

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 February 1997

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

### PAPERS TABLED

By the Minister for Racing (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—  
Racing Act—Regulations—Hindmarsh Stadium

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

Native Vegetation Act—Regulations—Exemptions

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

Workers Compensation Tribunal Rules—Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act

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

Local Government Act—Regulations—Voting Papers

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

Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—  
Report, 1994-95  
Report, 1995-96

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

Technical and Further Education Act—Regulations—  
College Councils.

### ELECTORAL COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

The **Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer)**: I lay on the table the ministerial statement relating to the report of the Electoral Commissioner on parliamentary elections of 11 December 1993 made today in another place by the Attorney-General.

### TAFE DEGREE COURSES

The **Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.C. KOTZ**: I am very pleased to announce that TAFE has entered a new era with the introduction of the State's first TAFE degree courses, which is indeed a historic achievement for TAFE SA. The new degrees are the Bachelor of Music Teaching, the Bachelor of Music Accompanying, and the Bachelor of Business and International Hotel Management. For many years TAFE SA has offered courses equal in complexity to university degree level status but has been limited to diploma awards. I am pleased that TAFE is now able to confer awards on its graduates which recognise the real level of their achievement.

Employers in a growing number of fields are demanding higher qualifications of their employees and it is therefore essential that TAFE be able to meet that demand. While it is important that TAFE retains a vocational focus, I believe that there is a great opportunity for TAFE to work even more closely with the State's three universities to ensure the best possible education and vocational preparation for its students.

The new degrees have been made possible by the introduction of the Australian Qualification Framework, which does not limit the conferring of awards to particular education sectors. This has now opened the doors to institutions other than universities to seek accreditation of their course at degree level and above. However, it must be also noted that advice from the universities must be sought before any course can be given degree status by the Accreditation and Registration Council.

The two music degrees are the first TAFE degrees in this area anywhere in Australia and are being offered by the Adelaide Institute School of Music, which is respected by professional musicians right across this nation. The Bachelor of Music Teaching is the first degree dedicated to music teaching in South Australia, and is again responding to industry needs.

The Bachelor of Music Accompanying builds on the highly successful diploma course, which has produced musicians who are working all over the world. The Bachelor of Business in International Hotel Management will also build on a highly successful three-year Swiss diploma offered through the International College of Hotel Management at Regency Institute. This step of providing a degree will ensure that graduates from Regency Institute are well placed to gain employment in this increasingly internationally competitive field. I am sure this degree will also attract an even larger number of overseas students to the course, which is already well renowned internationally and brings in substantial export dollars.

The State Government and myself remain committed to ensuring that educational and vocational training reflects industry needs and enhances the job prospects of individual students. Moving down the path of TAFE degrees in specific fields is an important step forward towards that goal which I am pleased to support. I congratulate those who are already undertaking degree studies and wish well all those who will pursue this challenging career path in the very near future.

### FLOODS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: Members will be aware that unseasonal rain has turned much of South Australia into a quagmire, and that downpours over the State's northern areas are continuing to exacerbate the situation. In some places I am told that the flooding will be the worst for at least 80 years. Because of the serious implications that this flooding will have on the State, in both a human sense and an economic sense, I wish to advise Parliament of the latest advice the Government has received on the situation and of the excellent action being undertaken by emergency services under extremely difficult conditions. I should point out that, because of the continuing rain, the estimates of damage and estimates of repair times change almost hourly.

The extraordinary tropical rain and thunderstorms over the past week have caused severe flooding in the Far North and Mid North East of the State. The areas affected range from the territory border taking in areas such as Mount Dare, Oodnadatta, Anna Creek, Maree, Hawker to Yunta and Olary along the Barrier Highway. To date there have been no reports of death or serious injury. In the Far North 10 tourists have been evacuated, while a further 213 people were evacuated from the Indian Pacific near Olary. Two people

were also rescued from a helicopter crash near Olary, and seven people were evacuated from properties in the same area. Further evacuations may be required, and food drops to some communities and road camps are being planned.

The State Disaster Plan's 'Recovery Task Force' comprises representatives of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, Treasury, the Department of Family and Community Services, the Health Commission, the Department of Primary Industries, the Department of Transport, the Department of the Environment and Natural Resources, South Australia's Farmers' Federation, the Insurance Council of Australia, the Local Government Association, the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, SA Police and the State Emergency Service. It is being convened operationally for the first time and is making initial assessments to ensure all relevant issues are properly coordinated. Pastoral and farming losses are still being assessed. However, indications are that some properties have suffered serious damage and stock losses. It may take weeks or even months before a full assessment can be made.

There has been substantial damage to roads, especially unsealed roads, and the first estimate of damage to roads and bridges is upwards of \$4 million. In addition, the Barrier Highway has been cut west of Cockburn, but a diversion could be operational later this week. There has been substantial damage to the main railway line between Cockburn and Mannahill which will take at least five weeks to repair, and services in the meantime are being diverted through Melbourne. Australian National has already commenced repairs to this line and to the Leigh Creek to Port Augusta line. BHAS advises that the disruption to rail operations should not adversely affect smelting operations in Port Pirie.

With gas supplies, I am advised that there are no operational problems or a threat to supplies at this stage. We are monitoring the pipeline to ensure supplies are not interrupted and, if necessary, will provide priority to road repairs which will maintain gas supplies. The SA Police are coordinating relief operations, and one helicopter and one fixed-wing aircraft are involved. An Army blackhawk helicopter is also on standby should it be required.

The weather forecast for the region is not good. Further showers and thunderstorms are expected to continue all week to the north-west of Lake Eyre. By Friday, this weather pattern is expected to move southward to Woomera and may extend further south during Saturday. There have been inquiries as to whether the situation requires declaration of a state of emergency. I am advised that as recently as early this afternoon the Director of the State Emergency Service held discussions with the Police Commissioner and they jointly agreed that no declaration was required at this time.

It should be pointed out that a state of emergency is normally declared when there is potential for serious threat to life or injury or when a situation requires a coordinated response by a number of agencies. I have been advised that neither of those situations occur at this time, because the police response to date has been quite successful. In closing, I commend the people involved in the emergency services for the dedication and commitment they have shown so far. It is reassuring that, property damage aside, there have been no reports of loss of life.

#### PROPERTY TRANSACTION

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** During the past week various allegations have been made about the business dealings of the Minister for Finance, Mr Dale Baker, while Minister for Primary Industries several years ago. In a ministerial statement to the House on Thursday 6 February, Mr Baker refuted those allegations. Today he had intended to table further documents in this House providing evidence which he believes will clearly show that he had no conflict of interest in relation to the sale of a piece of land in the South-East and did not act improperly. I now table those documents. The first is a letter from Hume Taylor and Co., barristers and solicitors, dated 11 February 1997 and signed by Mr W.F. Taylor, setting out the facts and dates relating to the sale of land and his advice. It states in part:

On the facts outlined, there can be no question of any breach of the code (of conduct) by you. You did not use confidential information of the department, you were not aware that the department intended to purchase the property when the Banksia Company offered to purchase portion, nor did you interfere in any way with the sale to the department once its offer was accepted. There is also no breach on your part of the code, which states that Ministers will cease to be actively involved in the day-to-day conduct of any professional practice or any business in which the Minister was engaged prior to assuming office.

I also table a letter from Mr Richard Yeeles (former Chief of Staff to the former Premier) dated 10 February 1997, which supports the statement of Mr Baker that, until Mr Yeeles approached the Minister, he had no knowledge that the department had made an offer to buy the land. This morning I was advised by the Police Commissioner (Mr Hyde) that the Anti-Corruption Branch, acting on information sourced from the Hon. Michael Elliott MLC, has commenced an inquiry.

The Minister welcomes that decision, informs me that he has no fear of any inquiry or investigation (which he strongly believes will exonerate him), has sought to take several days leave (which I have agreed to) and, if the inquiry proceeds to an investigation, has offered to stand aside from his ministerial position during that period. At this stage the ACB inquiry is of a preliminary nature. If it decides to investigate further, I will then accept the offer of the Hon. Dale Baker to stand aside for the duration of that investigation. Mr Baker has offered his full cooperation with any such inquiry and investigation.

## QUESTION TIME

### FINANCE MINISTER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Is the Premier aware that extracts from Australian Securities Commission records dated today show that a Dale Spehr Baker is listed as a director of Tomina Pty Limited as well as Tyncole Pty Limited and Dale and Robert Baker Nominees Pty Limited, in direct contravention of his Government's ministerial code of conduct, and what action will the Premier take in relation to these breaches of the code? Tomina Pty Limited, the principal activity of which is described as trustee for the Dale Baker Family Trust, and which also lists an Ian Douglas McLachlan as a director, is today described on Office of Consumer and Business Affairs records as the corporation that is now carrying on the business 'the Banksia Company'—the same company from which, the Minister told Parliament last week in a ministerial statement, he had immediately resigned his directorship following his elevation to the ministry. The Minister was reappointed to the ministry in December 1996.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Opposition has been caught out this Tuesday as it was last Tuesday. I suggest that members opposite scrap their questions and get a new set of questions for Question Time today. I have today tabled a statement in Parliament from solicitors on behalf of Mr Baker, which clearly puts in context matters relative to the code of conduct. Independently, that firm of solicitors has indicated to the House, and I quoted from a part of the letter, that the Minister has not breached the ministerial code of conduct.

**Mr Clarke:** It's up to you to decide.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair will decide about the Deputy Leader if he continues any further.

### MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

**Mr WADE (Elder):** Will the Premier advise the House of recent investments in the South Australian automotive industry and the implications this has for ensuring job security for South Australians and, in particular, within my electorate of Elder?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am delighted to get on to some positive news stories about job creation in South Australia, the bigger picture and what is important for South Australia. I welcome the question from the member for Elder, who joined me yesterday at Bridgestone for the announcement of the new BSTG consortium to drive forward a major employer—550 people employed. The investment of Toyoda Gosei in Bridgestone will bring international technology and research and development into air bag technology to Adelaide and South Australia. It will have the capacity to replace imports to South Australia. It is a positive news story: it talks about our manufacturing base, how important it is for this State, how successful it is and in attracting new investment from overseas for companies in South Australia.

The important issue about this investment is the way in which it underpins job certainty and job prospects in the State of South Australia. It was only a couple of years ago that there were some doubts about Bridgestone's continuing role in some of those facilities and employment in South Australia because of the lack of upgrade of that plant. This investment ensures that jobs within Bridgestone (now BSTG) in Adelaide will be secure for the future. I certainly welcome the support of the member for Elder in that investment decision, but is it not in absolute contrast to what we get from members of the Opposition? We well remember how they have sought to dissuade investment into South Australia because they know investment equals jobs. They know investment equals the path to recovery for South Australia. They know investment means that we will rebuild South Australia after the very significant debt that was left to us by the former Administration. We did not create it, but we accept the responsibility to clean it up.

This new investment is important. The Opposition continually wants to decry South Australia in investments. Look what they said about Westpac, Motorola and Australis. Look what the member for Hart did, in an unprecedented way, by detailing to the public investment attraction packages. Why did he do that? Clearly, the member for Hart wanted to frighten off any company thinking about investing in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition, when tackling a whole range of companies wanting to invest in South Australia, tackles them on all the negative components. He does not look at the fact that positive investment means a new factory and new jobs for South Australians: no, we want to

pursue the course that foreign investment is bad investment. If that is the case, let us hear from the Opposition.

Do they or do they not believe that Toyoda Gosei's investment in Bridgestone is a good thing for South Australia? Every investment we have had from an international or national company has been criticised in some way. We have heard what they have had to say about EDS, which now employs 570 people in South Australia. We have heard what they have had to say about United Water, which has CGE and Thames as parent companies. Look what they have had to say about them—400 jobs being created in South Australia. The constant dripping away at positive news stories, trying to decry investment in South Australia, using select committees, calling business people back time and time again, breaching confidentiality and putting it out in the public arena are all designed for base political purposes, that is, to drive investment out of South Australia.

Go to the factory floor at Bridgestone, go out to Mitsubishi, General Motors, Vulcan, Bonaire or SAFCOL and talk to the workers to find out what they want. I can tell you what they want. They want the policies pursued by this Government over the past three years. They want job certainty created for them. They do not want the negative, carping, yapping dog approach that we have from the Opposition. What will the Opposition say? Will they say that all the investment in 1836 from principally English companies was bad for South Australia? Is US investment in General Motors bad? Is Japanese investment in Mitsubishi bad? Taking the principle espoused by them in the past three years, they stand condemned. They have learnt nothing. They do not deserve consideration for Treasury benches in the foreseeable future because they have no policy thrust, no big picture and no vision for South Australia. They are not interested in the future of South Australia: they are only interested in base political purposes. Let it be known that the work force in those factories will be told where you stand—no policies, no program, no vision and have learnt nothing from the 1980s.

### FINANCE MINISTER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. Why did his Minister for Finance tell the House last week that he had resigned as a director of the Banksia Company (and that is not covered in your ministerial statement) immediately he became a Minister in December 1993? Can he explain why historical records from the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs list a Dale Spehr Baker as a person carrying on the business of the Banksia company until 26 December 1994, over a year after the Minister was appointed Minister for Primary Industries?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I advise the House that I have just answered that question. I have tabled documentation from solicitors clearly talking about the code of conduct and the actions of the Minister for Primary Industries at that time two years ago and subsequently. If the Opposition is not quick enough to generate a new set of questions when the actions of Government render irrelevant the questions Opposition members ask, it is on their shoulders.

### FLOODS

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Minister for Emergency Services inform the House of the efforts of

emergency services during the past few days of flooding throughout the State?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The Government is very proud of the actions of emergency services groups in the north of South Australia. The police, the SES, the CFS and the ambulance service have combined to bring emergency relief to the whole of northern South Australia. As a Parliament, we should put on record our thanks for the tremendous effort that all these people have made because, primarily, they are volunteers. They are headed by the Police Force through its operations centre at Port Augusta. The local member would well know that the emergency operations centre at Port Augusta has been heading this group. In Adelaide, Superintendent John White has been behind the coordination of the whole effort.

As the Premier said, the devastation in the north has to be seen to be believed, and it will take a long time for us to get back to normal in the north of South Australia. The work that has been done by volunteers, by the Police Force, by the SES and by the ambulance service has been a tremendous boost to those people who have been left stranded in the north of South Australia. As the Premier said, over the next two to three days a lot of food packs and emergency material will be dropped into the north of the State to enable these people to carry on in the next two to three weeks in very difficult conditions.

Earlier this year the Government decided to double the amount of funds allocated to the SES, and those funds have been utilised to their maximum benefit in the north of South Australia in this emergency situation. I congratulate all the emergency services and all the volunteers who have helped South Australians relieve the problems of the people in the north.

#### FINANCE MINISTER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given the serious nature of the allegations made against his Minister for Finance involving conflict of interest and involvement in the day-to-day running of a business, is the Premier now prepared to speak to the Minister for Industrial Affairs to establish why the former Premier sacked the now Minister for Finance in December 1995?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The questions in substance just get worse. If you cannot generate a question on employment, investment or major policy initiatives, which the majority of South Australians want, that is okay by me: just keep it up. I think that you are demonstrating day by day with your questioning of irrelevant matters before this Parliament that you are not worried about jobs.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition has asked merely 19 questions about jobs over the past two years. What is the most important issue for South Australians? Jobs, jobs, jobs! I suggest that members opposite start looking at policies that affect people in South Australia—the important things—not careering off and pursuing irrelevant matters as they have been doing over the past two weeks. With each question they ask and each press conference they hold, they demonstrate that they are not worthy of consideration for Government in South Australia. They have no policies, they have given no consideration to policies and they have no vision or plan for job creation in South

Australia. Let the public of South Australia see what they stand for.

#### DAMAGES AWARD

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** Will the Treasurer advise the House on the latest developments in the Motor Accident Commission's appeal against the New South Wales Supreme Court decision in December 1995 to award record damages totalling \$33.2 million to actor Jon Blake, who was seriously injured in a motor vehicle accident near Port Augusta in 1986? I understand that the judgment of the Full Court of the New South Wales Supreme Court was delivered today.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Today the Full Court of the New South Wales Supreme Court reached a determination on the appeal against Justice Robert Hulme's decision of December 1995. The December 1995 decision was that Jon Blake should receive \$44.3 million for losses incurred as a result of his accident. That sum was reduced by 25 per cent for contributory negligence in the belief that alcohol had played some part in that accident. On appeal, the Government won on the issue of negligence to the extent that the claim was discounted by some 35 per cent, rather than 25 per cent. Even though some of the material that should have been available at the time was not available, the court felt that it was appropriate to reduce the award accordingly.

Today I am pleased to announce that, as a result of the Full Court's determination, the \$33 million has now been reduced to \$8.7 million, with associated interest and costs. So, we expect that the cost of that case to the CTP fund and ultimately to those who pay third party insurance will be of the order of \$10 million. That is a vast improvement on \$44 million or \$33 million, but I would point out that it is, by an extraordinary degree, still the largest sum in a determination involving the CTP fund here in South Australia.

We were all appalled by Justice Hulme's original decision, and I believe that the appeal has vindicated our stance on the quantum of damages awarded at the time. However, even when the appeal has been won and the damages awarded amount to \$8.7 million plus costs and interest, it is still a huge burden to bear and not an appropriate awarding of damages under such circumstances. Obviously, if this is a precedent and future earnings can be judged to be of some hypothetical value and can lead to determinations of the order of \$10 million, the Government has to look seriously at the structure and functioning of the CTP fund.

It is now a matter of some urgency that we review whether a cap should be put on the economic loss provisions involving the CTP fund. Without some certainty in the process (and I do not know what the actuaries will do with this determination), I can only assume that CTP insurance premiums will be under enormous pressure well into the future. We were absolutely appalled by the original decision. This matter was removed from the South Australian jurisdiction and taken to New South Wales, and that bears some reflection.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Indeed; some forum shopping occurred, as the member for Spence suggests, and we have to address that issue. We must also seriously address the matter of economic loss as part of the total question of how we control the quantum of claims *vis-a-vis* people's rights so that nobody is disadvantaged in the process. I congratulate the appeal team who fought this case. However, unless we do something dramatic about this situation, I have grave fears

that motorists in South Australia will bear increasing burdens through CTP insurance.

