not only meet growth in demand but actually reduce the number of clients in crisis. I am acutely aware that the \$3 million funding will provide life-changing support for people with a disability. There is some pressure to distribute all the funding immediately, and that is perhaps illustrated by the earlier motion of the member for Elizabeth. For the sake of people with a disability, I believe that such pressure should be resisted.

Many of the support services that are needed by people with a disability are eligible for matching with Commonwealth funds under the Home and Community Care program, and the South Australian Health Commission seeks this match. Whilst I share the frustration of those who wait, I consider, and I will work hard to ensure, that the wait is worthwhile. As the HACC matching process was taking longer than first expected, I asked the Disability Services Office to develop scenarios for funding with and without HACC funding. Through this process, we have been able to identify a base amount which can be distributed without compromising the HACC funding application. I considered that it was doubly appropriate to announce this \$1.3 million recurrent allocation and a further \$150 000 one-off allocation on the International Day of Disabled Persons. A further portion of the \$3 million will not be HACC matched but will be allocated differently depending on whether HACC funding is available.

The funding will be distributed as follows. In the intellectual disability sector: \$610 000 for intensive home support or supported accommodation; \$50 000 ongoing for day options, including post-school options; and \$150 000 for ongoing behaviour intervention services and skills training. For adults with a physical and neurological disability, \$50 000 for ongoing therapy services. For people with a brain injury, \$150 000 for therapy services and \$50 000 for behaviour

intervention services and skills training. For children with a physical or neurological disability, \$190 000 for therapy services. For people with a sensory disability, \$50 000 for skills training. Further, beyond the \$3 million budget commitment, I am pleased to be able to announce that the Government is making a once off \$150 000 allocation to adults with a physical or neurological disability.

I assure the House that the Government is closely monitoring demand for disability services. Through the options planning process, we are developing an unprecedented data base on the need for disability services as well as the tools to ensure that resources are targeted to those in greatest need. In this year's budget the Government showed that it is willing to put resources into disability services. I assure people with disabilities and their carers that, as the fiscal situation permits, more resources will be committed by the Government to meeting their needs for support. On this International Day of Disabled Persons, the Government reaffirms its commitment to a society which provides people with a disability with the support they need to be full participants in our community.

MOUNT LOFTY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am happy to inform the House that the issue of vegetation clearance at the Mount Lofty development has been resolved. Late yesterday afternoon the Native Vegetation Council gave approval to clear 42 trees that had regenerated after the 1983 Ash Wednesday fires. This will ensure ongoing views from the site of this new and long awaited redevelopment—a redevelopment that has overwhelming support throughout South Australia.

This decision by the Native Vegetation Council puts back into balance and perspective the fact that this Government is planting some 17 000 trees and shrubs at this site. Further, it puts into balance the fact that this Government is undertaking a major program to improve the overall environment of the area through the clearance of infestations of weeds, blackberries and introduced species. Work also includes the undergrounding of power lines to improve the visual amenity and allow for large tracts of previously cleared land to be revegetated.

In addition, I wish to point out that in the past financial year a record 10.6 million trees were planted throughout South Australia—a figure far greater than the number of trees lost to natural attrition, disease, clearance and other causes. This is a milestone of which this State can be proud, a milestone that should be celebrated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: —by the entire community. I again emphasise that vegetation management at Mount Lofty to allow for viewing opportunities was acknowledged as one of the first priorities of the consultative panel that was established to set the criteria for the long awaited development. There is nothing new in this, nothing sinister, nothing out of the ordinary and no precedent has been set. Rather, the decision by the Native Vegetation Council acknowledges that vegetation management for views has been undertaken at the site as far back as the 1920s, and it was put on hold only after

the devastating 1983 bushfires, awaiting redevelopment at the summit.

Vegetation work began this morning. It is being carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Native Vegetation Council, the independent umpire on this issue. Of the 42 trees cut, 14 were stringy-barks and these are expected to regenerate and form part of the ongoing view management program at the summit.

The Mount Lofty redevelopment is one that members of this Government and I have been proud to achieve. In a matter of weeks, South Australians and national and overseas visitors will be able to enjoy the fruits of our work and this State Government's vision and commitment to provide a world-class tourist facility that sets exciting new standards. This is yet another development that shows the capacity of this Government to achieve what previously has been the unachievable.

OPERATION CHALLENGE

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Correctional Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement. Leave granted.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: On 28 August 1995, Cabinet approved the retention and partial upgrade of the Cadell Training Centre. At my instigation, the Department for Correctional Services over the past 12 months has developed an innovative and exciting new program for Cadell Training Centre called Operation Challenge. A four month trial program—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There are far too many interjections. Members are carrying on in a most unprofessional manner. There are one or two people to whom I do not want to talk again.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: A four month trial program will commence on 9 December this year. It is an established fact that first-time offenders entering into the prison system—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Playford.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—learn and are at risk from habitual long-term offenders.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I am not sure of the Standing Order, but could you protect me from the interjections of those opposite, Sir?

The SPEAKER: Order! I was protecting the honourable member from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Minister for Correctional Services.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The program will be available to selected first-time adult male prisoners who are imprisoned for non-violent offences. Prisoners will need to successfully complete the program in order to become eligible for home detention at the end of their sentence. These prisoners will live within a structured, disciplined regime where they will have minimal association with other prisoners not undertaking the same program and where they will be required to abstain from substance abuse or lose their place in the program.

At the start of the program, each prisoner selected will be required to sign an undertaking that he will abide by the conditions of the program. The agreement will clearly set out the circumstances by which the contract between the department and the prisoner may be terminated and the

possible consequences of this decision. The program is an incentive based program where prisoners will be given the opportunity to develop a work ethic and learn new skills. They will also be required as part of the program to work within the community, and the entire program is based on a mutually supportive team environment. Individual components of the program include:

- Cognitive skills where prisoners will be taught to identify and actively question their beliefs, attitudes and values and to stop and think before acting;
- Drug awareness sessions to teach prisoners the issues surrounding drug use and abuse and how to deal with and prevent possible relapses to former drug and alcohol behaviour on release from prison;
- Ending offending, which is aimed primarily at addressing issues which involve alcohol abusers;
- Anger management to teach prisoners how to control and redirect their anger;
- Education courses in basic literacy, numeracy, computer and skills which will enhance employment opportunities upon release; and
- An intensive physical fitness program.

The prisoners' day will commence at 6 a.m. and end at 10 p.m. Monday to Saturday, and commence at 7.15 a.m. and end at 10 p.m. on Sundays. Some sections of the community are likely to compare the program with American style boot camp programs. Such comparisons would be inaccurate. I repeat: such comparisons would be inaccurate. While specific elements of the program have been drawn from these, the program developed by Correctional Services staff, including those at Cadell, is unique and will be distinctly an Australian first with elements not comparable with most American programs. Through this program it is believed that recidivism can be reduced and that young first time offenders will be rehabilitated and returned to fulfil a more useful role in the community.

For the first time, offenders experiencing the hardship of the first term of imprisonment will have the opportunity to be fully isolated from the mainstream prison population and learn valuable skills in education, self-discipline and everyday life. Today's announcement marks the beginning of a new era for Cadell Training Centre, which just over 12 months ago was given an eleventh hour reprieve by this Government after more than one decade of uncertainty. If the trial proves successful, the 140-bed prison farm will be divided into three separate sections: Operation Challenge for 42 inmates, mainstream for 74 inmates and a therapeutic community for 24 prisoners.

A new dormitory block is to be built for inmates undertaking Operation Challenge. All accommodation areas of the prison are to be security fenced for the first time. The Government will spend an estimated \$521 000 at Cadell this financial year, with a further \$668 000 being spent on the prison in 1997-98. Specific selection criteria has been established for Operation Challenge participants. They include: that the offender is being imprisoned in an adult institution for the first time, excluding those sentenced for serious crimes; and that their prison sentence be greater than eight months at the time of joining the program. Each Operation Challenge course will consist of 14 inmates and run for a duration of 4 months. When fully implemented, three courses will be operating at any one time and this number could expand in the future, as could the prison if the program proves successful.

Special incentives will be offered for the successful completion of the program, including guaranteed home detention for the remainder of the prisoner's sentence or accommodation at the low security Adelaide pre-release cottages for those not eligible at that time for home detention or completing the remainder of their imprisonment, bypassing the mainstream prison population. Failing the program, including breaking prison rules and regulations, could lead to the individual repeating the course or being sent to the mainstream prison population.

Operation Challenge is designed to teach first time prisoners the error of their ways while at the same time giving them an insight into what prison life is really like without their having to mix with the mainstream prison population. The rest is up to the prisoner. If he wants to embrace the program and utilise his time of imprisonment the best way he can and reduce his chance of re-offending, Operation Challenge will show him the way. If he does not, he will experience the harsh realities of mainstream prison life.

I thank the members for Chaffey and Custance for visiting Cadell Training Centre recently, discussing the program with staff and indicating their support for it. I thank you, Mr Speaker, for your strong support of the program and your analysis of it to date. I commend the staff at Cadell Training Centre for developing the program and, if their motivation and belief in the program is any indication, Operation Challenge will be one of the great successes of the department and the Government.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: During the grievance debate last Wednesday, the member for Elizabeth raised the subject of Housing Trust rent increases and their effect on people receiving pension entitlements. The claims made by the member for Elizabeth were once again incorrect and I wish now to provide the House with accurate information on this matter so that Housing Trust tenants will not be subjected again to unnecessary anxiety caused by misinformation spread by the Opposition.

First, it is totally false for the member for Elizabeth to claim that pension increases are swallowed up by Housing Trust rent increases. The constituent to whom the member for Elizabeth referred had complained that he was 80¢ a week worse off since his rent was increased in May this year. I have investigated this case and over the period August 1995 to September 1996, when his rent was most recently reviewed, this person's rent has increased by \$2.30 per week, as the member for Elizabeth claimed. However, what the member for Elizabeth has not revealed is that her constituent's income increased by \$10.50 per week during that period. This tenant's Housing Trust rent was reviewed and adjusted in August 1995 in line with the consumer price index over the 12 months to 31 March 1995.

In March 1996 the trust advised the tenant that an error in his rent assessment had been discovered and that his rent would be adjusted to the correct amount with an increase of 50¢ per week from 18 May 1996. The rent was again reviewed in September 1996 and adjusted in line with the increase in the consumer price index. This increase, assessed on the tenancy income at that time, was \$1.80 per week.

The Housing Trust provides a very generous rent rebate system to assist tenants on low incomes and does not increase its rent for people receiving pensions beyond the level of pension increases. It is committed to maintain the rent rebate safety net whereby tenants are not required to pay more than 25 per cent of their income in rent. I urge the member for Elizabeth to control her penchant for misinformation and, when she raises issues in this House, to start talking the truth for a change.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister has imputed improper motives to a member of the House, and I would ask that, under Standing Orders, he withdraw his remarks.

Members interjecting:

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

RETAIL SHOP LEASES AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I lay on the table the ministerial statement relating to the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 1996 made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Trevor Griffin.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 5, 12, 21, 22, 24, 30, 35, 36, 39, 40 and 42; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

CHILD CARE

In reply to **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)** 1 October.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I can inform the Leader of the Opposition that my colleague in another place, the Hon. Rob Lucas, Minister for Education and Children's Services, has written to the Hon. Judi Moylan MP, Minister for Family Services, concerning the potential impact on child care services in South Australia arising from the recent Commonwealth Budget announcements.

