

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4 February 1997

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

### ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAILWAY BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Adoption (Miscellaneous) Amendment,  
 Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes)(Interim Control Boards) Amendment,  
 Criminal Assets Confiscation,  
 Development Plan (City of Salisbury-MFP (The Levels)) Amendment,  
 Electricity,  
 Equal Opportunity (Tribunal) Amendment,  
 Fisheries (Protection of Fish Farms) Amendment,  
 Industrial and Employee Relations (Transitional Arrangements) Amendment,  
 Irrigation (Conversion to Private Irrigation District) Amendment,  
 Legal Practitioners (Miscellaneous) Amendment,  
 Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment,  
 Motor Vehicles (Inspection) Amendment,  
 Parliamentary Remuneration (Supplementary Allowances and Benefits) Amendment,  
 Pay-roll Tax (Superannuation Benefits) Amendment,  
 Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) (Miscellaneous) Amendment,  
 Police (Contract Appointments) Amendment,  
 Racial Vilification,  
 Road Traffic (Inspection) Amendment,  
 Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification)(Amendment of Indenture) Amendment,  
 Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers,  
 South Australian Ports (Bulk Handling Facilities),  
 South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage (Contributions) Amendment,  
 Statutes Amendment (Taxation Administration),  
 Taxation Administration,  
 Waite Trust (Miscellaneous Variations).

### CHAMBER AMPLIFICATION

The **SPEAKER:** Members will have noticed new microphones in front of them. A major upgrade of the amplification system has been undertaken and members

should notice significant improvements in the sound reproduction. Members may adjust the position of their microphones, although it should be unnecessary as long as they face the microphone when speaking. A red light at the base of the microphone will indicate that it is live. The misleading message will be replaced shortly.

### STURT STREET PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 3 317 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reverse its decision to close the Sturt Street Primary School was presented by the Hon. J.W. Olsen.

Petition received.

### PUBLICATIONS, INDECENT

A petition signed by 271 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ban the sale of indecent publications from unrestricted newsagents and other retail outlets was presented by the Hon. R.G. Kerin.

Petition received.

### QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 1 956 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish an independent inquiry into the emergency services section of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was presented by the Hon. M.D. Rann.

Petition received.

### LAFFER'S TRIANGLE

A petition signed by 266 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure the retention of the land known as Laffer's Triangle as open space was presented by Mr Caudell.

Petition received.

### 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 13, 17, 26, 33, 38, 41, 49, 50 and 52.

### SA WATER SECURITY

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** This morning the Acting Deputy Commissioner, Mr John Murray, announced that a special task force has been set up to investigate security issues at SA Water's Australis Building headquarters. I have been informed that police investigators will work alongside computer specialists analysing security data to determine possible breaches to the building's electronic security system, or any unauthorised entry into the offices.

### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER:** I lay on the table an erratum to the supplement to the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1996. Are there any notices of motion from private members?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House has not started off particularly well. I have warned the Minister for Finance. His conduct is out of order, and the Leader of the Opposition knows better.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! And I warn the member for Hart.

#### EMPLOYEE OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

**The SPEAKER** laid on the table the report of the Employee Ombudsman 1995-96.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Electricity Act—Regulations—  
Principal  
Vegetation Clearance—Bushfire Risk Areas  
SA Generation Corporation—Charter—1 December 1996  
to 30 June 1997

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

National Crime Authority—Report, 1995-96  
Regulations under the following Acts—  
Firearms—Compensation for Non-Registered Firearms  
Witness Protection—Non-disclosure of Identity

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

Friendly Societies Act—General Laws of Druids Friendly  
Society—Confirmed  
Taxation Administration Act—Regulation—Disclosure of  
Information

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Listening Devices Act—Report, 1996  
Regulations under the following Acts—  
Acts Specified in Schedule—Common Expiation  
Scheme  
Expiation of Offences—Principal  
Legal Practitioners—Fees  
Liquor Licensing—  
New Years Eve Dry Areas  
Prohibition in Public Places time Extension  
Public Corporations—  
West Beach Trust  
TransAdelaide  
Lotteries Commission  
Rules of Court—  
District Court Act—  
Arbitration and Mediation  
Consumer Credit Act  
Magistrates Court Act—Forms  
Supreme Court Act—Rules of Criminal Court—  
Disclosure of Information  
Youth Court Act—Alibi and Expiation Relief

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development  
(Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Development Act—  
Interim Operation of the City of Elizabeth—Elizabeth  
Centre Plan Amendment  
Regulations—MFP (The Levels) Zone  
Development Assessment Commission—Report on  
Freeholding of Shacks, Hundred of Cadell

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon.  
D.C. Brown)—

Industrial Relations Advisory Committee—Report,  
1995-96

Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety  
Committee—Report, 1995-96

Passenger Transport Act—Regulation—Taxi Fares  
Remuneration Act 1990—Determination of the Remunera-  
tion Tribunal—No 2 of 1996—Members of the Judi-  
ciary, Industrial Relations Commission, State Coroner,  
Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and  
Development Court and Employee Ombudsman.  
WorkCover Corporation of South Australia—Report,  
1995-96

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

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Dentists—Treatment by Dental Hygienists  
Controlled Substances—Poisons

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon.  
E.S. Ashenden)—

Coast Protection Board South Australia—Report, 1995-96  
Corporation—By-Laws—  
City of Mitcham—No 2—Council Land  
City of Noarlunga—No 5—Dogs  
District Council—By-Laws—Kapunda and Light—No  
6—Creatures

By the Minister for Recreation and Sport (Hon.  
E.S. Ashenden)—

Racing Act—Rules—SA Harness Racing Authority—  
Repeal  
Track without a Running Rail

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Re-  
sources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Botanic Gardens, Board of the—Report, 1995-96  
National Environment Protection Council—Report,  
1995-96

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. R.G.  
Kerin)—

Seeds Act—Regulation—Fees for Seed Analysis Service

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further  
Education (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Education Act—Regulation—Various.

#### WATER OUTSOURCING CONTRACTS

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** I seek leave to make  
a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The only political issue and the  
only Government agenda that really matters in South  
Australia in February 1997 is the rejuvenation of the econ-  
omy. The majority of the South Australian electorate agrees  
with that viewpoint. For that reason, there would be an  
expectation—and I guess a vain hope—that the Labor Party,  
having been responsible for crushing this State's future,  
would feel some obligation somewhere in its political strategy  
to concentrate at least some of its energies on the main game  
of getting our State back on its feet.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is probably another vain hope,  
but I will continue to try to interest Labor in our State's  
future. It is with that aim that I am making this statement. I  
hope that by putting on the parliamentary record a statement  
of details surrounding the Kortlang contract we can finally  
interest Labor in what matters—South Australia's future. In  
early 1995, after the South Australian Government and the  
former EWS Department had decided on a short list of

companies which would be invited to submit a proposal for the water outsourcing contract, EWS identified—and I, as Minister for Infrastructure, agreed—that there could be issues which needed to be resolved by a communication strategy. The main issue was the misinformation campaign by the Labor Party, which sought to bring unnecessary fear into the homes of South Australian residents.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** On that interjection—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** This is supposed to be a ministerial statement. People want jobs not jibes.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition has had more than a fair go. If he defies the Chair again, he will be named, as will anyone else. I realise that the temperature is fairly high in this Chamber, but that is no excuse for members to continue behaving in a disruptive and unruly manner. The Chair will take appropriate action; if members want publicity, they will get it.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I point out to the House that the interjection of the Leader of the Opposition is part of the last page of this statement. So innovative is he, he read the last page and then interjected to put the jibe across the Chamber.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** Sit down!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest to members on my right that they cease interjecting, because the same Standing Orders apply to them.

**Mr CLARKE:** Mr Speaker, I point out that ministerial statements are for the purpose of informing the House of Government policy and are not to be the subject of argument or debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House gave the Premier leave to make a ministerial statement, and the text of that statement is entirely in the hands of the Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Everyone here is aware of the range of this misinformation at the time, but two lies in the community particularly stood out, as follows:

1. That water was to be sold rather than managed by an appropriate company, and that lie included the sale of our reservoirs.

2. That the basic necessity of an Australian garden—the hose and sprinkler system—would have to be licensed.

Whilst in hindsight these suggestions can be seen for the puerile political scare campaign they were, unfortunately, they did cause a level of community agitation. The EWS Department was worried that the political storm, coupled with these community concerns, would inhibit or scare off the list of potential investors who wished to bid, or at best reduce the value of the bid. That is what was at stake. A decision was taken by the EWS—with which I agreed—that an issues management specialist would become involved at departmental level.

This company would be asked to carry out various tasks, namely, to assess public concern and to advise on how the true message could be communicated so that the public would be reassured and the chosen short list of water companies would feel confident enough of the political climate and the public view to commit to an interest and enhance their bid. Kortlang was chosen because of similar successful work it had carried out. One such issue pertinent to South Australia

was Kortlang's work for National Mutual when a French company became its majority shareholder.

Last week the Leader of the Opposition distributed copies of so-called 'leaked' material relating to the water outsourcing contract. The 724 or so pages appear to match exactly the personal file of the former chief of staff of the then Premier. The file contained Cabinet submissions, confidential minutes of Cabinet subcommittees, parliamentary briefings, Crown Law opinions, minutes and file notes and, obviously, details of some market research. By photocopying and redistributing the contents of that file, Mr Rann has breached all parliamentary protocol and conditions of the Westminster political system, not to mention the now police investigation into the break in of SA Water. All members of Parliament—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford will come to order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—indeed, the general community, should feel nothing but abhorrence at this behaviour. It is sabotage to investment and jobs in this State. It has the effect of intimidating any business person looking to do business in this State. As a business person, would you submit yourself to the rigours—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—of innuendo and constant appearances before a select committee to disclose your commercially sensitive procedures and dealings, or would you turn your back on such an environment and go elsewhere? That is what is at stake with the tactics of the Labor Party and, of course, we understand why it does not want us to be successful.

Mr Rann could have displayed honourable behaviour, like the now Federal Education Minister, Amanda Vanstone, who was recently placed in similar circumstances and who gave all her material back to the then Labor Government. The Leader of the Opposition has developed a track record for this type of behaviour. Let me remind the House that it was in the early 1980s when, as the press secretary to Mr Bannon, Mr Rann obtained information about Roxby Downs, but to make it interesting to the media—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I know the honourable member does not like this being recycled and put on the record—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We understand why members opposite are sensitive.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Clarke:** Your nose is growing, Pinocchio!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Mr Rann obtained information about Roxby Downs, but to make it interesting to the media we all know that he removed a cover sheet and stamped it 'confidential' to heighten media interest in the story. In fact, the material was not confidential.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In leaking parts of the Cabinet file containing confidential information, it would seem that the Leader has taken a few liberties. It would seem that some

cover fax pages have been removed in an endeavour to give a different impression of the contents. In looking at the contents of the personal file, I hope Mr Rann has learnt something because the documents prove that, first, the contract was well executed and debated at length to get the best deal for South Australia; and, secondly, a massive amount of time and work was invested to get the work right and to explain to the public the outcomes. The then Premier and various Cabinet members were kept informed of the process, background and reasons for various decisions and activities through 1995-96. It shows due process, due diligence and dedication to securing a good deal for South Australia. Thirdly, they show there was close and continuing contact between my office and that of the former Premier in dealing with the many misrepresentations of this contract in this House and elsewhere.

I wish to summarise the contents of the file here in three categories and explain to the House the significance to our State of this material. Then there will be no mystery or mystique about the contents of the documents. Then I hope for all our sakes that we can get on with the main business of the State and not be distracted by irrelevant side players—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—who have nothing to do with getting jobs for South Australia. Let me briefly highlight some of the contents of these leaked documents. First, on the subject of consultants, Kortlang, let me make it clear to members that I did not have a copy of even the summary of the market research in my office. As one of the fax cover sheets in the leaked material now removed by Mr Rann has explained, a copy of this research material was not kept in my ministerial office.

**Mr De LAINE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. About five times now the Premier has referred to the Leader of the Opposition as 'Mr Rann'. That is against Standing Orders.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Price is correct. The Premier should refer to the said person by his title, that is, the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I was informed that there was naturally community opposition to the words 'privatisation' and, yes, there were some very general questions about the state of voter trends at the time, which were no different from any other research publicly available at the time. It was, I am told, benchmark research which required this check of the sample being taken.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition, for the last time.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is a methodology common to even research that the Leader of the Opposition would undertake. In September 1995 I was given a verbal briefing by Kortlang of their communication strategy for the next months based on a whole range of information they had gathered. On 18 August 1995 I arranged for an overview of the executive summary to go to the Premier. My recollection is that that was in a sealed envelope. It was subsequently tabled at a Cabinet subcommittee, and 'leaked' minutes will show it was discussed. This does not conflict with my statement in the House on 18 October 1995 when I said: 'SA Water—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, for the second time.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—has not as a corporation commissioned polling'—fact. Nor that of the Premier on 28 November and my repeated statement the following day: 'The State Government did not commission the polling'—fact. SA Water did not commission the polling: the issues management consultancy did. I was not consulted on the question, format or purpose. Mr Kortlang has confirmed the details in a select committee. I remind the Leader of the Opposition and the House that he was under oath in making those statements before the select committee.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition knows—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition is fully aware of the Standing Orders.

**Mr Cummins:** He should be thrown out.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Norwood is also out of order, and he is warned for the first time. The Chair does not want to have to take the next step in this process. All members have had ample warning. This is an important statement. I suggest that members act in a manner that the public would expect of elected representatives.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition knows what Party political polling at taxpayers' expense is all about. When he was a senior adviser to the former Premier, that Government used the Labor Party's own pollster to ask a series of questions at taxpayers' expense about the personal approval ratings of leading figures in that Government—including the man he worked for, the then Premier, Mr Bannon. That was Party political—blatant and basic. The results were given to the Labor Party organisation on South Terrace. That was more than abuse of taxpayers' money. It was corruption.

Nothing of the sort has occurred with this research. The research merely sought to identify whether the Government's public standing at particular points in time, and the financial strategy of which this contract is an integral part, may be affecting public attitudes to the water contract as a means of validating that the research results were reliable.