### FINANCE MINISTER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier get an undertaking from his Minister for Finance that the Minister categorically did not undertake any personal business in relation to companies, joint ventures or other businesses in which he has a financial interest while on taxpayer-funded visits to Hong Kong during the periods he has been a Minister of the Crown?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Here they go again! Here is an Opposition that stands up in this Parliament and, in the broadest of terms, just drops something out on the table. These are totally unsubstantiated allegations. If you've got—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has some information, he should put it on the table. Where is it? Put it on the table! If you have some information, front up. If you are not prepared to front up, shut up! I invite the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Put it on the table. Why don't you put it on the table? Come on! They want to play a political game of cat and mouse. They want to stand up in this Parliament and make a series of accusations and do a smear or sleaze job on somebody, without any substance. They are not prepared to pack the substance in behind the allegations. They are the sorts of tactics we have from the Opposition. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to make an accusation, let him substantiate it in the same forum. If he is not prepared to do that, I invite him to do something constructive. What I would expect him to do is, for example, take up with his Federal colleagues—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Clarke:** I would ask the Minister today, but he is not here.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! For the second time I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to contain himself. I also call to order the member for Custance.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Clearly the Opposition prepared all these questions yesterday. They then get into Parliament, and a statement is made that renders the question irrelevant. Either their footwork is so slow or they have no other questions in the top drawer to pull out and ask; so, embarrassed as they are, they just push ahead with the questions—prepared, out of date questions. Once again, they cast an aspersion, do not put any substance to it, and just leave a cloud hanging over someone's head. That is what they seek to do. I invite the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to do something constructive. He could contact his Federal Labor colleagues and do something constructive for all taxpayers. He could have assisted with the passage of the Hindmarsh Island ratification Bill through the Senate. As a result of his colleagues in Canberra voting down that Bill, we cannot now build the bridge. We cannot go ahead with it. We now have to go through \$1 million expenditure of taxpayers' money for yet another inquiry. That is the way the Labor Party plays political tactics.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** After all the uncertainty involved in clarifying the matter, members opposite are not

prepared to bring about any certainty so that the bridge can be proceeded with. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not want to tackle the Hindmarsh Island bridge issue, I invite him to tackle tariffs. The Deputy Leader claims that he comes from a union background and supports the work force. If he does, where are his questions about jobs in South Australia? Where is his statement—just one of them—on tariffs and the protection of the motor vehicle and manufacturing industry in South Australia?

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence does not have the call.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is condemned by his silence.

### UNEMPLOYMENT SCHEME

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the House of her response to the Federal Government's recent announcement made by the Prime Minister of a work for the dole scheme?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** It is a change to get a serious question in this House about a serious issue. I was pleased to hear the Prime Minister announce the Federal Government's commitment to the work for the dole program, because it is a concept that the employment division of the department of TAFE has been investigating for some time. In fact, we have a fully developed program called First Job, which proposes to utilise Commonwealth unemployment benefits while providing vital work experience for young people. The concept of the South Australian initiative is that, in the first instance, it is a voluntary program, which will place people who have been unemployed for at least two months in a job for a minimum of six months. This is not a work gang proposal: First Job involves assessing individuals, providing relevant training where necessary and placing them in appropriate real jobs. It is the intention that unemployment benefits will be used as a wage subsidy, with participating employers topping up the wage to a relevant award rate.

For most young people the opportunity to earn their income, rather than just be given it, is considered by them to be a real plus. I was particularly interested to hear that the Prime Minister is keen to pilot 30 work for the dole programs in the near future. Advice from the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs confirms that the work for the dole concept is still at the development stage. Therefore, in the past 24 hours, I have written to the Prime Minister urging him to consider the model we have already fully developed in South Australia. I have also written to Senators Vanstone and Newman, as well as the Federal Minister for Vocational Education and Training, Mr Kemp, to urge them to endorse the South Australian scheme.

First Job differs from the work for the dole concept in that it is not confined to particular industry sectors or activities. Initial discussions with the Commonwealth Government on the First Job proposal took place late last year. As all members would be aware, legislative change at the Federal level is needed for the program to proceed. Last month, I approved the continued development of the First Job proposal, and I trust that the Federal Government will move to support this plan. I also bring members' attention to an article in the *Financial Review* that came out today, with the writer of the article, Michelle Grattan, stating:

The best way to prepare people for 'real jobs' and get them experience and networks that would maximise their chances of such work would be to have the work for the dole scheme operate in the general employment market.

The South Australian program will provide young people with real opportunities for real work experience and for the real development of self-esteem that will inevitably help them to win real jobs.

### FINANCE MINISTER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister for Police recommend to the police anti-corruption branch that it interview the Minister for Industrial Affairs as to why he sacked the now Minister for Finance as the Minister for Primary Industries in December 1995?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I am sorry that the Deputy Leader did not even realise who the Minister was, because it changed some time ago. That is one of the most inane questions that we have had—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** —from the Deputy Leader for a long time.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is the second time for the Deputy Leader.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence will come to order.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I would have thought that the Deputy Leader would recognise that the people of South Australia are sick and tired of the dirt politics of the Deputy Leader and the Labor Party. It is about time that we in this Parliament got on with doing things that the people of South Australia want. I would have thought that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would be one of the first people wanting to lead the Opposition into this new era. I remember the Leader's saying that he was not about getting into all this rubbish politics: he wanted purely and simply to lead South Australia in this new direction. We have heard nothing but nonsense and dirt from this Opposition for a long time.

### YOUTH AND TRAINING WAGES

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Will the South Australian Government support the continuation of youth and training wages in industrial awards and agreements when these issues are reviewed by the Australian Industrial Relations Commission? Many employers in South Australia, particularly in the retail and hospitality industries, employ young people on youth and training wages under industrial awards. Recent amendments to industrial relations laws will require the Australian Industrial Relations Commission to review these award wage rates.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The answer to the question is 'Yes.' I stress that Liberal Governments, both in South Australia and federally, very strongly support the principle that there should be a youth award rate. I believe that thousands of young people employed in the hospitality and retail industries in this State would otherwise not be able to get a job unless there were a youth award rate. This Liberal Government, when it introduced the legislation in 1994, very strongly supported the position of allowing the Industrial

Commission to maintain youth award rates. It is interesting, because it was the Deputy Leader of the Labor Party who moved an amendment to try to knock out that part, but this Government stuck to its task and ensured that that amendment got through.

We support the youth award rate because we believe that it is a way of giving jobs to a large number of young people who do not have the work experience and who otherwise would not get jobs, particularly in the retail and hospitality industries. Under a Federal Labor Government, those youth award rates would have been outlawed on 22 June this year. Fortunately, a change of Federal Government occurred. New Federal legislation has been introduced that removes the requirement that, on 22 June, youth rates be abolished across Australia. I stress that this Liberal Government supports the maintenance of the youth award rate and will continue to do so when that review comes before the Federal Industrial Relations Commission.

### PROPERTY TRANSACTION

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. In the attachment to the Premier's ministerial statement today, namely, the letter from Hume, Taylor and Company, how did Hume, Taylor and Company know when the Minister for Primary Industries first became aware that the department intended to purchase the land in which the Minister had also expressed an interest? Did Dale tell them?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader is commenting; he knows that that is out of order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I have advised the House that certain matters which were tabled in another place and which were referred to the ACB by a member—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Do you want to listen to the answer?

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** First, the Deputy Leader asks a question and then carries on a conversation—it is clear that he is not interested in the answer to the question. Secondly, and importantly, it is a question that has been drummed up by the staff upstairs. The Deputy Leader has been on the telephone between each question. He is somewhat embarrassed today. He is trying to pick up the pace as to how he can make the questions relevant to today. Well, the staff upstairs still have not got it right for him. The draft question sent down to the Deputy Leader today ignores the fact that I advised the House that the ACB is investigating all matters that were put on the deck by the honourable member in another place. That is the end of the matter. The Deputy Leader might not like the fact that the Minister for Finance, of his own initiative, has sought leave—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the Deputy Leader's attention to the fact that the Chair has been tolerant. If he continues, he knows the answer.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I simply state that, as I said in my five previous answers, this matter is under investigation and, therefore, it renders irrelevant the point to the questions being asked by the Opposition today.

## HEALTH, PRIVATISATION

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** Will the Minister for Health inform the House whether private sector involvement in health care is compatible with public health?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** It is important to acknowledge that the Government is committed to public health, and for us 'public health' is defined as quality health services with accountability to the community provided free of charge to the patients. The three key elements are quality, accountability and free of charge. In contrast to that, the Labor Opposition in this State asserts that to ensure quality public health the State needs to do a number of things: it needs to own all the land; it needs to own all the assets; it needs to provide all the medical staff; it needs to employ all the nursing staff; and it needs to provide all the management personnel.

That is simply ideological claptrap that bears no relevance to today's society. How does the name on the title to the land affect the quality of health services? It clearly does not. Does a nurse stop caring for a patient when he or she is employed by the public or the private sector? Of course not. I would like to illustrate how out of touch and, in fact, out of reality the Labor Party is in this State. I contrast its stance with another Labor Party facing an election in the next 12 months. The Tory Government in Britain allegedly wants to sell the London Underground. The British Labour Party opposes this move on the ground that it would offer no proper strategic control over a vital public asset.

So what is Labour's alternative? According to the electronic telegraph—and I note that the member for Playford reads the *Weekly Telegraph*; I am talking about the *Daily Telegraph*—Mr Blair asserts that a new Labour Government would retain the London Underground in the public sector but seek to attract private capital to improve services. Mr Blair, the Leader of the Labour Party in the United Kingdom, is quoted as follows:

It would offer no proper strategic control over a vital public asset, and it would yet again be selling off a monopoly public service with no prospect of competition.

That is if it were sold: Mr Blair is saying that he would use private sector capital to improve services.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr CLARKE:** Could the Minister advise members when he became responsible for the actions of the British Labour Party, or for the London Underground?

**An honourable member:** What's your point of order?

**Mr CLARKE:** It's a question of relevance.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! When the House comes to order, the Chair will make a ruling.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Ministers are given a lot more latitude in answering questions than are members in asking them. I suggest to the Minister that he round off his answer because the Opposition no longer has a guarantee of 10 questions.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The relevance of this question, for the benefit of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, is that, by doing what the Labour Party in Britain intends to do, if it were to win the next election, we are providing better, more modern and more services to the people of South Australia. We are producing 20 000 more admissions every

year than under the Labor Party—20 000 South Australians are having operations who would not have had them under the Labor Party. Why? Because the Labor Party wears ideological blinkers: it refuses to use private money. It insists that the name on the title of the land cannot be held in private money because of some ideological rubbish.

That means that it is not prepared to use money to provide the best possible public health services in South Australia. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition thinks that is not relevant, it is no wonder he is sitting over that side of the Chamber. As I said to the House last week, we have not sold any hospitals, we do not intend to sell any hospitals, and we will not sell any hospitals. However, we will favourably consider partnerships between public sector units and private sector organisations in the delivery of quality public health care. The Labour Party in Britain has acknowledged the benefits which can flow from private sector involvement. The contrast between the South Australian Labor Party and British Labour is so stark that perhaps Trades Hall and the South Australian Labor Party ought to be renamed the 'outhouse'. They are out of touch, out-of-date and, thank goodness, out of Government.

## FINANCE MINISTER

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier ask the Minister for Finance whether, when he was Minister for Primary Industries, he directed his department against its advice to conduct extensive research into matters affecting the production of proteas and whether, following the completion of the report, he kept it confidential? Did this place the Minister in a position where he had a conflict of interest? In a private capacity, the Minister is known as a major producer of proteas.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** My response is the same as for the second question, or was it the third, the fourth or the fifth? I am not quite sure; I have lost count. Once again, the honourable member comes into Parliament (the Minister is not here, and I have explained why the Minister is not here) and puts accusations and innuendo on the table which are not backed up or substantiated in any way. The Opposition might want to pursue the sleaze agenda; that is fine, because the public of South Australia will judge it on its actions in the fullness of time.

## SPORTING EVENTS

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** Will the Minister for Recreation and Sport inform the House of the major sporting events the Government is currently attracting to South Australia and outline some of the benefits they will bring to the State?

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** Before I answer the question I shall address comments that were made in this House last week by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hart in relation to the Test match. Neither honourable member is here today, but let us get some facts on the table. First, allegations were made last week that only Adelaide's Test has been moved from a long weekend. I point out to members opposite that last year Sydney's Test over the New Year long weekend was moved. That proves conclusively that it is not just Adelaide.

After all the criticism that members opposite have levelled at us, let us ask the Opposition about 1988, 1989, 1990 and 1992. If my memory serves me correctly, the Opposition was in Government for each one of those years. What happened

in 1988, in 1989, in 1990 and in 1992? The Test match, which was normally held on the Australia Day long weekend in Adelaide, was moved. How about that! Here is the Opposition telling us that I am responsible and that this Government is responsible for having our Test match moved. I suggest that, next time, members opposite do a little bit of homework before they throw mud in here. As the Premier so capably pointed out today, members opposite throw mud and hope a bit of it sticks. By doing this, they think they will achieve their ends.

Let us now consider what this Government has done to attract sport to South Australia. First, I give full marks to my predecessor, the now Deputy Premier, in this respect. Adelaide will host a round of the Davis Cup. That took a lot of work on behalf of the Deputy Premier and the Government, but we will host a round of the Davis Cup in Adelaide.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** We have a lot more to go yet. We will also host the Masters Tennis Championships. That did not just occur: that took a lot of work on behalf of the Government. The Adelaide Rams will commence in the not too distant future. Make no mistake, the Rams themselves would be the first to acknowledge that, if it had not been for the assistance of this Government, there could have been very real difficulties in terms of whether they could have commenced in this State. We also have the launch of Port Power. One might say, 'What good is that?' But it is a positive, because it means that an AFL team will visit Adelaide every weekend, and as such local accommodation and the local tourism industry will benefit.

I know that a lot of members, particularly those on this side of the House, are interested in the Rugby Sevens competition. I was fortunate enough to see that event for a number of hours over the weekend. It is a marvellous competition. What is the result of this Government's initiatives in terms of having successfully held the Rugby Sevens competition for two years? The Australian Rugby Union now totally supports this State and this Government in terms of conducting a round of the Rugby Sevens world championships here in the year 2000.

Ford announced on the weekend, after yet another successful Ford Open at Kooyonga, that it will not only continue its sponsorship of that major event but put more money into it. I take the opportunity to congratulate Tom Lehman. He is one of the greatest ambassadors of golf I have ever seen. For anyone who attended the golf over the weekend, I suggest that it was one of the most moving tournaments we could have had. A popular Australian looked as though he would win, but disaster struck on the seventeenth hole. Right up to the last hole it was not known who would win. Again, I make the point that this is another successful event which was brought to South Australia by this Government and which received major input from this Government.

In August we will host a world cycling event, which will attract representatives from 20 countries. Again, I make the point to this House that that did not just occur; it took a lot of work from this Government to do it. In October we will host the Champions Trophy for hockey. This is the world championship for the top six nations. We will also stage the World Masters Rowing Championship. This event will attract between 2 000 and 3 000 competitors, let alone those who will come to watch it. Adelaide is truly alive with an absolute smorgasbord of sports events that are coming, and I will be—

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** There is an international jetski event in two weeks.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** As my colleague points out, there are other events. There are so many now that it is difficult to put them onto one or two pages. I wonder when the Opposition will come out and commend the Government on the work and the effort it has put into attracting these sporting events not only to Australia but to Adelaide. More importantly, let us remember what these events do in terms of the generation of income and the generation of jobs for this State and, importantly, the generation of international interest. All the events I have outlined generate international television coverage. All these events will promote the 'Sensational Adelaide' banner. This is really great for South Australia, and I look forward to announcing other projects which are very much in the pipeline right now.

### WOMEN, MIGRANT

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Does the Minister for Family and Community Services believe that the interests of migrant women in crisis will be better served by amalgamating the migrant women's emergency support service with the domestic violence outreach service as recommended in the Minister's review of services for women and children escaping domestic violence?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** That matter is currently under consideration.

### CLEANER PRODUCTION PROGRAM

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources inform the House of successes achieved by the cleaner production program that has been operating in South Australia since 1994?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I am pleased to inform the member for Mitchell about the successes of the cleaner production program. Before responding, I advise that on Sunday I was privileged to attend a conference, organised by the Environment Protection Authority, which brought together industry and environmental groups and other groups (local government, etc.) to discuss issues relating to the Environment Protection Authority. It was a great success. It was the first conference of its kind that has been organised by the authority. I was very pleased with the number of people and organisations who were there and the comments and the positive points that were made which the Government will be able to take into consideration.

In respect of the cleaner production program, to date it has involved some 37 projects in South Australia in 18 industry sectors. The project has led to cost savings among participating industries of \$2 million a year, which is quite an achievement, with substantial savings in energy, water and resource consumption.

In water alone, reduced consumption of at least 100 million litres a year has been achieved, and that is good news, particularly for South Australia. The program has also led to the elimination in many instances of hazardous waste chemicals and of emissions going to air, water and land, which are the direct responsibility of the Environment Protection Authority. In many cases the clean, green image has led to improved export opportunities for this State, and we are seeing improvements in that area all the time.

I would like to cite some particularly successful examples of this program. First, local firm Bordex Wine Racks received



\$30 000 to install a new induction oven. As a result, this company increased its production capacity three times, while reducing electricity consumption by 70 per cent. Its product quality has increased to the point where it is now exporting to both Europe and Japan and its staff has increased from two to 12, all as a result of improved environmental performance in South Australia. Korvest Galvanisers is involved in hot dip galvanising for fabricated steel products. That company now saves \$120 000 a year through improved production procedures and saves \$150 000 on waste acid disposal. Another South Australia company, Soniclean Pty Limited, received \$75 000 to develop a new system to replace hazardous methods of heavy industry cleaning. The technology it developed has been so successful that it has featured at international trade exhibitions and, in particular, it has received enthusiastic responses from Malaysia, Thailand and Japan.