With regard to the continued availability of operational subsidy, the Federal Minister has been advised that a number of new child care centres have been completed or are scheduled to open over the next 12 months in small rural areas of South Australia. The State Government has recently endorsed a 'once off' grant to these new centres to ensure their financial viability for their first 12 months of operation.

The Government has sought an assurance from the Commonwealth that the rural integrated centres built under the National Child Care Strategy, and those centres in rural areas and/or areas of high socioeconomic disadvantage will maintain their current level of operational funding from the Commonwealth.

FINDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)** 16 October.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information.

I have previously explained how the Minister for Education and Children's Services' comments on Findon Primary School were not taken in context and how, rather than opposing public consultation, he approved broader community consultation which enabled the Findon Primary School Council to prepare its own submission. In regard to his comments about funds, the Leader of the Opposition has again not considered the background to the Minister's notes. This background information is also related to the Minister's approval for further community consultation.

In order that as much information as possible could be given at the public meeting, the District Superintendent of Education sought advice from the Minister for Education and Children's Services regarding the likely expenditure of funds from the sale of the site should the closure option proceed. To assist the community in their consideration of the options and possible implications which may follow, the Minister indicated that, should the closure option proceed, funds would be directed to any required upgrade and the rest to adjacent schools in the total central west district. There had been no decision to close the school at this point. The Minister did not authorise his department to tell parents how the funds from sale of land would be spent. He advised on the likely direction of funds to enable community members to make a considered assessment of the options they faced.

FINDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)** 16 October.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information. The Mid West Cluster Review Group which consisted of school principals, parents elected by School Council representatives of all the schools in the cluster, and a nominee from the South Australian Institute of Teachers, developed and researched a number of options for the future of Findon Primary School. These options were reduced to two: closure of the school and redevelopment, using funds to be derived from sale of part of the school grounds.

The Cluster Review Group then developed a community consultation paper which described how it had arrived at these two options. The community consultation paper was forwarded to the Minister for Education and Children's Services, seeking permission to consult more broadly with the school community.

The Minister for Education and Children's Services noted this report and sought advice on the extent of community consultation which had already occurred by asking 'can't a decision be made on the basis of the cluster group's recommendation to close the school?'. This was not a decision, but a question seeking clarification on the community consultation process undertaken to that point by the Mid West Cluster Review Group.

Officers in the Department for Education and Children's Services advised the Minister that because consultation on the options had been largely restricted to within the Mid West Cluster Review Group, there was a need for this to be extended to the broader school community. In particular, there was a need for broader community consultation to enable the Findon Primary School Council to prepare a submission on its preferred option.

The Minister approved this consultation process which allowed the School Council to engage Hassell and Company Consultants to prepare their submission.

No decision to close Findon Primary School was made prior to the broader community consultation. The Minister for Education and Children's Services received reports from the Mid West Cluster Review Group, the Findon Primary School Council, the City of Hindmarsh Woodville and others. The decision was made after these reports had been received and considered. The Minister accepted the recommendations of the Cluster Review Group and announced his decision before the end of term 3, 1996, as requested by the Findon Primary School Council and the South Australian Institute of Teachers.

TAFE PRIVATISATION

In reply to **Ms WHITE (Taylor)** 14 November.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I can confirm that the Government is not considering any Serco proposal concerned with administration or the provision of facilities management services to TAFE Institutes.

In May 1995 a representative from Serco was a speaker in a departmental seminar on the topic 'Outsourcing: Its Role in the Management and Delivery of Non-Core Services'. Following the seminar the Serco representative handed out a paper titled 'Proposal for the Provision of Facilities Management Services to TAFE Colleges in South Australia'.

No one from the department asked for such a proposal and it has never been formally received, acknowledged or considered by the department. It is this document, which has no status and is some 18 months old, which has resurfaced in the hands of some journalists, unionists and members of the Opposition.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I bring up the forty-third report of the committee on the Upper South-East Dryland, Salinity and Flood Management Plan, Stage 1, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

LIBERAL PARTY LEADERSHIP

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier stand by his public statements on the evening of 27 November about the future political career of the member for Finnis and, if so, will he offer the former Premier a Cabinet position? Yesterday the member for Finnis announced that he would continue both in Parliament and as a Minister, a move that was first discussed between the present Premier and the former Premier shortly after the leadership spill last Wednesday night.

On the 7.30 Report on 27 November in a live interview the reporter asked the present Premier, 'What will happen to Dean Brown now?' The new Premier replied, 'Well, that's a matter for Dean Brown to determine. I look forward to working cooperatively with him in the future. Dean is going to consider where and what he does from this point on.' The former Premier has now determined. Will you honour your promise of a job in Cabinet if he wants it?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition knows full well that I will not answer that question.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that he cannot make those sorts of comments across the Chamber. I do not want any further interruptions from him during Question Time: he knows the consequences. I understand that when he gets into trouble he has a double-jeopardy penalty. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Opposition will go along the front bench and ask a series of questions to try to put together the composition of the Ministry. Well, it will not work, because we will not debate that. What we will debate and what is important to debate is the economy and future of South Australia. That is the real issue that ought to be put on the agenda in this Parliament.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let us take last Thursday, for example, the day the Centre for Economic Studies released its report on the economy of South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition professes his concern about the creation of jobs and wants to have a summit with me and others on the creation of jobs in South Australia. If the Leader of the Opposition is so concerned about the economy and creation of jobs in this State, why is he not using the main forum of the Parliament to pursue that? No, he is not doing that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Last Thursday the Leader of the Opposition was embarrassed and goaded into asking the first question—half way through Question Time—on the Centre

for Economic Studies report, preferring up until then to pursue side issues and issues not relevant to the economy and jobs.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I assure the Leader of the Opposition that there is one item and focus on the agenda and that is the creation of jobs for South Australians in the future and I will not be deflected from that objective.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: That policy thrust will be the determinant of this Government; that policy thrust will be one that we will pursue vigorously over the course of the next year; and that policy thrust will deliver jobs for South Australia.

GRADUATE AND POST-GRADUATE EMPLOYMENT

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Premier advise the House of the Government's initiatives which will increase job opportunities in South Australia for graduates and post-graduates?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yesterday, I had the opportunity and privilege to speak to delegates from interstate and overseas at a national conference at the University of South Australia, underscoring the good tertiary education system in South Australia and its capacity to build in this State for the next millennium an education city. Much of that conference was devoted to promoting career opportunities among graduates in information technology and software engineering. With the growth of our defence and electronics industry in South Australia we have a great need for more software engineers. With companies like Motorola establishing in South Australia with a commitment to provide some 400 jobs by the year 2000, with AWA Defence Industries having been purchased by British Aerospace, which has now won a major Commonwealth Government procurement contract, and with other such initiatives, we can see clearly that this is a growing area of opportunity in South Australia.

National conferences such as the one in question, which provide a focus on South Australia and opportunities in this State, help us remarket, reposition and refocus South Australia. They help us demonstrate the opportunities emerging in South Australia now and in the future. While talking about Motorola, I noted in the *Advertiser*, I think, an article following the report of the member for Hart relating to commitments and incentive packages given by this Government to attract investment in South Australia. This has drawn some criticism across the board, but I wish to put the matter in context, because it is important to do so. The total assistance actually issued to date amounts to \$10.715 million and 998 jobs have been created. That shows the real value and cost per job. Let me now go into detail.

For example, in Motorola 104 jobs have been created to date, and the target initially with the incentive package put in place was to achieve 400 jobs by the year 2000. That was the objective, and the member for Hart and other members well know that. It is like giving support to Bankers Trust to come to South Australia to establish its centre. It is not instant or overnight job creating, but that organisation will create 400 jobs as soon as the building is completed at Science Park—and building has already commenced—and it will start recruiting in March.

Westpac, which has been the bone of some criticism from members opposite and the public, has to date created 550 jobs for locals, that is, South Australians, and 133 people have come from interstate to take up jobs at the mortgage loan centre here in South Australia. Some 683 jobs have therefore been created this calendar year within Westpac, and there is a further commitment to expand those job opportunities in Westpac by another 227 by March 1998. Yes, we are putting in incentives; yes, we are attracting new investment in South Australia; yes, it is creating jobs in this State, and it is no different from what Playford did back in the 1950s in identifying General Motors-Holden's and bringing it to South Australia.

As a result of bringing some critical mass, we attract a number of other companies that collocate and feed off that large critical mass major company. That is what was being achieved in the 1950s—a manufacturing base for this State—and what we are achieving and cutting out for South Australia is a new industry sector in information technology, the services industry and telecommunications as the vehicle for that. It is creating a foundation for South Australia for the most important task of all, that is, creating jobs in this State for South Australians so that they do not have to go interstate and overseas to pursue a career path of their choice. Much more needs to be done but at least the process has been started.

WINE AND TOURISM COUNCIL

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Why did the Deputy Premier tell the House three times on 12 November and again today in his ministerial statement that he had absolutely no involvement or influence in the appointment process of his former adviser, Ms Anne Ruston, to the position of General Manager of the Wine and Tourism Council when yesterday he publicly admitted having made at least one telephone call to a member of the interview panel to discuss Ms Ruston's application? The Opposition has a transcript of a meeting of the board of the South Australian Tourism Commission held on 16 October 1996, which quotes the former chief executive of the commission as saying:

I was influenced politically for the appointment.

The transcript also quotes the Chairman of the commission, Mr John Lamb, as saying:

I certainly had one phone call on one occasion to support her for the job but that wasn't in any way an influencing factor as far as I was concerned but I could equally see how Michael could have been influenced.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The first part of the answer to the honourable member's question is in the ministerial statement that I made earlier today. Mr Gleeson's statement was made about 10 days after his contract was terminated.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Can the Premier advise the House of an example of a small business which has chosen to establish itself in South Australia? I have been contacted by a constituent who informs me that, while much publicity is given to major announcements involving new jobs, why would small business choose to establish itself here in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Of the 585 or 589 companies that have been given support and incentive packages by this Government over the past three years, some 578 have been

South Australian based companies to grow. The important factor to remember is that we are supporting local industry and small to medium businesses to expand their operations to put in new plant and equipment and have the prospects of employing more South Australians as they expand those operations. Of course, that is in addition to those incentives that have been put in place effectively by reducing power costs by up to 34 per cent for small to medium businesses in this State in order for them to get their costs of operation down and to achieve greater profitability and capacity to chase new markets.

Last Saturday I had the pleasure of visiting Hardi Australia Pty Ltd, which will establish a new manufacturing plant and research and development facility at Cavan to produce agricultural spraying equipment. It is a \$5 million investment, with 25 jobs being created immediately and a further 14 jobs being established with reinvestment in the adjoining facility at Cavan. That combined facility and investment by Hardi Australia will bring about 50 jobs in this State in the course of the next quarter or so. As I said, the total investment is some \$5 million. It clearly underscores the fact that we are able to get Hardi Australia to invest here in this State because of the skilled work force, the capacity of the work force, the availability of the work force and, further, the cost of manufacturing in this State *vis-a-vis* the other States of Australia. Clearly it is a competitive base from which we can build and market investment and job creation in this State.

Mr Clarke: They are not cheering.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I beg your pardon?

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The simple fact is—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, I know that the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition do not like hearing about new investment and new jobs being created in South Australia. They are about talking this economy down. The simple fact is that a foundation has been laid that we are now building on. I have mentioned previously that much has been done but much more needs to be done to rebuild the economy of South Australia, but there are some encouraging signs.