The second matter that I wish to highlight briefly is Australian equity. Amongst the leaked documents there are not only *Hansard* transcripts but also Cabinet sub-committee minutes and parliamentary briefing notes, where it is clear that both the former Premier and I sought from SA Water and those managing the contract the purest and most 'legal' definition of what the term 'Australian equity' meant in the crafting of the contract. These minutes reflect the healthy debate and discussion before the final contract was drawn up. There is commercially sensitive information within them, which I hope the Leader of the Opposition will continue to respect. My intentions are to make it clear that this kind of definition and subject was not treated lightly and deservedly was given fair attention.

The former Premier and I were both given full explanations of the very precise intent and meaning. It is now on record. The Leader of the Opposition may have been unwilling to leak two of the documents clearly slashed 'Premier Brown', which are the confidential and highly secure copies of the water contract 'Evaluation of proposals' and an outline of the 'Penalties and sanctions' for the termination of the contract. Both of these show what a careful and considered document the water contract is, and the nature

of the competing bids. I will honour and respect the security of the SA Water process and the commercially sensitive nature of these documents and will not be releasing them.

This information is now almost two years out of date. However, because I take the view that I have nothing to hide, I now table the documents: all of them. The only exceptions to this are the two documents that are the commercially sensitive evaluation of the water contract bids and a similar one relating to the termination agreements, which I have just mentioned.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Spence.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** And, of course, I am unable to table some of the documents which, in the intrigue of photocopying, I assume by the Leader of the Opposition, have not returned to the informant or the file. There are some things we understand, on advice, are missing. Under any other circumstances, the Cabinet sub-committee minutes, a Cabinet submission and Crown Solicitor's opinion are not public documents. If you take out of context the papers tabled, you can get any answer you want. Taken as objective material, they clearly confirm the accuracy of my advice to the Parliament.

In addition, today the executive summary of the water contract has been handed to the Auditor-General before being forwarded to the select committee. Upon sign-off by the Auditor-General of the veracity of the contract summary, I will forward the document to the select committee, and I expect that they will ultimately be made public—the document and the contract will be made public.

Today, I intend that there may be no doubt in the mind of the public as to the contents of this so-called 'secret' file. I am tabling the photocopied contents as provided to me of what I believe to be the personal file handed over to the Opposition. It is here 'warts and all' for every diligent journalist and member of the public to pick the eyes out of. I have nothing to hide. I believe, through the highlights I have outlined, that this file is an accurate reflection of a series of events that is now history. What matters is the water outsourcing contract bringing jobs and benefits to South Australians. The savings are being reaped in the form of dividends that are being invested by the State Government in education and health. These investments would not have been possible if the South Australian community had relied on the Opposition's method of managing our State economy.

In summary, I believe that South Australians want jobs, not jibes. South Australians, with a will to make this State something to be proud of, want the economy stimulated and want jobs created—not the rumour mill, sleaze and innuendo we have heard over the past few weeks. I repeat: I have nothing to hide, therefore I am tabling all these documents.

The message I give to this House today is that I have inherited a job to lead and foster the development of this State. That is my goal. We have also inherited the bad management of the previous Government and some personal grievances. That is the baggage which comes with the job. It is also history. We will not be shirking that responsibility, or forgetting it. The Leader of the Opposition, in the *Advertiser* of 3 September 1993, was quoted as saying:

I see whingeing and blaming as a substitute for a lack of ideas and a lack of guts.

I could not agree more. My focus is on the future and what we can now do for South Australians. Let us just get on and do it.

## MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** I rise on a matter of privilege. The Premier, when he was Minister for Infrastructure, told this House on 18 October 1995 that SA Water had not commissioned water polling. One month later, the former Premier (now Minister for Industrial Affairs) told this House that the Government did not commission any market research on the water contract. The next day, the present Premier in this House supported fully the statements by the former Premier that the Government had not instigated research. The Opposition has been provided with a set of official documents which the Opposition believes demonstrates that both the present and former Premiers misled this House and deliberately so.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Mr Speaker, this is a serious matter. I have a memorandum addressed to the former Premier and signed by the present Premier. The memorandum reads as follows:

To the Hon. Premier

Re: Market research conducted by Kortlang for SA Water

At your request I have obtained from Kortlang the executive Summary of market research conducted by Kortlang on behalf of SA Water during May this year. This was proposed as part of Kortlang's brief to prepare a marketing strategy for the outsourcing project.

Kortlang advises the results must be read in the context of little or no marketing of the concept having been undertaken by SA Water at this stage, and that there has been considerable effort and a shift in public perception since then.

Under the supervision and direction of the Chief Executive Officer and the new SA Water Board, it is understood further research will be undertaken to monitor public perceptions of which I have asked to be kept informed.

Please let me know of any particular concerns or questions you may have about this research which is now four months old.

The memorandum is personally signed by John Olsen, Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and Minister for Infrastructure.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Mr Speaker, this is a serious matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Finance and others will come to order.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The signed memorandum was dated 18 August 1995, two months before the Premier's first statement to the House that the research was not commissioned on behalf of his department and three months before the former Premier absolutely denied the existence of taxpayer funded polling. Mr Speaker, the Opposition will give you a copy of excerpts from a Cabinet subcommittee meeting held on 11 October 1995 in which the present Premier briefs the committee on the polling and which states that the committee had been previously supplied with the research, together with related interpretations and conclusions. The Opposition also has a submission dated March 1995 from Kortlang addressed to this Premier's former department proposing to undertake polling on behalf of the Government. The Opposition has a minute to the present Premier dated 7 April 1995 seeking his concurrence as Minister to undertake a consultancy which includes market research into water outsourcing. The Opposition has another minute—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Do I get the same protection, Mr Speaker, during a privileges matter?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat. I sincerely hope that he is not reflecting on the Chair. All members receive the same protection. The conduct of some members on both sides of the House this afternoon has been far below the Chair's expectation of the sort of behaviour elected members should display. The Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Thank you, Sir. The Opposition has another minute from a senior Premier's Department executive, Matthew O'Callaghan, urging care on how the issue of who had the research and how the Government could use the research were addressed because of what had been publicly asserted by the present and former Premiers about the water polling. The Opposition has a transcript of a radio interview with the Premier just last week in which he stated clearly that his department, SA Water, did commission polling, contradicting his statement to the House two years ago and today.

I have quoted previously in this House the precedents in relation to the matter of misleading the House and Parliament, and you, Sir, found a breach on 5 December last year. I ask you, Sir, to examine these documents and the statements made in this House by both the Premier and the former Premier and to rule *prima facie* that a case of misleading the House has been made. I ask you to give precedence to a motion to establish a Privileges Committee to determine whether the Premier misled the House on 18 October 1995, 29 November 1995 and today, and whether the Minister for Industrial Affairs as Premier of this State deliberately misled this House on 28 November 1995.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will take into consideration what the honourable member has said and bring back a considered response.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Tourism):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I advise the House that I have agreed with recommendations of the South Australian Tourism Commission Board for changes to be made to the structure and organisation of the commission. The changes will be appropriate and consistent with the Government's commitment to the promotion of South Australia as a tourism destination. As part of the proposed changes, Australian Major Events will be integrated with the South Australian Tourism Commission as an integral operation group and the Australian Major Events Board will serve as an advisory council to me as Minister.

The SATC was established in 1993 under the SATC Act to promote South Australia as a tourist destination and to further develop and improve the State's tourism industry. The Act further prescribes that the SATC shall have a board of directors reporting to the Minister to direct the activities of the SATC and its Chief Executive.

The South Australian Events Board, trading as Australian Major Events, was formed as an agency of the Minister for Tourism under articles of establishment signed by the Minister on 31 October 1994. AME is controlled by a board which has powers to perform as an agent of the Crown under delegation from the Minister. The primary function of AME is to secure and stage major events for South Australia,

thereby increasing the State's exposure and economic development.

The functions of the South Australian Tourism Commission and Australian Major Events are closely linked. Australian Major Events organises major events which are packaged and marketed by the Tourism Commission. The South Australian Tourism Commission and the Australian Major Events partnership has been responsible for supporting over 40 major events to date, generating an estimated \$90 million in economic activity and 40 000 visitors to South Australia.

In view of the close relationship between these two Government agencies, it is proposed that they be merged and collocated. Australian Major Events' 16 staff, currently located in Hospitality House, 60 Hindmarsh Square, will be accommodated within the existing offices of the Tourism Commission at 178 North Terrace following minor accommodation works and internal office layout adjustments.

In addition to being logical, this merger will realise substantial recurrent savings through reduced office rental and equipment costs, reduction in staff salaries and reduced board fee payments. The merger will require a capital expenditure of up to \$100 000 to finance minor works required to accommodate Australian Major Events staff within the Tourism Commission's existing offices. Funds for this work will be provided from within existing Tourism Commission and Australian Major Events budgets and from the recurrent savings that will be realised in the first year. The estimated savings in recurrent expenditure are as follows: office rental, \$120 000; office equipment, \$10 000; salaries, \$190 000; and board fees, \$112 000. Total estimated savings will be \$432 000 per annum.

The merger will enable staff resources to be reduced by three, including one chief executive. The Tourism Commission's Chief Executive position is currently vacant, and the Australian Major Events' Chief Executive has been undertaking both roles since 4 November 1996 in an acting capacity. Applications have been called Australia wide for the appointment of a permanent chief executive. The proposal also recommends that the two boards be merged. The Tourism Commission's board has nine directors and the Australian Major Events board has nine directors. The new board will consist of a maximum of 10 directors, pursuant to the SA Tourism Commission Act. The SA Tourism Commission board considered this matter at its meeting on 18 December and resolved to endorse the merger of Australian Major Events and the South Australian Tourism Commission. The office accommodation issues have been discussed with the Government accommodation unit, which raises no objection to the relocation, provided the SATC continues to pay rental on the offices vacated by the AME until an alternative tenant assumes the lease.

#### ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Local Government):** I seek leave to make a further brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** As I said, I can assure you that the second article on page one is absolutely false.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is not the subject of a ministerial statement.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I wish to correct an article in the *Advertiser* today which is headed 'City council could go next year' and which misrepresented my and the Government's intentions for Adelaide City Council. The first paragraph in this article states:

The Adelaide City Council could be sacked next year to make way for the election of a new council under a new structure, the Local Government Minister, Mr Ashenden, said yesterday.

That is not correct. I did not say that I intended to sack the council next year to make way for a new council, and it is not my or the Government's intention. What I do intend to do is to work with the council, the Opposition, the Democrats and representatives of the residents of Adelaide and of wider metropolitan Adelaide to decide on a process that will be used to determine the future governance of the council. I have no plan at this stage to delay the May elections, because any changes that are to be made to the governance may take more than a year to finalise. However, if the council is in favour of an election deferral I am prepared to consider that request. I have convened a meeting of interested parties for later this week to continue discussions on the process which should be adopted to consider the future governance of the city.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart has had more than a fair go.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Well, it is the first time you were not the offender.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I bring up the following reports of the Public Works Committee: the forty-sixth report of the Flinders Medical Centre Private Hospital Development and the forty-seventh report on the Adelaide International Airport Runway Extension and move:

That the reports be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr OSWALD:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is customary for the Deputy Premier to move that the reports be printed.

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

That the reports be printed.

Motion carried.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### WATER OUTSOURCING CONTRACTS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Given the security bar coding of Cabinet documents, does the Premier believe that a member of the former Premier's staff or one of his ministerial or parliamentary colleagues handed documents about the water deal to the Opposition and, if so, has that person been confronted with the Premier's evidence or suspicions, as his staff are currently briefing the media?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The staff are not currently briefing the media. These are the tactics of the Opposition, and its objective is to try to drive in wedges. It might try, but it will not work.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Let us look at the circumstances. I have been very interested to read a number of articles of

recent times on these so-called leaked documents. I presume they were all leaked; they might have come from the break-in from SA Water's premises, for all I know, in which case they would be stolen documents and a criminal offence would have been committed. I do not know the answer to that, but I was fascinated to read in the *Sunday Mail*—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Spence to order for the second time.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—the account of the Leader of the Opposition to Mike Duffy as to what had occurred. The Leader of the Opposition missed his calling: he should be an author. His imagination just went wild. I ask the House to think about it. It was a Dick Tracy special. It conjured up the idea and the vision of the Leader of the Opposition with his trench coat, with his hat pulled down tightly over his ears and with some sunglasses; and, to add to the intrigue, he was dropped off by a taxi two blocks from the front lounge room of this so-called prominent Liberal. If you were doing that, why would you ask the Leader of the Opposition into your lounge room to exchange the papers?

**The Hon. D.S. Baker:** You would like to have a beer.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, you would like to have a beer. You would have a bit of neutral ground. There we have the Leader of the Opposition going down to this meeting that he alleges took place. You can almost see him speaking into his watch radio phone, 'Mike to Ralph, Mike to Ralph, I'm getting close to the deal.' As fertile as the Opposition's imagination is, it simply will not work. The Leader of the Opposition wants us all to believe that it was a Liberal—and, what is more, a high ranking Liberal—who did this. Try as he will, it will fall on dead ground and dead ears and will get no action from me.

As I said the other day, so what? We are talking about something that happened two years ago. If the media go through the schedules in the documentation that I have tabled today, they will see in the bar coding, 'Polling, commissioned by Kortlang to Public Opinion Strategies'—or whatever was the name of the company. Kortlang commissioned them, and that is exactly what I and the former Premier told the House. There is no doubt about that; there is total consistency and accuracy. Try as he will, all the Leader of the Opposition wants to do is create this innuendo and suspicion. The simple fact is that his great Dick Tracy theory that he put forward last week will not wash; it is just too bizarre by half.

##### MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Will the Premier inform the House of recent activities in South Australia to preserve jobs in the car industry and indicate whether the Opposition has made a submission? The reason for my question is the recent circulation of the Productivity Commission's Draft report on the future of the automotive industry.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I thank the honourable member for her question today and obviously her keen interest in the automotive industry, given the significance of Mitsubishi to her electorate. I just wish the Opposition would show the same concern for a major policy issue that will have an impact on South Australia in the future and get onto the real issues about jobs for South Australians rather than concentrating on the petty politics of two years ago. This is a critical and important policy issue for South Australia; let no-one underestimate that. This Productivity Commission report was released late last year, and there is a majority report and a

minority report. The minority report, by Ian Weber, in effect, supports the South Australian Government's position before the Productivity Commission.