The member for Mitchell should appreciate that a number of the industries in his own electorate have been assisted through this program. The response to cleaner production in this State is growing at such a rate that environmental technology is becoming a major business in South Australia. All this comes on top of the quarter of a billion dollars that is being spent on environmental improvement programs by industry which have been negotiated by the EPA. This means that South Australia is gaining an increasing reputation as being cleaner and greener, and environmental efforts mean improved performance and ultimately the creation of jobs in this State.

#### MINISTERS' CODE OF CONDUCT

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier tell the House what in his opinion constitutes a breach of the ministerial code of conduct in terms of 'Ministers will cease to be actively involved in the day-to-day conduct of any professional practice or in any business in which the Minister was engaged prior to assuming office'?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is of the view that this question runs very close to being hypothetical. However, I will leave it to the discretion—

**Mr CLARKE:** On a point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member will resume his seat forthwith. The Chair is currently addressing the House. I suggest that the honourable member pay attention to Standing Orders when attempting to rise while he is out of order. I will leave it to the judgment of the Premier whether he cares to respond to the question.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The questions on this subject by the Opposition today have been all over the place. We saw the Deputy Leader embarrassed, so we had a pause and went to two questions on other subjects whilst they had a bit of time to beat up the questions, because they were getting a little embarrassed that the questions were going nowhere and the homework had not been done and, because of the ministerial statement and the letters I tabled in Parliament today, they were no longer relevant. There is just one fact that needs to be—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition has actually arrived. Here we are, 52 minutes into Question Time and the Leader of the Opposition just arrives for Question Time. Belatedly, welcome. I never thought that I would actually say this or think it: given the standard of the questions of the Deputy Leader, I am almost glad that the

Leader of the Opposition has turned up today. We might actually have an improvement in the standard of questions being presented. In the first question that was put up there was an allegation that the ASC records obtained today indicated that there had not been a resignation. That is what was alleged by—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Deputy Leader wants to ask a question and then answer it and interject in the process of my giving the answer to that question. Let me pick that up again. In the first question, I think, posed by the Deputy Leader today there was an assertion that they had obtained ASC files that indicated that the Minister for Finance had not resigned from one of his positions. While the Deputy Leader has been rabbiting on about a whole range of other matters, we actually made a phone call to check whether that had taken place. And yes, the Minister for Finance did lodge with the ASC his resignation as a director. If the ASC's records or processing of them are not up to date, neither the Minister for Finance nor I can be held accountable.

That once again demonstrates that members opposite come into the Parliament, make these broad accusations of no substance, and then they sit down and leave the cloud hanging there. Let it be known by the public of South Australia that what this Opposition is interested in is not jobs; it is not the future of young South Australians.

#### GRAIN HARVEST

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** Will the Minister for Primary Industries outline to the House the anticipated flow-on effects to the State's economy from another bumper grain harvest and what forecasts were made for the industry at the recent ABARE Outlook Conference?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the honourable member for his continuing interest in the performance of our rural sector. South Australian grain growers have just generated the second largest crop ever. Receipts of wheat are likely to reach 2.74 million tonnes, with South Australian barley production just under two million. As I said, they are both the second highest on record. That has been achieved despite the fact that the crops were planted against a background of a late break in the season and what looked in the middle of the year as being a very conservative outlook. The better than expected crops reflect the fact that farmers have increased their ability to apply the latest technology and that is another positive indicator of the fact that farmers in South Australia are willing to accept change.

Although prices have declined from last year's levels, these levels of production will see the grain industry contribute about 20 per cent or more of the State's total export income, which is a lot coming from one industry. As you are well aware, Mr Speaker, the excellent grain season is once again responsible for hundreds of very important jobs in regional South Australia and, as the grain cheques come in, there will be a flow-on to other parts of the community as spending increases in those areas. At last week's ABARE conference, the forecasts for the future were indeed positive, despite some mixed media reporting of the proceedings. Increased demand is expected to keep world grain stocks at manageable levels in 1997-98, and this will be important in determining future prices. As the incomes in developing nations increase, opportunities will increase for grain exports and feedlot activities. Is the Deputy Leader interested?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** This is perhaps a little too positive, but what is happening here is about jobs; it is about economic activity; it is about what the Deputy Leader always claims as very important regional development, of which members opposite hold themselves up as the masters.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** This is a very important issue for all those people. Despite the forecast of slight declines in prices, the grain industry continues to be a vital part of the State's economy and to play a major role in regional development in South Australia.

### GUN LICENCES

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** My question is directed to the Minister for Police. What progress has been made on the issue of photo gun licences, what number of persons who met the necessary requirements by the stated date last year have not yet been issued with their photo gun licences and how many are still in the mail, as mine is?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It is not very often that we get personal questions as Ministers, but this one is a very good personal question. I know that the photograph taken of the honourable member was a very good one. As a matter of fact, four were taken. They sent a photograph to Victoria where it was covered with plastic—and they have done a very good job. In relation to the other three photographs, I know they destroyed every single one of them. I know that because the honourable member opposite asked me to give him a personal briefing on that only the other day. The question about the need to keep four photographs is a major issue, because some concern has arisen that the other three may be used at another time for other purposes. We have made sure that that will not occur.

I have also taken the opportunity to visit the Firearms Division of the Police Department to ensure that this whole process was going along in the way in which we hoped it would. As well as the licences, we have the issue of how the monitoring of the return of firearms is going. The Government decided to extend the return of firearms from the end of December to the end of February. It was only today that I received a full briefing on the fact that it has virtually dropped off to a trickle. I hope that, with the advertisements appearing on a weekly basis in the media, we do not get a run in the last week.

In relation to the photographic licences, we have also conducted some investigations into why this slowness has occurred in Victoria. I have been advised that the process is very similar in time frame to that which the motor vehicles department experiences: the delay is not any more significant than it is for our photographic motor vehicle licences. The honourable member asked a very good personal question. I know that he has a very special interest in this whole firearms area not only because of his interest in the sport but because of his interest in ensuring that we get reasonable firearms legislation. This is very important to him and to all the people whom he represents in South Australia.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling on the Grievance Debate, I draw members' attention to the fact that they will all have received temporary parking permits. I sincerely hope they all read the accompanying letter, because the provisions in that letter will be strictly adhered to.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Today the Premier mentioned the issue of tariffs. I found the comments made last week and quoted in the *Advertiser* by Senator Grant Chapman extraordinary. Grant Chapman used to be the member responsible to represent people who worked at Mitsubishi motors. I have now written to Grant Chapman and to all Federal Liberal MHRs and senators in South Australia asking for their support for the car industry in this State. My letter to Senator Grant Chapman states:

I write to you concerning the comments attributed to you on the Productivity Commission review of post 2000 assistance arrangements for the automotive industry. With the greatest respect, it is time for you and your colleagues to join the real world in understanding the grave threat now posed to our car industry.

I have made the decision to write to you believing that the comments attributed to you in the *Advertiser* of 6 February are ill-informed and have policy implications harmful to the national interest and devastating to South Australia's regional economic and employment interests. . . Thankfully, there exists in the South Australian Parliament bipartisan support for continued assistance to the automotive industry. It is the position of the South Australian Parliamentary Labor Party that there should not be further reductions in assistance to the Australian automotive industry after the year 2000.

Additional reduction in tariffs after the year 2000 would be both terrible and terrifying for the automotive industry, the Australian economy and balance of payments, and especially for the vulnerable South Australian economy.

Since 1988 the share of imports in the Australian automotive market has risen from 20 per cent to almost 50 per cent this year. During this time Nissan ceased Australian manufacture to become an importer. Under current arrangements, automotive tariffs will fall to 15 per cent by the year 2000.

**Mr MEIER:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I note under Notices of Motion that two items deal with the information the Leader is debating, that is, tariffs, and I seek your ruling as to whether that is allowed.

**The SPEAKER:** They are only notices of motion.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am referring to a letter written and posted to Senator Grant Chapman since that time. It further states:

The most notable success of more than a decade of restructuring has been the substantial growth in exports which stand at nearly \$1.8 billion today. Much of this growth has been facilitated by enlightened Government policies such as export facilitation, which has also eased the pain of restructuring by encouraging the gradual movement of resources within the sector to areas of greatest competitiveness. The Export Facilitation Scheme would be abolished under the Productivity Commission majority proposal. . . Trade in automobiles is one of the most heavily protected and managed in the world. Recently, the Federation of Automotive Parts Manufacturers has provided up-to-date information on the application of barriers in automotive trade. Australia was found to be the market most open to import competition in cars.

The basic thesis of my argument is that we may not see closures occurring overnight. The letter continues:

Rather, the most vulnerable companies are likely to continue production for the period until the next change of model, when large additional investment is required. Then we would see the closure of whole production facilities. Machines would be unbolted and shipped out of Australia and to another country with a more supportive policy environment. As a flow on effect, many of the industries linked to the highly integrated Australian car industry would also be forced to contract. Industry analysts and commentators have linked—

**Mr MEIER:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Again I raise the issue that the Leader is commenting about other manufacturing industries connected to the motor vehicle industry. He is talking about the motor vehicle industry. Whilst I appreciate what the Leader is seeking to convey, this was conveyed to the House in a substantive motion last week and is before us for debate again this week.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair on this occasion is more familiar with the notice of motion and the matter before the House. I suggest to the Leader that he take that into account and not canvass those areas which are currently before the House.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The letter continues:

Industry analysts and commentators have linked any further reduction in assistance to automotive beyond the 15 per cent year 2000 target to the closure of another automotive major.

That should be of concern to members of the Liberal Party opposite who, unfortunately, continue to try to support the death knell of the car industry in this State.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I support the Prime Minister's announcement for a work for the dole scheme, as announced on Monday 7 February 1997. The House would remember that on 5 May 1994 I proposed a notice of motion which read:

That this House urges the Federal Parliament to make such changes as necessary to existing legislation and administration procedures as will require recipients of unemployment payments for 12 months or more from social security to perform work for a proportion of each week (or each month) either for local government or in a community service program within the locality in which they live if not already involved in approved training courses.

As members of the House would also recall, that fell off the Notice Paper because it was not debated by members opposite. So, on 25 August 1994 it was therefore necessary for me to reintroduce the same notice of motion and attach to it the same arguments. I did so because of its importance to youth and the general unemployed in South Australia. I am delighted today to hear that Minister Kotz has indicated that South Australia will be among the first to trial the work for the dole scheme as part of First Job.

When I introduced a notice of motion in May and August 1994, the Opposition managed to put up only one member to speak against the motion. The key issues that were raised at that time were the same old trite, union-based statements—the same old tired clichés—that we hear every time these initiatives are put forward. They suggested that we would force people to work; there were accusations that I was knocking people on the dole, that unemployed people were being used as slave labour, and that we were punishing the victims of unemployment in South Australia. Claims were also made that it would destroy the unemployed's chance of getting back into the work force.

I suggest that we look at what really happens when a work for the dole scheme is established, not only for the unemployed but most importantly for the long-term unemployed. The longer people are out of work, the harder it is for them to get a job. That is because they lose contact with the labour

market, they lose touch with the community and they find that fewer opportunities come their way. Their skills deteriorate, their confidence wanes and their morale is sapped. Employers believe that the longer people are unemployed, the less employable they are, and this compounds their problem.

A work for the dole scheme can also be used to overcome some of the side issues associated with unemployment, and one need look only at the link between unemployment, poor health and social problems that is clearly shown in most research concerning the unemployed. It also provides the unemployed with ways to keep very close to what the employer is looking for. The top four factors that have been listed by managers in deciding to hire a long-term unemployed person are whether they are suitable for the job, whether they have any good references, whether they have a good work history and whether they have the ability to perform the skills asked of them. People who are long-term unemployed without any of those contacts and not in training find it very difficult to impress an employer. A work for the dole scheme is one way of building up self-esteem and support.

Most importantly, youth support a measure such as this. A study conducted in Sydney by the Australian Youth Institute showed that two-thirds of those interviewed in the 18-to-25 years bracket favoured some sort of work for the dole scheme, and half the number of people interviewed were already long-term unemployed. To the direct question 'Should people have to work in return for unemployment benefits?', 66.4 per cent said 'Yes'. Only 19 per cent of those long-term unemployed said 'No'.

This scheme is a sensible one. Its aim is to give back to the unemployed some self-esteem, to give them contact with work areas, to give them skills development and to help them maintain a work ethic, which is easy to lose. The majority of South Australians do not want to be looked after, as Keating once said he would do for the unemployed in Australia. The majority of South Australians do not want to be looked after. They want to contribute something positively to the State that they live in. The Australian Institute of Health—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mrs ROSENBERG:** Shut up, stupid! The South Australian Institute of Health—

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

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** In his rather disconnected and rambling answer in Question Time, and before he wandered off into the London Underground, the Minister for Health asserted that quality, accountability and free of charge were the three flagships of our public health system. I will spend the few minutes that I have today bringing some other information to the attention of members. I will quote from the initial results of an extensive community survey undertaken by the Council on the Ageing and SACOSS towards the end of last year. Members can watch the Minister's flagships sink as they listen to the information contained in the document as follows:

Feedback from COTA members, and people generally, consistently points to problems with health services being their No. 1 issue at State level. This has been the case for a good many years. . . The health system has been under severe pressure for several years. Health provision has become not a matter of need but of what the Government, or Treasury, prescribes. Health services have had to contribute to cost cutting by Government irrespective of the impact on patients.

Cutbacks have not been accompanied by any substantial commitment to improved quality in health care. Overwhelming feedback about concerns about health care quality led COTA to conduct the *Vision for Health* project in August-October 1996 in cooperation with SACOSS.

The document continues:

We invited the community to either complete a standard 'health report' form, or to participate in a statewide phone-in, on their experience of health services. Detailed responses were received on behalf of almost 700 people. Both consumers and service providers were asked to tell their stories about the health system, with the freedom to report any aspect they wished. The aim was to get an overview of the strong and weak points of the system. . . Most hospitals were represented in the survey in proportion to their size and the presence or absence of an accident and emergency department. These departments came in for a large number of serious complaints. Praise for the system was expressed by some contributors, but unfortunately it was a small minority.

One respondent gave a graphic description of the treatment he had received regularly at the same hospital, over many years. He reported a steady deterioration in conditions over this period, to the point where for a day admission he now had to change into a hospital gown in a toilet and was no longer given a bed or even a towel. As expected, discharge problems were frequently raised—

surprise, surprise!—

with many readmissions as a direct result. Waiting times for hospital admission and long hours of waiting in casualty upset many contributors. The most frequent complaint was a failure of communication, leaving both patients and their carers under stress.

Most disturbingly to COTA, the project also clearly showed that age is a serious disadvantage. In some cases older patients only got improved treatment after intervention by a relative or their GP who pointed out that person had a good quality of life even if they were of an advanced age.

The report goes on, detailing instances of unplanned discharge. Terrible situations were cited, as follows:

There can be no excuse for the discharge by taxi at 2 a.m. of a 92-year-old lady who lives alone, nor for a person taken to Glenside because of a suicide attempt being discharged a few hours later without even the fare for the bus home.

It goes on and on. I was very interested when the *Advertiser* telephoned me on Sunday, asking for a comment on this matter. I asked whether they intended to talk to the Minister and, when I was told that they were, I said, 'I bet he says that it is not statistically valid.' And what do you know? If members read yesterday's article, they will see that the Minister for Health's comment on all this was that it was not statistically valid. So much for accountability! What he means is, 'If I do not like the result, then I'm going to listen to it. I'll make up some excuse as to why I won't take any notice of it.' I yet again suspect that he will invite Professor Lane to come back and take a special quick and dirty look at our entire health system and provide him with the result he wants.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I am very pleased that some major works are to occur at the Wallaroo jetty, and that some of them have already commenced. It needs to be pointed out that the Wallaroo terminal has received the highest level of grain deliveries of any single bulk handling site in South Australia since bulk handling began 41 years ago. In fact, 498 000 tonnes have been received from growers, plus 75 000 tonnes silo to silo. The amount of grain taken to Wallaroo indicates its great importance to South Australia. I also acknowledge that in the electorate of Goyder I have the silos of Ardrossan and Port Giles as well, so we are certainly well served from a shipping point of view.

It is Wallaroo that I wish to highlight today. I am pleased that significant works will occur, and I compliment the Ports

Corporation or its foresight and the way it is recognising the importance of Wallaroo. One of the key projects proposed involves new mooring chains that are about to be installed at an approximate cost of \$90 000. The current mooring chains have certainly required an upgrade for some time. I was recently taken under the Wallaroo wharf in a small boat to look at the state of repair. Much this work should have been done quite some time ago. There is no doubt that the Wallaroo jetty has been the subject of significant neglect over the past 20 years, and I am pleased that under this Government things are being done.

Those mooring chains will assist not only when ships pull up at any given time but also when ships move forward or aft to make way for others to load from the grain area. Likewise, work on new timber decking where the phosphate trucks unload phosphate from ships has already commenced at a cost of \$135 000. From an environmental point of view this is a great asset to the area, because some of the phosphate apparently could get through the two or three layers of timber that currently exist. This new timber will ensure that that does not happen but, perhaps more importantly, it will ensure that loose timber decking on the top does not suddenly spring up and damage a truck. Last year a fuel tank was damaged when one of these pieces of timber decking sprang up and hit a truck.

Additionally, a walkway is being constructed, which means that the Wallaroo wharf will be accessible to members of the public for 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. That has not been the case for the past few years, because the wharf has been shut off when phosphate was loaded. That has annoyed many visitors to the area who have come up specifically to do some fishing and found the wharf shut. Only last Friday and Saturday when I was there the wharf was shut off and many people were disappointed. This will allow constant access, at least through to the spur jetty. Additional work will be done on the horizontal fenders: they will be fixed fenders, at a cost of \$40 000; a fuel outlet is proposed on the spur jetty to assist the fishing industry, and that will be a marvellous boost; and additional work will occur on the spur jetty, with new horizontal support bars providing appropriate facilities for boats mooring at the jetty. The concreting of the rest of the jetty surface is also being considered, but a final decision on whether it should be concrete or wood has yet to be made. I compliment the Ports Corporation.