WINE AND TOURISM COUNCIL

Ms WHITE (Taylor): When questioned yesterday about the appointment process for his former adviser, Ms Anne Ruston, to the position of General Manager of the Wine and Tourism Council, why did the Deputy Premier attempt to implicate the family of another member of Parliament, and was that member the Hon. Legh Davis, MLC? Yesterday, in response to questions about Ms Anne Ruston's appointment, the Deputy Premier said, 'Perhaps you ought to find out whether there are any other members of Parliament's families involved.' The Opposition has a copy of a document which ranks the wife of the Hon. Mr Davis, Ms Jan Davis, ahead of Ms Ruston in the interview process for the position.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: All of the questions asked by the honourable member have been answered in the ministerial statement.

ENTERPRISE AGREEMENTS

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs inform the House which South Australian enterprises have been recognised for their development of innovative

workplace agreements? Last week the Minister provided an up date of the number of enterprise agreements now operating in South Australia. I am informed that some of these enterprises have now been recognised for the initiative in their agreements.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am always staggered that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition likes to talk in this House and play down all the good news. Today, four companies and a department received awards for innovation in enterprise agreements.

Mr Clarke: The police?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will get to that. R.M. Williams was the winner of the first award for a large enterprise; the Guide Dogs Association of South Australia was the winner for the medium enterprise; Mrs Field's Bakehouse won the small enterprise award; Smith's Snack Food Company won the continuing innovative enterprise agreement award; and the public sector award for innovation went to the South Australian Police Department. Each category has received a grant of \$3 000 to help establish the organisations next enterprise agreement, and I would have thought that was a fairly positive thing for the Government to do, particularly as 43 000 South Australian employees are now covered by 344 agreements. It is important that this Parliament congratulates those who are interested in enterprise agreements, and particularly those who do it very well.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Does the Deputy Premier stand by his statement to this House on 12 November 1996 in respect of staff employment matters, as follows:

It is not my responsibility, nor has it ever been my responsibility, to interfere. I do not interfere in any area in terms of employment.

He also said:

Ministers have no right, nor should they have any right, in the selection, payment, or enrolment of individual staff.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the honourable member would like me to distribute another copy of the ministerial statement, she will find that that answers all her questions.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE BIRTH CENTRE

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of the benefits expected to accrue from the introduction of the new birth centre at the Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for her very important question in relation to the new birth centre at Flinders Medical Centre, which is of enormous import to the women in the south, whom the member for Reynell represents so well, along with other members in that area. Last Friday it was my great pleasure to officially open the new birth centre at Flinders Medical Centre. Flinders has always demonstrated a great commitment to excellence in service provision, and I know that, with the opening of the new birth centre, this tradition will continue. Many women like to have a more natural approach to labour with minimal intervention and minimal use of drugs. Studies done in the southern region of health care services that were available picked up on a growing demand for low intervention births, and certainly highlighted the need for us to look at non-traditional ways of approaching labour.

The proposal to establish the birth centre was the result, and planning commenced in late 1994. Work was put out to tender in February 1996 and, very pleasingly, construction commenced in March and took only six weeks to complete. That is a very impressive performance, and I congratulate everyone involved. The centre is located in the antenatal ward, immediately above the labour and delivery unit, which does allow easy access and transfer to the labour and delivery suite if required. Although a natural approach to labour is encouraged, the close proximity of specialist help and intervention if necessary is obviously reassuring to the mothers. It does reaffirm the fact that the health of the child and the mother are paramount.

The centre is beautifully designed and each of the birth suites has a terrific view of the hills and the trees in the south, with a spa, kitchen area, microwave, television, fridge and so on. It is almost five star accommodation, yet all the technology is there if necessary. The aim of the birth centre is to allow women to have more control over their pregnancy and child birth. It is available for all women with uncomplicated normal pregnancies. It is managed by midwives and provides continuity of care through ante-natal, intranatal and postnatal phases of delivery. The bond that is created with the midwives as they take these pregnant mothers through all these stages is excellent, and it enables the new mother to be reassured, and I am certain that it does help the mother's confidence in parenting.

It is envisaged that 350 births per year will occur in the centre, now that it is fully operational. There have been 22 births already, and some excellent feedback has been received. The feedback is so good that, at the opening, they were already predicting that the 350 births may be exceeded. With the opening of this new centre, the Government demonstrates its commitment to the women of the southern region and certainly its commitment to providing them with the best possible options and choice in obstetric care.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Given that the Deputy Premier said to the House on 12 November, 'I do not interfere in any area in terms of employment,' why did he direct the former Chief Executive of the Tourism Commission to sack a staff member of the commission, Mr Rod Hand? The Opposition has a copy of a record of a meeting between the Commissioner for Public Employment, the then Chief Executive of the Tourism Commission (Michael Gleeson) and another senior Tourism Commission staff member held on 11 June 1996. The record of that meeting states:

A meeting was arranged to urgently discuss the situation with regard to a ministerial direction being given to the Chief Executive to terminate employment of Rod Hand.

It goes on to state:

Michael believes it inappropriate to terminate employment of Rod and refuses to do this as directed.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I did not.

GAWLER CRATON

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Minister for Mines and Energy inform the House of the extent of exploration work that is being undertaken by mining companies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CUMMINS:—in the Gawler Craton region of South Australia? There has been considerable media interest in developments in that region, in particular, the gold seeking activities of a company named Helix Resources, which I understand has a large claim in the area. Helix Resources' fortunes have changed dramatically recently with its share price rising from 45¢ to a peak of \$4.15 this week.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I suspect that 12 months ago most members of this Parliament, indeed most South Australians, would not have had a clue that we had a Gawler Craton in South Australia, but they certainly do today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: In recent times there has been enormous speculation in the national media and locally about the Gawler Craton. The member for Norwood referred to the recent announcement by Helix and the extent to which it has affected the Stock Exchange. It is fair to say that the Gawler Craton has undoubtedly generated an enormous amount of interest in mining in South Australia. In 1992, there was about \$2 million worth of exploration; now, there is about \$10 million, and the whole area is under exploration.

Earlier discoveries have assisted in this process, and the pace of exploration of the Gawler Craton continues to increase by those who hold exploration licences. As has been pointed out, there has been a recent announcement. Based on the Helix Adelaide Stock Exchange report, drilling has intersected a 100 to 150 metre wide zone of primary gold mineralisation within highly fractured and altered sulphide-bearing granite below a 60 metre thick leached zone. The most significant results were 36 metres at 4.4 grams per tonne of gold from 108 metres in hole LRC7 and 112 metres at one gram per tonne from 60 metres in hole LRC9.

These discoveries come on top of the discoveries made by the Resolute Samantha-Dominion Mining joint venture and Grenfell Resources, each of which has put down holes, and every hole has found something. The important thing is that the explorers are hitting pay dirt. Whilst there is still some way to go and whilst we recognise that a whole range of issues, such as native title and infrastructure, need to be overcome, I would like to share with Parliament the fact that we are now seeing an enormous amount of interest generated in this State. We believe that this means that in the not too distant future we will see not only an increase in intensity of exploration effort but also the generation of employment and investment in this State. It is pleasing to be the Minister for Mines and Energy at this time in South Australia's mining history, because I believe that what we are seeing today is just the start of a great exploration and mining adventure for this State, which will be of great benefit to all its citizens.

MEMBERS, FILMING

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been brought to my attention that, last week, there was possibly a breach of the rules which apply to the electronic media. I point out to the electronic media and to anyone else who is given privileges in this House that they must film only the member who is on their feet at any particular time. Any further breach will lead to the same penalties which have been applied by my predecessor when dealing with a breach of this arrangement.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Is the Deputy Premier aware of the contents of a minute dated 5 June signed by 13 members of the staff of the Tourism Development Group to the then Chief Executive of the Tourism Commission which describes the behaviour of the now Deputy Premier in relation to the Rod Hand matter as unethical; and, if so, what action has he taken regarding that minute? The minute states:

We feel that the treatment of Rod, as we are aware of it, was unethical in that it steps outside accepted conventions relating to the separation between Ministers and public servants.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am not at all aware of the minute. If the honourable member believes that it is of major importance, I would be happy to see it and comment in due course. My position stands: I am not, nor have I ever been, involved in the process of the appointment of staff other than the Chief Executive.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources inform the House of new directions being undertaken by the waste management industry in South Australia and of the benefits that these will bring to the environment, the economy and job creation?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased to be able to provide information on this situation, because it is an area in which we can gain many more jobs for South Australia, one in which we are seeing fantastic improvement and in which I suggest South Australia is well ahead of any other State of Australia. I am particularly pleased to be able to inform the House of a very exciting new development in this State that combines waste management, environmental considerations and job creation possibilities. This development is an Australian first, and it will help to bring about incredible improvement in the recycling industry in this State.

Last week, I had the pleasure of opening a new \$2.5 million Mobile Reclaimers South Australian Recycling Centre, which recycles a range of materials from clean concrete, masonry, demolition rubble, asphalt, and steel to green waste. This material is sorted, crushed, reprocessed and reused. The company recently acquired a \$1.5 million mobile crusher, the first of its type in Australia, which grinds bricks and concrete into material suitable to be used for new roads and building sites. I am very pleased, because this means that waste is being diverted from landfill and put to good use, thus considerably easing the pressure on resources, quarries and, particularly, landfill. Green waste and wood are shredded and broken down to be used as mulch, which is in considerable demand, particularly in the metropolitan area.

This development will make huge inroads into helping to achieve South Australia's commitment of a 50 per cent reduction in waste to landfill by the year 2000. However, just as importantly, it shows the vision and commitment of one young small businessman by the name of Simon Brown, whom I wish to commend for combining the elements of business and environmental care in a winning formula. I admire this young fellow tremendously for what he is doing in this area in South Australia.

As a measure of the success of his operation, his Wingfield recycling facility now employs 11 people, four of whom were employed in the past three months to keep up with demand. I am also happy to say that since launching the facility in the past few days the Department of Road Trans-

port has stepped up its usage of the facilities, and many inquiries have come from councils and contractors interested in either depositing their waste for recycling or purchasing repossessed material.

In short, this is by far one of the most exciting ventures that I have seen in the environment area for a very long time. Here is another example that waste can no longer be seen as rubbish. In fact, demolition and green waste can now mean money and a successful business enterprise, and that is exactly what is happening in this business. I am sure that all members of the House would want to commend the initiative of this young fellow and the people who are working with him in what is a great achievement, as far as the environment is concerned and the provision of jobs in South Australia.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier and Minister for Tourism. Did the Deputy Premier sack former South Australian Tourism Commission Chief Executive Mr Michael Gleeson because Mr Gleeson refused to sack a Tourism Commission employee, Mr Rod Hand, as directed by the now Deputy Premier?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The answer is 'No.' I find this whole argument about Rod Hand, in particular, who is a very senior public servant in the Tourism Commission, quite fascinating, because I understand that Mr Rod Hand was appointed and encouraged to go to work as the manager in the McLaren Vale Visitors Centre, and I understand that that was organised by Mr Gleeson. I find it quite amazing that a very senior person has decided to work within the tourism industry and at the McLaren Vale Visitors Centre. The answer is 'No.'

KOALAS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise the House of the steps to be taken immediately to implement the Kangaroo Island koala strategy?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased to be able to provide further information to the member for Flinders—recognising, of course, that Kangaroo Island is part of her electorate. I would also like to thank the member for Flinders for helping me to organise a very successful meeting that I had at Kingscote last Saturday, when I had the opportunity to meet with a significant number of land owners who have been expressing some concern over a period of time regarding the damage that is being caused to native vegetation by the koalas.