This draft report will now lay on the table until 12 May. On 12 May, a final report will go to the Commonwealth Government. I have sought and obtained from the Prime Minister, on two occasions, as late as yesterday in a telephone discussion with him, a commitment that, prior to Cabinet's giving consideration to this question, there will be detailed discussions and consultations with the Government of South Australia. We will pursue vigorously the interests of South Australians in the form of 17 000 jobs, and 44 000 jobs, second and third tier.

One of the arguments put forward was that by reducing tariffs you reduce the cost of cars to the domestic car market. If the Federal Government or, more particularly, Bill Scates, is fair dinkum about reform in this country and getting the cost of cars down for domestic customers, he should tackle the wholesale sales tax, which is \$5 000 on a Magna and a Commodore and not the \$2 000 post the year 2000 that is related to tariffs. In the body of his report, Bill Scates says that tax reform is more important than tariff reform. If that is the case, his report is fundamentally flawed, because the recommendations are totally silent on the need for the Commonwealth to address wholesale sales tax as it impacts on the domestic car market in Australia.

It is important to have this matter clarified sooner rather than later, for the following reason: members would have seen in the paper today encouraging positive news that there will be 400 new jobs at General Motors leading up to the Vectra production line, as well as decisions on second and third tier automotive component suppliers. They are the people who are making investment decisions, many of them overseas, looking at Australia's policy direction before they make further investment decisions. Investment decisions equal job creation. We have to get this matter sorted out as early as possible to remove any doubt and uncertainty in terms of the investment climate in the automotive industry in South Australia and Australia.

The other important factor in this whole question is industry policy, particularly the export facilitation scheme that has assisted Mitsubishi and Air International to sell air-conditioning units and steering columns to Korea and to sell rear-view mirrors to BMW in Germany and to Ford in the United States. They have been able to access those international markets not only because we have a skilled and reliable work force in South Australia but also because we can access the international marketplace on price and quality.

The export facilitation scheme has enabled us to get into those markets and to be internationally competitive. It is absolutely critical for the future of South Australia that access to the international market is not impeded by any policy decision of the Commonwealth Government. I welcome any public support that the Leader of the Opposition would give to the quest of the South Australian Government to ensure the policy outcome is right, importantly, for every South Australian.

#### WATER OUTSOURCING CONTRACTS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Given the Premier's claims today that you, as Premier, were kept fully informed about the water polls, does the Minister still stand by his statement in the House on 28 November

1995 that the Government did not commission any market research on the water contract and, if so, on what basis does the Minister make that claim, given his briefing from the former Minister for Infrastructure, John to Dean, on 18 August, three months before his statement to this House that no Government polling was undertaken whatsoever?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Minister for Industrial Affairs, if he cares to answer the question.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** 'Yes', Mr Speaker.

#### NORTH WEST WATER

**Mr WADE (Elder):** Will the Minister for Infrastructure inform the House of the benefits to be gained for South Australians from North West Water winning the water supply and waste water treatment concession in the Philippines?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** North West Water, which won the contract for 10 filtration plants in South Australia, will export its jobs and infrastructure into Manila and the Philippines. One of the major projects set up in the South Australian water industry was the development of jobs in South Australia because of export opportunities. Clearly, North West Water, through its advertisements in the *Australian* and in all Australian papers this week, called for some 37 executive jobs in South Australia to build a water industry and export business in South Australia. One of the fantastic benefits from the development of our water is the opportunities for young South Australians. The \$3.2 billion concession is for 25 years, so it is a long-term opportunity to create jobs for young people in South Australia. It is important that we recognise that the spinoff from the water industry is already starting to develop job opportunities in South Australia of long-term value for South Australians, particularly our young people.

#### FISHER, MEMBER FOR

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Has the Premier investigated the claims by the former Minister and member for Fisher that Ministers were 'actively lying', and will the Premier identify and dismiss those Ministers who have broken the Liberal Party code of conduct for ministerial behaviour? In an interview last Friday, the former Employment Minister said:

I have seen some pretty unethical behaviour. People who hold ministries are actively lying and doing all sorts of things, and I don't think the public of South Australia wants that.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The series of questions we have had today from the Opposition clearly indicate that it has learned nothing from the 1980s and the 1990s—absolutely nothing! It was the Bannon Labor Government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—and the Leader of the Opposition who, in effect, bankrupted South Australia. We did not create the mess, but we accept absolutely the responsibility for cleaning it up, and we will get on with the job. However, the series of questions posed by the Opposition show an absolute dearth of policy ideas or initiatives. It shows no concept, no vision, no program and no interest in the direction of South Australia.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is interested only in cheap political point scoring spots and not in rigorous debate about



the interests of South Australians. Even though I know that he will never take it from me, I will give the Deputy Leader a little bit of advice: the public of South Australia are not interested in what one politician says about another. However, they are interested in what the politicians will do about job creation for their children in this State. That is what they are interested in. They are not interested in the irrelevant trivia that members opposite put on the agenda today. May members opposite long keep this up, because they are demonstrating to the electorate at large that they are not worthy of consideration as an alternative Government in the foreseeable future.

### MINING AND EXPLORATION

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** Will the Minister for Mines explain to the House what is being done to ensure that there are adequate water supplies for potentially important mining opportunities in South Australia? The South Australian exploration initiative has stimulated an increase in exploration activity and mineral discoveries in this State, particularly in the Gawler Craton region.

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his interest in the matter. For those members who were riveted to their radios on Sunday looking for some positive news on South Australia—they were not getting it from the Opposition—there was a release from Mines and Energy South Australia about a ground water survey of the Great Artesian Basin. For those members who do not know, the Great Artesian Basin covers one-fifth of Australia and roughly one-third of South Australia.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** I am reiterating the information: some members opposite do not understand because they are reading these other documents.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** The importance of the Great Artesian Basin is that it has allowed the development of Roxby Downs—an initiative that the Leader of the Opposition tried to stop. Mines and Energy has carried out that work as it relates to Roxby Downs. However, there is some more good news, because there is potential for quite significant gold mineralisation in the Tarcoola area. A viable gold mine in that area must have adequate ground water, and Mines and Energy is carrying out work on the edges of the Great Artesian Basin to assess the amount of water available for mining in that region. That work will be completed in 12 months.

**Mr Venning:** Is there more?

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** There is more—there is lots more—and it will all happen this year. I can assure members that later this year significant announcements will be made about what is happening in South Australia, and Mines and Energy will be part of that.

### FISHER, MEMBER FOR

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Does the Premier know the identity of those members of the Liberal Party who the former Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education and the member for Fisher says are dishonest and who may have been involved in the offering of inducements to members to vote for the Premier as Leader of the Liberal Party? In a radio interview on

Monday, the member for Fisher refused to rule out allegations of money being offered to campaign funds as inducements in the Brown-Olsen contest. The member for Fisher said that he knew the identity of a small group of dishonest people in the Liberal Party and said, 'When people are dishonest, I wouldn't be surprised what they did.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I do not know what we have to do to encourage the Opposition to say something positive—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—about a policy direction for South Australia. I would have thought that the Deputy Leader would have in his electorate a school, a hospital, some jobs, roads or some other matters—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I name the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for continually defying the Chair.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Unley, whose assistance is not required when I am dealing with a sensitive matter. The honourable member will be the next person named if he says another word. Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wish to be heard in explanation or apology?

**Mr CLARKE:** Yes, Sir. I apologise to you, Sir, for transgressing your rulings.

**The SPEAKER:** As it is the first day, I will accept the honourable member's apology on the condition that he does not interject again today. If he does, he will be named forthwith.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** To come back to the point, I wish that this Opposition, the Labor Party, would start focusing on some real issues for South Australia. As I mentioned, the Opposition is demonstrating day by day how it is not worthy of consideration to form a Government in this State. I hope that it keeps up these tactics. Keep going guys: do not let me dissuade you from what you are doing, because day by day you are convincing the electorate that you have not learnt a thing from the past. You crippled the State. You have not even attempted to re-establish your credibility in South Australia as a Party with policies that are important for South Australia 2000 and beyond.

Rather, you work on allegations, rumour, no evidence and hearsay, and you pump it up. Chris Kenny released a book, *The State of Denial*, which talked about how members opposite acted in pumping up rumour machines, how they got rumours going in Adelaide and the effect and the political impact of that sort of thing. We know the tactics. I simply say that the claims, unsubstantiated allegations and rumour that members opposite drop on the table today are absolute rubbish.

### TOBACCO PRODUCTS

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Will the Treasurer advise the House what action the Government is taking to streamline tobacco products legislation in South Australia?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I announced today that I would be seeking leave to introduce a Bill tomorrow that merges the provisions of the Tobacco Products Control Act and the Tobacco Products Licensing Act so that tobacco provisions will then be under one Act. The House would recognise the damage caused to the community by smoking and, of course,

an extraordinary amount of evidence has been produced about the harmful effects of tobacco and smoking.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Some of the advertising and the education programs have had outstanding success but a lot still remains to be done. The link between tobacco and health has been well established. As most members would recognise, the tar content of tobacco has also caused considerable damage. The Bill being brought before this House recognises that there should be a differential in the way tobacco is taxed. A three-tiered taxation system will be attached to tobacco products, of course mostly to cigarettes. The tiered system takes the existing 100 per cent taxation to 105 per cent. The 105 per cent applies to tobacco products with a tar content of greater than 10 milligrams.

Cigarettes in the 0 to 4 milligram category will remain at 100 per cent, and those in the 5 to 9 milligram category will incur 102 per cent. A differential is being created, just as we have created differentials in terms of low and full strength beers and between super and unleaded petrol. Those differentials were introduced for very good reasons, as are the new taxation rates for tobacco. The Bill also prescribes increased penalties for those who transgress. It defines who can be a fit and proper person to be a merchant of tobacco.

I would like to pay tribute to my department and the Minister for Health. This program has been a matter of discussion over a period of time. There is a very strong health element to the combining of the Bills, as well as the mandatory taxation system. Of course, we include greater penalties for those who transgress, including those who sell to minors. Overall, there will be a strengthening of the regulation of the industry in the areas of importance, which we believe will lead to better outcomes for South Australians.

#### FISHER, MEMBER FOR

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Did the Premier reinstate the member for MacKillop to the ministry because of the role he played in deposing Dean Brown as Premier? In a radio interview on Friday morning, the member for Fisher and former Employment Minister said:

He [the Premier] says he wasn't part of it . . . but Dale Baker was one of the masterminds and supported by Ren DeGaris and people in the right wing of the Liberal Party. I mean, there is no secret about that.

The member for Fisher also said:

Dean Brown . . . is an honourable, decent person and I think that what happened and the way it happened was disgraceful and disgusting.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question is particularly dubious in relation to the Premier's responsibility to the House. The Chair will allow it, but I suggest that the honourable member round off his explanation or he will be ruled out of order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We have another inane question. The answer is 'No.'

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs provide details of increased benefits in wages and conditions of employment for employees in the South Australian Public Service as a result of the State Government's industrial relations and enterprise bargaining policies?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It is very interesting to look at what has been achieved under three years of Liberal Government in terms of enterprise agreements and to compare that with what occurred under the previous Labor Government from 1991 to 1993. As members know, under the former Labor Government from 1991 to 1993 Government employees—public servants—did not get one dollar increase in their salary from a general across-the-board wage increase. The only way that they could get an increase in salary was to go out and somehow manipulate or manoeuvre an increase in their position, in other words, a reclassification. They did have discussions with the union movement—the United Trades and Labor Council—and in about November 1993 that resulted in what they put down as an enterprise agreement framework. That framework did not deliver one extra dollar for Government employees.

I draw a sharp comparison of those years under Labor with what has occurred during the last three years under a Liberal Government. First, this Liberal Government has delivered wage increases to its employees of \$240 million, with a further \$60 million already locked in under existing agreements over the next two to three years. In other words, this Government will deliver a \$300 million increase despite the financial situation that we inherited on coming to Government. Thus, the Liberal Government has shown its ability to work very closely with its employees, to give them appropriate reward and to strike enterprise agreements with them which reflect the change in work practices that they have brought about within the public sector. It is fair to say that the reforms we introduced, first, through the new Public Sector Management Act—which I am very proud of having introduced as Premier—and the enterprise agreements that were negotiated, together with the change in productivity that has been brought about, have been of great benefit to the people of South Australia. Equally, we have now been able to reward our employees with a commitment of \$300 million in wage increases over that period.

It highlights a very sharp contrast between the former Labor Government and this Liberal Government, which, in fact, does care for its employees and which works very closely with them. It shows that the new industrial relations mechanisms we put in place have worked very effectively indeed.

#### FISHER, MEMBER FOR

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** As a senior economic Minister in the Brown Government and now as Premier, what responsibility does the Premier accept for claims by the former Employment Minister that the Government's economic policy is 'ideologically driven claptrap' that is turning people in the north and west into an underclass. In an interview on radio last Friday, the former Employment Minister and member for Fisher said:

Our State schools are crying out for upgrading and the people in the suburbs in the north and the west are being turned into an underclass of people because they are being denied quality public facilities . . . I've seen people suffering.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** At least by that question the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is attempting to demonstrate that he has been out in the electorate somewhere. That surprises me, because I think he spent most of last week in here trying to draft the questions he has posed today. How could one ever claim that a rebate of stamp duty for first home buyers was an economic rationalist policy direction?

How could you say that? We have put in place a policy that has some concern for first home buyers in South Australia. I ask the Deputy Leader to consult with his colleague, the member for Price, in relation to the Parks. The member for Price knows that I went back to look at that policy area. Is that what the honourable member has some concern about?

The honourable member's track record does not support his claims. Clearly, our track record indicates that there is a balance of policies looking after the needs of South Australians. We want to give first home buyers the first chance to get into that home sooner rather than later. What did we do? We introduced a modest stamp duty relief scheme. We would have liked to do a lot more, as the housing and real estate industries wanted. But why could we not? It was because of the debt that Labor left us three years ago. That is why we cannot do more.