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

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I rise this afternoon in relation to the non-answers that the Premier supplied to the House today with respect to issues of concern surrounding the Minister for Finance. In particular I draw the attention of the House to the letter dated 11 February 1997 from Hume, Taylor and Co. which, addressed to the Minister for Finance, was tabled by the Premier. The Premier said that this letter adds to the substance of his statement that the Minister for Finance is cleared of any wrongdoing with respect to any breach of ministerial conduct. I might add that the second paragraph of that letter states:

I understand the facts to be as follows: [then there are a number of star points]. On the facts as outlined there can be no question of any breach. . .

Of course, lawyers can operate only on the basis of information supplied to them by the person seeking the advice. In this case, the person seeking the advice is the Minister for

Finance, who presumably provided those facts on which Hume, Taylor and Co. based their legal opinion. Frankly, the letter is quite worthless because, until such time as the matter is tested by an independent body to ascertain the sequence of events and the facts, any opinion from the solicitors involved has to be suspect. I also draw the House's attention to the extraordinary situation that occurred today whereby the Premier could not tell the Parliament what in his opinion constituted a breach of the ministerial code of conduct. It was quite a simple question:

Will the Premier tell the House what in his opinion constitutes a breach of the ministerial code of conduct in terms of 'Ministers will cease to be actively involved in the day-to-day conduct of any professional practice or in any business in which the Minister was engaged prior to assuming office'?

The Premier ducked and weaved and made all sorts of allegations concerning the Opposition and my personal motives and those of the Leader of the Opposition with respect to our pursuit of the Minister for Finance, but at no time could the Premier tell us what he believed his own code of conduct meant. This is the person who must arbitrate from time to time on the conduct of his 12 Ministers and determine whether they are in breach of his own guidelines—his own code of conduct. I find it extraordinary that he could not tell this House what in his view was a breach of those guidelines—what it meant in terms of Ministers ceasing to be actively involved in the day-to-day conduct of their business. I would have thought that any Premier would be able to answer that question fairly succinctly knowing what a ministerial code of conduct meant—the foundation of the Westminster system of Government and accountability of Government.

I thought I was listening to a former Premier of Queensland—Joh Bjelke-Petersen—who, when he gave evidence in a court case only a few years ago and was asked, 'What do you understand by the doctrine of the separation of powers?' could not answer, because he did not know. I thought that was just a peculiar Queensland affliction that would never be replicated here in South Australia. But that is what we have seen here today, when the Premier could not tell the House and the public of this State what he believes his own code of conduct actually means and what would constitute Ministers' being involved in the day-to-day conduct of any professional practice or any business. I find that not only extraordinary but also totally unacceptable. It indicates that this Government is very much on the run. Only in the past few weeks we have seen a Premier and a former Premier who are under a huge cloud with respect to misleading this House and who, only by the sheer weight of numbers on Party-political lines, have been able to be saved; and we saw a Deputy Premier in a similar predicament at the end of last year.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader's time has expired. The member for Lee.

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** I wish to talk about the conduct of the media in recent times. I wanted to enter Parliament because I was not happy about the representation of members of Parliament during my teenage life and about the increase in unfounded discriminatory laws that have produced two or more classes of people in Australia. I believe that there should be tough penalties for people of all age groups who commit repeated offences, be they white collar or blue collar crimes. The penalty to be applied should not reflect the offender's prior life experiences.

The background of the offender should be explained, and Government policy should be addressed to correct future similar problems such as bad parenting, low income problems or the past family situation, slow responses by FACS to that person's situation or whatever. That should all be rectified. However, a sentence reduced in those circumstances only gives a signal to future criminals that they can use a similar excuse—be it true or made up—to get their own sentence reduced.

I would also like to draw members' attention to an article in the *Advertiser* of today, 11 February, entitled 'School fire gaol term suspended'. According to this article, a teenage arsonist, who caused \$1.2 million damage to a northern suburbs primary school, was given a suspended sentence. People in that same age group who read this article and who commit a similar offence will expect to receive the same penalty as this offender. The media has a lot to answer for with regard to the increasing crime rate in this State, repeat offenders and do-gooders. When they print this kind of article, it does nothing to deter other offenders.

I bring to the attention of the House the criticism of members opposite in respect of the present Government's honesty. When members opposite were in power from 1982 to 1993, a number of questions were asked by Jennifer Cashmore with regard to the State Bank and other matters. The then Labor Government did not investigate the allegations closely enough and, if it did, it misled the House and the electors. The electors gave Labor a sentence in the majority of seats it won at the last election and, of course, it won only 11 seats. It should declare to the electors of this State its policies with respect to the way it conducts itself, and its code of conduct from 1983 to 1993.

---

## SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 4 February. Page 832.)

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** This is an opportune time to put on the record some of the facts as they apply to how this Government has managed the finances of this State since we took over. Most members would recall that we had a two-pronged problem. First, we had the total debt of this State, which was getting very near \$9 billion; and, in no small way, that was due to the ineptitude of the Labor Government. No matter how one looks at this situation, one sees that it caused more harm to this State during its years in office than any other Government has ever caused to this State in the history of South Australia. Certainly, the Liberal Government has gone a long way towards getting that debt under control. As members would recall, that debt was continuing to escalate; every year it was getting larger and larger. This in itself was cause for real concern. Not only has this Liberal Government stopped it from getting larger but it has turned around the total debt and cut it down by well over \$1 billion, and we are heading close to a \$2 billion cut in that total debt.

I wish to compliment the Government on the way it has handled that matter. Of course, the result is that we have not had to increase taxes, because the debt has not been getting out of hand. The interest rates we are being charged on the total debt—and of course the State has to borrow that

money—have come back significantly, and they would have been a lot worse if we had not managed to turnaround the debt. Therefore, without question, South Australia is seen in a much more positive light, both within Australia and internationally, than it had been seen previously.

The second thing I wish to highlight is the day-to-day budget situation or, to be more accurate, the annual budget situation. Again, members would recall that when we took office we were spending about \$300 million more than we were earning—a situation that was simply adding to the total debt. Again, we have sought to address that in no uncertain manner, and I would like to thank the people of South Australia who have recognised the need to pull in their belts, who have recognised many of the tough decisions we have made and who appreciate that this Government has not had an easy row. However, on a more positive note, things will be a lot better in future years. It is very heartening to appreciate that this year the debt will be nearer \$60 million. What a turnaround. We have gone from a \$300 million debt that was increasing to a turnaround of about \$60 million. The really good news is that we hope to have a balanced budget in the next financial year.

I know that it has not been easy on any of the Ministers of this Government, because I have quite often approached Ministers to obtain additional funds for things in my electorate. A few of them have said to me, 'Look, John, if we had the extra money, we would love to accommodate your request and requests from other members as well. However, we are faced with a debt situation that this State has never seen before; therefore, we don't have the money we would like to spend when we would want to spend it and how we would want to spend it.' With those few words, I am pleased that the supply debate is before us, and it will be of interest to hear whether the Opposition contributes anything to the debate. Again, I compliment the Government on the excellent work it has done in the past three years.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I will say a few words on the Supply Bill and its relevance to the State in relation to budgetary matters, the running of the State and the paying of public servants. Over the past 12 months in particular we have seen many cuts in many areas, particularly those of health, education and the police. I am particularly concerned about cuts to health, because they include parts of my electorate, especially the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Much has been said about the cuts at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and on several occasions I have outlined to the House what has been happening there. I will not canvass all those matters at this stage because they are on the record. Certainly we are aware of the closure of wards and the loss of many beds at the QEH over the past three years, as well as the cuts to staff numbers, the pressure under which the staff has been placed and the shortage of equipment. I do not know why there should be a shortage of equipment at the QEH because one would think that, with the closure of wards, there would be an oversupply of equipment, but that is not the case.

There have been cases where a patient has needed a drip feed and, even though all the necessary equipment was available, staff have been unable to find a stand on which to mount the equipment. Staff have also not been able to find a bowl into which a patient can vomit. The hospital endures a shortage of chairs, wheelchairs, and the like. Many family members of patients have had to assist staff with feeding and cleaning not only for their own loved ones but also other patients. It is disgraceful. The last time I visited the hospital

I could hardly see out of the windows on the upper floors because of the dirt. They have not been cleaned for many years, and the hospital is just generally run down.

Despite all that, I take off my hat to the dedicated doctors and staff who work at the QEH. They do a magnificent job under very difficult circumstances. The nurses, in particular, work long hours. They are exhausted at the end of their shifts and do not get a lot of support. They are run off their feet and I pay tribute to them for their dedication and application on behalf of the patients at the QEH. Many rumours have circulated about different privatisation deals concerning the QEH. The current rumour is that Columbia, the US-based health service provider, may take over the delivery of services at the QEH. I do not know whether that will happen, but certainly the rumours are persisting at the moment.

Another issue relating to the QEH is the demolition of historic Tenterden House. This wonderful piece of architecture, and a home that has stood there since the 1840s, was set for demolition by this Government. Some action was taken by the Woodville council and the union movement, and a ban was placed on the home's demolition for some weeks. However, eventually the Minister for Health and this Government threatened that, if the contractor had not demolished the building by, virtually, the next day, he would be liable for substantial damages and costs, which he could not afford.

The contractor therefore moved in and demolished this beautiful home. The Government's reason for the demolition was that car parking space was needed. The area occupied by this historic house, in my estimation, would cater for about 20 cars. Infinitely more space was available in the area taken up by the lawns surrounding this historic home which could have been used for car parking, so I do not know what the Minister and the Government had in mind when they decided that this home had to go to make space for about 20 or 25 motor vehicles. It is ridiculous, and it was a shame to see this beautiful place razed to the ground.

I believe that some of the lace work, the pillars and verandah tiles, which were heritage items, had been sold to people in Sydney but, because of the speed with which the place was demolished, those items were destroyed by the bulldozers. It was very unfortunate and a tragedy that that happened. The other health aspect I would like to mention relates to the Port Adelaide Community Health Service, which provides a magnificent service to the community. It is one of four health services in the western area: the others being the Eastern Service based at Enfield; the Parks Centre, obviously based at the Parks Community Centre; and the Dale Street Women's Health Centre.

The Port Adelaide Community Health Service makes up the fourth element of this four-part provider of health services to people in the western suburbs. Over the past few years, all services have experienced cuts to their resources and staff, and most of the services have been reduced by about half their original number, despite the fact that, with an ageing population, there is more and not less need for health services. Even though these services have been cut by about half, the Government proposes to cut the staff of the Port Adelaide Community Health Service from 16 to 10, and this is just not on. The current staff of 16 is totally inadequate.

If this staff cut occurs, it will be absolutely impossible for the service to perform its function of providing health services to the people of the western suburbs. One only has to look at the health atlas to see that there is an enormous need for health services in the western districts, particularly

in the north-western section of Port Adelaide and the surrounding suburbs. As I say, with an ageing population and many younger families with small children moving into refurbished areas, there is a desperate need for more and not fewer community health services.

The advantage is that these services can provide much more than an ordinary GP in private practice. Whether they are covered by health benefits or by the Medicare scheme, people visit a private GP for a particular reason, and normally a GP prescribes some sort of medication. However, a community health service caters to patients in a much more comprehensive way. There is no time limit to a consultation—patients are not allocated the usual 10 or 15 minute consultation. Much longer times are allocated for consultations with physicians and specialists in different areas, and therefore a person's needs are met to a much greater extent.

The community health services are much more embracing as they refer patients on to not just the medical system but also to alternative medical systems and health treatments. One big aspect of the community health services are that they cater, in a large way, to preventive medicine, which is very important. People attend a health service with not only a health problem but also in an attempt to head off a complaint before it arises. The service gives advice and counselling to people to assist them in preventing health problems arising further down the track. It is a very much needed service and, for the life of me, I cannot see how a further cut of six personnel from the Port Adelaide Health Service could be undertaken.

I do not believe the service can continue to survive under those circumstances. As I say, the service has been cut before and it just cannot sustain a further cut. A public meeting was called on 16 January at Port Adelaide to protest against the proposed cuts. I reiterate that those cuts have not yet been announced: they are proposed cuts. Nevertheless, once a service is reviewed by this Government and proposals are put up, it is 10-1 on that the proposals will be implemented. However, it was a very well attended meeting. Many people attended from different agencies, as well as many concerned residents and some members of Parliament.

Accusations were made by one of the Liberal members, who said that it was a political stunt. I assure that honourable member that, as far I was concerned, that was not the case. I was informed of the situation by local residents and asked if I would speak for five minutes, and I accepted. It was not a political stunt. I made the point at that meeting that I did not have the facts and figures before me. I attended as the local member to express my concerns about what was likely to happen under these proposals to cut staff numbers from 16 to 10 at the Port Adelaide Community Health Service. It was certainly not a political exercise as far as I was concerned. I quoted the facts and expressed my concerns as the local member and, more importantly, as a local resident who has lived in the Port Adelaide area his entire life. If that attracted criticism from a Government member, that is his problem and not mine. I made the point that I would not be political about it. I would have been just as strong in my opposition to this if a Labor Government or any other Government proposed the same cuts.

I am concerned about these across-the-board cuts, from cuts to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and other hospitals in the State. I am particularly concerned about what is happening in my electorate. I hope that the Minister will give due consideration to this proposal when it comes before him. I issue an invitation to the Minister for Health to visit the Port

Adelaide Community Health Service. I get the impression that, although the Minister is a medical doctor, he does not fully understand the types of services provided by community health services. I invite him to visit the Port Adelaide Community Health Service and the other three health centres in the western suburbs to learn first-hand the types of services these establishments provide. If there is anything he does not understand at this stage he can find out what they do and take those things on board before he makes his final decision based on the proposals that will no doubt come before him to make these cuts. I conclude with those remarks and hope that the Minister will see for himself what takes place in those excellent places.

**Dr SUCH (Fisher):** I am pleased to support the Supply Bill. As we all know, my status has changed in this place but, nevertheless, I am very much committed to representing the people of Fisher and to doing the best I can for the people of South Australia. I had the privilege to be Minister for three years: to be Minister responsible for employment, training, further education and youth affairs is a privilege. I wish the member for Newland all the best in her role, and she has the added responsibility of correctional services as well.

As members have heard on many occasions, our TAFE system in South Australia is an excellent one. Today, I was pleased to hear the new Minister indicate that TAFE will now issue degrees. It is something that I have advocated for a long time and, in fact, was actively working towards. Indeed, in the Estimates Committee on 27 June 1995 the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me whether I was still pursuing a one man crusade with respect to TAFE institutes issuing degrees. I pleaded guilty then and I plead guilty today.

It is an important issue, and it is not to take away from the responsibility of universities in which the State Government has a keen interest. It is evidence of our TAFE system in South Australia moving, expanding and catering for the needs of its student population. Polytechnics, the TAFE equivalent in New Zealand, have issued degrees for some time now and with great success, particularly for the Maori people, because Maoris can study at an introductory level, continue at the same institution and then complete a degree. So I welcome that announcement. It is a positive one and it is further evidence of the advancement of TAFE in South Australia.

It is critical that as a State Government we pursue and expand training opportunities for our young people, because the statistics clearly show that those young people who have a training background and who have a degree, diploma or other training (it does not always have to result in a certificate or degree) have at least a 50 per cent greater chance of obtaining employment. That is something we should all be striving to achieve. I shall be keen—and I am sure all members of the Government will be keen—to see the TAFE system expand. We have many important building projects under way. The Urrbrae development will give us the most sophisticated horticultural training facility in the southern hemisphere, because it will be integrated with DECS and the universities. Likewise, as you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, the expansion in the South-East and other regions will continue.

Regarding universities, the State Government does not provide a lot of direct funding, although it does provide some moneys towards their operation. It will be no surprise to members who have charted my comments in recent times that I am very concerned about the future of our universities. I am not suggesting that our universities should be free from a

commitment to efficiency and effectiveness: they should not. I believe that for the wrong reasons our universities are being subjected to very serious cutbacks. In particular, the University of South Australia finds itself in a position where approximately 200 staff may have to be retrenched over the next two years. That is in addition to the people who have already taken a package and to the people at Flinders University and the University of Adelaide who have taken a package. Our universities are not insignificant in terms of employment but, importantly, if we want to become the Cambridge of the South and if we want to become the educational training centre, our universities must be able to grow and they must be properly resourced. Even though they now get much of their money from private sources, they still need strong Government support.

Unlike in the Eastern States, where half the postgraduate students get their fees paid by business, particularly in business-related areas, we do not have head office companies here that pay the fees of postgraduate students. Unless something is done, we will see a decline in the number of postgraduate students studying at universities here. I note that the Victorian Government has introduced a scheme to assist people with their university study. Clearly, Victoria has a greater resource base than we. It has a bigger private sector component, many financial institutions with a head office, and so on. It is a sad situation when State Governments have to dip into their pocket increasingly to fund the important university sector.

I am not saying that universities cannot become more efficient. There are opportunities for them to share some of the administrative tasks, for example, to have a common payroll. They can save money, but we in South Australia will not get any money for capital works at universities over the next three years from the Commonwealth, and we are suffering a \$12 million cut. I was pleased to be assured by the Premier that he will push this matter with the Prime Minister so that there is a particular understanding of South Australia and its needs to ensure that we are not subject to the decisions of bureaucrats in Canberra who do a simple mathematical calculation that results in further diminishing of and damage to our important university sector. We will not attract overseas students if they hear that the Federal Government is putting less money into our universities. I echo the concerns I have been raising for quite a while.

In terms of employment, the Premier is right: the main focus in this State is creating jobs—jobs, jobs, jobs as he says so often. Obviously, the answer is not totally in schemes such as work for the dole, but members would be aware that for many years now—and in particular last year—I put forward a range of detailed proposals to the Federal Government via the then Premier. Initially called Job Bank—but in this game you have to be quick off the mark because someone registered the name—it is now called First Job. The term ‘work for the dole’ is crude and in many ways offensive. My suggestion was for dole money to be used to supplement a contribution from private employers. Various models were suggested but importantly in each and every one of those schemes to have a training component so that young people could experience the work ethic. I was particularly focusing on those who have just left school without skills or work experience. I do not believe the scheme should be compulsory, because that introduces an element which, in the end, becomes counterproductive.