I am pleased to inform the House that immediate steps are being taken to implement the program that I announced in conjunction with the Federal Minister last Sunday. It is important that that should happen. It is important that we get on with the job of overcoming this problem, which was exacerbated by the inaction of the past three Labor Environment Ministers, who refused to act on this issue. As I have said—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is exactly the case. If the three previous Labor Ministers had got off their backsides and done something about this, we would not be in the crisis situation that we are in now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They refused to take any action in regard to the need for research to be carried out in this area, and they are the two major problems that we now face in regard to dealing with the koala situation. It has been this Government that has had the gumption to address the problem in a way which will benefit the Island and its environment and the koalas and which has saved South Australia and Australia from threats of international boycotts that could significantly harm our economy, our reputation and the job prospects in this State. The solutions that we have adopted are balanced and effective. In fact, the Federal Environment Minister, Robert Hill, described them as enlightened and much more advanced than the primitive measures that some people have been calling for. He went on to say that South Australia has adopted a first class program at the leading edge nationally and internationally and has called for the support of all Australians in backing the strategy that has been introduced in this State.

I am pleased to be able to announce today that as the first step to implement the strategy we have now appointed a project officer who will be working full-time in this area, Mr Drew Laslett. He will oversee the problem, including measures of translocation, fertility control, revegetation and environmental protection. Mr Laslett will also play a key role in liaising with the Island community—and I have given a commitment that that will happen: it is essential that that should happen. He will also help businesses, community groups and the many volunteers who have offered their assistance.

If I could make one point, there has been some concern about the success of translocation of koalas from the Island onto the mainland. I remind the House that Victoria has translocated 10 000 koalas from within Victoria in the past 70 years. I also make the point that the expenditure of about \$100 000 on translocating sterilised koalas pales into insignificance when compared with the long-term economic costs that this State would suffer should images of shot koalas and bloodied bodies falling out of trees be beamed around the world. It is not our intention that that should happen.

Already we have had offers from Rotary International wanting to collect funds, from Kangaroo Island Sealink, which will collect donations from passengers and transport koalas free of charge, and from Fast Ferries, which has offered free transport for people involved in the program. This program has enormous support from the community and it has the support of the Government. The funds are now in place and we have appointed a person who will head up this strategy. I believe that the program—which is supported by the vast majority of people in South Australia—will be very successful, and at long last we will have some answers to this problem, which has been with us for a decade.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the Deputy Leader in whom the Chair is particularly interested. The honourable member for Taylor.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier and Minister for Tourism. Is the Deputy Premier cooperating with the Auditor-General in relation to any inquiries into ministerial directions given to staff of the Tourism Commission or to the board of the commission and, if so, has he made all documents available to the Auditor-General? In his 1995 report to Parliament, the Auditor-

General devoted two pages to concerns related to ministerial directions given to the Tourism Commission.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am not aware that the Auditor-General has any interest in my department as it relates to the Minister for Tourism, but I can assure the honourable member opposite that, if he has, he will have the total cooperation of my office and my ministry. I am quite sure that, if there are any issues—as he has with other items where he has been to me, in particular in relation to the TAB—he will come to me and we will sit down and discuss it. He will have full and open cooperation from my office.

BUSHFIRES

Mr VENNING (Custance): Will the Minister for Emergency Services provide the House with details on the emergency services personnel and other resources utilised to combat the recent spate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING:—of bushfires throughout South Australia? On Saturday and Sunday up to 80 fires were recorded in South Australia. It was a bad fire day and a further reminder that we face a serious problem this summer. Some of the fires are still burning.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Regrettably, the start of the bushfire season on 1 December saw South Australia's front-line firefighting troops, the Country Fire Service, come into action to fight fires across the State. During the first two days of the bushfire season, we had almost 80 fires raging across the State. The first report of bushfires started about 6 a.m. on 1 December when lightning activity in three waves hit areas from the Flinders Ranges through the Barossa Valley. In total, more than 2 000 firefighters were committed to fighting those fires across the State. At this time, a conservative damage bill for the first two days only is estimated at more than \$1.2 million and this figure is expected to rise as property owners continue to assess damage.

Major incidents where land, livestock and equipment were lost occurred to Gulnare, Yanyarrie, Three Creeks, Morchard, Wilpena, Mount Brown, Truro and Renmark. There were also 68 other fires of a more minor nature in relation to which the total damage was about \$200 000. The Country Fire Service has reported to me that fires burnt more than 38 000 hectares, including 200 plus hectares of crops, and destroyed more than 80 sheep, 310 kilometres of fencing, several farm vehicles and a number of buildings.

On the ground, 150 fire appliances were deployed by the Country Fire Service and assistance was received from numerous agencies as part of the established support plan, in addition to farm firefighting units. The agencies involved included the Department for Primary Industries, the Department for Environment and Natural Resources, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, the Country Fire Authority of Victoria, the State Emergency Service, the South Australian Police Department, the SA Ambulance Service, St John Ambulance and many community groups right across the State, most notably the Salvation Army which, as usual, provided an incredible back-up and support effort to our front-line firefighting troops. Six strike teams (four units) were also utilised by the Country Fire Service from other parts of the State to act as support back-up with some crews assisting overnight before returning home on Monday when the fires, at that time, had abated.

An estimated 50 private farm firefighter vehicles were deployed, and the amount of personal equipment that is put forward by people in our rural community never ceases to amaze me. Machinery including graders, bulldozers, water tankers, large loaders, floats, and communications and catering units have all been put forward by private property owners. That, indeed, is an incredible effort by those people—an incredible team effort in those areas.

I know that members will want to know about the aerial support. I can advise that the two air water tractors contracted to the Country Fire Service were deployed to Truro and the Flinders Ranges fires, and a third bomber was redeployed to the Woodside Air Base from the State's South-East to protect core central areas. Three fire spotting aircraft were utilised—one from the Department for Environment and Natural Resources, another from SAPOL, and the Rescue 2 helicopter was utilised in fire spotting activities. All those craft are being utilised at this time in the north of our State—in your electorate, Mr Speaker. I place on record my appreciation, Mr Speaker, for your effort in speaking with firefighters this morning—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Members might not appreciate the effort that goes into fighting these fires, but it is important that they hear. This morning, the Speaker was up north speaking to firefighters; he reported back to me what he witnessed first hand. I certainly appreciate his being able to do that and giving those firefighters support. In determining the usage of aircraft, obviously consideration was given to using the Canadair CL-215 aircraft. However, of the 80 fires under way at that time, only three were fires in which that aircraft could have been utilised, those three being the only fires within effective flying distance of a water source suitable for that purpose. Given that no fires were threatening townships or communities, CFS command decided that there was no operational imperative to use the Canadair aircraft. However, knowing the public pressure that could be brought to bear, the Country Fire Service on Sunday contacted Canadair to determine the availability of its aircraft should they be required. They were advised that one aircraft was in Queensland and, therefore, would not be available, and the other aircraft was not available due to work being undertaken on it: the earliest it could have been made available was some time on Monday morning.

I have stated before that, if there is a need to use the Canadair water bomber, that will be determined when all our existing resources have been exhausted. At this time, a number of severe fires are burning in the northern region of the State—in your electorate, Mr Speaker, as we discussed earlier today. At this time, we have three water bombers deployed to that location and a further two are being drawn on under the terms of our existing contract. We have, as indicated before, today commenced discussions with Canadair in the event that the craft may be needed. At this time, Country Fire Service command advise me that that aircraft is not needed, but that can always change with the events of time. Should that change occur, that aircraft would be used, but only if our existing firefighting resources proved to be insufficient.

As at early today, the three fires burning out of control were near Wilmington in the Mid North at Mount Brown, Moockra Tower and Dutchman's Stern. More than 200 personnel, 18 appliances, 20 vehicles and, as I have indicated, three aircraft have been deployed to combat that fire. I am sure that all members of this House would wish our

volunteers well in the many hours that they have ahead in trying to bring that fire under control.

TOURISM MINISTER

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Given the issues which have been raised regarding actions by the Deputy Premier in his tourism portfolio, will the Premier support an independent inquiry into matters raised inside and outside this House in relation to the Deputy Premier's handling of his tourism portfolio and his actions in relation to the very serious matters raised today?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education explain to the House how all South Australians can help to create more jobs in the lead up to Christmas and beyond?

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I am less worried than you will be about yours. I would like to get the Opposition focused on some real issues, that is, job creation. The Premier outlined many initiatives that we, as a Government, are doing in terms of the big picture for creating jobs. I would like to draw members' attention to a simple approach to the creation of jobs, that is, for South Australians, wherever possible, to buy South Australian made products. In this State we have an excellent range of goods and services available and, obviously, for reasons of time, I cannot list all the companies but I refer to Beerenberg Jams, Aldinga Turkeys—

Mr Clarke: They are on your side of the House.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No: they are right in front of me. There is a whole range of other products: motor cars, wines in which we excel, Rossi Boots, R.M. Williams products, Springs Salmon and the list continues. Dozens of locally made products are excellent. Wherever possible, people should buy locally made products. The longer term strategy must be better identification of locally made products. We need better identification in the supermarkets at point of sale; and we need shoppers' guides to make it easier for people to identify locally made products. We are often our own worst enemies in this State, but I implore people, not only in the lead up to Christmas but also beyond, to look at the opportunity to buy locally made goods to create more jobs in South Australia for South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PARKS HIGH SCHOOL

Mr De LAINE (Price): Given the Premier's announcement that he would personally intervene and settle the teachers' dispute, will he now visit The Parks High School and review the decision to close the school? The former Premier refused invitations to attend a public meeting at The Parks on 25 May and three other meetings with representatives of the school community to discuss the decision of the Minister for Education to ignore the recommendations of the review and close the school. The most recent invitation was on 4 September, when The Parks Education Action Group invited the Premier to visit the school to discuss the option

of maintaining a senior secondary college at The Parks centre. All four invitations were refused.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes.

LAMB MEAT SALES

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise how we in South Australia can improve our already considerable share of national lamb meat sales? Does he agree that improving marketing systems and seeking consistency with quality will help; and, if so, what is being done about the beneficial effects we could get from addressing these two factors?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: As the honourable member has pointed out, South Australia has a considerable share of the national lamb sales, currently running at about 33 per cent of what are growing national exports. The industry nationally is working to build on the sales and has set itself a goal for lamb sales of \$2 billion by the year 2000. In South Australia we hope to get our share, but to do so we need to improve our marketing systems and seek more consistency with our quality. We have been working with industry through the South Australian Lamb Development Team on ways in which we can enhance opportunities for the industry to grow in this State.

The South Australian lamb industry recognises the need to improve current management and marketing systems to ensure the production of a consistent quality product that satisfies and stimulates consumer demand. Feedback through all sectors of the production and marketing chain will be essential to achieve this. PISA will work closely with market development officers in the livestock agencies to form key links and direct marketing relationships between producers, processors, wholesalers, retailers and food service companies. We will also be involved in the development of value-based lamb marketing programs as well as programs to ensure the consistent supply of quality assured large lean lamb. Importantly, we will work with lamb groups to assist them in their planning process.