We are moving down the track of budget integrity, reducing the deficit and getting some debt balance stabilisation and reduction. It is the right strategy for South Australia.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Spence will be the next one to be named.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is an important strategy for the legacy of our children in South Australia and it is one which will continue to be pursued by this Government as it has in the last three years. But where we have the capacity, we will give some encouragement in the economy. First home buyers are but one area. I refer to the youth employment strategy and to the small business strategy and policy that we put in place, giving encouragement to small business to employ school leavers from last year or those unemployed for greater than two months. Is that not a fair minded and reasonable policy direction that looks after all South Australians no matter where they live in South Australia?

We will stand foursquare on our track record over the last three years, and I will stand foursquare on what I have said over the last 2½ months. I will be more than happy to stand foursquare at the next election campaign on what we promised, on what we have delivered and on the solid foundation we are building South Australia for the future.

#### DISABLED ATHLETES

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Will the Minister for Disability Services share with the House any information as to community recognition for prominent South Australians with a disability?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the member for Unley for his question which, obviously, is the first to me as the Minister for Disability Services; indeed, it is the first question to a Minister for Disability Services in South Australia. The new portfolio reflects a focus by Government on the contribution and the needs of people with a disability. People with a disability enrich the South Australian community. Australia Day just past was a very good focus for our pride in our fellow South Australians who, frankly, conquer superbly with their disabilities. The South Australian Citizen of the Year this year was Mr Richard Maurovic. In 1986 Mr Maurovic became a quadriplegic following a horse riding accident. In 1997 he is a renowned professional artist who paints by using implements strapped to his hands. The recognition of his effort in the community is particularly fitting.

Equally, on Australia Day our paralympians were made members of the Order of Australia. These people include

basketballers Troy Andrews, David Gould, Tim Maloney and Richard Oliver; judo champion Anthony Clarke; cyclists Kerry Golding and Kieran Modra; and the track and field athlete Katrina Webb. I was lucky enough to be invited to the Julia Farr Centre shortly after the paralympians returned. It was an occasion of palpable joy where the athletes had conquered so brilliantly and done themselves and their families proud. I emphasise that, as is always the case, behind the stars there is, in fact, a constellation of ordinary South Australians with a disability who continually enrich their families and our community as they contribute in their own way to make us challenge our views and reassess what our life means and what it means to be an Australian.

When we see paralympians compete, we appreciate that participating in sport is an expression of the spirit as much as of the body. When we witness the sensory awareness of a person without sight, we know that contributing to society is more an act of will than an ability to see. And when we experience the thoughtfulness of a person with an intellectual disability, we know that civilisation, frankly, is a product of the heart rather than of the mind. I am delighted to take the opportunity to acknowledge the contribution of people with a disability to South Australia's community life, and I reaffirm the Government's commitment and determination to work with people with a disability so that they can contribute fully to society and enrich us as I know they wish to.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Does the Premier agree with the member for Fisher and former Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education that the real rate of unemployment in South Australia is actually twice the official rate, and will he say what is the Government's target for reduced unemployment for the end of 1997? On radio last Friday the member for Fisher said that he had been criticised by Liberal Caucus colleagues for stating that real unemployment in South Australia was about twice the official rate. South Australia's current official unemployment rate is 9.6 per cent. Since December 1993 the rate of new jobs growth has been 2.9 per cent compared with national jobs growth of nearly 8 per cent, and there was no jobs growth in the year to December 1996.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** What this Government has done over the past three years is put in place a number of policies that will bring about substantial rebuilding of the economy from where it was left by the former Labor Administration, that is, bankrupt as a result of its failed management of the finances of South Australia. Stabilising the debt, reducing the debt, is an achievement that we have put in place, and that will reflect in good credit ratings in the future. That, in turn, will reduce the interest bill paid by South Australians on the debt we inherited from the Labor Government's mismanagement. That will give us the capacity in the future of a greater amount of funds to put into essential services such as education, health and other community services that we would want to put in place.

It is why we put in place a youth employment strategy. It is why we are putting in place policies to assist small business to employ young South Australians. It is why we put in place stamp duty relief for first home buyers. It is all designed to rebuild the economy. It is why we have been able to attract and encourage Western Mining to make a \$1.25 billion investment. It is why Mitsubishi is putting a \$500 million

investment in South Australia. It is why General Motors is putting a \$1.4 billion investment into a second production line of the Vectra in South Australia. It is why SAFCOL is shifting its headquarters back from Victoria to South Australia. It is why Bonaire Vulcan shifted its manufacturing operations out of Victoria back to South Australia. It is why Westpac put its mortgage loan centre here, with something like 900 employees now and anticipating well over 1 000 employees within four years.

It is why EDS employment is up something like 570 or 600 now. It is why in Motorola we are progressing in terms of the commitment given for expansion in jobs. That is a list in but three years from a standing start. Compare that to the former Administration and what we inherited. I will see the Deputy Leader on the hustings any day and we will stand on our track record, and we will win on that track record.

#### MILE END SPORTS STADIUM

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** Will the Minister for Recreation and Sport provide a status report on the development of the athletics and netball stadiums at the Mile End redevelopment?

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** It is good to have a question from the member for Hanson, because he does not have an opposing candidate at the moment, I see from today's paper, so it looks as though the honourable member will get back unopposed. I welcome the honourable member back. The member for Hanson is now in the safest seat that you can imagine and is one of those lucky people who crosses the Hilton bridges frequently, so he, like many South Australians, can now see at first hand just what this Government has done in relation to sport in South Australia. At Mile End we had a situation where there was just an old rail yard, severely contaminated, which is now rapidly taking shape as one of the top sports precincts not only in this State but anywhere in Australia. Certainly, the athletics track will be of world class. I am delighted to be able to advise the member for Hanson on progress down there, and to reassure him that today I was again advised that both projects are on time; in fact, the athletics track is ahead of time. Both projects are expected to be completed in September.

I also point out to members opposite that over the many years they were in power they did absolutely nothing for sport in this State. This Government, in that one area alone, has spent almost \$20 million to ensure that two of the most important sports in this State are catered for. As far as athletics is concerned, we would all acknowledge that Kensington did a marvellous job for many years, and from that track many competitors from this State went on to national and international fame. Unfortunately, that track does not meet the stringent standards required for international competition today. Not only will the track we are now putting in down at Mile End enable us to bring in international competition but, more importantly, in the build up to the Olympics we will have athletes training in this State and acclimatising themselves for the Olympics in Sydney in the year 2000.

It depends on whom you speak to, but it can be strongly argued that netball has more competitors than any other sport in Australia. We are now providing a stadium at Mile End which will be second to none. It is a facility that the netballers are looking forward to utilising, and one that will enable top competition to be brought to this country. This area is in the member for Hanson's electorate, and there is a very good

residential development associated with the total redevelopment. So, we will have an international athletics facility, a world class netball stadium and a very good and well planned residential development in that area. This Government, with \$20 million, has turned an absolute eyesore into an area of which this State, as in so many other areas, can be absolutely proud.

#### STATE BUDGET

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** My question is directed to the Premier. Is the 1996-97 budget on track or is the deficit now expected to blow out? One of the factors bearing on the budget deficit outcome is the rate of economic growth in South Australia. The 1996-97 State budget forecast of gross State product was 2.75 of 1 per cent. On 14 January a director of the Canberra-based economic consultancy Econtech, Chris Murphy, released a study showing that South Australia is expected to have the lowest growth rate in the Commonwealth this financial year, of 1.1 per cent.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The budget is certainly on track and we will deliver it as we said we would at the beginning of the financial year.

*Mr Caudell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitchell is out of order.

#### SMALL BUSINESS

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. What assistance is being provided to small business in South Australia to help improve their environmental performance, and what effect is this having on their productivity and competitiveness?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** At the outset, I acknowledge the strong support the member for Norwood provides to small business in his electorate and in particular the support he provides for sound environmental policies in his electorate as well. I am very pleased to be able to answer this question because so often we hear from the Opposition, particularly from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, all the negatives associated with the responsibilities of the EPA. We all know the Deputy Leader wants the EPA to close down more industry which would create more unemployment and which would make the situation even worse than it was when we came into office three years ago. I will disappoint the Deputy Leader because that is not what this Government and the Environment Protection Authority are about.

The small business pollution prevention project is being conducted in a number of areas of South Australia, particularly in the metropolitan area; for example, the Edwardstown, Melrose Park area—and I acknowledge the interest that the member for Elder has shown in that project—the cities of Marion and Mitcham and the Patawalonga Catchment Board. It has been a model of success, so much so that it is now spreading into other areas, and other States are showing a strong interest in this program. I bring to the attention of the House some of the outcomes from that project. They include: the reduction in noise levels by a number of companies; reducing stormwater contamination by increased vigilance in cleaning up and avoiding spills; installing taps on oil lines; clearing rubbish from the vicinity of rail yards; storing chemicals more appropriately—and the list goes on, because a number of industries are involved in this program.

It is all good for business and particularly good for the environment in this State. I am also pleased—and this will be of interest to the member for Norwood—to be able to say that the small business pollution prevention program is now being launched in the Torrens catchment area specifically to target heavy and light industrial activity in Campbelltown, Payneham, St Peters, Burnside and the Kensington and Norwood council areas. Through the Eastern Metropolitan Regional Health Authority, the Torrens Catchment Board and the Office of Environment Protection, this particular campaign will provide cleaner promotion initiatives to help alleviate stormwater contamination of the Torrens River. We all recognise the high priority given to that project by this Government. As a first step, an environment protection project officer will be employed to liaise with the industry and to arrange a series of workshops, seminars and site visits.

This is the type of pro-active response that should be supported to bring about an improved environment performance. It is in sharp contrast, as I said earlier, to the Labor Party, which, of late, has given the impression that it would close down every business and throw people out of work rather than try to tackle environmental issues at the source and encourage, instruct and guide industry to change its ways.

In conclusion, this Government believes that economic, environment and social considerations can work in harmony, and it is important that that is the case. We only have to look at the \$250 million or so being invested by local industry in environmental upgrades to prove this point throughout South Australia. As a result, business improves by being more competitive, the community reaps the benefits in a social sense and the environment becomes an overall winner. I am sure that the member for Norwood agrees with the fact that all these efforts need to be applauded.

#### WATER SUPPLY, NORTHERN SUBURBS

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** Will the Minister for Infrastructure explain why the residents of outer northern suburbs have been receiving dirty water for up to six weeks and say when this problem will be rectified? Many of my constituents have been complaining about water which appears to be unfiltered, causing concerns about the impact on health and resulting in the staining of clothes.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Any person living in any part of the city who, on turning on the tap, receives dirty water obviously has some major concerns and, as far as SA Water is concerned, it is something that should not happen. There are many reasons for it, and three prime reasons are as follows. First, a massive usage of water creates extreme volumes through the pipe and it obviously disrupts some of the internal sediment in the pipe which, as anyone would know, creates a major problem. Secondly, at this particular time there has been a significantly higher manganese level in the water than normally occurs: that is an issue that has to be properly treated, and SA Water, through United Water management, is moving to ensure that that problem is minimised. Thirdly, with the massive use of water at the same time there is an increase in the use of chlorine which also has the chemical effect of attacking the side of the pipes. They are the three fundamental reasons for the increased colouring problem.

It is my understanding that the issue lasted for three or four weeks and is now coming under control. It is an issue about which SA Water is very concerned, and it is working to minimise this problem. If there are any special areas about

which the honourable member is concerned, she can take them up with me and I will have SA Water examine them directly to see whether any special reasons exist for the problem.

#### YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House of recent efforts to combat youth unemployment? Late last year the Premier announced a youth employment initiative involving Government, private sector and community groups in a \$30 million investment in our youth.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I thank all members for their support, and I sincerely thank the member for Kaurna for her question. I know the honourable member has had a great and keen interest in the area of youth employment and particularly in the area of assisting to look at jobs which we as a Government are creating for youth. The member for Kaurna has also had an involvement in the Government's employment youth task force which initiated many of the schemes that this Government is bringing into place. In December the Premier released the Youth Employment Statement. This is the first time any State Government anywhere in Australia has made such a concerted and broad ranging commitment to improving youth employment. The key to this program is the participation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Neither will the Minister for Finance or the Deputy Leader be in the House much longer if they continue.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** The key to this program is the participation of all sectors; that is, Government, business, industry, the community and education sectors to provide the solutions to youth unemployment. Two particular initiatives which I have been pleased to announce in the past fortnight have been Job Shop and Community at Work. These programs complement the already highly successful Kickstart for Youth, the group training scheme Self-starter and the State Government youth recruitment scheme of 150 trainees. Job Shop invites a range of Government agencies, as well as community service organisations, to act as job brokers and match young people with suitable employers in their area. Most service clubs, as members will know, are well placed to act as brokers because of their extensive community and business networks, and each time they are successful the Government will provide a financial incentive.

Service groups will have access to up to \$400 for each young person who gains 350 hours of paid work. These groups will have access to \$200 for each young person who is guaranteed 20 hours of paid work, sliding up to \$400 when the 350-hour target has been reached. This program aims to take full advantage of the great wealth of knowledge and energy that is contained within the service clubs in each electorate.

The Community at Work initiative, which was announced last week, also calls on community groups to get together and develop projects which will boost employment in their local areas. The Government will provide grants of up to \$20 000 for worthy projects which will guarantee jobs, particularly for young people, by revitalising business communities and improving business performance. The projects may include worthwhile community ventures including business, environmental, cultural and training projects. At least 20 projects will

be funded this year, with at least 60 per cent of the projects located in regional areas of the State, which are extremely important, as every member would know.

The State Government realises that there is much to be done in the area of youth employment, but it is important to recognise that Governments alone cannot solve this problem. That is why we are seeking to bring the community, the education sector and employers into our overall strategy, and we will continue to do that. Both these programs are a very important step in this Government's commitment to providing real jobs and a positive future for the youth of South Australia.

This points to a Government that is taking constructive action to create employment; meanwhile, the Opposition continues to harp, carp and highlight negatives instead of positives in the area of youth employment. I trust that members opposite will get off their collective butts and support these youth initiatives because these very initiatives can be lifted and raised with a little bit of effort from each of them in their electorate. They should support the youth of this State instead of knocking them.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair heard the ringing of a mobile phone. I point out to everyone in the Chamber, particularly those in the media, that there is a shortage of mobile phones at Parliament House, so we will have some if it happens again.

#### CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education give a guarantee to this House that she will not move to abolish or diminish the Construction Industry Training Fund?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I thank the honourable member for her question and advise her that the CITB board is under review. I am sure that the honourable member is aware that the legislation under which the board was set up called for a review to take place in February this year. That review is under way, and there is nothing further to report until that review has been completed.

#### WOOL INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT BOARD

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** Will the Minister for Primary Industries inform the House of the likely benefits to South Australia from the Wool Industry Development Board, which he announced last week?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the honourable member for Custance. I am sure that, with his two sheep, he will benefit greatly from this board, as well. As the honourable member said, last week I announced the membership of the Wool Industry Development Board, and we are fortunate that excellent people have accepted positions on this board. This shows that a lot of business and community leaders in South Australia are willing to give the Government a go and to try to get behind the Government and make things happen.

In my first meeting with the board last week, the desire of this group to do something in the interests of South Australia and its wool growers became obvious. This talented group will be chaired by top marketing and wine industry leader Perry Gunner, and it was terrific to see that board members were excited by the challenge of increasing returns to wool growers, and many ideas were floated on the night. The wool industry remains an important player in increasing the primary industry sector's contribution to the State's economy,

which over the next decade we hope to increase from \$3 billion to \$4 billion; and with this type of effort we will succeed.

Our primary producers have done an excellent job in increasing production over the years, but this increase in production has not been reflected in returns or in terms of trade. This board and those covering other industries will focus on new ideas and opportunities to see that our primary producers' incomes increase. We want greater profits for farmers and more jobs and wealth creation for South Australia.

---

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** This afternoon I want to speak about two important, ongoing developments in the electorate of Hanson which mean employment, sporting facilities of world-class status and much-needed housing. I refer to the Hilton shopping development on Burbridge Road and the Mile End railyards development, which has been in progress for about 18 months and which the Minister addressed in Question Time today.

The Mile End development is an outstanding State Government initiative which is the regeneration of wasteland into a world-class sporting facility for athletics and netball and a housing complex, and all within one mile of the City of Adelaide. As the Thebarton City Manager, Mr Alan Radbone, said recently, we are seeing the conversion of an old, derelict, dirty and unused railyard into something that will be clean, vegetated and populated. In other words, it has been a dramatic transformation.

This development is to be finished late in 1997 and it gives first-time visitors coming from the airport a great impression of the City of Adelaide. Venturing down an upgraded and beautified road, Burbridge Road, which is the main approach to the city, the visitor moves on to Hilton Bridge, where he or she will ultimately be able to view first-hand to the north a world-class sporting stadium and housing complex, and to the south a magnificent new home for netball in South Australia. The project manager, Mr Manuel Delgado, said that it was one of the largest bio-remediation projects in Australia, successfully dealing with soil contamination from continued rail use over many, many decades.

The \$8 million athletics facility will have a 1 000 seat grandstand, gym and sports injury clinic, among many other things, and the \$9.9 million home for the Netball Association will have four indoor courts, 3 000 seats, media facilities, corporate boxes and, initially, eight outdoor courts. This area was totally neglected by the previous Labor Government during its time in office. When completed, the complex will benefit the constituents of Hanson and all South Australians, especially the young people who will have opportunities to perform at these outstanding, world-class venues.

The second point I wish to make is that, finally, the Hilton Shopping Centre development is under way. Work has started on the site on Burbridge Road, Hilton, opposite the West Torrens council chambers and the civic centre. The council, led by Mayor George Robertson, has put much energy, time

and money into the project becoming a reality. During the two year struggle to build the centre, the plans were twice rejected by the Development Assessment Commission and the Supreme Court, and the plans were also approved three times by the DAC. The council's legal bill has totalled more than \$25 000, and the council has spent more than \$1.5 million on the project itself. It is great to see the bulldozers and the tractors finally moving in and working on that site. The shopping centre should be completed by September this year.

I welcome this development. After exercising a great deal of patience, everyone in the western suburbs of Hanson welcomes this development, especially the residents of Hilton, Cowandilla, Richmond, West Richmond and parts of Brooklyn Park. This Government has already indicated its intention and philosophy regarding business development in this State. The Olsen Liberal Government recognises the necessity and urgency to create jobs. It has always totally supported the Hilton development. I too have always been a vocal supporter and have openly and publicly supported the West Torrens council and the residents. I look forward to watching this development and ultimately seeing it put into operation as a shopping centre.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** I wish to talk about the issue that has dominated Question Time today and the media for the best part of the past five or six days. The Premier has tried to give the impression that this is irrelevant, and that this leaking of documents to the Opposition and their subsequent provision to the public is somehow not the main game. I say to the Premier of this State that the main game must always be the integrity and honesty of our leader, the Premier. It is not good enough for our Premier to be flippant and say that this is of little consequence to the main game. His integrity and honesty to this Parliament is very much the main game. As we know, back in October 1995, the then Premier as Minister for Infrastructure said, after being asked whether polling had been conducted:

I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the South Australian Water Corporation has not as a corporation commissioned polling.

That is a blatant, deliberate attempt to say that none of the SA Water Corporation, EWS or the Government had commissioned polling. The documentation provided to the Opposition has clearly shown that not to be correct.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart has to bear in mind that his own Leader has placed this matter in the hands of the Speaker for investigation. The honourable member was in order in making passing observations about the matter, but now he is introducing the subject of the investigation and as such his comments are out of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** I take your point and will observe your guidance on that matter, Sir. I draw to your attention an affidavit provided by Mr Ted Phipps, the present Chief Executive Officer of SA Water under this Government. In a court case that the Opposition took against the Government, the present Chief Executive Officer of SA Water said in that affidavit:

In order to facilitate the work of the consultancy, Kortlang commissioned Public Opinion Strategies to conduct market research. A report was subsequently prepared in relation to this research conducted in May 1995. I requested Kortlang to provide the Minister with a copy of the report for the purposes of discussion by the subcommittee. I believe that the Minister subsequently received a copy of the report.

Mr Phipps went on to state:

On 2 August 1995 Kortlang Pty Ltd were again engaged as consultants to SA Water Corporation.

So, clearly, months before the Premier rose in this House he was fully aware; and, as the documentation released today points out and which is subject to an investigation by the Privileges Committee, I believe it will be found to be quite clear evidence that the Premier of this State has been deliberately misleading in his statements on this matter. The whole issue of the water contract is very much the main game. That is why the former Premier commissioned hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money to research the issue. It was very much the main game, and the member for Mawson knows it was the main game.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. This matter is before the Privileges Committee and ought to be left there. It has been requested that all these issues be referred to the Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am inclined to agree with the Deputy Premier. The matter came under investigation the instant it was referred to the Speaker. The Deputy Premier has raised the point that the honourable member is now continuing to debate the substance of the matter, namely, the evidence which has been placed before the Speaker for investigation. The honourable member's comments over the past 30 seconds or so are clearly part of that substance that will be placed before the Speaker.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Surely the only possibility of prejudicing an investigation is when that investigation starts. The Speaker has not ruled that there will be a debate on the Privileges Committee, let alone a Privileges Committee, so there is no investigation to prejudice.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The question of prejudice is not at issue. The question is simply that the matter has been referred to the Speaker for investigation. The honourable member was quoting the substance of that. The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** As one of the members representing the southern areas of Adelaide I have heard again in recent times the fabricator, the Leader of the Opposition, running around saying he has documents indicating that there is an acute shortage of police and that law and order is a major issue in the south. It is interesting that, when my colleagues and I start to investigate this, no-one in a senior position in the South Coast police division knows anything about this document that the Leader of the Opposition has been brandishing around to the media. If the Leader of the Opposition is serious about what he says in that document, he should table it in Parliament tomorrow or stop misleading the community of South Australia by fabricating issues again.

The Leader of the Opposition should be reminding the people of South Australia of the simple fact that any problems that relate to youth and law and order were primarily created when the Leader of the Opposition was a senior Cabinet Minister during the debacle of this State not only financially but also in devaluing the family unit, breaking up families and destroying the social fabric of this State. That is why there is frustration and law and order problems in the community.

I commend the police down our way. I know many of those police officers very well and I know that they do a

diligent and committed job to ensure that the community in the south is kept safe. They also do a lot of extraordinary work. Only last weekend I was privileged to have one of them out with me and the community on a graffiti wipe-out, and I have them at meetings and so on, where they are committed and do lots of voluntary work. I am happy to put on the table that I know that, whilst most of the police are there in a bipartisan manner, one or two police officers in the Christies Beach station actively support the Labor Party. It would not surprise me if the documentation, if it is around, has been put forward—

**Mr CLARKE:** On a point of order, Sir, the member for Mawson has cast serious aspersions on serving officers of the Police Force with respect to the Christies Beach station. Being public servants they are not in a position to publicly defend themselves, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member has no point of order. Members are free to range as widely as they wish. An individual member takes personal responsibility for any comments made under privilege in the House.

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Sir, in the closing weeks of last year, the Speaker cautioned me for criticising the District Superintendent of Education in my area. I wonder on what basis he cautioned me on that occasion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member would have to ask the Speaker. The Deputy Speaker is in no way responsible for another ruling.

**Mr BROKENSHERE:** I must have hit a raw nerve, judging by the frivolous points of order. If the Leader of the Opposition has a document he should table it so that we can look at it, and if he has not got the document he should not mislead the people of the south. Since coming to office an enormous amount of money has been spent on infrastructure for policing in the south. Look at the new Sturt centre—built at a cost of \$11 million. Labor had that opportunity and did nothing. It sat on its hands, destroyed the State and gave the south nothing. We have put in \$11 million of capital infrastructure. An additional five CIB detectives have been brought down south. We know also about the command response unit at Sturt, which clearly works and supports the south coast division right over the Fleurieu Peninsula.

There are never enough police and I would like to see police on every street corner. It would be a hell of a lot easier to have police on every street corner if the Labor Party had not bankrupted South Australia during its 10 or 11 years of terrible management as a Government. We have low major crime rates in the south. It is a safe place to live and it is important that we remind the people of the south about it. Instead of the Leader of the Opposition being negative he should build up empathy with our young people, create opportunities for young people and for South Australians, support the Government in what it is doing, give us an accolade about the expressway and the extensions of Mitsubishi in the south, the viticultural expansion and the money it is putting into rebuilding the schools that had little money put into them under Labor and letting the people of South Australia know that he is a credible leader. But, no, he is not prepared to do that but continues to mislead the public.

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

**Mr CLARKE:** On a point of order, Sir, the member for Mawson accused the Leader of the Opposition of misleading the Parliament. I ask him to withdraw that statement or otherwise do it by substantive motion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Under Standing Orders it is appropriate that a point of order be taken by the member offended: the Leader is not present in the House.

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** I take this opportunity to do something that rarely happens in this place, namely, to congratulate one of our local companies. Robway Safety Systems in December last year was proclaimed the winner of the Cathay Pacific China Trader of the Year Award, defeating three other Australian finalists. The awards recognise companies that have used imagination and innovation to break into the Chinese export market. Companies must be 100 per cent Australian owned and manufacture their exports largely, if not entirely, in Australia. In the case of Robway Safety Systems, 100 per cent manufacture of the systems occurs in the State in my electorate.

The judges of the award said that they were impressed by Robway Safety Systems decision to develop a niche market, a sector which Chinese safety system manufacturers had unsuccessfully tried to supply and they had failed to develop technology to cater for that market. Such a move has ensured the long-term viability of Robway's Chinese market and its systems now set the standard of quality for China-produced systems.

I understand that Robway Safety Systems has worked hard and has been keen to take its systems to the highest level and has become the only crane safety system supplier to be approved by the Chinese Occupational Health and Safety Commission and the Chinese State Bureau of Technical Supervision. In fact, Robway Safety Systems—its forerunner being Way's Cranes—commenced business in 1953, approximately 43 years ago, employs 30 staff, has about 30 other associated jobs that go with the company and is located at Thebarton. This proves that by hard work, sheer determination and sheer raw courage South Australian companies are able to go into other countries and obtain a niche market and the recognition they rightly deserve.

The Cathay Pacific China Trader of the Year Award is a high honour for a local company to obtain and the competition is pretty fierce. Robway Safety Systems is so well regarded in China and Hong Kong that it has become official consultants and suppliers to the Chinese ministry of electric power for crane safety systems, become sole supplier to two of China's largest crane manufactures, and won the highly sought after Hong Kong Hutchinson International Terminals contract. Persistence has been the key to cracking the Chinese export market, and the company will keep searching for new markets in China and elsewhere in the world.

Congratulations, well done Robway and its staff: it is great news for a local company, a company that did it on its own. This company has the get up and go to do something of benefit for South Australia by establishing a wonderful Australian reputation for safety systems. It is a reliable South Australian company and we should be very proud of it. I cannot express in sufficient words the high honour that this award brings that company. I wish the company all the success in the future.

The trouble is that this company is doing something positive, something for the benefit of the nation and the State, and we do not hear about it. We will not read a word in the *Advertiser*, the *Adelaide Review*, the *City Messenger* or anywhere else, because they are not interested. All we get is these airy-fairy stories about someone leaking water contracts—someone who perhaps may be a member of the Liberal Party or who may have a grouch against the South



Australian Government. It is the Opposition's role to criticise the Government but not to sabotage the State or to act as a traitor to development and job creation. I, like all South Australians, am disgusted at what has happened in the past few days and what has been alleged. I challenge those who are fabricating these stories to reveal their source or else give their stories to Barry Ion and Tony Pilkington of the Bazz and Pilko Show and Peter Plus, because they could create a better scenario when they do the Lone Ranger or Biggles. That is the type of performance we are getting in State politics. South Australia is more important to us all. As Rob Way and his company have shown, it is important to do something positive in South Australia. Every international flight that leaves Adelaide Airport carries some Rob Way systems to Asia. Well done!