I am pleased that that issue is at least on the agenda. It can be refined and improved, but what we need fundamentally is

to create employment through the encouragement of the private sector and private sector investment. That will come if we have fundamental reform of taxation, particularly at the Federal level. I would like to see payroll tax go completely and be replaced by a more universal and better taxation arrangement—reform of the wholesale sales tax system, goods and services tax, whatever you want to call it, but something that replaces a hideous tax on employment. We have had suggestions from Martin Ferguson (originally of the ACTU, now member of Parliament) and others that job sharing is the answer. I believe that there can be an element of that, but it is not the total answer.

You need a pretty good income to afford a decent living standard for the two or more who are to share the income. What we need, fundamentally, is to focus on job creation in a real sense, through stimulating the private sector, encouraging private sector investment and, in a sense, creating in South Australia a State that is in some ways the Singapore of Australia. We do not need its draconian behavioural laws—although some of my colleagues may find those appealing at times—but we need to set ourselves apart in an economic sense, in terms of attractiveness, from the other States. That has already happened to some extent as a result of our lower electricity tariffs, and so on. That process must go much further if we are to create employment here.

We do not have the mineral boom of Western Australia, or the population of the Eastern States, but we have unique attractions here. Our future lies in areas such as becoming the training and education centre not just of Australia but of the Asia-Pacific area. Many other issues are of great interest to me, and the matter of open space has gained a bit of publicity in recent times. This is an issue that I have already taken up with my ministerial colleagues in relation to having a coordinated look—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** They're not ministerial colleagues any more.

**Dr SUCH:** They are still colleagues. It means having a coordinated look at the question of open space in South Australia, particularly in the Adelaide metropolitan area. For a long time we had the concept of the second parklands scheme, and that needs to be reinvigorated, as does a third generation parklands scheme. In my electorate, as in many, we are facing the sale of surplus Government land. I do not object *per se* to the disposal of land that has no use, but in some areas there may well be a deficiency of open space and we need to look very carefully at that. That is an issue that I will continue to pursue with Ministers to ensure that in a few years we do not look back and say, ‘We should have kept that piece of land.’

In terms of the environment, I believe that, to the credit of the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, we have made a lot of progress in many areas, but the two key environmental issues facing South Australia and probably the world at the moment are, first, the threat to biodiversity through removal of flora, the destruction of fauna and the loss of habitat; and, secondly, the threat to fresh water. Politically, often, the issue that gets the most attention is litter removal, and that is an important issue but, fundamentally, particularly in South Australia but throughout Australia we need to focus on the retention of biodiversity, the retention of various species (because we have already lost far too many) and our clean water supplies, which are continually being threatened.

Education is another issue. Sadly, teachers are still undervalued in our society, and I was pleased that the pay dispute involving them was resolved at the end of last year.



Pay and conditions are important. I believe that our State school system is due for revitalisation, and there is a great challenge for the Minister responsible to ensure that our State school system is revitalised and reinvigorated. Personally, I would like to see more local input into decision making affecting local schools, particularly as it relates to school council decision making, and parents having a greater say in what happens in their local school. Our teachers not only play a vital part in transmitting our cultural heritage but are very much the custodians of values in our society. We as a community should value them, respect them and appreciate the very considerable effort they put into teaching.

Despite what some people believe, teachers, with a few exceptions, often work far longer than they are given credit for. I know school principals and teachers who work on weekends. In fact, I called in on someone last Sunday, and there was the teacher preparing work for this week. Our teachers are dedicated, committed people.

In terms of the role and future of government in South Australia, as we approach the centenary of Federation I think it important that we do not just look at the head of State issue. I have had something to say on that in the past, so in some ways I can claim some credit for helping to get that debate under way. The issue of the centenary of Federation is more than just about the head of State. I believe that, if you cannot have a resident head of State, a resident monarch, it is inevitable that we will go down the republican path. Members would know my preferences for a constitutional monarch, but only if the monarch is resident in our country.

In terms of the role and future of government, we should be looking at all levels of government with an open mind, not quarantining ourselves from examination or rigorous discussion. We should put all levels on the table—local, State and Federal—look at all the issues pertaining thereto—what their roles and functions should be—and move away from what is often, sadly, a feature that I hear in the corridors here that can be taken to be disparaging of local government. Local government has a role to play and, in the creation of larger councils, those councils are saying, 'Let us have a bigger slice of the action.' We should not run away from the issue: we should face up to it and seek to address the issues that stem from that and see what the various roles should be. The discussion should not be confined to politicians but should involve the wider public in a very general sense.

I wish to touch on a couple of other issues, the first being our Public Service and public servants. I have always been an advocate in praise of our public servants. South Australia has been well served by its public servants and Public Service. I believe that they have been dedicated—and still are—honest and committed. There has often been a temptation for some people to have a cheap shot at the expense of public servants when the record shows that in South Australia they have been outstanding in their commitment to the people of this State. Without patting ourselves on the back too much, that applies to members of Parliament of any political persuasion. We have not had the scandals and ratbagery that has occurred in some of the other States. That is to the credit of members of Parliament but also it very much applies to members of the Public Service.

Once again, I regret that the previous Government sold off land that was reserved for an arterial road system in Adelaide. I have said on many occasions that that was a foolish thing to do. I welcome the Southern Expressway, but as a community we will still face the difficulty of getting people from areas such as Darlington, Old Belair Road and so on into the

heart of the city. We need to look at creating a very fast, modern, preferably electrified transport system, whether it be monorail, heavy rail or light rail. It is clear that not just in the next few years but in the decades ahead we will need a more modern, upgraded transport system to cope with what was a silly decision of an earlier Labor Government to sell off the land that was already set aside.

So, what we will have now is a bottleneck. It harms the southern area because it hinders transport flow to industries in the south, and the Government of yesteryear that made that decision stands condemned for that. There is a challenge for us, and I believe that a project that warrants Federal Government support is the electrification of a modern transport system in Adelaide. We are now the only mainland capital that does not have one and I believe that, like the other capitals, we warrant Federal Government support because it would be an important way of helping to create employment and to kick-start the economy in South Australia.

The issue of young people is often featured in the press. As Minister for Youth Affairs, I spent much time with young people and interacting with them. We need to reflect on the fact that only a very small percentage of young people get into any serious trouble with the police; most of them are fine, upstanding people and deserve to be acknowledged as such. We have a small core of repeat offenders who cause mischief, often in difficult situations. The answer has to incorporate both appropriate punishment and, importantly, tackling some of the preventative issues as well. It is a serious issue, particularly in the northern and southern suburbs, and one which needs to be dealt with. For example, in terms of assistance for parents who are struggling to cope with wayward teenagers, I am pleased that the State Government through the Minister has introduced a parenting support scheme. That task is a huge one, and many parents need extra help to ensure that they and their teenagers get through what are often difficult years.

I do not suppose that the teenage years were ever meant to be easy and being a parent of a teenager was not meant to be easy either, but with support from the Government through programs such as Parenting SA more support is now available. Our young people are fantastic. I want to see them flourish; I want to see them gain employment and as the member for Fisher I am committed to that.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** I confess that I did not expect to be standing to support the Bill at this time. I would have thought that, as is the usual tradition of the Parliament, a member of the Opposition would want to speak to the Supply Bill. It is an important Bill that gives the Opposition an opportunity to express its concern about matters pertaining to Government against the allocation of Supply. Regrettably, so far this debate has gone down exactly the same path as we have seen with Question Time in the past few sitting days. We have seen irrelevant matters brought before this Parliament and no focus on the principal issues about which this State is concerned—jobs. We now have a chance—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** I am pleased to see that the member for Spence finally has graced us with his presence. Perhaps the honourable member may even grace us with a contribution to this Bill. No, the honourable member is making his exit now; that would be too much to expect. The Opposition has a chance to address the Parliament, to represent its constituency against this Supply Bill, and it has abrogated that opportunity—indeed, I would argue, that responsibility to its

electors. All we have seen so far is the member for Price stand up in this place and lament spending cuts, or what he perceives as spending cuts, in his electorate, because his contribution was far from accurate against the reality. The reality is quite simple. The only reason that there may have been a need for any spending cuts in the electorate of the member for Price is that his Government, the one of which he was a member during his considerable number of years in this Parliament, consistently mismanaged the State's funds. If the honourable member has any lament at all about the level of expenditure in his electorate, the blame lies not with this Government but fairly and squarely at his feet.

I will not stand here and pretend, however, that this Government has done everything perfectly, that this Government has not made mistakes, for indeed it has made mistakes but, as any political analyst would know and as anyone would expect, if a Government makes mistakes it needs to act with haste to rectify those mistakes. Regrettably, one of those mistakes took some time to rectify—and I give the new Premier credit for ensuring that it was rectified, although it took the best part of three years. I refer to this Government's industrial relations strategy as it pertains to enterprise bargaining. It is fair to say that, of all the Government members in this Parliament, aside from the Minister for Industrial Affairs, I have probably had the greater exposure to contentious industrial issues. That is the very nature of the rather contentious portfolios that I had the privilege of managing during my time as Minister: notably, the police, correctional services, fire service and ambulance service, all of whom were, with quite some justification, putting their case for a pay increase.

Frankly, I found the process being embarked upon (an agreed majority policy decision by this Government) to be a frustrating one. As Minister for Police I was placed in the unenviable position of having to push a barrow that, quite frankly, I did not believe should be pushed and of running an argument I believed was incorrect. It was my view as Minister for Police that police were not only deserving of a pay increase but that that pay increase should be such that South Australian police officers were placed in the mid-range of salaries paid to police around Australia. I argued quite strongly behind closed doors that South Australian police officers were deserving of a pay increase that would put them about third highest paid in Australia, which was a point that was fairly easily agreed upon between myself and the Police Association. But, regrettably, the Government's short-sighted industrial relations strategy at that time as it pertained to enterprise bargaining meant that that was not possible.

The Government had embarked upon a strategy of a 2 per cent pay increase and equated that back to a pay increase of about \$36 paid in two instalments of \$26 and then about a year later another \$10. If that strategy had been applied to police salaries, it still would have left police officers in South Australia among the lowest paid, if not the lowest paid, in Australia. Understandably, I was not comfortable with that position. I believed it was not a fair, reasonable and just salary to pay to police officers in this State. It was my view that they should be paid, in the first instance, a minimum salary increase of \$45 per week up front in exchange for an 18-month enterprise bargaining agreement, to be followed at the end of that 18-month period by a two-year enterprise bargaining agreement for which the negotiating salary parameters would be to look at the salary for constables, senior constables and sergeants being, at the worst, at mid-

range compared with their Australian counterparts. I have to say that—

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** I thank the member for Giles for bringing a few more of his colleagues into the Chamber. Perhaps we will hear a contribution from them. As I was saying, I believe that was a fair and reasonable proposal to put on behalf of police officers of South Australia, and it would have received the agreement of the Police Association and would probably have received the support of police officers in South Australia. Regrettably, I was never given the opportunity to formally present that offer, and there was a police pay dispute that should never have happened.

One of the principal reasons it occurred was because of concern about paying teachers and nurses at that level, and the rest is history. One thing I will say strongly for the new Premier is that he has ensured that the industrial relations policy has changed. I am pleased that the new Industrial Relations Minister will have the opportunity firsthand to ensure that this Government learns from the mistakes of the past 2½ to three years of a wrong strategy of industrial relations against enterprise bargaining to ensure that a more equitable strategy is put in place so that Government employees are reasonably and properly compensated for their fair day's work.

We have reached that position with police getting the pay rise they deserve, with teachers getting the pay rise they deserve, with nurses getting the pay rise they deserve, and with all other Government employees getting a fair and equitable pay increase. That is reflected through this Supply Bill.

Something that is pretty close to my heart in relation to policing issues is the maintenance of the policy that I presided over, initially in my time as Opposition police spokesman and for the two years at the beginning of this Government as Police Minister, to ensure that another 200 additional operational police positions are delivered. In order for that to occur, it is apparent that there needs to be an increase in recruits into the Police Force. I for one will not sit by quietly if that increase does not occur.

I have been assured by the new Minister that the recruitment increase will occur, that the new numbers will be there, and I sit and watch with interest, but I am not prepared to wait long. South Australians are demanding, quite properly, that the Government honour that promise. As the person who wrote up that promise in the first place, I want to ensure that it is implemented as it should be.

The other issue to which I turn my attention today is the success of this Government in more equitably allocating appropriation. It is fair to say that my electorate has benefited significantly over the past three years from a more equitable appropriation to the southern suburbs of Adelaide. During its time in office, the Labor Party neglected the south to the extent that those of us who live in the south and represent southern electorates tagged the south 'The Forgotten South'. Money was not available for school expansions under capital works projects and school maintenance was not undertaken. Road building, road maintenance and road upgrades were neglected to the extent that a massive capital upgrade program had to be planned and implemented, and it has been planned and implemented by this Government.

As a consequence, I am now in the position of being able to say to my electorate that, after just three years of Govern-

ment, promises that were made have either been fully delivered or are being progressively implemented. I need to look only at the schools in my electorate to see the way in which those promises have been implemented.

In the case of the Hallett Cove school, we have delivered on the promise to take that school to year 12—a full high school facility for that area. To facilitate that undertaking, expenditure on capital works of almost \$4 million had to be made. That expenditure has been made, the capital works are finished and the students now occupy their classrooms. In addition, because of the size of the school, it now warrants a performing arts centre, and I was pleased at the decision of the Education Minister last week to acknowledge that and to release just over \$900 000 in funding to ensure that that performing arts centre can be built, and construction will start in May this year.

The Hallett Cove East school is expanding in numbers. That school, which was the brainchild of the Liberal Party, was ridiculed by Labor but it reluctantly built it because of representation by me and the Liberal Party in this place. The successful school of houses has been expanded again by this Government, with more money being injected into new classrooms.

The Hallett Cove South school has benefited through the significant injection of maintenance moneys to ensure that Labor's years of neglect were reversed. The Seacliff Primary School has had \$1.3 million injected into it so that it could be consolidated onto one site, and the building works on that school have almost been completed. Seaview High School has benefited from more than \$3 million of capital works to make it a quality school. The Brighton secondary school has \$4 million in capital upgrade almost completed, again to bring that school to the standard of one of the finest in the State and to reverse Labor's neglect.

The Brighton Primary School has had significant expenditure on it over the last 1½ years to bring it up to a standard that the parents, children and teachers expect and, again, to overcome Labor's years of neglect. Paringa Park Primary School has also received significant expenditure to implement the maintenance program that was not possible under Labor. When one hears that list of expenditure, one may well ask what on earth Labor did in the way of capital works in the south during its time in Government. The answer is 'Not very much.'

In terms of road building, the Southern Expressway was continually promised but never delivered by Labor, and it is now well under way. I encourage members who do not live in the south of Adelaide or who have not been down there recently to witness the significant extent of capital works that have been undertaken as this exciting new venture is under way. I look forward to the latter stages of this development. I have always been and I remain an advocate of the extension of the O-Bahn system along the Southern Expressway, and I hope that the Minister for Transport takes that on board and is in a position to deliver that in the very near rather than the distant future. One thing is for certain: if a commitment were given by this Government to implement something of that nature, unlike Labor, it would be implemented. I am sure that would give the south the full extent of public transport it needs. While the southern suburbs are well serviced by a train service, regrettably it was constructed along the coastline, and it makes access particularly difficult for some people.

This Government may have made some mistakes but, where it has made mistakes, it has recognised them and it has addressed them. That is the way it should be. I hope that well

behind us are the years of Labor. When mistakes were made, and there were plenty of them, they were denied and swept under the carpet until the bulge became so great they could not deny it any more. The bulge in the form of the State Bank became so great that it collapsed and put the State in the position of bankruptcy. This Government has made a fair fist of turning this State around to a significant extent in just three years.

I will be interested to see whether, during this debate, one Labor member of Parliament can stand in his or her place and not only contribute to this debate but contribute productively by demonstrating an area where the Government has failed and then not acted to reverse that failure. I put that challenge forward for them to find just one case. Indeed, after three years, they have failed to do that.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** This afternoon I want to address some of the things that have already been mentioned in the course of remarks made to the House by other members in this debate. I support the measure and, as members know, it is to ensure that the State has sufficient funds to pay the expenses of providing the Public Service, for the benefit of the people in South Australia, a matter to which we address ourselves everyday at the commencement of our proceedings in our prayers.

Before I get onto the matters which are related to other members' remarks, let me again draw attention to what I believe we must do in South Australia. It is a matter of urgency which at the time we were elected to office was second only to the necessity to address State debt. Sensible people all agree it was crazy for us to continue with such a huge debt servicing burden on the public purse, because the interest on what we owed was so great that it detracted from our ability to provide the public services that the people of South Australia really need. Worse, if we did not reduce that level of debt the world financial market operators would have downgraded our credit rating to the extent that the increase in interest bills as a result of the increase in interest rates would have been so high that we would have been paying out that much anyway. Then we would have been forced not only to reduce the amount but to do so from an even higher interest rate per annum on that total amount of capital—there was no question about that.

There was no choice in the matter. We had to reduce the State's debt. To do that we had to reduce the level of expenditure on a per capita basis so that as a State and as an economy within Australia our ability to retain our democratically determined status in the national economy of the Federation could be maintained.

There are three things we now need to do immediately. We have never properly addressed our talents and attention to these matters since Labor took office in 1982. We must expand our exports, expand our import substitutes and increase the level of training and education in crucial industry sectors so that we can maintain if not improve our position within the national order of things and in the international marketplace—the international arena.

Today I will address a couple of the sectors in which we can easily expand our exports. In the past, members will have heard me speak at length about exports of commodities whether they are simply primary producers without any or much value adding, or sophisticated tertiary manufactured items which are sought by the rest of the world, which South Australia has the ability to produce with excellence and of which there are many examples that I have mentioned in

recent speeches in this House. Today I will not talk about those matters, but rather about increasing those categories which are not immediately obvious as being exports. They are the numbers of visitors—tourists—who come here to spend their money. (That is an export, because in fact it means that people are using foreign currency to purchase services from South Australians in South Australia. That is why they are exports) and overseas students because, again, the money used to pay for fees and the other things they buy while they are studying here comes from overseas. If we in South Australia can expand the number of visitors and students who come here in a way which provides us with a significant expansion of total funds expended on consumption in South Australia, we will expand our economy and increase the number of jobs for those who live here who are citizens and

resident in South Australia. In this way we will achieve for ourselves a more secure future that is sustainable in perpetuity if we do it with wit and get on with it quickly. We must get on with the job.