The lamb industry is extremely valuable to South Australia and we need to maintain and improve on our performance to get a greater slice of the \$2 billion national target. That growth will mean jobs for South Australia in a whole range of activities not only on the farm but in transport, processing and shipping. PISA will continue to work with the Meat Research Corporation and the South Australian Lamb Development Team to ensure that the opportunities are taken.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Housing and Urban Development review the market rents for tenants currently renting substandard Housing Trust properties? As tenants move to market rent, many will be paying the same level of rent as those in the private rental market, yet the standard of housing could be well below that of private housing. In fact, they could be paying the same rent as their neighbours in Housing Trust properties, yet the quality and standard of their housing could be vastly below that of their neighbour.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The honourable member shows a total lack of understanding of what 'market rent' means. 'Market rent' means that the person inhabiting a house will pay the rent that the market says that the place is worth. The whole idea behind market rent is to ensure that

there will be a differentiation so that the standard and size of a house and so on is taken into account in determining the rent. I cannot understand why the honourable member has asked that question, because market rent is a fair form of rent. The honourable member is really saying that when her Government stepped out of power it left behind a mess in the housing area, and that is correct. Since I have been Minister I have ensured that we have spent additional funds in making sure that we upgrade existing Housing Trust stock. That program will continue. The honourable member has no understanding of what 'market rent' means because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:—'market rent' means that the person concerned will be paying the rent that that house is worth—purely and simply that and nothing more.

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister for Primary Industries explain what programs are being implemented to help protect and restore fisheries habitats and raise community awareness of fisheries issues in South Australia?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Goyder for his question and acknowledge the importance of both the professional and recreation sector in his district on Yorke Peninsula, on which he keeps a good eye.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Last year commercial production for fisheries in South Australia was worth \$226.5 million, which shows the importance of the resource to the economy. Recreational fishing also returns much valuable income to the economy in a whole range of ways through the industry that has been created around the supply of bait tackle and other commodities to recreational fishermen.

Last week we made two important announcements on the management of the fisheries resource, particularly in relation to the recreational fishing part of the activity. First, we will be creating a new representative group which will be to tackle issues affecting recreational fishing and which will be answerable to me about what recreational fishermen want the Government to do to respond to the activity. About 400 000 people are involved in recreational and sport fishing in South Australia and it has been identified that they spend in the region of \$285 million per annum on supplies and equipment. The new advisory body will be called the Recreational Fisheries Management Council and will develop policy positions on recreational fishing issues. Recreational fishing is of major social and economic importance to South Australia and we can expand significantly on this already significant economic benefit by capitalising on the wonderful natural assets we have in South Australia.

Members with rural electorates will readily identify the major benefits that fisheries bring in tourism, whether around the coastline or in the Murray River area. The council will be backed up by a network of regional fisheries committees. The State will be split into nine areas and each of the committees will be formed early next year to give recreational fishers an opportunity to express their views on local fishing issues. It is vital that the community work together to ensure a long-term sustainable future for this leisure activity.

The Pirie and Districts Recreational Anglers Association is doing well at the moment and is to be congratulated on its

efforts. Last Thursday night I had the pleasure of attending the presentation of its No. 500 membership which, considering that it has only been actively seeking membership for five months, is a tremendous effort. The second initiative is the Fishcare program, the aim of which is to ensure that our fisheries resources will be there for many generations to come. The Fishcare Volunteer Program, which has been running successfully in this State for some time, is clearly aligned with the purpose of the national Fishcare program and encourages the community to take on the responsibility of caring for the resource.

Fishcare could become the Landcare of the marine environment, and funding for programs is still available. We seek applications from community groups, local government, industry and individuals. We should look at programs for community awareness and training, rehabilitating fish habitats and monitoring water quality in streams and estuaries. As I have indicated, fisheries is big business in South Australia, and we aim to enhance the value of both recreational and commercial fisheries, the tourism impact of a well managed resource and the enjoyment of many recreational fishermen in South Australia.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr ATKINSON: Last Wednesday in the House the member for Lee accused me, in my capacity as a member of the Social Development Committee, of voting to introduce poker machines in South Australia. *Hansard* of 1992 records that I voted against poker machines in every division on the Gaming Machines Bill, and I was one of very few members to vote against poker machines for the Casino. The Social Development Committee in 1992 neither received a reference on gaming machines or took any evidence on gaming machines nor made any recommendation on gaming machines.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): As members would know, investigation companies undertake surveillance of injured workers to establish the credibility of the workers' claims. Recently we heard of some pretty shoddy work. In fact, on television recently we viewed a video taken by Kingswood Loss Assessors, which I understand is now called 'Kingswood Investigations', whose operators took a video of a client through a side mirror, reversing the image of the client. Nina, the person concerned, was then seen to be using her injured arm. This drastically disadvantaged her case, simply because the video misled the doctors, who accepted her injury. One doctor who initially gave her a 60 per cent disability reassessed his decision to 10 per cent at best, based solely on the video, and suggested that she seek psychiatric assessment.

Her own solicitor withdrew from the case, which was probably the best service he provided to her in the whole process. If Nina had not pursued the matter she would have lost the case and would have been totally discredited. In fact, had she not spent some 12 months 'walking' through the Yellow Pages seeking a solicitor who would accept her case, she would never have been able to obtain justice. But justice at what price? Over 12 months of Nina's life has been hell; she is angry and bitter and questions the morality of these operators.

Having read another client's surveillance report I, too, question the morality and ethics of these companies and their operators. The report to which I refer is not accurate; the address of the client under surveillance carries two street numbers, and the description of either of the houses does not accurately describe the client's house. There is the question of the described activities of the injured worker, but in this case the video cannot be obtained to test its accuracy: we have been told it has been lost, misplaced, erased, given to someone else—and it now appears that it may be used in a court case relating to part of the client's claim. Yet it cannot be viewed to test its accuracy!

The surveillance industry, it could be said, is using unscrupulous methods. It appears that it is not answerable to anyone. Nina has not received an apology from Kingswood Investigations, yet it has caused deep and lasting emotional trauma not only to her but to her family. How many other injured workers have been so affected and had their claims disadvantaged or completely wiped out by what could be called, at best, shoddy surveillance and, at worst, a manipulation of videos? We have to ask ourselves, 'To whose tune are they playing?' Are these operators attempting to seek the truth in the interests of justice or is it simply a game and injured workers are the prey?

There are no limits to the extent to which some operators will go. I cite the case of a woman who went to her child's sports day. The surveillance operators actually followed her onto the school grounds and, while the woman was watching her daughter and other students, those operators pretended to video the students' activities but were observed to be wearing a backpack with a small lens protruding from the side, and it was clearly directed at this woman. I believe that this borders on harassment and possibly stalking.

No-one disputes the right of WorkCover to investigate a compensation claim. Indeed, the corporation has the responsibility to ensure that anyone who attempts to defraud the system is stopped from doing so. I say this because each time somebody attempts to defraud the system they disadvantage the genuine injured worker, and injured workers are already disadvantaged enough. Injured workers are now being disadvantaged again by the unethical activities of some insurance investigators, whose credibility is clearly in question and the credibility of any video tendered in a court case is obviously in question as well.

Garry McDonald, the acting CEO, has said, 'This evidence is relied upon in assessing WorkCover claims.' I think it is time to investigate some of these investigators—watch the watchers—and, more importantly, cease acceptance of all surveillance work until we can be assured that the operations have been undertaken by competent operators. Those operators found to be doing the wrong thing should lose their licence. I believe this would be the opinion of those operators who do the right thing and maintain proper standards and who do the job that they are contracted to do without blurring the truth. Sadly, in many cases, parts of this

industry flourish untouched by the restrictions of common decency—

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

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I, too, am concerned about aspects of the administration of WorkCover and about the way in which Mr Ron Smith, who is one of those people within WorkCover, has the power to say what will happen to other people in his peer group and similar professions as to whether or not they will be paid for the treatment they give to injured workers to get them back to work and what kinds of treatment will be paid for. I find it quite untenable that the internal inquiries conducted by WorkCover on itself result in people such as Ms Ann Jackson being prevented from obtaining payment even though she has been able to get quite a considerable number of workers, who are considered basket cases, back to work again by the kind of treatment she offers. WorkCover uses, as the ground for doing that, clause 32(2)(c), which refers to 'the cost of approved rehabilitation', whereby it decides that it will not approve the rehabilitative treatment and, therefore, it will not pay the cost of it. It also refuses to authorise treatment under paragraph (i), which refers to 'any other costs (or classes of costs) authorised by the corporation'.

So, we now find that people who have undergone treatment—treatment which WorkCover has decided is appropriate but which has failed those workers in their attempts to get back into the work force—are taking money from their own resources and savings which they obviously need for other purposes and spending it on their treatment so that they can get back to work. Regrettably, people such as Ron Smith, who himself has a number of physiotherapy practices around this city to whose associates he refers WorkCover patients for his own personal gain, it would seem, denies that there is any legitimacy in the treatment provided by people such as Ms Ann Jackson. I reckon that that is as crook as hell and it is about time it was fixed. It is shonky, to say the least, to have a person referring to associates of his, in practices in which he has a financial interest, patients taken from people to whom he will not give approval.

The next matter to which I wish to draw attention is the stupidity or duplicity of the present State Government's policy in its administrative procedures of dealing with the ill-gotten gains of crime. Everyone knows that in this country, cigarettes kill more people every year than guns have killed this century, yet we see in yesterday's *Advertiser* on page 34 an advertisement, placed by State Government agencies responsible for these things (S.0047/96), for the sale of one shipper of cigarettes. For goodness sake, if they have been confiscated as part of a crime they ought to be burnt the same way we burn guns. By doing so at least fewer people might die.

I now wish to turn to another matter that has concerned me for a long time, and that is the way in which the Labor Party has been completely and utterly silent on the question of the Hindmarsh Island bridge and the kind of people out in the wider community on the left of the political fringe of the Labor Party who are in an unholy alliance with God knows who and no-one is saying. What is it that the Labor Party really believes about the Hindmarsh Island bridge? In mid-1994 the question of whether there was secret women's business at Hindmarsh Island was in very grave doubt, and in November that year a motion was moved to disallow former Minister Tickner's 25-year ban on the bridge.

At that time the single most important factor in determining the truth of the matter seemed to be irrelevant to the Labor Party, both federally and in South Australia: it simply decided to ignore the truth of the matter. It was irrelevant to it and to the media at large, it seems to me. Now that we know the truth, why is it that the media cannot acknowledge it? Now that the secret women's business has been exposed as a fraud, we ought to put the record straight here and elsewhere.

The truth is that secret women's business was never raised by any anthropologist even though the area—that is, that geographic area of the State as well as the people and the culture of the Ngarrindjeri—had been well researched by anthropologists; secret women's business had never been documented as having existed. Surely, if it had existed, it ought to have been documented somewhere by good scientists doing their investigations of that culture prior to 1994.

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

Ms WHITE (Taylor): What an extraordinary turn of events we have seen today from the Minister for Tourism, a Minister who has now been promoted to the position of Deputy Premier of this State. We have an incompetent Minister who does not know his own portfolio, powers and role and who has clearly acted inappropriately. Today, we saw the Minister refuse to answer the serious substantial issues in the questions put to him about a number of matters not just once or twice, because a number of questions have been asked and the Minister refuses to answer. Indeed, these issues are so serious that the Minister was pre-warned about them. In 1995 the Auditor-General devoted two pages of his 1995 report on ministerial directions in the South Australian Tourism Commission, yet this afternoon the Minister said that he was unaware of any interest in his department by the Auditor-General. What extraordinary behaviour.