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** In the past couple of weeks, my office has been inundated with phone calls from people ranging from Elizabeth Downs to Gawler regarding the appalling state of their water. They were complaining not about a mere discolouration of their water but about very dirty water. It has been causing staining of white clothes in the washing. It has been causing concern to people with young children who are reluctant to give their children such dirty water which has sediment in it and which forms scum on the top when it is boiled. In this sort of weather, when people are encouraged to give children water to keep up their fluid levels, people are reluctant to give them tap water.

This has been going on for some time now. Since some two weeks before Christmas, people have been ringing both SA Water and United Water about this state of affairs and have been getting very different answers, day by day, week by week. When they called United Water they were told that they would be compensated for the ruining of their clothes. However, SA Water has been telling them that they are not eligible for compensation. We heard from the Minister today that it is due to three causes: first, high flow of water (which surely happens every summer); secondly, high concentrations of manganese; and, thirdly, high concentrations of chlorine.

The second two reasons would probably come closest to explaining the cause of the problem. What the Minister did not say directly is that there is a chemical mix in the water. In other words, they are mucking around with chemicals in the water in those outer northern suburbs. The Minister said that this is causing the sediment on the side of the pipe to come off the pipes and go into the water. This raises more questions than it answers. We need to know what is in that sediment, the chemical composition of the sediment and the effects of this changing chemical mix on the health and safety of the residents in the outer northern suburbs. This problem has been spreading rapidly and is causing increasing consternation for people in my electorate. It is a problem that should be fixed, and fixed quickly. There has been mains flushing in the Craigmare area on the weekend, and reports from yesterday and today indicate that it has still not solved the problem.

United Water is in charge of fixing this problem yet it seems it does not know how to fix it or, in the first instance, why it happened. People in the affected areas who have always had crystal clear water ask why this year the problem is coming to the fore. In their telephone calls to me, my constituents are blaming the change in management of the water. They are saying that, when SA Water was a Government owned enterprise and responsible for the management of the water, this sort of thing did not happen to them. They

are saying that they are paying more for their water this year yet their water quality is absolutely appalling. People are talking about not paying their water bills because they cannot use the filthy, disgusting water and, even when they do use it, they cannot afford to pay for it.

We want clear answers from the Government about the sediment in the water and why the chemical mix had to change so rapidly. Why, suddenly, is there a higher concentration of manganese in the water and what action is United Water taking to fix this problem? The flushing is not working and the chemical mix is such that the problem is continuing to be magnified. The Government has mismanaged this situation as far as residents of the outer northern suburbs are concerned. I do not know why it has occurred simply in the suburbs within my electorate, but I warn members that, if United Water does not know what is causing the problem and if it cannot fix it in my area, maybe it will come to their areas next.

An honourable member: It will not be in Burnside.

**Ms HURLEY:** Possibly it will not be in Burnside, but let us hope that some of the executives of United Water live in areas where the problem will occur.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I pay tribute to the various citizens in my electorate who received Citizen of the Year awards this year. I offer my sincere congratulations and compliments to each of them. The citizens are: for the District Council of Warooka, Joanne Murdoch; the District Council of Yorketown, Maurice Johnson; the District Council of Minlaton, Coral Mumford; the District Council of Central Yorke Peninsula, John Simmons; the District Council of Northern Yorke Peninsula, Frank Camporeale; the Corporation of Wallaroo, Robert Miller; the District Council of Bute, Graham Taylor; and the District Council of Wakefield Plains, Ruth Catford.

It is wonderful that the Citizen of the Year awards are made available and that ordinary rank and file citizens are able to receive them. I use 'ordinary' in a very positive light. Too often so many of these people do so much for the community yet their work goes unrecognised. I was delighted to be present for the presentation of several of these awards and I would like to mention briefly a few things in which these people have been involved.

Joanne Murdoch, a relatively young person from Warooka who left the area for a while and then returned, has been actively involved in the netball club, not only playing but also umpiring, coaching and fundraising. She has assisted in the Southern Yorke Peninsula Business Centre and has been involved with the Western United SYP Sports Club in a variety of ways, most importantly as Treasurer. She has also helped with the organisation of cricket and football, and has been involved with the Warooka Progress Committee, in particular as secretary. It is great that a young person such as Joanne has been recognised through the Citizen of the Year award.

The recipient for the District Council of Yorketown, Maurice Johnson, comes from Coobowie and has been involved in many activities. I was pleased to be associated with Maurice in earlier years when I lived at Yorketown and it was great to be present at Maurice's presentation. He was involved with the Edithburgh Tennis Club; he played football for Edithburgh and has been involved in administration; he has umpired in the local football league and is now involved with the Southern Eagles Football Club. He has been a member of the Lion's Club of Yorketown, as well as its

secretary and president. He has been an elder with the Uniting Church and, for some years, served on the Yorketown School Council. He is also a member of the Weavers Agricultural Bureau and is currently a councillor with the District Council of Yorketown. As well, he finds time to play bowls occasionally.

The District Council of Minlaton nominated Mrs Coral Mumford as its Citizen of the Year, and again I was pleased to attend the presentation. Mrs Mumford is what I would describe as a 'good samaritan' in that area. The number of people who came forward and commented on Coral's work was simply phenomenal. Certainly, her involvement with the local Meals on Wheels has been outstanding. Again, congratulations to Mrs Mumford. John Simmons was named Citizen of the Year for Central Yorke Peninsula. John and I have known each other for a long time, and I was disappointed that I could not attend his presentation.

John has been involved with the RSL, the Ardrossan Rifle Club, the Petersville Agricultural Bureau, the Masonic Lodge and the Ardrossan Lions Club. He has also been involved with the hospital, the National Trust, the Maitland Show Society, the Ardrossan Cricket Club, the Ardrossan Retirement Home, and the Ardrossan Community Club and Football Club. What a huge number of activities! The District Council of Northern Yorke Peninsula presented its award to Frank Camporeale, who has been involved with the Moonta Scout Group for some time. He has taken that scout group from an organisation that was not operating to one that is most successful today. Again, congratulations.

The Corporation of Wallaroo presented its award to Robert Miller. I attended that presentation and congratulations to Robert.

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

### SUPPLY BILL

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced an Act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1998. Read a first time.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

This year the Government will introduce the 1997-98 budget on 29 May 1997.

A Supply Bill will still be necessary for the early months of the 1997-98 year until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and received assent.

In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill.

The amount being sought under this Bill is \$500 million which is the same amount as last year's Supply Bill.

The Bill provides for the appropriation of \$500 million to enable the Government to continue to provide public services for the early part of 1997-98.

#### Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

*Clause 1 is formal.*

*Clause 2 provides relevant definitions.*

*Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of up to \$500 million.*

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

### 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 25 February 1997.

Motion carried.

### LIVESTOCK BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 November. Page 660.)

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition supports the second reading of this Bill which seeks to consolidate and modify some seven existing Acts of this Parliament. It introduces some new provisions which harmonise South Australian legislation with the livestock legislation in other States, thus ensuring compliance with and funding responsibility for the very important control of exotic diseases and vendor liability for the supply of quality food products for all Australians, wherever they live, as well as helping to maintain high quality uncontaminated products to the export trade.

This is something I know to be dear to the heart of the shadow Minister in another place, the Hon. Ron Roberts. I well remember his advocacy for consistent standards across Australia to ensure public safety and supplier liability when the meat hygiene legislation was passed in this Parliament. Unfortunately, it took the death of a young South Australian child and Federal intervention by Labor Senator and then Primary Industries Minister Bob Collins to insist that uniform standards be set for meat hygiene so that all Australians can be assured of high quality meat product, no matter in which State that meat is processed.

This legislation should assist consumers and processors to access clean livestock for local consumers and the export markets. Members would be aware of the recent sale of Samcor. Like me, they are probably aware of problems emerging within the meat processing industry in this State. The Opposition is hearing already of problems that could well destroy existing local businesses even before the first kill under the new owners has been done. It is not my intention to go into that today. However, I am sure the shadow Minister in another place will be addressing these issues very shortly.

I note also that the Bill makes provision for the setting up of advisory groups with clauses 8, 9, 10 and 11 specifically referring to these matters. Clause 10 in particular deals with appointments, terms and conditions. Clauses 12 to 15 deal with industry funds, their collection and distribution but does not, I note, mention funding advisory committees as one of the purposes for which funds can be used. The Minister may be able to clear this point in closing the debate.

This Bill properly covers many of the existing provisions of legislation including artificial insemination, stock movement and quarantine, notifiable diseases, beekeeping and brands, which need no comment and, as the Bill has been on the table since 27 November and the Opposition has received no submissions, it appears that these matters are acceptable and uncontroversial to the industry. Division 5—Implied Contractual Terms and Conditions as to Health of Livestock, and Division 3 of Part 8—Administration and Enforcement, dealing with compliance notices and new initiatives which appear designed to provide inspectorial quality control and

enforcement, have also not been commented on to the Opposition and therefore are supported.

There are provisions for appeals in part 10—Miscellaneous matters, including clause 77: Telephone warrants, which will allow the breaking into premises or anything on premises or to destroy certain parts of property. While we can clearly see the reason for such a clause, we trust that it will not be abused. I understand that my colleague in another place will be seeking the views of particular principal players in industry before this Bill finally passes the Parliament. However, the Opposition will be supporting the legislation without amendment from our part in this House, but would appreciate the comments of the Minister in respect of the use of fund contributions, telephone warrants and the protection of civil and property rights.

The Opposition supports the second reading and looks forward to the contribution by the member for Custance who I am sure will follow me on this matter, given his depth of knowledge on matters agricultural which I acknowledge only surpasses mine in this House. I take this opportunity to wish him well in his new role as Presiding Member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. I realise he will add lustre to that committee by his chairpersonship.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I thank the Deputy Leader for his good wishes. I am very pleased and honoured to be elected Presiding Member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. I only hope that I can perform my duties as well as the previous Presiding Member. I rise to support the Bill. It establishes the livestock advisory groups for each of the livestock sectors, that is, sheep, cattle, pigs, etc. The Minister has advised me that these committees will meet only when required and that he will set them up in any of the sectors as the need arises. I hope that in his second reading reply he will explain how he will regulate that and whether he will set them up now or wait until the need arises.

The Bill modifies the industry self-funding schemes, currently available to the cattle, pig, deer and apiary industries, which were used as compensation funds for owners of diseased animals. The change widens the scope in relation to what the money can be spent on and gives each individual sector the power to decide what is beneficial to its specific sector of the industry. We all know that government is best when it is with the people. This will be made available to any livestock industry. If a sector of the livestock industry wishes to have a group such as this, perhaps the Minister can tell me how it will in fact go about doing it, because we cannot have an advisory committee for every small group.

The Bill also makes it mandatory for more serious diseases and contaminants to be reported by livestock owners. That is very welcome, because it has been an issue of conjecture for many years. This action is deemed necessary to expedite the process before the diseases, etc. spread. I refer to the problem with lice, which matter I raised with the Minister. In 1989 when I was a member of the Advisory Board of Agriculture we lifted the requirement for compulsory dipping because lice were developing a chemical resistance to it. Time has shown that we have caused a few problems with that decision. Apparently, lice are more prevalent than before. They are reported to be more prevalent and the Minister may wish to comment on that. I am not sure whether this is because farmers have been lazy in not dipping sheep or because depressed wool prices have made it too expensive—or is it because chemical resistance has reached

the stage where many of our current dips do not work any more? We await certain outcomes on that issue.

The Bill allows the Government to investigate and control any disease or contaminant that affects livestock. The Government has the right to decide on the priority and capacity in which it will act in the public interest with respect to public health and that of livestock and native and feral animals. The Bill allows for the use of vendor declarations for the health of their livestock, although this is not compulsory. This section of the Bill will be used immediately to retain access to the United States and European markets, thus guaranteeing the absence of growth promoters, lead shot and any other pollutants. The Bill also upgrades the provisions for feeding livestock, with the products to be similar to all other States. The Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund is to be replaced by the Exotic Disease Eradication Fund which, with minor changes, will bring us into national uniformity.

**Mr Clarke:** Have you spoken to Bob about that?

**Mr VENNING:** I have spoken to Bob about it. The honourable member may like to know that my first secretary was Bob's secretary, so we certainly had a very good liaison path there.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Senator Bob Collins. A review of cattle and sheep brands will be activated by this Bill. It is certainly high time that this happened, because we have 10 000 registered brands out there and we know that we have only 3 000 producers. So, there are many out-of-date brands. I congratulate the Minister for bringing in this Bill. It has had a long consultation period of almost two years. The Bill is relevant and timely. The livestock industry has been experiencing hard times. Thankfully, the sheep meat industry has been experiencing very good times, and that has offset the downturn in wool prices.

I make one final comment to the Minister, and it relates to livestock inspectors. There has been much comment from the electorate that we are seeing a downturn in the number of livestock inspectors from about seven or eight in the State to about two. These officers are very important. The work they do cannot be left to the private sector. We need to have Government controlled livestock inspectors, particularly because of outbreaks of disease. I believe that sometimes the Government must act as a mediator and that we must always have on hand adequate numbers of livestock inspectors. I have spoken to the Minister about this, and he may or may not wish to comment. I hope this Bill assists the whole of the industry and that the fortunes of the industry improve quickly. I support the Bill.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries):** I thank the Deputy Leader for his knowledgeable support of the Bill and also the member for Custance for his contribution. It is fitting that I place on record some of the history of this Bill, because it is important. As the member for Custance has said, there has been an enormous amount of consultation. I thank everyone who has contributed to what has been a very lengthy process. As a result, we have brought in a Bill that should be non-controversial. The Bill enables the establishment of livestock advisory groups for each livestock sector. Their role will be to advise the Minister on the operation of the Act in respect of each sector which they represent. The aim of these groups is to foster a greater degree of input in the management of the livestock industry and to give the industry some ownership of the process.

The Deputy Leader and the member for Custance both asked questions. The answer to the question asked by the member for Custance is that the establishment of livestock advisory groups and the number of times they meet will be based on need. We do not want to set up any more groups than is necessary. Basically, we will decide whether there is an issue within the industry that needs to be dealt with at the time. Some obvious issues will need to be addressed but, as far as the less important aspects of the industry are concerned, we will set up advisory groups based on need, and they will meet on that basis. If there is an issue to be resolved, several meetings may be held within a short period of time.