I commend this Government on what it is doing today, but it simply does not go far or fast enough. To illustrate that point I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* two tables which are absolutely statistical and which set out the Australian merchandise trade with East Asia and other countries in the world in which members might be interested (that is, exports and imports to and from those countries), so they can see for themselves what has been the long-term trend from 1980 to the most recent figures available.

Leave granted.

#### Australia's merchandise trade with East Asia

| Country             | Australia's Exports |            |            |            |            |      | South Australia's Exports |      |            |      |            |      |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------|---------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|
|                     | 1980-81             | 1985-86    | 1990*      | 1994*      | 1980-81    | Nat. | 1985-86                   | Nat. | 1990-91    | Nat. | 1994-95    | Nat. |
|                     | \$ Billion          | \$ Billion | \$ Billion | \$ Billion | \$ Million |      | \$ Million                |      | \$ Million |      | \$ Million |      |
| Japan               | 5.2                 | 9.3        | 13.1       | 14.6       | 171.6      | 3.3  | 357.1                     | 3.8  | 443.1      | 3.4  | 682.9      | 4.7  |
| Korea               | 0.5                 | 1.3        | 2.9        | 4.3        | 20.7       | 4.1  | 23.7                      | 1.8  | 115.0      | 4.0  | -          | -    |
| China               | 0.7                 | 1.5        | 1.5        | 2.8        | 77.1       | 11.0 | 122.7                     | 8.2  | 143.3      | 1.6  | 177.9      | 6.4  |
| Taiwan              | 0.4                 | 1.0        | 1.8        | 2.6        | 28.2       | 7.1  | 42.3                      | 4.2  | 94.9       | 5.3  | -          | -    |
| Hong Kong           | 0.3                 | 0.7        | 1.3        | 2.4        | 25.1       | 8.4  | 28.8                      | 4.1  | 79.9       | 6.1  | 193.0      | 8.0  |
| Thailand            | 0.1                 | 0.2        | 0.6        | 1.3        | -          | -    | -                         | -    | -          | -    | -          | -    |
| Singapore           | 0.5                 | 0.7        | 2.3        | 3.1        | 51.8       | 10.4 | 85.8                      | 12.3 | 202.0      | 8.8  | -          | -    |
| Malaysia            | 0.4                 | 0.5        | 1.0        | 2.0        | 12.4       | 3.1  | 35.6                      | 7.1  | 73.0       | 7.3  | -          | -    |
| Indonesia           | 0.4                 | 0.5        | 1.4        | 1.9        | 22.0       | 5.5  | 28.9                      | 5.8  | 49.9       | 3.6  | -          | -    |
| Vietnam             | -                   | -          | 0.03       | 0.1        | -          | -    | -                         | -    | -          | -    | -          | -    |
| Total East Asia**   | 8.5                 | 20.5       | 25.9       | 35.1       | -          | -    | -                         | -    | 1 889.0    | 6.0  | 2 004.0    | 5.7  |
| Total All Countries | 19.2                | 32.8       | 52.4       | 67.1       | 1 400.0    | 7.3  | 1 988.2                   | 6.1  | 3 005.4    | 6.0  | 3 829.3    | 5.7  |

  

| Country             | Australia's Imports |            |            |            |            |      | South Australia's Imports |      |            |      |            |      |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------|---------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|
|                     | 1980-81             | 1985-86    | 1990*      | 1994*      | 1980-81    | Nat. | 1985-86                   | Nat. | 1990-91    | Nat. | 1994-95    | Nat. |
|                     | \$ Billion          | \$ Billion | \$ Billion | \$ Billion | \$ Million |      | \$ Million                |      | \$ Million |      | \$ Million |      |
| Japan               | 3.6                 | 8.2        | 9.1        | 11.1       | 214.5      | 6.0  | 670.8                     | 8.2  | 498.6      | 5.5  | 984.4      | 8.9  |
| Korea               | 0.2                 | 0.6        | 1.1        | 1.6        | 5.9        | 3.0  | 11.1                      | 1.9  | 35.1       | 3.2  | 66.4       | 4.2  |
| China               | 0.3                 | 0.4        | 1.6        | 3.4        | 4.9        | 1.6  | 9.4                       | 2.4  | 28.5       | 1.8  | 86.9       | 2.6  |
| Taiwan              | 0.5                 | 1.2        | 1.8        | 2.3        | 16.6       | 3.3  | 34.4                      | 2.9  | 60.0       | 3.3  | 75.9       | 3.3  |
| Hong Kong           | 0.4                 | 0.7        | 0.8        | 0.8        | 13.3       | 3.3  | 22.0                      | 1.5  | 28.1       | 3.5  | -          | -    |
| Thailand            | 0.1                 | 0.2        | 0.5        | 0.8        | 3.4        | 3.4  | 13.7                      | 6.9  | 33.8       | 6.8  | 45.5       | 5.7  |
| Singapore           | 0.5                 | 0.7        | 1.1        | 1.9        | 8.3        | 1.7  | 35.3                      | 5.0  | 51.4       | 4.7  | 58.8       | 3.1  |
| Malaysia            | 0.2                 | 0.3        | 0.8        | 1.5        | 10.4       | 5.2  | 15.9                      | 5.3  | 27.3       | 3.4  | -          | -    |
| Indonesia           | 0.4                 | 0.2        | 0.5        | 1.0        | -          | -    | 8.3                       | 4.2  | 139.4      | 27.9 | -          | -    |
| Vietnam             | -                   | -          | 0.03       | 0.3        | -          | -    | -                         | -    | -          | -    | -          | -    |
| Total East Asia**   | 6.2                 | 12.5       | 17.3       | 24.7       | -          | -    | -                         | -    | -          | -    | -          | -    |
| Total All Countries | 19.0                | 34.7       | 48.9       | 74.6       | 1 151.5    | 6.1  | 1 736.8                   | 5.0  | 2 193.7    | 4.5  | 3 099.5    | 4.2  |

Source: DFAT, ABS.

Note: All currencies A\$. \*Originally \$US figure converted at exchange rate of US\$0.75.

Australia's exports and imports rounded to nearest 100 million (except Vietnam 1990). South Australia's exports and imports rounded to nearest 100 thousand.

## Australia's merchandise trade with East Asia

| Country             | Australia's Exports   |                       |                       |                       |                       |                               |                          | South Australia's Exports |                          |                     |                          |                     |                          |                     |                          |                     |                               |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
|                     | 1990<br>\$<br>Billion | 1991<br>\$<br>Billion | 1992<br>\$<br>Billion | 1993<br>\$<br>Billion | 1994<br>\$<br>Billion | Per cent<br>Change<br>1990-94 | 1990-91<br>\$<br>Million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent       | 1991-92<br>\$<br>Million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent | 1992-93<br>\$<br>million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent | 1993-94<br>\$<br>Million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent | 1994-95<br>\$<br>Million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent | Per cent<br>Change<br>1990-94 |
| Japan               | 31.1                  | 14.4                  | 13.6                  | 13.3                  | 14.6                  | 11.5                          | 443.1                    | 3.4                       | 534.7                    | 3.7                 | 647.6                    | 4.8                 | 625.4                    | 4.7                 | 682.9                    | 4.7                 | 54.1                          |
| Korea               | 2.9                   | 3.3                   | 3.4                   | 3.8                   | 4.3                   | 48.3                          | 115.0                    | 4.0                       | 121.1                    | 3.7                 | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| China               | 1.5                   | 1.8                   | 2.0                   | 2.6                   | 2.8                   | 86.7                          | 143.3                    | 1.6                       | 116.8                    | 6.5                 | 208.0                    | 10.4                | 220.2                    | 8.5                 | 177.9                    | 6.4                 | 24.1                          |
| Taiwan              | 1.8                   | 2.3                   | 2.4                   | 2.4                   | 2.6                   | 44.4                          | 94.9                     | 5.3                       | 136.0                    | 5.9                 | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Hong Kong           | 1.3                   | 1.9                   | 2.1                   | 2.3                   | 2.4                   | 84.6                          | 79.9                     | 6.1                       | 101.0                    | 5.3                 | 171.7                    | 8.2                 | 165.2                    | 7.2                 | 193.0                    | 8.0                 | 141.6                         |
| Thailand            | 0.6                   | 0.7                   | 1.0                   | 1.1                   | 1.3                   | 116.7                         | -                        | -                         | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Singapore           | 2.3                   | 2.9                   | 3.5                   | 2.8                   | 3.1                   | 34.8                          | 202.0                    | 8.8                       | 135.5                    | 4.7                 | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Malaysia            | 1.0                   | 1.0                   | 1.3                   | 1.8                   | 2.0                   | 100.0                         | 73.0                     | 7.3                       | 62.6                     | 6.3                 | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Indonesia           | 1.4                   | 1.4                   | 1.6                   | 1.5                   | 1.9                   | 35.7                          | 49.9                     | 3.6                       | 95.0                     | 6.8                 | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Vietnam             | 0.03                  | 0.05                  | 0.05                  | 0.1                   | 0.1                   | 233.3                         | -                        | -                         | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Total East Asia**   | 25.9                  | 29.8                  | 31.0                  | 31.7                  | 35.1                  | 35.5                          | -                        | -                         | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | 1 899.0                  | 6.0                 | 2 004.0                  | 5.7                 | -                             |
| Total All Countries | 52.4                  | 55.1                  | 60.7                  | 64.6                  | 67.1                  | 28.1                          | 3 005.4                  | 5.7                       | 3 505.1                  | 6.4                 | 3 756.3                  | 6.2                 | 3 889.8                  | 6.0                 | 3 829.3                  | 5.7                 | 27.4                          |

  

| Country             | Australia's Imports   |                       |                       |                       |                       |                               |                          | South Australia's Imports |                          |                     |                          |                     |                          |                     |                          |                     |                               |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
|                     | 1990<br>\$<br>Billion | 1991<br>\$<br>Billion | 1992<br>\$<br>Billion | 1993<br>\$<br>Billion | 1994<br>\$<br>Billion | Per cent<br>Change<br>1990-94 | 1990-91<br>\$<br>Million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent       | 1991-92<br>\$<br>Million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent | 1992-93<br>\$<br>million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent | 1993-94<br>\$<br>Million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent | 1994-95<br>\$<br>Million | Nat.<br>Per<br>cent | Per cent<br>Change<br>1990-94 |
| Japan               | 9.1                   | 8.5                   | 9.3                   | 10.1                  | 11.1                  | 22.0                          | 498.6                    | 5.5                       | 555.1                    | 6.5                 | 825.7                    | 8.9                 | 845.1                    | 8.4                 | 984.4                    | 8.9                 | 97.4                          |
| Korea               | 1.1                   | 1.3                   | 1.4                   | 1.6                   | 1.6                   | 45.5                          | 35.1                     | 3.2                       | 44.5                     | 3.4                 | -                        | -                   | 54.3                     | 3.4                 | 66.4                     | 4.2                 | 89.2                          |
| China               | 1.6                   | 2.1                   | 2.5                   | 3.1                   | 3.4                   | 112.5                         | 28.5                     | 1.8                       | 41.0                     | 2.0                 | 49.5                     | 2.0                 | 63.6                     | 2.1                 | 86.9                     | 2.6                 | 204.9                         |
| Taiwan              | 1.8                   | 1.8                   | 1.9                   | 2.0                   | 2.3                   | 27.8                          | 60.0                     | 3.3                       | 67.9                     | 3.8                 | -                        | -                   | 73.0                     | 3.7                 | 75.9                     | 3.3                 | 26.5                          |
| Hong Kong           | 0.8                   | 0.8                   | 0.8                   | 0.6                   | 0.8                   | 0                             | 28.1                     | 3.5                       | 23.2                     | 2.9                 | 21.5                     | 2.7                 | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Thailand            | 0.5                   | 0.6                   | 0.7                   | 0.7                   | 0.8                   | 60.0                          | 33.8                     | 6.8                       | 32.1                     | 5.4                 | -                        | -                   | 39.5                     | 5.6                 | 45.5                     | 5.7                 | 34.6                          |
| Singapore           | 1.1                   | 1.4                   | 1.3                   | 1.4                   | 1.9                   | 72.7                          | 51.4                     | 4.7                       | 47.9                     | 3.4                 | -                        | -                   | 60.0                     | 4.3                 | 58.8                     | 3.1                 | 14.4                          |
| Malaysia            | 0.8                   | 0.9                   | 0.9                   | 1.1                   | 1.5                   | 87.5                          | 27.3                     | 3.4                       | 33.4                     | 3.7                 | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Indonesia           | 0.5                   | 0.9                   | 1.1                   | 1.0                   | 1.0                   | 100.0                         | 139.4                    | 27.9                      | 188.7                    | 21.0                | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Vietnam             | 0.03                  | 0.03                  | 0.2                   | 0.2                   | 0.36                  | 900.0                         | -                        | -                         | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Total East Asia**   | 17.3                  | 18.3                  | 20.1                  | 21.8                  | 24.7                  | 42.8                          | -                        | -                         | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                        | -                   | -                             |
| Total All Countries | 48.9                  | 60.0                  | 59.6                  | 64.5                  | 74.6                  | 52.6                          | 2 193.7                  | 4.5                       | 2 376.3                  | 4.0                 | 3 068.1                  | 5.2                 | 2 803.4                  | 4.4                 | 3 099.5                  | 4.2                 | 41.3                          |

Source: DFAT, ABS.

Note: All currencies A\$. \*Originally \$US figure converted at exchange rate of US\$0.75. Australia's exports and imports rounded to nearest 100 million (except Vietnam 1990).

South Australia's exports and imports rounded to nearest 100 thousand. \*\*Selected East Asia (Excluding Philippines and Brunei)

**Mr LEWIS:** Members can see from the two tables that our most significant trading partner is Japan and, as far as exports are concerned, the next most important country is Korea. Whereas, for instance, the change in exports to Japan over that period has been about threefold, in the case of Korea it has been ninefold. There are some other interesting statistics in those tables, but when members peruse the tables in *Hansard* they will be able to see the illustration I wish to make of what has been happening over the longer term. The most recent figures available for comparison show that, in 1994, our exports to Japan were \$14.6 billion and to Korea \$4.3 billion. No-one comes within a bull's roar of that; China is next on the list at \$2.8 billion. However, back in 1980 our exports to Japan were \$5.2 billion, to Korea they were only \$500 million and to China they were \$700 million.

The next set of statistics I wish to incorporate in *Hansard* show the figures for some other countries, where we see that from 1980-81 to 1994 our exports to the United Kingdom, a traditional customer, rose from \$700 million to \$2.1 billion; and to the US (the most important of our customers at that time) from \$2.2 billion to just under double that at \$4.4 billion now. South Australia does not get much joy out of those figures. Our exports to the UK were \$31.8 million, and now they are \$246 million; and exports to the US were \$75.6 million, and now they are \$329 million. Other countries are listed there for the interest of members to ensure that we can all understand the context in which East Asian countries rate and how that has changed over time.

Leave granted.

## Australia's merchandise trade with other countries

| Country | Australia's Exports      |                          |                        |                        | South Australia's Exports |                          |                          |                          |
|---------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|         | 1980-81<br>\$<br>Billion | 1985-86<br>\$<br>Billion | 1990*<br>\$<br>Billion | 1994*<br>\$<br>Billion | 1980-81<br>\$<br>Million  | 1985-86<br>\$<br>Million | 1990-91<br>\$<br>Million | 1994-95<br>\$<br>Million |
| UK      | 0.7                      | 1.2                      | 1.8                    | 2.1                    | 31.8                      | 72.7                     | 180.9                    | 246.1                    |
| US      | 2.2                      | 3.3                      | 5.4                    | 4.2                    | 75.6                      | 135.9                    | 324.6                    | 329.9                    |

## Australia's merchandise trade with other countries

| Country             | Australia's Exports      |                          |                        |                        | South Australia's Exports |                          |                          |                          |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                     | 1980-81<br>\$<br>Billion | 1985-86<br>\$<br>Billion | 1990*<br>\$<br>Billion | 1994*<br>\$<br>Billion | 1980-81<br>\$<br>Million  | 1985-86<br>\$<br>Million | 1990-91<br>\$<br>Million | 1994-95<br>\$<br>Million |
| Germany             | 0.5                      | 0.9                      | 1.1                    | 0.9                    | 16.6                      | 31.6                     | 85.0                     | -                        |
| Pakistan            | 0.04                     | 0.2                      | 0.2                    | 0.2                    | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                        |
| USSR                | 0.8                      | 1.0                      | -                      | -                      | 244.2                     | 150.5                    | 107.6                    | -                        |
| Total all countries | 19.2                     | 32.8                     | 52.4                   | 67.1                   | 1 400.0                   | 1 988.2                  | 3 005.4                  | 3 829.3                  |

  

| Country             | Australia's Imports      |                          |                        |                        | South Australia's Imports |                          |                          |                          |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                     | 1980-81<br>\$<br>Billion | 1985-86<br>\$<br>Billion | 1990*<br>\$<br>Billion | 1994*<br>\$<br>Billion | 1980-81<br>\$<br>Million  | 1985-86<br>\$<br>Million | 1990-91<br>\$<br>Million | 1994-95<br>\$<br>Million |
| UK                  | 1.6                      | 2.5                      | 3.4                    | 3.7                    | 54.4                      | 81.9                     | 99.5                     | 150.0                    |
| US                  | 4.2                      | 7.3                      | 11.8                   | 13.8                   | 134.6                     | 264.4                    | 343.3                    | 413.3                    |
| Germany             | 1.1                      | 2.7                      | 3.2                    | 3.7                    | 38.3                      | 81.2                     | 155.4                    | -                        |
| Pakistan            | 0.01                     | 0.04                     | 0.08                   | 0.1                    | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                        |
| USSR                | 0.01                     | 0.01                     | -                      | -                      | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                        |
| Total all countries | 19.0                     | 34.7                     | 48.9                   | 74.6                   | 1 151.5                   | 1 736.8                  | 2 193.7                  | 3 099.5                  |

Source: DFAT, ABS

Note: All currencies A\$. \*Originally \$US figure converted at exchange rate of US \$0.75.