Is the Minister saying that he is not interested and that he does not care? What incompetence. The Minister should be aware. In fact, he must be aware of the concern raised by the independent arbiter of this Parliament, the Auditor-General, about the Minister's actions in the commission, where a number of issues have been raised. As to Ms Anne Ruston's appointment to the Wine and Tourism Council, we have had all the information put before us over a number of weeks, yet the Minister gave an emphatic denial. On the one hand, the Minister said that he was not involved, had no influence and did not try to influence the process yet, on the other hand, he admits that he physically telephoned at least one member of the interview panel to discuss her application.

What is the Minister going on about and what is he trying to say? That is not all. Today, more information has come to light. The Minister has emphatically said time and again that he played no role in the employment of any person in his charge, yet we find evidence suggesting otherwise, that in fact he rang the Chief Executive of the South Australian Tourism Commission and said, 'Sack Rod Hand. I want him out of the commission today.' That is what came to light today.

Who was this public sector employee in the commission? He was a senior employee charged with handling the sale of Estcourt House, a Tourism Commission property. For whatever reason, the Minister was not satisfied with whatever Rod Hand's decision had been and he rang up the Chief Executive and said, 'Sack him.' That is what happened. It is outrageous and totally outside the province of what Ministers

are allowed to do. The Minister has acted inappropriately, and I question whether he has acted unlawfully in this matter. On several occasions the Minister has acted outside his powers and, extraordinarily—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is generally the custom in this place that no-one can impugn an improper motive unless by way of substantive motion. That was a ruling held by Speaker Peterson. I ask you to rule on that matter, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the view that the member for Taylor is imputing an improper motive and is therefore out of order. I uphold the point of order.

Ms WHITE: Was Rod Hand sacked? No: Michael Gleeson, the Chief Executive, said, 'I refuse to do your bidding, Minister.' Who goes? We find that Michael Gleeson is sacked. We asked the Minister why he was sacked. On the one hand, he says a review is going on and there are too many positions and, on the other hand, he says that that is not the reason at all. Why did the Minister sack Michael Gleeson? Because he refused to do the Minister's bidding and sack that employee. What happened today? The Minister withdrew his own Bill.

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

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Mr Speaker—

Mr Atkinson: A good member!

Mr SCALZI: I thank the member for Spence for his confidence in me. Today, I wish to comment on the International Day of Disabled Persons. I commend the Minister for the announcements in his ministerial statement, and I commend the Government on the initiatives it has taken in support of disabled persons in South Australia. It is important to note that, if it were not for the grace of God, any one of us could be disabled. A truly compassionate society which is in touch with the needs of others should have adequate services and facilities for those who are less fortunate. True equality is equality of difference. There can never be true equality for the disabled, unless the needs brought about by the differences they experience are catered for, unless their disability needs are met to enable them to participate and contribute as fully and equally as any other citizen in our society.

Whilst it is difficult to ensure that the needs of all disabled people are catered for, it is important to try to address the problems so we must aim to ensure that as much as possible their differences are catered for. Of course, the Government inherited an unmet need for disability services, which has increased exponentially as the baby boomer generation moves into care. Previous Governments failed to address this growing demand. One indicator is that the IDSC clients-in-crisis list had increased from about 10 in 1989 to 141 when this Government came to office. It is a fourteen-fold increase in four years. In contrast, in the past three years this Government has minimised the growth in this group, and this has been achieved by a number of initiatives including the disability sector wide efficiency dividend which led to \$6.4 million being freed up and put into intellectual disability and other services.

This Government has a commitment to ensure that the needs of the disabled are met. I am aware of support from the \$3 million funding to provide life changing supports to people with disability. Funding has been signalled in various areas. For example, in the intellectual disability sector, \$610 000 is to be provided for intensive home support;

\$50 000 ongoing is to be provided for day options; \$150 000 ongoing is to be provided for behaviour intervention services and skills training; \$50 000 ongoing is to be provided for therapy services; \$150 000 is to be provided for therapy services; and \$50 000 is to be provided for behaviour intervention services. There are additional programs for children with physical or neurological disability.

We must also look to the future and the provision of adequate employment for disabled people because it is important that they, too, are able to participate and fully contribute to our society. We know how important jobs are for the general community, how employment provides self esteem and a sense of worth, and we must do likewise to ensure that jobs are provided for people with disability in the future. Access and equity are important. I have had disabled access provided to my office by way of ramps for wheelchairs. I also take the opportunity to congratulate the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) for the access to buses that was provided last year.

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

Mr FOLEY (Hart): On behalf of my colleague the member for Taylor, who is the shadow Minister for Tourism, I will read into the record a transcript of portion of the Chairman's report of the South Australian Tourism Commission Board dated 16 October.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Where we get every other document concerning the Government. It reads:

JOHN LAMB: Um, in the report as well, the Wine Tourism Council's Manager, Wine and Food Tourism, Ms Anne Ruston, and we have had some discussion on the process of that appointment which both Phillip and I confirm was not a political appointment but it was an evaluation of the best person for the job as far as we were both concerned.

MICHAEL GLEESON: I don't support that, Chairman. My view is not the same. You know about political influence for the candidate.

MARGIE GREIG: What's not the same?

MICHAEL GLEESON: Um, I was influenced politically for the appointment and, er, I mean that if two or three say the opposite, you know I accept that, but I mean I don't want to indicate the same thing.

JOHN LAMB: No, no, that's fine, although I don't believe—

PHILLIP STYLES: I was put under no questions by the Minister and I was delighted that I wasn't. I was prepared for it, but I was delighted that I wasn't.

JOHN LAMB: I certainly had one phone call on one occasion to support for her for the job, but that wasn't in any way an influencing factor as far as I was concerned, but I could equally see how Michael could have been influenced.

I will let my shadow colleague deal with the Minister in respect of that issue. I want to talk briefly about the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. This has not been a good day for the Minister. It commenced with the most extraordinary backflip, the most extraordinary embarrassment for the Minister. He has been instructed by the new Premier to withdraw the Bill that allowed for the amalgamation of the Tourism Commission, the Department of Sport, Recreation and Racing and a host of other Government agencies, such as the Convention Centre. The Bill was debated only a few weeks ago in this House. It was due to go through the Upper House, with the Labor Party indicating its support, barring some amendments, but in the main supportive of the Bill, yet the Minister has withdrawn it.

I have to ask: how competent is this Minister to handle his portfolio when he has managed this Bill through the House for the past three or four weeks, only to have it withdrawn on

the eve of its being supported in the Upper House? What is more distressing is that the Minister for Tourism is reported to have spent \$160 000 for a Mr Sam Ciccarella to do a review and recommend this legislation. So, Sam Ciccarella has been paid \$160 000 for a Bill that has lived for about three weeks in this House. Many hundreds of hours have been taken up by my colleague the shadow Minister for Tourism, me, Government officers, and people representing industry, tourism and sports to get to this point, yet what do we have? We have the absolute embarrassment of the Minister for Sport having to withdraw this legislation on the eve of its support in another place.

It has been reported that Sam Ciccarella has been paid \$160 000. We are yet to see a report or any documentation. We are yet to see what Mr Ciccarella's qualifications were to undertake a structural review of Government agencies. Sam picked up \$160 000, we spent three weeks debating the Bill in this House and then it was withdrawn. I say to the Minister for Tourism: you look pretty silly. We are on the eve of supporting the Bill in the Upper House, and he has withdrawn it. The Minister is either on top of his job and about reform, restructuring and taking on the fight or he is not. I ask the Minister not to waste my time as shadow Minister for Sport and that of the shadow Minister for Tourism by having us spend hours upon hours in this place debating legislation just to have it withdrawn.

What is more important, I ask the Minister to not waste taxpayers' money on what can only be described as an absolutely disgraceful experience of paying Sam Ciccarella, who has no qualifications in the structural reform of Government, to undertake a review and then kybosh the report and withdraw the Bill. I would have thought that that money was better spent on schools and teachers in my electorate than on a consultant whose report has gone down the tube.

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

Mr BECKER (Peake): I want to explain the situation in relation to a new commercial aircraft flying into Adelaide Airport during the curfew hours. Ansett Airlines has sought permission of the Airport Environment Committee to bring in a hushed kitten, a DC9 cargo aircraft, at 4.20 a.m. on a four week trial period. That service commenced this morning. I did not hear it, so it must be extremely quite. At 5.5 a.m. a Qantas 767 arrives, and on occasions that is rather quiet also.

I am not too happy about the arrangement, because at the moment we are experiencing ideal weather conditions, and you could probably fly just about anything into Adelaide Airport and get away with it if it approaches over the sea. If the airport authorities and Ansett are genuine, they would conduct this trial in the middle of winter, or select a time when there is extremely heavy cloud, with certain wind velocities, and test out the true weather conditions for Adelaide Airport. To bring it in on a lovely morning, with clear skies and very light or hardly any wind, is not a fair trial. The chances are that, over the next four weeks, the weather will hold reasonably well.

I am very cross. I would have expected more from Ansett than this particular request, because it replaces three light aircraft that are reasonably quiet and can operate within the curfew hours. That has always been the understanding. Many years ago I asked the Federal Government to agree to a curfew at Adelaide Airport. It is one of those gentlemen's agreements that has always been honoured by the Labor Government. I understand that Clyde Cameron was reason-

ably supportive of it, as was John Scott, the former member for Hindmarsh. We had a fairly comfortable arrangement for the airport residential environment.

When Qantas sought approval to bring in a flight at 5.5 a.m. simply because it could not land at Sydney before 6 a.m. as they were coming down from Singapore, we had to agree to allow that aircraft in. I said at the time that I was opposed to it, that this would be the thin end of the wedge, and you could bet your bottom dollar that there would be more requests. Sure enough, a couple of years later, along comes Ansett with this request.

If Ansett can prove it is as quiet as the 767 and does not disturb the residents, fair enough. However, what concerns me at this time is that the three light aircraft operators with their pilots, crew, back-up service mechanics and others will lose their jobs. That worries me. That concerns me more than one company bringing in one large aircraft to take over the business of the small business people.

I was very critical of Ansett management and told them so at the airport environment meeting. I said, 'You are not good corporate citizens because you do not have any direct international flights from Adelaide. From every other capital city in Australia, Ansett operates direct flights into Asia, but not from Adelaide.' Ansett Airlines operates those awful, rowdy 727s in and out of Adelaide Airport to Melbourne. They cannot go to Sydney because it costs extra money. Ansett has not done the right thing by Adelaide or South Australia, and I hope that my objections, small as they may be, will come home to roost with the Ansett company executives. If it suits Ansett to bring a 30 year old DC9 aircraft from Brisbane via Sydney to Adelaide at 4.20 a.m. and have it leave Adelaide at 4 p.m., it is about time it did the right thing by the rest of South Australia and gave us a better service. I am a little tired of large corporations making demands and dictating to the rest of us what we should do. The Government is fighting hard for tourism, and it expects a bit of support from those people.

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

POLICE (CONTRACT APPOINTMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) (AMENDMENT OF INDENTURE) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON YUMBARRA
CONSERVATION PARK RE-PROCLAMATION**

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Tuesday 4 February 1997.

Motion carried.

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (TRIBUNAL)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 28 November. Page 699.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I do not want to disappoint the Treasurer by not giving the House a history of the Equal Opportunity Act, but I will avoid the temptation: it would have been a great temptation had the Deputy Premier been in charge of these Bills, and that was something to which I had looked forward this afternoon. So, it is with some disappointment that, as a member of the Opposition, I note that the Treasurer is in charge of these Bills because, during the three years in which I have been dealing with the Treasurer in his capacity as Minister representing the Attorney-General in this place, I have noted his considerable learning in the law. It has been a pleasure to deal with the Treasurer during those three years and to watch his increased capacity for dealing with Attorney-General Bills.