That brings me to the question raised by the Deputy Leader about the financing of these advisory groups. The Bill is silent in that respect. The reason for that is that sometimes these groups might not need to meet for a couple of years whereas at other times if there is an outbreak of disease they may need to meet several times in quick succession. If it is felt that payment of members is warranted and that can be justified, a ministerial decision will then be made. So, rather than lock the department into bearing the cost for groups that might never meet, they will be formed on the basis of need and, if members are asked to contribute an enormous amount of time to these groups, the Minister will determine whether payment is justified.

With respect to the problem of lice, which was raised by the member for Custance, the lice task force is doing an enormous amount of work. There is a lot of justification for the decision that was made regarding lice when the honourable member was a member of the advisory board. That has been criticised quite often, but those who understand the lice problem have no argument with what is being done. However, they want to address it. It is a difficult issue. It will not be solved by bringing back compulsory dipping. It will require a lot of thought. It involves a number of issues such as the economic loss that we are experiencing as well as chemical resistance and contamination.

The Bill modifies the self-funding schemes which were previously available to cattle, pig, deer and the apiary industries, which had a base of providing compensation to the owners of infected animals when they needed to be destroyed. Now we have schemes where money collected can be spent outside of what was intended before. The money can be spent on anything the relevant livestock advisory group considers would be beneficial to their industry within the State. This facility will be made available to any livestock industry and will enable those industries to build on any strategic advantages that they may have, or tackle problems within the State. Once again, that is giving the industry a lot more ownership of the whole process.

The more serious diseases and contaminants must be reported by livestock owners, veterinarians, agents and livestock consultants. That is considered essential to enable the implementation of action in relation to these diseases and contaminants before they spread any further. It also provides an ability to Government to investigate and control any disease or contaminant which affects livestock and which previously was limited to a list of diseases and contaminants. The implied contractual terms and conditions section allows the use of vendor declarations for the health of livestock, livestock products and livestock food in South Australia. That is something that has been called for.

There is a national agreement for the introduction of this facility into the livestock legislation of each State. It is not compulsory for vendors to give a declaration, but if they do,

then the buyer has certain rights if the declaration is considered false by an independent third party. Certainly, those vendor declarations will come into use straight away. The feeding of animal products provisions have been strengthened in response to what has happened in the UK with the mad cow incident and will now, basically, be the equivalent of provisions existing in other States. That has certainly picked up and addressed a community concern.

The member for Custance spoke about the Exotic Diseases Eradication Fund and the branding system which is picked up in it. There is also a special provision relating to bees, to allow the retention of the Ligurian bees on Kangaroo Island and to provide protection to the dried fruit industry. The remaining provisions of the Bill are mainly administrative in nature and are required to ensure that the Act operates effectively and efficiently.

I think it should be pointed out again that the industry consultation has certainly been integral in the development of the Act, and it has taken just short of two years to do that. There have been many discussions throughout the process with more than 30 producer/processors and service sector groups, and more than 300 copies of the green and white papers were mailed out. So, to our knowledge, all the issues that arose within the consultative phase have been addressed and there remains no dispute.

I thank not only the contributors in this House, but everyone who has contributed to the process. It has been a long, drawn out process, but instead of having quite a stack of Bills, as we had before, this has modernised the legislation and should see the livestock industries well and truly catered for into the next century.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

**Mr CLARKE:** With respect to the issue of telephone warrants and the protection of civil and property rights, a question that I raised in my second reading contribution, the shadow Minister will pursue that matter in another place.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:**

I move:

Page 2, after line 26—Insert:

'livestock industry' includes—

- (a) the manufacture, production or supply of livestock food; and
- (b) any other industry of a class declared by regulation to be within the ambit of this definition;

This amendment relates to problems we have encountered in the hay industry with rye grass toxicity. Western Australia has had problems in the Japanese market, and the local industry needs certain powers to ensure that it is not a long-term problem. This amendment has been moved so that within the livestock industry we can pick up on the processed hay industry, which gives us good export value.

**Mr CLARKE:** I do not believe that the Opposition shadow spokesperson on rural affairs has had an opportunity to consider this amendment. I do not raise an objection at this stage, but I reserve the right for our shadow Minister to do so when he has had a closer look at this. I have a question of the Minister about the definition of paragraph (b), relating to 'any other industry of a class declared by regulation to be within the ambit of this definition'. If either House of Parliament wishes to disallow the regulation, it has the power to do so,

but this Minister has a habit of overriding the wishes of Parliament in that matter.

With respect to the regulations banning the recreational net fishing, on two occasions the Legislative Council has voted to disallow that regulation and on each occasion the Minister has immediately reinstated the regulation concerned, thereby negating the will of the Parliament. We in the Opposition therefore have a very jaundiced view because of the Minister's behaviour in flagrantly ignoring the wishes of Parliament on this issue by defying a clear vote on two occasions.

There is little point in Parliament's reserving itself the power to disallow regulations if Ministers insist on overriding it by blatant disregard of the majority view of at least one House of Parliament. The Minister may have problems with respect to this issue, because of his actions with respect to recreational net fishing.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 4 to 67 passed.

Clause 68—'General powers of inspectors.'

**Mr CLARKE:** Whilst Opposition members recognise the need for these powers, we again obviously have concerns regarding civil liberties. Will the Minister explain in more detail the circumstances in which the use of telephone warrants would be sought by his department in respect of this matter?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Obviously, telephone warrants were included in this clause because of the isolation factor that we have with rural industry, particularly the livestock industry, where many of them are situated hundreds of miles from anywhere. If the Opposition has any problems, we will sort them out.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (69 to 88), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, I advert to a ruling which I made a little earlier. The member for Ross Smith raised a point of order and, in some haste, I assumed that he was doing it under Standing Order 124 or 125, and I ruled in accordance with Standing Order 126 as the offended member was not present. The honourable member pointed out to me subsequently that he had raised the point of order under Standing Order 127. As such, the honourable member did have a point of order, and I apologise for ruling so hastily against him. I have had words with the member for Mawson with regard to the alleged offence.

#### **BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN (DIRECTORS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 November. Page 661.)

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I always admire a person who is prepared to admit that they have made an error and I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for doing so. I will wait to hear what the member for Mawson has to say about that issue either later today or tomorrow. Certainly, I appreciate your preparedness to admit your mistake, Sir, and I only wish others would follow your lead. The Opposition supports the legislation. We commend the board of the South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling Limited, particularly its Chief Executive Officer, for the way that this change has been introduced. At all times the board

has kept its constituents informed and consulted, seeking their views with 14 regional meetings across the State to ensure the maximum opportunity for growers to have input into the decision making process of their organisation. In fact, I commend the process to the Government because it would lead to the far better governance of this State if the Government followed the lead of the Directors of CBH.

It does credit to the growers and their leaders that the 14 meetings, after full consultation, endorsed the proposal which was finally approved by an extraordinary general meeting of the company in line with its constitution. The Opposition shadow Minister in another place, the Hon. Ron Roberts, has welcomed and appreciated the full consultation by the board's CEO with the Opposition throughout the process and recommends full support of the legislation. In conclusion, the Opposition supports the second reading without amendment.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** First, I must declare my interest as a grower member of the South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling Limited and also as a son of a former Chairman of Directors of the company. I rise in general support of the Bill, but I wish to speak on the deeper issues surrounding the changes and seek some clarification. I welcome the amending of the Act because it has not been amended since 1984. Indeed, it was 29 November 1984 when we last addressed the Act. After reading the Act again last night I see that it is clearly much in need of amendment. Much of the terminology is out of fashion, and the penalties and fines are no deterrent in regard to today's prices. I agree that the reasons for amending the Act today are valid, as the Deputy Leader just said, because the company, which began in 1955, has had a great record of handling grain for over 40 years here in South Australia. However, I am afraid that the past 10 years have probably been its poorest, and the reasons for this are many.

One reason is the constraints put upon the company by this Act, which we are addressing today. Many factors have caused a poorer than expected performance—for example, some of the decisions made by some of the directors of the day. It could be claimed that in recent times the board has lacked the expertise and skills required to run a modern company in the 1990s. That disappoints me greatly, considering the first 30 years of the company when SACBH was the leading grain handler, certainly in Australia and arguably in the world. It had state of the art facilities, low handling charges, extremely high quality and hygienic storage of the product and rapid intakes and outakes from facilities. The company kept up with modern day demands by continually upgrading and modernising its grain handling equipment. In those days the company built and bought equipment not necessarily based just on price but on the quality and the long-term benefit to the industry.

That is one of the chief reasons why, until this time, we have been very competitive in grain storage and handling, guaranteeing unsurpassed quality within our storage system. It is also the main reason why, many years ago, we built cement vertical storage in silos. Although they were much more expensive than steel horizontal storage, the cement storages allowed much better control of hygiene, that is, insect pests, particularly weevils. They also offered longer life for the facility and much cheaper running costs because there was much less handling of the grain as it was stored in a vertical fashion with only a small area at the bottom to push out the last of the grain and clean up the residue. There was also much less waste.

Today, as you would know, Sir, these principles seem to have been overlooked and more and more horizontal storages are being built, and, even worse, bunker storage. My father always opposed bunker storage because of the comparatively high running costs, the difficulty with guaranteeing the quality of the grain, and much higher waste. I know that today's costs have necessitated some changes but I believe that we are being very shortsighted in our approach and thinking only in the short term rather than the long term. I am sure that we will regret some of the decisions that we are making today.

All these factors have led to the amending Bill that is before us today. It seeks to give the bulk handling company the ability to be much more professional in its decision making, to have hands-on expertise on its board and generally to engage in best practice management without the constraints of the Act, which provided that all the directors had to be elected and, therefore, were usually grain growers. It has worked very well for 30 years but, in the past 10 years, we have seen some shortcomings. This is an opportune time to allow the board to remove the constraints of the Act and to give it the opportunity to appoint directors from outside the industry if it sees fit to better equip the board for the changing economic and competitive environment affecting the Australian grain industry today.

I was in attendance at the extraordinary general meeting of the company on 29 October 1996 at which two items were put to members, one being the alteration of the memorandum and the other the adoption of the new articles of association. By deleting sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Act, as this Bill does, the articles of association of the company can be altered, allowing up to three directors, one of whom could be the Managing Director, to be appointed. I note, and I agree, that any appointed director must be elected by a 75 per cent majority of the board and that appointment ratified by the members at the annual general meeting. The Minister may wish to clarify whether that means 75 per cent of members at the annual general meeting. That is a very important addition to that provision.

At the extraordinary meeting in October, the first resolution adopted rewrites the memorandum in a shorter form, which is now permitted by the Corporations Law, even though the company's prime objectives will remain unchanged, namely, the development of the agricultural resources of Australia. The power to store and handle grain will now specifically include other bulk commodities, reflecting the recent trend towards diversification of agricultural products. I gather that this would include fertilisers and chemicals, and the Minister may wish to elaborate on that. It is a big move.

The restriction on certain SACBH activities to the State of South Australia will be removed as it is outdated and imposes restrictions in a geographical sense. That widens the scope of the board's activities, and I gather that it also means that we can operate interstate. The Minister may wish to comment on that because it is certainly changing the rules, but I do not think there is any opposition to it. The company feels that it would be placed at a disadvantage in the future if these were not removed.

The second resolution passed at the meeting saw the adoption of new articles of association, which attracted support from 98.9 per cent of all members across the State. The first resolution attracted the support of 92 per cent of members. This second resolution addressed the question of

directors, being the reason for the deletion of sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Act which we are handling in this Bill.

Some of the other aspects covered by the new articles of association include: an upgrade of the range of definitions to help with the easier reading of the articles; an upgrade of eligibility and application for membership—which is way overdue; and an upgrade of the register of members, which would record whether a member is a sole or co-proprietor, a partner of a grain growing partnership, a partner to a grain growing share farming concern or other financial arrangement or a company.

Also, the company wanted to clarify the distribution of profits. It will be confirmed, as has always been the case, that no distributions or profit or capital can be made by the company. It also goes on to clarify the provisions and explain the winding up procedures in greater detail. Heaven forbid; I hope we never see those implemented. The toll system upon which the company is based will continue as before, but the company will have the authority to deduct from a member's toll account any moneys due to the company by the member. Most importantly, provisions have also been made for the forfeiture of tolls where a person entitled to repayment cannot be located. This is certainly an area that needs to be tidied up, because it is surprising how often members of the company seem to just disappear and the moneys owed to them cannot be paid. Some of these cases go back 30 years, so eventually these moneys can be put back into the company.

Members' entitlement to vote, proxies and voting procedures are to be addressed in the new articles of association. Indemnity of the company is addressed. SACBH agrees to provide indemnity to directors, secretaries and executive officers who act in good faith in accordance with their duties. The commencement date for the changes to the articles of association which were agreed to at the extraordinary meeting on 29 November 1996 is dependent upon this Bill's being passed today. The deletion of sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Act will enable the changes to the articles relating to directors to be effective.

In view of the importance of these changes to the articles of association, I definitely support this Bill and urge its swift passage through this Parliament. However, I seek clarification from the Minister as to why these changes to the operation of the company, via the articles of association and under Corporations Law, are not also specifically covered under the Act. In effect we are removing clauses 5, 6 and 7. Why then do we not put back into the Act what is required? I understand that what is being done is quite lawful and that these provisions do not need to be put into statutes, but I would prefer to restore them to the Act so they are there for us all to read and understand and for future amendment if required. They have been there since 1955. I wonder why, now that they are being removed, nothing is put back. We are taking provisions out of the Act and not replacing them. Why can the changes to the articles of association not also be reflected in the Act? The Minister may wish to clarify that, and I would like that on the record.

I am most concerned for the future of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act. Apparently, the Government will schedule a review of that Act, incorporating the Government's applications under the competition principles agreement for 1997-98. The review will discuss the need for an Act; this is highly contentious and will take some time to sort out. To say it is highly contentious is an understatement. If CBH lost its unique powers, orderly storage and handling and best practice in South Australia would eventually be destroyed. We do not

want to go back to the 1930s, as you probably well remember, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr Clarke:** You are a great socialist.