Australia's exports and imports round to nearest 100 million (except vietnam 1990). South Australia's exports and imports rounded to nearest 100 thousand.

**Mr LEWIS:** If we then talk about to whom we should export our services—which people will become visitors to our country—we need to look at the statistics of where those visitors have been coming from in recent times, from both the East Asian countries and from the rest of the world. I seek leave to incorporate into *Hansard* two simple tables which will show the population in those countries under comparison with East Asian countries, as well as the GDP total and

the GDP per capita in each case, and another figure which is chosen these days by economists to be more illustrative of the amount of purchasing power citizens have in any one country. It is called the purchasing power parity, or PPP, and it is based on World Bank ratios. I assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the tables are purely statistical.

Leave granted.

## East Asian Wealth

| Country   | Population<br>1996<br>Million | Population<br>Growth<br>1996<br>Per cent | GDP<br>Growth<br>1996<br>Per cent | GDP<br>1994*<br>Billion<br>\$ | GDP<br>(PPP)<br>1994*<br>Billion<br>\$ | Per Capita<br>GDP<br>1994*<br>\$ | GDP<br>1996*<br>\$ |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Japan     | 126                           | 0.3                                      | 3.3                               | 5 739                         | 3 159                                  | 46 300                           | 27 800             |
| Korea     | 45                            | 0.9                                      | 6.7                               | 475                           | 635                                    | 10 600                           | 14 700             |
| China     | 1 225.5                       | 1.2                                      | 9.9                               | 635                           | 3 724                                  | 500                              | 3 700              |
| Taiwan    | 21.5                          | 1.0                                      | 5.6                               | 301                           | 321                                    | 13 800                           | 17 900             |
| Hong Kong | 6.5                           | 2.1                                      | 4.3                               | 166                           | 170                                    | 27 500                           | 29 900             |
| Thailand  | 61.5                          | 1.5                                      | 8.5                               | 179                           | 444                                    | 3 000                            | 9 400              |
| Singapore | 3                             | 2.0                                      | 3.9                               | 73                            | 71                                     | 25 000                           | 29 500             |
| Malaysia  | 20.5                          | 2.4                                      | 8.0                               | 89                            | 209                                    | 4 500                            | 11 800             |
| Indonesia | 197.5                         | 1.6                                      | 8.1                               | 198                           | 774                                    | 1 300                            | 4 600              |
| Vietnam   | 76.5                          | 2.3                                      | 9.5                               | 20                            | 105                                    | 300                              | 1 600              |
| Australia | 18.5                          | 1.2                                      | 3.8                               | 403                           | 469                                    | 22 500                           | 25 000             |

Source: DFAT, Asiaweek.

Note: All currencies in A\$. \*Originally \$US figure converted at exchange rate of US\$0.75. Population rounded to nearest half million. GDP per capita rounded to nearest 100.

Purchasing Power Parity (PPP, based on World Bank ratios) takes into account price differences between countries, for a more accurate measure of national wealth.

## Other Countries—for comparison

| Country | Population<br>1996<br>Million | Population<br>Growth<br>1996<br>Per cent | GDP<br>Growth<br>1996<br>Per cent | GDP<br>1994*<br>Billion<br>\$ | GDP<br>(PPP)<br>1994*<br>Billion<br>\$ | Per Capita<br>GDP<br>1994*<br>\$ | GDP<br>1996*<br>\$ |
|---------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| UK      | 58.5                          | 0.3                                      | 2.4                               | 1 278                         | 1 306                                  | 21 875                           | 23 900             |
| USA     | 266.5                         | 1.0                                      | 2.2                               | 8 423                         | 8 423                                  | 32 375                           | 33 500             |

## Other Countries—for comparison

| Country   | Population<br>1996<br>Million | Population<br>Growth<br>1996<br>Per cent | GDP<br>Growth<br>1996<br>Per cent | GDP<br>1994*<br>Billion<br>\$ | GDP<br>(PPP)<br>1994*<br>Billion<br>\$ | Per Capita<br>GDP<br>1994*<br>\$ | GDP<br>1996*<br>\$ |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Germany   | 82.5                          | 0.7                                      | 2.4                               | 2 294                         | 1 681                                  | 28 125                           | 25 200             |
| Pakistan  | 133                           | 2.9                                      | 6.1                               | 66                            | 379                                    | 500                              | 2 900              |
| CIS       | 150                           | 0.4                                      | -4.0                              | -                             | 880                                    | -                                | 6 000              |
| Australia | 18.5                          | 1.2                                      | 3.8                               | 403                           | 469                                    | 22 500                           | 25 000             |

Source: DFAT, Asiaweek.

Note: All currencies in A\$. \*Originally \$US figure converted at exchange rate of US\$0.75. Population rounded to nearest half million. GDP per capita rounded to nearest 100.

**Mr LEWIS:** The United States has been near or at the head of the table, especially in terms of the PPP figure at \$33 500, whereas the United Kingdom is about the same as Australia—it is \$23 900 and Australia is \$25 000. Japan is \$27 000, but Korea has come from absolutely nowhere up to \$14 700. That compares with Taiwan at \$17 900. If members take a look, they see that the per capita GDP from Vietnam, for instance, is \$300, and the GDP in 1996 was \$1 600. That illustrates in some measure why there has been an increase in percentage terms in the number of visitors from that part of the world and, in particular, from countries such as Korea. However, in terms of increase in total numbers,

Korea outstrips all other sources of visitors to our country. I seek leave to incorporate two short tables which show visitors who have been coming here from East Asia and from some other countries. I assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the tables are purely statistical.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The only reservation the Chair has is the sheer volume of insertions. The Standing Order does stipulate—and the honourable member is part of the committee which recommended it—that insertions not exceed one page. Leave will be granted, but I ask that the honourable member bear that in mind.

Leave granted.

## East Asian Visitors\*

| Country             | Visitors-Australia |           |            | Visitors-SA |        |         |        |            |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|--------|---------|--------|------------|
|                     | 1990               | 1995      | % Increase | 1990        | Nat. % | 1995    | Nat. % | % Increase |
| Japan               | 459 616            | 737 897   | 60.5       | 20 860      | 4.5    | 14 258  | 1.9    | -31.7      |
| Korea               | 8 346              | 160 622   | 1 824.5    | 532         | 6.4    | 4 272   | 2.7    | 703.0      |
| China               | 7 017              | 20 938    | 198.4      | 82          | 1.2    | 446     | 2.1    | 443.9      |
| Taiwan              | 24 542             | 138 277   | 463.4      | 1 369       | 5.6    | 510     | 0.4    | -62.8      |
| Hong Kong           | 49 511             | 117 300   | 136.9      | 3 022       | 6.1    | 6 656   | 5.7    | 120.3      |
| Thailand            | 15 976             | 72 528    | 354.0      | 632         | 4.0    | 1 469   | 2.0    | 132.4      |
| Singapore           | 65 738             | 168 513   | 156.3      | 4 025       | 6.1    | 4 883   | 2.9    | 21.3       |
| Malaysia            | 41 640             | 94 431    | 126.8      | 2 612       | 6.3    | 3 676   | 3.9    | 40.7       |
| Indonesia           | 32 762             | 107 645   | 228.6      | 3 498       | 10.7   | 3 105   | 2.9    | 11.2       |
| Vietnam             | -                  | -         | -          | -           | -      | -       | -      | -          |
| Total East Asia**   | 705 148            | 1 618 131 | 129.5      | 36 632      | 5.2    | 39 275  | 2.4    | 7.2        |
| Total All Countries | 2 065 500          | 3 404 100 | 64.8       | 235 800     | 11.4   | 249 200 | 7.3    | 5.7        |

Source: South Australian Tourism Commission (International Visitors Survey).

Note: Estimates may be affected by small sample base.

\* Includes all categories of visitors.

\*\* Selected East Asia (Excludes Philippines and Brunei).

## Other Visitors\*

| Country             | Visitors-Australia |           |            | Visitors-SA |        |         |        |            |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|--------|---------|--------|------------|
|                     | 1990               | 1995      | % Increase | 1990        | Nat. % | 1995    | Nat. % | % Increase |
| UK                  | 271 656            | 333 587   | 22.8       | 62 297      | 22.9   | 52 966  | 15.9   | -15.0      |
| USA                 | 239 088            | 284 986   | 19.2       | 33 459      | 14.0   | 31 612  | 11.1   | -5.5       |
| Germany             | 71 767             | 118 077   | 64.5       | 26 159      | 36.4   | 29 782  | 25.2   | 13.9       |
| Pakistan            | -                  | -         | -          | -           | -      | -       | -      | -          |
| USSR                | -                  | -         | -          | -           | -      | -       | -      | -          |
| Total All Countries | 2 065 500          | 3 404 100 | 64.8       | 235 800     | 11.4   | 249 200 | 7.3    | 5.7        |

Source: South Australian Tourism Commission, DEET.

Note: Estimates may be affected by small sample base.

\* Includes all categories of visitors.

**Mr LEWIS:** I assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and all members that I doubt that the tables will exceed one page in *Hansard*.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I thank the honourable member for that assurance.

**Mr LEWIS:** I have worked carefully on the research to ensure that there is only relevant information to enable the comparisons I wish to make to be evident from what I have sought to include. In years gone by, we were not getting many visitors from Korea. In 1990, there were about 8 300 visitors yet, in 1995, there were as tourists—apart from business people—over 160 000. That represented a massive increase in tourism from Korea in those five years of 1 824 per cent. No other country is in the same ball park in respect of the rate of increase in the numbers of visitors to Australia. Yet we in South Australia are in a sad situation. In 1980 we had 532 Korean tourists, whereas in 1995 we could manage only 4 200—yet the national figure is an 1 824 per cent increase. In South Australia we get only 2.7 per cent of the total number of visitors coming from Korea to Australia. We get 1.9 per cent of the Japanese and 2.1 per cent of the few who come from China. Of those other places in East Asia that are really significant in terms of the total numbers of visitors, 168 000 tourists came to Australia from Singapore, but only 2.9 per cent of them visited South Australia, that is, 4 800.

With respect to Malaysia, in 1990 we had a base of 2 600, which has increased by a meagre 40 per cent to 3 600, whereas the national increase was 126 per cent. Of the total number of tourists visiting South Australia from Malaysia in 1990, our proportion of the total number was 6.3 per cent. It has now fallen to 3.9 per cent. Indeed, in all instances the trend in South Australia's share of visitors from overseas has been absolutely appalling, terrible and horrible. It shows—and I suspected this throughout the 1980s, and I asked questions about it during the Estimates Committees whenever I had the opportunity—that the market strategists in the Department of Tourism were giving the Government crook advice. What is more, successive Administrations in this State have been abysmal failures at going to the Australian Tourism Commission and arguing for a fairer share of the dollars that are spent in advertising Australia to be spent promoting South Australia as a destination.

It is a self-fulfilling prophecy that, if you feature the reef, the rock and the bridge on every darn thing that you send out of this country to overseas tourist markets, what people will come here to look at and all they will think there is of interest to look at is the reef, the rock and the bridge. That is half-witted when we knew 12 or 15 years ago that the international market consumer trend was away from sightseeing in the built up areas to an experience that was related to ecotourism and a savouring of the local experience, where in any way that food and/or whatever pleasurable experiences were similar to the experiences those people had had in their home country culture. We did nothing about that as a State, and we have done even less about getting our fair share of the money spent by the Commonwealth in promoting South Australia's attractions.

It is vital, in my judgment, to recognise that, despite the fact that East Asian visitor numbers to Australia increased significantly in that period, South Australia lost its percentage share. Only in the case of China was there any increase. However, the numbers coming from China are insignificant and do not warrant consideration when one compares them with the numbers coming from other East Asian countries.

Our significant negative growth in the number of Japanese visitors entering South Australia was despite the fact that the number entering Australia was increasing, indeed by more than 60 per cent: that is, the number increased by more than 278 000 people.

If we were to increase our share of the total from the 1.9 per cent in 1990 to 5 per cent and get back to something like we had enjoyed, we would increase overall visitor numbers by 22 000 per annum. The greatest amount of growth we have seen nationally so far has been with Korea. Once again, South Australia's share of that growth has fallen. In 1990, South Australia had 6.4 per cent of the market; by 1995 it had fallen to 2.7 per cent. South Australia has had negative growth in the number of visitors from Taiwan despite the overall growth to Australia. It is the second largest increase. South Australia's share of Taiwan visitors has plummeted from 5.6 per cent to .4 per cent. That situation requires our immediate attention, in my judgment. It is easily the quickest and safest way we can get some response and increase in the number of jobs that are provided for South Australians in this export industry.

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

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** As the shadow Treasurer, I ought to give a treatise on the economy, and other such matters, and I am tempted to do that. However, an issue has arisen in my electorate which is really of no consequence. It is an issue that might influence one vote, probably not even that, and it involves only a relatively small amount of State resources and revenue. But it is very important to the individual concerned. I will make out my case and then read into the record a few letters that I think illustrate the point very well. This matter is about legal aid. I know that most members in this place know that, if you have the assets of a refugee, you cannot get legal aid. Most members in this place would point the finger at the Federal Government and say that it is miserable with its money, and I agree with that. I think John Howard is a particularly miserable individual and a fairly short-sighted one.

I make that comment with respect to a number of issues, including the gun legislation, about which I was not really enamoured. Mr Howard's comments yesterday that States will pay for their laws and that the Federal Government will pay legal aid only for Federal cases, I think, were another excuse for a cut. Let us put all that to one side and talk about a fellow in my electorate, a man by the name of Mr Carlisle Wardle. Mr Wardle is an ordinary individual. He is a pensioner now but not by choice: he is a pensioner because he is looking after his grandson. The reason he is looking after his grandson is that his son disowned the child and the child's mother not only disowned the child but proved to be an incapable parent. In essence, this matter involves a continuing legal battle between the natural mother—who needs the child so that she can rob houses and do a number of other things—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** Yes, I am very serious. This woman robs houses and undertakes various other criminal activities around town, including a few alleged instances of physical abuse on the child—or more than alleged instances. The Legal Services Commission has done what it could to return the child to the mother from his grandfather. To be fair, Legal Services has said, 'We will give legal aid to both sides. We will give it to the mother, even though she has been a



convicted felon in almost every State of Australia and currently has three outstanding warrants for her arrest.' However, that has not stopped Legal Services paying for another custody hearing before the Federal court.

On the other hand, Legal Services will also provide Mr Wardle—a pensioner who paid off his house through hard work—with legal aid, but there is a catch. Mr Wardle gets only \$865 and, by the way, the bill already totals \$10 000 and the next case is yet to commence. Legal Services will give him the money; that is fine, there is no problem, but it intends to put a mortgage on his house. If Mr Wardle refinances or sells his house, or if he dies—and this man is 63 years of age and the child is only six—Legal Services will recover the money from Mr Wardle. It will get nothing from the woman concerned, and it will deprive this child of the one thing that the grandfather can ensure the child will be brought up with.

I would have thought that that was a reasonably straightforward case. I have been waiting for some time to say this but, because of the forums of this House, it is difficult to find enough time to read into the record a few letters. Mr Wardle came to see me and I was horrified, because this matter has become what can only be described as a legal nightmare for this man. Legal Services is threatening the man and the child. I point out that this fellow is looking after this child to save him from being placed in a foster arrangement. He is doing it at his own expense. He gave up his job. In fact, he is a technician and would be employed tomorrow by those cable roll out people because that was his job before he decided to look after the child.

At this stage, I should declare that, by happenstance, this child is in the same class as my second son. I saw this gentleman the other week and he saw me and I know, not from what he says in the office but from my contact with the school and seeing him as a parent, that he is there every day to take the child to school and make sure everything is done. I wrote to Legal Services as follows:

I am writing to you on behalf of a constituent of mine, Mr Carlisle Wardle. . . whose case is a rather sad one which involves the custody of his grandson. In essence, he keeps being dragged back to court because the child's natural mother, Ms Kathryn Treagus, is granted legal aid on a regular basis. She is a many times convicted felon who currently has several warrants out for her arrest and she has been convicted in previous times of larceny, using the child. Very shortly, a further custody hearing will be commenced. Mr Wardle has to defend the child and, should you wish to know the precise reasons, Dr Raftis at the Children's Hospital can provide details of broken legs and various other evidence of neglect. The child is five years old. The nub of the problem is that my constituent gets some legal aid but so far has a bill of \$10 000 that has now been converted into a mortgage over his home. Could you please investigate urgently this matter because, should Ms Treagus continue to get unlimited legal aid, she will either bankrupt my constituent or still get the child.

I sent that letter to the Legal Services Commission and a copy to the Attorney-General because I took the view that most members would not be too happy with these arrangements. We all have constituents who cannot get legal aid. Certainly, any member here who wants to start a legal process will not get legal aid either. The mechanic fixing their car or any of a number of other people out there will not get legal aid because, as I said, if you have the assets of a refugee, you cannot get legal aid. One reason is that the system is not administered properly. I am saying that here because this case clearly shows that.

I then received a letter from the Attorney-General telling me that the Legal Services Commission fellow would respond on his behalf. I am sad about that, because I have time for the

Hon. Trevor Griffin. I have done some deals with him over the past year or so where I think we reached a good bipartisan compromise on a number of issues. However, on this issue I got a letter back from James Hartnett, as follows:

Thank you for your letter of 8 November 1996 on behalf of your constituent Mr Carlisle Wardle of Ingle Farm. Your constituent alleges that Ms Treagus has committed criminal offences and suggested that these may have bearing on the merit of any application she may make to the Family Court. By way of general comment I advise that the fact that a parent may have a criminal conviction will not necessarily mean that they will be prevented from having contact with their children. The court may take into account any criminal convictions, together with all the other circumstances of the case in weighing up what, if any, contact would be in the best interests of the child. If your client has evidence—

it has become 'client' and not 'constituent'—

tending to suggest that a parent's criminal convictions are such that the child would not benefit from a relationship with that parent, then such evidence should be discussed with your client's solicitor and may, if appropriate, be presented to the court.