Towards the end of that three-year period, I have become most impressed with the Treasurer's grasp of the detail of Attorney-General Bills. It would have been fun for the Opposition to have had the Deputy Premier represent the Attorney-General on these Bills today, because I am sure that he would not have been able to master the brief in the way in which the Treasurer does. Having the Deputy Premier represent the Attorney-General in this place is a pleasure to which I look forward very much. I am only sorry that today is not the day. I had intended to ask of the Deputy Premier some questions about this Bill and the one that follows because I knew that he would not know the answers. I shall not ask those questions now because I know that the Treasurer will know the answers because of the kind of person he is.

This Bill seeks to amend section 18 of the Equal Opportunity Act 1984. Section 18(1) provides:

There will be—

- (a) a presiding officer of the [Equal Opportunity] tribunal; and
- (b) not more than two deputy presiding officers of the tribunal.

The Government seeks to amend paragraph (b) to provide that there will be 'as many deputy presiding officers of the tribunal as are necessary for the proper functioning of the tribunal'. The reason for this change is that one of the deputy presiding officers has an appointment in the Youth Court and finds himself unable to serve very much on the Equal Opportunity Tribunal. As the member for Spence, I have seen the consequences of that. People who seek access to the Equal Opportunity Tribunal at present are not able to get before the tribunal to have their case resolved according to law. I refer in particular to the case of whistleblower Steve O'Brien who would like to have the tribunal hear and resolve his matter which is now, I think, more than three years old, but he cannot do so. He continues to be mucked around by fruitless attempts at conciliation by the commission. Steve O'Brien wants his day before the tribunal but he cannot get

it. If for Steve O'Brien to get his day before the tribunal it is necessary to appoint more deputy presiding officers for the tribunal to function correctly, I am in favour of it. Section 18(5) provides:

Where a judge or magistrate is appointed as the presiding officer, or as a deputy presiding officer, the following provisions apply:

- (b) the office will become vacant if—
 - (i) the appointee completes a term of office and is not reappointed; or
 - (ii) the appointee ceases to be a judge or magistrate.

The Government seeks to add the following subparagraph:

- (iii) the appointee resigns by notice in writing to the Minister;

I understand that one of the current deputy presiding officers who has an appointment in the Youth Court would like to resign from his position with the Equal Opportunity Tribunal. The Government makes a compelling case why there should be no obstacle to a deputy presiding officer or a presiding officer resigning if they wish. With those comments, the Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I thank the honourable member for his support for the Bill. I point out that the relationship between members of the Upper House and members of the Lower House is by arrangement and not position. So, it could well be that the honourable member could deal with any member of the front bench on any occasion. It just so happens that I have been shadowing the Attorney since about 1985. I hope that I have learnt something in the process.

Mr Atkinson: You have.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Spence says that I have. The problem is that the Equal Opportunity Tribunal is dysfunctional at the moment simply because of availability of presiding officers. This provision allows the Attorney the flexibility to ensure that the tribunal works effectively.

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

**LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 November. Page 617.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Bill makes changes to the Legal Practitioners Act 1981. As I understand it, the only professional indemnity scheme for lawyers in this State is provided by the Law Society—and by 'professional indemnity' I mean insurance against civil liability arising from legal practice. I understand that the Law Society wishes to change the management of the scheme to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest and to separate out the management committee of the scheme, the underwriters and the panel of solicitors who conduct the litigation. To that end, the Law Society has requested the amendment of section 11 of the Legal Practitioners Act to allow for the delegation of the running of the indemnity scheme to a company which would be, I think, a subsidiary of the Law Society. Section 11 provides:

Subject to this Act the council may delegate any of its powers to—

- (a) a committee consisting of such persons as the council thinks fit; or
- (b) any officer or employee of the society.

The amendment would add a paragraph:

(ab) a company that is a subsidiary of the society within the meaning of section 46 of the Corporations Law; or.

The Labor Party has no difficulty with that and is willing to support the Bill. A second amendment would allow money from the guarantee fund to be spent on educational and publishing programs, and we are told by the Attorney that this is to 'improve the standard of the legal profession by creating awareness of the misconduct or negligence of practitioners, and through training which will teach legal practitioners to deal with problems before they lead to misconduct or negligence'. I would not have thought it was necessary to draw the attention of lawyers to the existence of sin, but it seems that there is a special need to spend money to draw their attention to the sin of some in their ranks. Indeed, an article in today's *City Messenger* is headlined 'Unacceptably high level of unprofessional conduct reports against lawyers' and contains a brief look at five cases of malpractice. The introduction to the article states:

SA lawyers are being reported by clients for unprofessional conduct and over-charging at an unacceptably high rate, according to the board charged with investigating complaints. The Legal Practitioners Conduct Board, which called in the Attorney-General on cases against seven lawyers last year suspected of criminal conduct, says a few rotten apples are reflecting badly on the profession.

If the spending of money from the guarantee fund on education can reduce the number of rotten apples and the amount of money that clients of lawyers lose owing to lawyers' malpractice, I am in favour of it. However, I am a little sceptical of the proposal and I would rather that the money remain in the guarantee fund in order to compensate those clients who are wronged by lawyers. However, if the Attorney wants it spent on education and prevention, who am I to stand in his way? So the Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I thank the member for Spence for his support for the Bill. They are two very simple amendments, as he has explained. The first one deals with the indemnity and the second with the guarantee fund. As the member for Spence has quite rightly pointed out, the issue of the Law Society running its own scheme has been a matter that has probably vexed the society for some time. As far as the society is concerned—and I am sure that the Attorney has agreed with the principle for some time—the society should not have a hands-on determination in relation to the scheme that provides for professional indemnity. So, it would be wise for a separate company with a separate board with a hands-off approach to be adopted.

One of the difficulties with all practices, particularly in government, is that you have to have that semblance of independence and transparency. That is not the case that prevails today. We could indeed have a situation where, because of angst within the legal profession, the Law Society itself may transgress those principles and give favour or refuse favour on the basis that it has control of the fund. So, it is important that the professional indemnity scheme should operate in a professional fashion and is not subject to the wishes or whims of the society. I am not suggesting for one minute that that has been the case in the past, but certainly, in terms of modern day practice, it is appropriate to shift that scheme outside the society.

In relation to the provision under which some of the moneys in the guarantee fund are directed to proper educational purposes, as the member for Spence is fully aware, one of the issues that prevails in these circumstances

is the extent to which the legal profession is kept up-to-date, and the Attorney and the Law Society believe that there is a part to play in terms of material that should be provided perhaps on a continual but more often on a one off basis, informing legal practitioners of their responsibilities to their clients. So, on both counts we are pleased to have the support of the member for Spence.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Management of society's affairs.'

Mr ATKINSON: Why is it necessary to include paragraph (ab), which provides 'a company that is a subsidiary of the society within the meaning of section 46 of the Corporations Law', when paragraph (a) provides 'a committee consisting of such persons as the council thinks fit'? I would hope that everyone appointed to the corporation is a person that the council of the Law Society thought was a fit and proper person. Is there a hint of duplication here?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I do not think that the member for Spence is showing his true capacity for questions such as this. The reason why a company is being established is set out in the second reading explanation: there must be a distinction between the Law Society and its working committees and, indeed, a separate company set up for the purposes of determining the issues associated with professional indemnity. I would have thought that the member for Spence understood the difference. The very reason for going outside the Law Society, as such, even though it is a subsidiary of the Law Society, is to have that distinction. You cannot have that distinction whilst you have a committee that is actually a subset of the whole.

Mr ATKINSON: I thank the Treasurer for that answer and I accept it wholly. I was, of course, just testing him to ensure that he had read his brief, and it seems that on this occasion, as on so many other occasions, he has done so. This is a pleasure that the House will be denied if the informal arrangements lead to the Deputy Premier's becoming the Minister representing the Attorney-General in this place. This could be the last time that the Treasurer handles these kinds of Bills, and I just wanted a Committee for old time's sake.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Guarantee fund.'

Mr ATKINSON: Does the Treasurer really believe that educating lawyers not to be wicked will be cost effective for the guarantee fund?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: That is a reasonable question from the member for Spence. If members of the legal profession have information about what will happen if they do things incorrectly or wrongly, in terms of some cases that have occurred interstate and overseas, I would have thought not only that there was particular benefit in that practice that might act as a warning to be vigilant in the way the legal practitioner dispenses his or her duties to his or her client but also that the important issue of negligence would be kept firmly in front of the legal practitioner when dealing with any case.

The other issue to consider is the extent to which legal practitioners are involved in criminal activities. It occurs with every profession; it is estimated that about 5 per cent of any profession involves an element of corruption, some professions having higher percentages than that. I note that the New South Wales police, for example, would certainly not be able to put up their hands for 5 per cent, and I understand that the

new Police Commissioner in that State will have an enormous task in getting that police force back on the rails again.

However, the important issue is that within any profession, whether political, police, legal or medical, there are people who think that they can beat the law or make money outside the law at the expense of others. It is important that the system and the peak bodies, whether it involves legal practitioners or anyone else, have some capacity to convey a message that crime does not pay. I think the Law Society has a part to play in ensuring that the legal practitioners who operate in this State, (a), operate effectively and, therefore, reduce the capacity for negligence; and, (b), stay away from criminal practices. The extent to which the education program will work will depend on the character and capacity of the Law Society executive and the script writers.

Mr ATKINSON: How does the Treasurer arrive at the figure of 5 per cent as the proportion of rotten apples in each profession, and could he give the Committee some references to scholarly articles on that point? Moreover, how does he expect his Government to keep before the eyes of potential miscreants the undesirability of malpractice?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Spence is well read and would understand that every profession is subject to those who would wish to operate outside the laws governing that profession and, in fact, the laws that govern the State. The general theme that I have seen in terms of corruption is that about 5 per cent in any profession will actively pursue a practice of trying to beat the law. A number of others will be slipshod in their practices or breach the law inadvertently. The 5 per cent does not apply to any particular profession. In the many articles I have read on criminal activity—and I do take a great interest in this area—it is often quoted that in any profession the proportion is at least 5 per cent. I do not think the legal profession is different from any other profession. In some other professions it is much higher.

The member for Spence might reflect on the ship painters and dockers organisation. Having suffered threats from that organisation in the past because I took up some of their nefarious activities in this place, I think that members would well recognise that the level of corruption within that organisation was well above 5 per cent. Many other professions which operate effectively, which have strong peak bodies and which effectively administer their own codes, actively keep their members up to date and are quick to act should members transgress. In those professions the incidence of malpractice and law breaking will be much lower than the general average of 5 per cent, but 5 per cent does not apply to any particular profession.

Mr ATKINSON: How will the Government keep it before their eyes?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: That is up to the Law Society. The Attorney-General has agreed to the proposal to allow some of the moneys to be spent on this particular area, and I think that is an appropriate use of money. The old adage of prevention is better than cure applies in this area, as it does in many others. It is up to the Law Society to keep its members up to date and to ensure that the information flow on the sort of things we have discussed today is before their eyes on a continual basis.

Mr ATKINSON: Intrigued as I am by the Treasurer's reference to 5 per cent, I jotted down Rick Mochalski, Barry Morris, Brian Burke, David Parker, Ray O'Connor, Rex Jackson, Russ Hinze and Don Lane.

The Hon. S.J. Baker: They are the ones who got caught.