**Mr VENNING:** Call me what you like; I know what the growers want. I have been called everything, including an agrarian socialist. We do not want to go back to the 1930s, the days before wheat stabilisation and orderly marketing. Growers in those days suffered very badly from manipulation of the market by the traders, and there were many of them. Prices were very poor, being either at or just above the cost of production. The past 40 years have been a period of great prosperity for the industry in South Australia, and that has been reflected in the economy of the State. Why should we change that? We have deregulated the wheat industry and we are now trying to take away from the Australian Wheat Board the sole power to market our crop overseas. I am very concerned about this. I was not in favour of deregulating the wheat industry, as my Federal colleagues did. Time will prove which of us was right, but I am still not convinced that they did the right thing.

Why should we change it? We certainly have had a successful period. We have great uncertainty about the future of our railways and a great need exists for new deep sea ports in South Australia—at least one, probably two. We do not need any further uncertainty by pulling apart a great institution that has served us so well, namely, South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries):** The member for Custance addressed a number of points. In principle I agree with much of what he said, but I do not think it is appropriate for me as Minister to pre-empt where industry may go with some of its deliberations. We will go through a review of the Act, scheduled for 1997-98 under our obligations under the competition principles agreement, and that will be a highly contentious and drawn out debate. Industry will find that review difficult. I agree that the general industry view is that there is a need for an Act, but we should go through the process and see where we finish up.

With regard to the inquiry by the member for Custance about the articles of association in the Act itself, it is certainly not necessary for any continuation of the Act. This Bill is the result of the industry's asking the Government to remove sections 5, 6 and 7 so that it can run Cooperative Bulk Handling as a modern day company under the Corporations Law rather than under an Act of Parliament. To replace these sections with anything would be a step away from where we should be heading. The industry has asked whether we can remove those sections as it wants outside expertise on the board. That is a lot better than the Government trying to lead it down that path and I congratulate it on its foresight.

The member for Custance pointed out that probably it has had a difficult 10 years. The cost profile is enormous in that industry and with the money it needs to invest it needs to get the correct skills on the board. It has done well with growers. It has had a tremendous run of grower directors, but the time comes when it is very difficult and the board itself has felt the need for outside expertise and I am pleased that it has taken the steps it has taken. It has identified that need, come to the Government and taken the first step. We have done what it has asked us to do. As the Deputy Leader acknowledged, there was thorough consultation with industry, and that was good to see. It has gone about it the right way and made good

positive decisions. The Government has supported it and we should not tie its hands behind its back by going further with it.

The member for Custance also asked about the appointment of up to three directors; as far as their election goes it refers to a 75 per cent majority of the board, but the ratification by the AGM is a separate issue from the board vote. I assume that that would be picked up in the normal meeting procedure of SACBH. Here we are concerned with the 75 per cent majority of the board. It is up to SACBH as to its rules as far as the appointment being ratified at the AGM.

I thank the Deputy Leader for his unqualified support of the Bill. I thank the member for Custance because he covered many industry issues, which will be debatable. As time goes by he will have an enormous input into the way SACBH looks at its future and into the way the industry looks at its future. I also thank those who contributed and thank SACBH, the managing director and the board, for the way they have gone about the task. I thank all members who have rolled up at meetings, listened and not opposed change, an accusation often made. It must have been delivered to them very well. They have supported the change, and we look forward to this moving SACBH into the next century.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** I am delighted to be able to support another success story in my area. I refer to a project that has been developed through the Southern Vales Community Health Service and the Willunga High School, which is in the electorate of the member for Finnis. It is also a feeder high school for a great majority in my rural areas, and I attend council meetings at that school. We all know about the expansion and growth in horticulture and viticulture in the Willunga Basin, and we also know that the economic opportunities for the whole of the southern region will be enhanced by this expansion. It is no good expanding opportunities for economic activity if you do not have a trained work force, and it is also no good expanding those opportunities if you do not have a work force that understands how to work in a safe environment. That is where the partnership that the Southern Vales Community Health Service has formed with the Willunga High School, through vocational education and training and the wine industry in the south, is really going ahead in leaps and bounds.

The project is being coordinated by Mr Steve Parker, who is a special project officer for occupational health and safety with the Southern Vales Community Health Service, and by Ms Schneyder, from the Education Department point of view, who is very committed to vocational education and training. They have now supplied me with a trial package which is very comprehensive and which is divided into three areas: a student assignment work book, a student resource material folder, and a vocational education and training assessment plan *pro forma*. In the *Stock Journal* only last week, issues were raised about farm safety. We are all aware of the cost of injury to all employees, employers and, indeed, the whole South Australian community. In the handling of chemicals and working in confined spaces not only do the students who

take on the jobs need academic ability but an understanding of the dangers.

This pilot program could be adopted and enhanced right across the State. The Southern Vales Community Health Service is probably leading Australia in getting young people job ready, and it is high time that Australia focused on having people job ready. As an employer, I know one of the biggest costs is bringing into the work force young people who have all the qualifications required but not the general experience needed for the work force. That is where we are now seeing a real change in the focus of education in South Australia. This is just one example of what I have highlighted this afternoon.

Members would have noted that the Minister for Education announced that there will be a quite different direction with certain aspects of education. The direction will come back to teaching students about real life skills, values, sharing and working with fellow school students, budget cooking, budget financing and all those elementary things that have been lost from the system. I am delighted to see that they are coming back in. The most important part is vocational education and training. Not all students want a tertiary education, especially at university and, indeed, if they did we would have a massive problem getting enough people to work in other sectors.

In relation to the five high school cluster in my electorate, I commend the principals, staff, school councils and students who are strongly committed to clustering and making more opportunities available for students. This is a classic example of not just throwing money at the problem. For many years bandaids solutions were proposed, money was thrown at problems, but there was never an audit or assessment of whether or not we were on the right track with that program. Previous Governments just said that, if there is a problem and people are calling out, we will throw in more money. It is about working smarter and putting money and resources into real opportunities.

I also had the opportunity of attending the Hackham East AGM last night and was delighted to see the initiatives being put forward by the staff. They are developing a journey for students. It will be a comprehensive course involving a team development project where students will problem-solve to work through issues with parents and, most importantly, other students. They are starting to focus on getting primary school children job-ready and teaching young people that, first, you must identify the problem and then be able to find the solution—very different from the education most members in this Chamber were used to. When we left high school and went into tertiary education, many of us found it difficult. Instead of being taught parrot fashion (as we were in primary and secondary school), suddenly you had to research and think for yourself.

We now have an education system that is working well in this State and I hope that this year we will hear many more good news stories such as the one I have just highlighted. Almost on a daily basis, as a member of Parliament in my electorate in the south, I see great children coming through the education system and very committed staff. Last year we had a lot of industrial turmoil but this year it should be heads down and get on with the job of capitalising on the wonderful opportunities for education in South Australia.

It is not only education—that is only the key to start the motor vehicle. You also need other parts, such as the engine, body and framework, and that is what we must further develop, particularly in the south where we know there was

a vacuum of real effort put into developing new businesses and infrastructure to provide jobs once the people are job ready. We have a fair way to go, but I invite all members to drive along South Road from Darlington to Reynella to look at the magnificent work that is currently occurring with the Southern Expressway. It is great to see real activity supporting infrastructure and development opportunities for people in the south.

I have also been delighted to visit a few small businesses in recent times. I am the first to admit that many small businesses are still finding it difficult. At this time, I place on record that many small businesses are still finding it difficult because of the aftermath of what the Keating Federal Government did for this country. It is easy for Opposition members to say, 'Don't blame.' We are looking at the future, but we must also remind people of the history. It is not only in South Australia that some small business sectors are struggling. People in Sydney, Melbourne, Perth and Brisbane are all finding it difficult, because there was not enough commitment to creating an environment that would provide real job opportunities. I believe that we still have probably six to 12 months of tough time ahead, but there are some great signals out there at the moment.

Builders in my electorate to whom I have spoken and who were struggling six months ago are now very busy. One of them recently reported to me that they cannot get enough trades people; they are so busy that they are now extending the time of completion of some projects. Some manufacturing bases in the south are starting to get going with export opportunities. I appreciate that it is difficult in the retail sector, but we must continue to develop tourism opportunities. We have seen initiatives such as the merger of Australian Major Events with the Tourism Commission to capitalise on those opportunities. If small retailers can get on the backs of the big icons throughout South Australia to help market what they have to offer tourists, I believe that tourism is another opportunity to broaden their markets. Clearly, businesses must also be prepared to change and refocus and not rely on what has happened in years gone by. They must expand their opportunities and we are creating those opportunities for them.

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I rise on a number of points, but I particularly want to dwell for a few moments on something that clearly indicates that this Government is very rattled. It has been rattled since the beginning of January as a result of substantial leaks made to the Opposition concerning SA Water and, more particularly, issues that go to the very heart and soul of a Government, namely, its own accountability and credibility and the honesty and integrity of its leadership. I, as Opposition manager of business in this House, was told by the Deputy Premier just on the commencement of Question Time today that the former arrangement put in place by the former Premier, whereby the Opposition was guaranteed a minimum of 10 questions per sitting day, had now finished. It was not a question of negotiation or consultation with the Opposition: it was simply a *fait accompli*, as far as this Government was concerned, that the arrangement made by the former Premier of a minimum 10 questions per day had ceased.

That action shows quite clearly that this Government is rattled and rattled very badly. The former Premier guaranteed the Opposition a minimum of 10 questions per day. As a result of the massive win the Liberal Party experienced at the last election, the Opposition in this House was reduced to just



10 members. The then Premier wanted to at least convey an impression that his Government would be subjected to scrutiny by the Opposition, and the Opposition was guaranteed a minimum of 10 questions so that the Government, despite its lopsided majority, could still be held in part accountable to this Parliament. The new Premier has shown his hand. He has shown just how easily he and his Government can be rattled. That agreement did not simply die with the resignation of the former Premier: when the former Premier, the now Minister for Industrial Affairs, made that commitment in 1994 he did so on behalf of the Government. A change of Premier has occurred, but that does not mean a change in the overall personnel of this Government or its political persuasion.

This Government has been rattled by the Opposition's intense questioning and its very good use of parliamentary Question Time over the past three years. The Premier cannot stand the heat, nor can his senior Ministers. We saw how the Deputy Premier fumbled the handling of his own portfolio on the last sitting days of last year. We saw how he could not handle effectively the issues that went to his credibility; how ineffectually he handled the no-confidence motion with respect to himself; and the pathetic arguments put forward by the Premier in his defence at that time.

It is quite clear that this new Premier has decided that enough is enough. This is an election year. He cannot take the heat and therefore there will be no minimum number of questions. We can be assured that his Ministers will be as longwinded as the former Minister for Correctional Services. As time goes by the Opposition will probably be lucky to get up six or so questions as a result of longwinded ministerial answers, particularly to the dorothy dixers put to the Government from its own backbench.

We got through ten questions today because of the device used by the Premier and other Ministers to give brief answers as it obviously suited them in terms of the questions that were put by the Opposition. But we will see how Question Time is filled in with a lot of hot air and wind baggery on the part of Government Ministers to try to stretch out the time so that very few questions can be asked of Ministers.

Also, very importantly, it was interesting how today the Premier refused to answer the criticisms of his ministry and of himself particularly, not only as Premier but as the former senior economic Minister under the Brown Government. That is how he handled the questions relating to the criticism of his ministry by the former employment Minister and the now member for Fisher. Not once in the five questions that I put to the Premier did he answer the question. That should not surprise you, Mr Speaker, because Standing Order 98 is observed more in its breach than in its adherence in so far as Ministers dealing with the substance of the question are concerned.

We heard a lot of wind baggery from the Premier in trying to duck, weave and dodge around the scathing criticisms that were launched at his Government by the former Minister. The 'ideological claptrap' quote was a beauty, I thought, on the part of the former Minister, which has been illustrated by the fact that, unfortunately, South Australia enjoys the highest level of unemployment in mainland Australia—

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:**—and given the predictions by the Liberal Federal Treasurer with respect to unemployment, the increases in unemployment at the national level will only be compounded in this State. It will be worse in this State because of our very vulnerable economic position. These are issues which this Premier will not address.

**The SPEAKER:** I am pleased the member for Mawson is about to leave otherwise he would get an early minute.

**Mr CLARKE:** We constantly get the clichés from this Premier of refocussing, re-engineering and ramping up our economy, whatever those terms happen to mean. Every time the Premier talks about re-engineering, refocussing and ramping up our economy, I look at the statistics in relation to the State's economy, and every time he talks about win-win-win, the economy of this State goes further down the tube. So, we have a Premier who is cliché ridden but is absolutely barren of vision or ideas as to how to turn the ship of State around. He cannot keep blaming the former Labor Government. The Liberal Party has been in Government for in excess of three years, and the people of South Australia are tired of those excuses.

A mark of the failure of this Government on employment can be seen in relation to another of our symbols—Australian National. Last week we had the Senate inquiry into Australian National, and the Federal Government's plans to privatise it. I regret, as a South Australian, that the Minister for Transport in this State could not even be bothered to turn up before that Senate inquiry and put the Government's position and, in particular, the need to maintain the 2 500 jobs in South Australia. The Government's submission was not even put to the committee on time. It was actually walked in to the committee whilst the committee was in session and handed to the committee by some flunkey from the department. No departmental officer, not even a junior clerk, went before that committee to orally present the submission of the Government and to forcibly put it down the throats of this Federal Government that we want to retain AN, its skills and its work force in South Australia.

I am also disappointed that, with respect to the committee's going to Port Augusta, the member for Eyre, representing the great city of Port Augusta, was not present at that hearing, nor did he put a submission before that committee of inquiry, calling on it to retain the work force of AN in Port Augusta, to defend the jobs of over 500 AN workers at Port Augusta, in relation to which the Port Augusta city council itself has found that nearly 1 000 Port Augusta citizens rely on their employment through the Port Augusta workshops.

Unfortunately, that shows a gross indifference to the plight of the citizens of Port Augusta who are battling against all the odds to keep their city viable and capable of providing jobs for their children. AN is too important to this State for a Government and a member of Parliament to act in such a cavalier fashion with respect to the maintenance of employment opportunities for those workers.

Motion carried.

At 5.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 5 February at 2 p.m.