I have it all here: I do not need to present it to the court. I am presenting it here and in public. I will tell this bloke that he has to do a bit better than this next time I see him. The letter continues:

In relation to his complaint against suspected aid to Ms Treagus, I thank you for providing the information. You make reference to information to be obtained from one Dr Raftis at the Children's Hospital. Please note that we do not have power directly to obtain an opinion from Dr Raftis, who may be bound by considerations of professional confidentiality. If your client has a report, medical records, or other information which he believes is relevant to our investigation, then I invite him to submit a copy of that information to us. Owing to the confidentiality provisions in section 31a of our Act, I am not able to provide you or Mr Wardle with any information concerning Ms Treagus' legal aid status, but I can assure you that this matter will be investigated.

He does not need to do that. I know what the status is; I have the summons here for another trip to court by the same lawyer—Wendy Bidstrup. I do not think she has won Tatts and so I suspect legal aid. The letter continues:

In relation to the grant of legal aid to Mr Wardle I confirm that it is our practice to take a statutory charge over any real estate in which an aided person has an interest—

I wonder what real estate he will take over the mother, because she does not have any—

if the costs of their case exceed \$865. Most Family Court cases do in fact ultimately exceed \$865.

I wonder why. I wonder whether Mr Hartnett and his friends have something to say about that. The letter continues:

If Mr Wardle has any inquiry about his statutory charge he may contact our statutory charges officer for further information. As you may be aware, we do not require immediate repayment of the charge, but are reimbursed when the house is sold, transferred or refinanced, or when the owner dies.

Finally, you mention that your constituent is concerned about the possibility of 'unlimited legal aid' to Ms Treagus. Please note that no grant of legal aid is ever unlimited. In a Family Court case, the maximum amount that can be granted to any one person is \$12 500. Legal aid is always under review and can be stopped if there is any change in the merits of the case or in the financial circumstances of the aided person which alter his or her eligibility for legal aid.

I shall suggest one circumstance. I understand that this is the fifth trip this poor man has had to make to court in South Australia. This even involved a case in Queensland where he took charge of the child at court direction and had to have a police escort back to South Australia. Who was the escort provided for? It was provided to protect the child and the grandfather from the mother. Mr Wardle saw this letter from

Legal Services and took it as bureaucratic claptrap. He wrote the following response to it:

Dear Sir,

Having spoken to your people at the Legal Services Commission in Adelaide I have discovered that no investigation was ever made as to the outcome of Ms Kathryn Treagus' bid for custody of the child, namely Reece Karl Treagus, (now named Reece Karl Wardle), then 10 months of age.

I, Carlisle Wardle, was granted full custody and guardianship on 11 August 1993 to the above named child, with no access being allowed by Ms Treagus. In August 1992 Ms Treagus fled South Australia for Victoria after numerous warrants for her arrest were issued for various theft and larceny charges. Upon arrival in Victoria she committed further offences involving larceny, resulting in further warrants being issued for her apprehension, forcing her to flee Victoria for Queensland. Shortly after her arrival in Queensland Ms Treagus was arrested for robbery/larceny resulting in additional warrants, therefore forcing her to leave the State and head to NSW.

During this entire period Ms Treagus was still receiving legal aid from South Australia, even though the Legal Aid Commission were aware of all that had transpired throughout the previous months. Ms Treagus' lawyer, Ms Wendy Bidstrup of Sykes Bidstrup, was in contact with her client in each of the States listed above and was also aware of the circumstances necessitating the frequent changes of address. On 6 October 1992 a warrant was issued by the Family Court of South Australia for the return of the child, Reece, to Adelaide. The parents were located in Brisbane on 16 October 1992. Reece was brought back to Adelaide by myself on 19 October under the protection of the Australian Federal Police.

In early February 1995 Ms Treagus returned to Adelaide and was confident that because she had been away from South Australia for a considerable period of time she would not have to serve time in prison for the crimes she had committed earlier. Once again I was subjected not only to harassment from Ms Treagus but also to the stresses of court proceedings in order to preserve the wellbeing of my grandson Reece. As long as Ms Treagus knows that she is able to get legal aid she will continue to use the system to her benefit.

Since returning to Adelaide in 1995 Ms Treagus has again fallen foul of the law on numerous occasions. On 12 September 1996 Ms Treagus fled from South Australia into New South Wales only days before she was due to appear in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on charges of larceny. In the above instance she was apprehended whilst my grandson was in her care during an access visit. The police believed she was using Reece in her larceny escapades. Unfortunately, Reece aged five and a half years old was subjected to a body search which proved most distressing for him. On 24 September after failing to appear in court a warrant was issued for her arrest. On 4 October 1996 a separate warrant was issued for her arrest by the Elizabeth Magistrates Court for further incidences of larceny.

I feel that I am being penalised by the system for trying to protect a small child. I am on a pension, not through choice but necessity. Whatever happened to the slogan 'Who is Minding the Child' we see so blatantly advertised in police stations and child and family support agencies? I believe that Ms Treagus should be paying the \$5 500 fee asked of me by the Legal Services Commission as during this entire period she was receiving legal aid she was a felon wanted by the police in numerous States including South Australia. In court proceedings on 13 November 1996 the court saw fit to discharge all applications by Ms Treagus.

I want to stress that point: every time it goes to court it gets thrown out the door. It continues:

Despite there being warrants for her arrest I have discovered that Ms Treagus was in Adelaide from 1 January 1997 to 5 January 1997 and again from 24 January 1997 to 27 January 1997 which to my mind demonstrates a cocky disregard for our laws of the land.

Yours faithfully, Carlisle S. Wardle.

I wish to sum this up so that the Legal Services Commission gets the drift. It is just not doing a good enough job. The bureaucratic reply that I received was a nice little off-hand effort which some junior clerk in there wrote and which Mr Hartnett signed. I have to believe that, because I do not want to think that it was dismissed so quickly out of hand. What that organisation is doing is helping a person drive an old man who is looking after a child—whom he does not have to look after—into an early grave, and it is making sure

that that child will have nothing when that man is in an early grave. All it is doing is writing dismissive letters back to me and, as I understand it, to one other member in this Chamber whom Mr Wardle has gone around to see.

At the end of the day, I want to see the Legal Services Commission have a close look at this case and realise what it is doing in this instance. I do not believe it is in the interests of this man or this child that it continues to do these sorts of things. At the end of the day, this is a story about one man and a little boy. It may not be a matter of enormous moment to most people but it is of enormous moment to them. Not only do I believe that our society has to be convinced that legal aid is a necessary provision but, as I stated at the beginning of this speech, we have to ensure that it is not abused, as has happened in this case that I have related to the Parliament this afternoon. I understand that a further application is now being prepared.

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I wish to speak on a fairly wide ranging area. I appreciate the comments from the member for Unley, who I am sure will be very quick to point out if I should stray from the Bill currently before the House.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I am also aware of that. One of the things that has intrigued me a little is the fact that the other day the Minister for Industrial Affairs pointed out that, under his then Government and the current Premier's leadership, the various public servants in this State had received pay rises far in excess of those awarded under the previous Labor Government—in particular, between 1991 and 1993.

I almost detected a tear in the eye of the Treasurer who, I am sure, would have preferred to achieve the same record as when we were in Government, when there had been no wage increases for State public servants, given that it is the Treasurer's task to try to find the money. It will be very interesting to see from the State budget that will be handed down in May of this year where the money will be found for the settling of the teachers dispute at the end of last year, because the Minister for Education and Children's Services, when he was before the Estimates Committee in June last year, was quite emphatic when he said that the offer that was made to the teachers with respect to settling their dispute at that time was the maximum that the Government could afford to pay and that, if there was an award of even so much as one extra dollar to the teachers in the settlement of their pay dispute, there would need to be a teacher tax or a further cut in services to pay for it.

Yet, we had the now Premier announcing at the end of last year the settlement of the teachers pay dispute, where the Government has to find another \$100 million on top of that which had already been committed, saying, 'It is on track, we have found that extra \$100 million, there will not be any new taxes or charges and there will not be cutbacks in any services provided by our public schools.'

**Mr Brindal:** That is called good management.

**Mr CLARKE:** The member for Unley interjects 'good management'. I am intrigued to find that somehow or other in the space of six months the Minister for Education and Children's Services could find \$100 million in a hollow log. He must have an exceptionally good rapport with the Treasurer for the Treasurer to find that extra \$100 million. I actually believed the Minister for Education and Children's Services when he was giving an answer to Parliament, through the Estimates Committee, as to the costings of the

teachers dispute at that time. In this House we are entitled to expect the Minister's reply to be honest and frank. The Minister for Education and Children's Services said that they could not find any extra money for the teachers. Miraculously, in six months the Minister and his new Premier can find \$100 million extra. That is not a bad effort.

However, all the chickens have to come home to roost some time, and, come May this year, we in the Opposition will be very interested to see how the Government intends to fund this—unless there happens to be an early election around April of this year so that the Government can quickly go to an election, say that the budget is on track and Bob's your uncle.

**Mr Caudell:** Not necessarily.

**Mr CLARKE:** The member for Mitchell corrects me: Bob is not necessarily his uncle. I was not casting any reflection on the member for Fisher. However, we will be interested to see just how the Government tries to manoeuvre this, because I suspect that, as soon as an election has been held and with the remote possibility of members opposite being returned to office, we will quickly find that they will increase taxes and charges and so on, exactly as they have done since they were elected to office in 1993. You are not allowed to use the word 'taxes' if you are a member of the Government, but they do not mind using other words such as 'imposts', 'levies', 'charges' and any word other than 'tax'. Nonetheless, the effect is still the same. The public of South Australia has less money in its pocket to spend on other things because of increased charges by the Government of the day.

The other point that I want to make relates to the industrial relations side of the equation. I read a good article in last week's *Australian* which dealt with the issue of wages. We often hear from members of the Liberal Party (both State and Federal) and employers that we must not increase wage rates, that the low paid should put up with their measly \$8 a week safety net increase that the Federal Government is proposing in the current national wage case before the Industrial Relations Commission and that the ACTU claim should not be acceded to because that will only add to unemployment.

The article in the *Australian* was quite interesting, and I trust that Government members would have read it. It pointed out that wages is but one component of the issue of unemployment. I am not saying that it is unimportant, but it is but one component. The Prime Minister (Mr Howard) and our Premier often refer with approval to countries such as the United States in terms of, technically speaking, its lower rates of unemployment than here in Australia. They point to the flexible labour market in the United States as a model that we in Australia should follow to create new jobs. The United Kingdom has also been pointed to as a model.

The fact is that in the United States unemployment statistics are not accurate, because after six months in some States or 12 months in others people are no longer entitled to receive unemployment benefits. So, they are removed from those statistics. I do not know what happens to those people, whether they become homeless, quietly starve or resort to crime to pay for the necessities of life. Some of them take up extremely poorly paid employment in the service industry where they are paid as casuals or on a part-time basis. Basically, they are on a very poor rate of pay but technically they are working. They are not entitled to unemployment benefits, so they do not appear on the unemployment statistics, and at the end of the day, after a hard day's work, they sleep in cardboard boxes in the parks in the town in

which they happen to be living at that time. These people are grossly exploited.

Therefore, rather than use the United States as a model, we should veer away dramatically from that, because that system is building up a two-tiered structure, a huge under class of people within society who are technically working but who are poorly paid and who do not earn enough to provide the necessities of life for themselves and their family. The United Kingdom, which is another country that is widely referred to by conservative Parties in Australia as a country at which we should look, also has difficulties. It has an unemployment level in excess of 8 per cent. I think it is close to that of Australia at about 8.5 per cent.

Even though the United Kingdom has an entirely flexible labour market, particularly compared to Australia, as conservative Parties in this country would argue, and even though it has considerably lower wage rates which vary from region to region, and even though the old wages boards in the United Kingdom have been abolished under the Thatcher Government so that there are effectively no minimum wage rates in that country, the interesting point to note is that its unemployment level is about the same as Australia's. Its wage rates are lower than its European Union competitors for industry.

Thatcher thought that a number of companies would like to settle in the United Kingdom because of its lower wage rates, but the unemployment rate in the United Kingdom is not substantially lower than that of other nations in Europe; it has lower wage rates; and it does not have a number of the other add-ons in terms of redundancy pay or the social charter that applies in other European Union countries. Yet, the unemployment rate in the United Kingdom is not dissimilar to that of Australia and not substantially lower than that of its European Union colleagues. Basically, this furphy has been talked about and beaten up in the press not only this year but since time immemorial. The argument between capital and labour has always gone on; that is, if someone receives a pay rise it means that someone else will lose their job.

The problem with our economy in Australia and this State in particular is simply the lack of demand and the lack of confidence that workers in particular have that they will be employed tomorrow, next week or next year. Very little growth in employment has occurred in this State since the election in December 1993. Full-time employment in this State has dropped below the level of 1993, and overwhelmingly the growth has been in part-time and casual employment. If someone is on a part-time wage, a casual wage, or if someone happens to be engaged on a one year contract or a two year contract, and they race out to their local bank and say, 'I would like a housing loan for the next 25 years, please, so that I can purchase a new home,' bank managers tend to have a chuckle because they do not think you have the longevity of employment to be able to repay your loan.

The Government can cut stamp duty if it likes or it can bring in the \$5 000 Homestart bonuses and all the rest of it, and they will have some impact on the margins—I am not saying that they will have no impact whatsoever—but, in terms of giving the lift to the economy that the Government really wants, it is not good enough until workers believe that they will have employment not only now but next week and into the future so that they can plan with confidence. More than 10 000 State public servants have lost their jobs in South Australia over the past three years. Federal public servants are being shed, and that has a huge impact on small regional economies such as South Australia. As a consequence, the

State simply will not generate the necessary economic activity to create the type of growth that it needs.

I am amazed in Australia—and it is a sad reflection on us all, frankly, and particularly on the gnomes of the various banking institutions that we have in this country—that we are frightened if there is a growth rate in our economy of 5 per cent or 6 per cent. We cannot tolerate a growth rate of that order because there is a fear of inflation, and therefore we have to content ourselves with aiming for a growth rate of somewhere between 3 per cent and 4 per cent. We all know that a rate of 3 per cent merely marks time as far as unemployment is concerned: it barely keeps up with the number of new entrants into the work force at the end of each year. We need 4 per cent growth at least just to make an inroad into unemployment, and we need about 5 per cent growth rate if we are to make any substantial dent in the level of unemployment.

However, we have the banking industry and conservative Governments trembling in their boots at the thought of 5 per cent growth rate because they think that will kick off inflation. We have had low inflation for a number of years now where by careful management of the national economy, and particularly if we have a wages policy such as the former Federal Labor Government had with the ACTU—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** The member for Unley laughs, and I can well understand it, because on matters of industrial relations and economics he is generally ignorant, but I am prepared to forgive him, because he cannot be a master of everything and, in his case, little of anything. The Government can keep inflation under control if it has an effective wages policy. What we have under the Federal Liberal Government is a wages policy which says, 'Look, if you have enterprise bargaining, let the market rule the roost.' But, as soon as the market rules the roost—like the Transport Workers Union entering into an agreement with the transport industry for significant pay increases—suddenly Mr Peter Reith says that we cannot allow the market to rule the roost; we cannot have free enterprise in the labour market because workers might get too much money. What a dreadful thing!

The Government cannot have it both ways. Either we have a centralised wage fixing system, which applies fair and consistent standards across all classes of the work force, or we go the way the Liberal Party said it always favoured with enterprise bargaining, namely, to let the boss and employees sit down together and work out a fair rate of pay without the Arbitration Commission interfering and without questions about social justice and the public interest. If the boss wants to pay so many dollars and the worker is prepared to accept it, that is what it ought to be.

Unfortunately for the conservatives, the Transport Workers Union and employers in the industry got together and said, 'We have taken your charter on free enterprise at

your word; we have entered into a deal for significant pay rises and we will have them.' Peter Reith and the conservative Federal Government say that it must not be approved by the Industrial Relations Commission because we cannot allow free enterprise its full rein in the settlement of wages. The Government cannot have two bob each way with respect to this matter. The Government did not want a centralised wage fixing system but wanted to break the back of the Industrial Relations Commission, yet members of the Liberal Party thought that they and their employer supporters would get the benefit of it, while the 80 per cent of the work force who have no industrial muscle would be screwed in the marketplace by the employers. That is basically the Liberal Party's wages policy.

It will not work in the long run because inevitably there will be a wages break-out and members opposite will wonder that has hit them between the eyes as massive wage catch up applications will force their way through. No matter what the Government may like to point out about falling union numbers and all the rest of it—

**Mr Brokenshire:** And they are.

**Mr CLARKE:** The member for Mawson is right—they are falling for a number of reasons. However, in Australia our ethos—and your former colleagues, Sir, in the Police Department have shown only too actively how it works—will not accept that workers are not entitled to some form of comparative wage justice, that only some people who happen to work for a large company are entitled to these wage rates and that those who work for a smaller company do not have the same bargaining leverage, even though they may do the same work and exercise the same responsibilities.

You can get away with it for a while, particularly with the fear of unemployment, but ultimately it fails because, as politicians and judges know, when we compare our salaries to the salaries of MPs in other States or federally, we say, 'Why should we be paid less for exercising the same degree of responsibility?'. Judges go every year to the Remuneration Tribunal saying, 'Why should we earn less than our High Court colleagues or colleagues in the New South Wales Supreme Court?', and they put up their hand for more. Police officers do the same and did it effectively when they screwed the Government last year with their 15 per cent pay rise. It will apply across the board. The Government's only hope is to contain it to a few workers in general and avoid a wages break-out. Ultimately, it is a futile policy because it does break out, and it will be in an uncontrolled and unmanageable area. That is when you get inflation and you have real problems with the economic management of this country.

**Ms GREIG** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 12 February at 2 p.m.