Mr ATKINSON: Could he apply his 5 per cent theory to the Parliament of South Australia and provide us with any examples from the past 100 years?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am making no reflection on the honourable profession of being a politician.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): A week or so ago, on Saturday 23 November, the Labor Party held a 'health hotline', the result of which I will outline to the House. Six lines were open from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., and in that time 426 calls were received. The issues were grouped into particular areas and the biggest concern, particularly for older people, was early discharge. They told us that in many cases there were no services to help them when they got home and they felt that the system had abandoned them. That was of particular concern to older people. A second concern related to private health insurance. Again, older people in particular told us that they had dropped their private health insurance because they could no longer afford to keep it and they were now feeling at the mercy of a public health system that they did not believe would be able to cope with their needs. They said that there was now a public health system that had had too many cuts and their health needs could no longer be adequately dealt with.

A number of calls were received from the country and there were no surprises in the issues raised. Country people are concerned about a lack of services, a lack of doctors and specialists and a lack of services in mental health. People in the country said that they felt abandoned by this Government, particularly as they thought that this Government would look after their needs. One of the positive things that came through during the hotline time was that the people who telephoned never blamed hospital staff for the issues they raised. This was a constant theme. People had the greatest of respect for doctors and nurses and realised that these professionals were doing the best they could under the most trying circumstances.

It was interesting manning the hotline. People asked whether it was a statistical survey: it was not a statistical survey and was never meant to be. It was simply a snapshot of what 462 people on 23 November wanted to tell us about the health service. In that time there were no surprises, nothing we had not heard before and nothing that did not confirm many of the concerns that we have heard over the past 18 months.

I was interested to be sent a copy of an article from the *Eastern Messenger* of 27 November, just last week, containing an article that I will read into *Hansard* because it backs up from a different source more of what we heard on 23 November. The article, headed 'Casemix falls short for elderly patients', states:

Elderly people just discharged from hospital are going home to limited care, suffering relapses, and do not know how to contact support services for help. This is the picture painted by Kensington and Norwood Council's Community Services Office in a report on the impact of casemix on local health support groups. Casemix introduced last year by the State Government sees hospitals funded according to the number and type of procedures they do. As a result

patients are at times discharged from hospitals earlier than pre-casemix days to keep a certain volume of patients moving through the hospitals system. The council's report said casemix caused problems for every local health service because some were unaware patients from their area had been released from hospital and some residents did not know how to contact home care groups.

Other problems highlighted for groups like the council's home support services, District Nursing and Eastern Domiciliary Care, included: patients sent home to no carer with no consideration of the home situation or their ability to cope at home; readmissions resulting from early releases; patients coping poorly at home and added stress as a result of that; increased demand on the Royal District Nursing Society's services; waiting lists for Eastern Domiciliary Care and greater strictness in its eligibility requirements; patients released from hospital late on Friday afternoon with an expectation that care by support groups would be given over the weekend; and residents being discharged with two to three hours notice compared with two to three days notice in the past. In some cases, support groups were told care was needed only after patients had arrived home. 'All service providers interviewed are experiencing ramifications of casemix policy', the report said.

Council's senior community services officer, Steve Hollitt, said although problems had been identified, it was still early days for casemix. He said a report being compiled by the Council on the Ageing (COTA) would show if the problems were initial hiccups or shortfalls in the overall system.

Wider changes were being made to help cope with the impact of casemix. These included the Royal Adelaide Hospital funding an 'early discharge program' for domiciliary care.

Interestingly, the final sentence states:

At the time of going to press, a comment from Health Minister, Michael Armitage, could not be obtained.

That quote essentially says the same things that we heard during our phone-in on 23 November. It is time that all members acknowledge that these things have been said over and over again for a long time, and it is about time they were addressed.

I would like to raise the issue of the \$30 million blow-out in the State Government's health budget. I was interested in the comments that were made when the \$30 million cut was announced. I want to be very clear and put on the record precisely how that amount of \$30 million is arrived at, because it is exactly that. When the State Government brought down its health budget earlier this year it was quite clear that it was predicated on an increase of \$14.5 million of Federal funding, and at the time we remarked that it would be a miracle if that were to be the case. But, no, the Health Minister stood his ground and said that that was it and that he was going with the budget which was predicated on an increase of \$14.5 million.

After the Howard August Federal budget and the decrease in specific purpose payments to the States, a further \$12.2 million was cut from our health budget. This was announced by the Treasurer in this place a few weeks ago. So we have \$14.5 million and \$12.2 million, and the week before last we heard of a further \$3.3 million—a penalty levied on this State (and similar penalties levied on other States) by the Commonwealth Minister, Dr Wooldridge, for supposed cross-shifting. When you add the \$14.5 million, the \$12.2 million and the \$3.3 million you get a further \$30 million cut to the State budget.

What did the Health Minister say about it? He said nothing; he made no comment at all. That is something that we have come to expect from this Health Minister because he resiles from arguing the case of the health system and the need to replace some of the millions that have disappeared from it. So, when you add this \$30 million to the \$79 million or so that has already gone you can see that over \$100 million has gone from the health budget in this State. Quite frankly,

we all know that people everywhere in South Australia are feeling the brunt of this massive attack.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I wish to voice my concern about tariff reductions and the lack of protection for Australian manufacturing industries in general. It is obvious that many others share my concern, particularly in relation to the car industry in South Australia. Premier Olsen, in the *Sunday Mail* of 1 December, said:

We have to go on the front foot with the Prime Minister and the Federal Government to make sure the policies they develop will sustain manufacturing industry—in particular, the car industry.

I fervently agree with this sentiment. Recently it came to my attention that the furniture manufacturing industry in South Australia is struggling. I was asked to go to the recent Home Show at Wayville where a constituent of mine, Mr Joe Rufenacht, asked me to look at the sort of furniture that was being exhibited there, its price and where it was being made. Mr Joe Rufenacht of JR Furniture, which is located at Angaston in my electorate, alerted me to the plight of the Australian furniture industry.

It has been difficult in this industry for some years now, and we have seen the loss of excellent manufacturing companies such as Noblett, Macrob and Post and Rail—and in recent days I have noticed that Whitewood Furniture has gone, too—and many others that have closed down or gone into receivership. Joe believes that this year is by far the worst and that if it does not improve his firm may also become a casualty. That would be very sad, because he makes magnificent furniture. I have no doubt that the Treasurer will back me up on this because the other night we went to a restaurant and sat on JR Furniture's chairs, and they were magnificent.

This quarter should be the busiest of the year but there is very little work, and apparently other businesses outside the furniture industry also feel that the situation is poor. JR Furniture has exported small amounts of furniture to 14 different countries. At present the firm is a member of a group of firms looking at the possibility of exporting furniture to Japan. In March this year it displayed furniture at the International Furniture Exhibition in Singapore. Although it had a great response and generated a lot of interest, it would take all its resources to meet that market, and it would have to produce its furniture at significantly lower prices. However, that is hardly possible in this country with high interest rates (although they have eased now), high raw material costs, high labour costs, expensive transport costs and so on compared to most other countries.

Imports are continually on the increase, particularly now that the Australian dollar today recorded its highest level for many years—83¢ against the US dollar. That helps the people who bring product into this country; it makes imports cheaper for the Australian consumer. Increasing imports, together with the lowering of tariffs, does not help manufacturing industries in Australia. As from 1 July tariffs on imported furniture were lowered to around 5 per cent, and I believe that if you bring in the furniture in components (small pieces) the tariffs are even lower.

At present a lot of furniture is being imported from Malaysia, Indonesia, southern China and so on. These countries protect their own markets with import tariffs of up to 85 per cent. How is that for a seesaw! An amount of 5 per cent on one side and 85 per cent on the other! Joe Rufenacht put this question to me: 'Is the future of Australia only to dig bigger holes in the ground, fell more trees for paper, and

farming? Shouldn't we look ahead and try to value add to our raw materials so that our children have an opportunity to learn a trade or similar?' I have to agree with Joe. I feel that the time is ripe for urgent action to address the needs of the Australian manufacturing industry as a whole before it is too late.

Competition in the market place is necessary and good, but we do not have a level playing field, particularly with reduced tariff protection. If the current situation continues, we will eventually have imports competing against other imports. Even more tragically, we will have lost our trades skills base along with jobs. To reiterate the point that we do not have a level playing field when competing with imports, I will quote the National Secretary of the AMWU, Doug Cameron (whom I would not normally agree with), who in the November/December edition of *The Manufacturing Worker* states:

... our competitors help build their own industries by every kind of protection they can find—even if it is called by another name.

He went on to say:

For example, on a standard six cylinder Holden, Indonesia has a 125 per cent import duty tax plus 10 per cent value added tax. Malaysia has a 200 per cent import duty tax plus 10 per cent sales tax, and Thailand has 68.5 per cent import duty plus 7 per cent value added tax. How they must laugh when they hear the Australian Government wants to slash our own tariffs to the bone.

That is especially so in respect of Malaysian cars coming to Australia. I saw the Proton car being manufactured in Malaysia about three years ago, and it comes into Australia at a cost under \$20 000 because of our minimum tariff. I shudder to think about the consequences. In the *Sunday Mail* of 17 November Mike Duffy stated:

In the first 10 months of this year Korean auto-giant Hyundai sold 5 237 more cars in Australia than South Australia's Mitsubishi Motors.

Mike indicated that Mitsubishi Motors sold no cars to Korea during the same period, giving this reason:

Korea hits imported vehicles with special consumption tax and a value added tax, an acquisition tax, two forms of registration tax, an education tax and, wait for it, a subway bond tax.

As Mike says, here in Australia we have no such additional taxes to protect our local product and local jobs and, by the year 2000, duty protection for our car industry will have tumbled from a high of 57.5 per cent in 1984 to just 15 per cent. I have a problem with that. Tariffs have to be fair. We have supported our car industry a bit too much in the past, but

when we bring tariffs down to that extent the playing field has to be level. The fact that Mitsubishi and Holden's are selling on overseas markets today is amazing and speaks volumes for the quality of the product and the market acceptance of it.

It is definitely time to have a rethink about our tariff reduction program. We are told continually by economic rationalists and our Federal colleagues, particularly by a long time friend of mine, the Hon. Bert Kelly, that we have to pull down tariff barriers so that, as a net exporting country, which we are, we can give ourselves an advantage in the world market by exporting to more countries and thus improve our economy. Our exporting in primary industries is supposed to be the upside of all this. However, that has not been the case. We have continually seen some of our traditional markets, particularly grain, eroded by heavily subsidised produce from both the American and European markets. The return of the Economic Enhancement Program (EEP) from America just makes a mockery of all the talk that has been going on since the recent GATT round gave us some hope that these ridiculous marketing ploys would be scaled out.

So, the upsides are not being delivered; and the downside is what we see happening, as I have said, to all our own manufacturing industries—particularly furniture, clothing and footwear—and certainly, as Jeff Kennett said today, in our heavy industries of which we have little left. Australia is being the bunny in this. I am not sure whether it is our naivety or political ineptness that is causing these concerns. The same rules that some overseas countries apply to us should be reciprocated. The goodwill we have shown in our trading strategies is not being recognised or rewarded. I believe that we should immediately reassess the situation before all our manufactured goods are imported.

I support Joe Rufenacht in respect of Australian manufacturing. He is a good operator who makes a good product and employs people in regional South Australia at Angaston. We can do much to assist our manufacturing industries by buying locally. I am not a hypocrite: I drive an Australian made motor car, much of which is manufactured here in South Australia at Elizabeth, and I urge all members to do the same.

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

Motion carried.

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 4 December at 2 p.m.