

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 10 February 1999

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Before the House rose in December last year, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me a question without notice requesting that I make a statement to the House on how I intended dealing with any future matters of privilege. First, it is unlikely that there would be any two matters of privilege which are the same and which would be dealt with in the same way. The principal and only role of the Chair is to determine in the Chair's eyes whether the matter of privilege is a matter of privilege under Standing Order 132 and is a legitimate allegation for referral to the House and whether it warrants suspension of the consideration of all other questions and motions on the Notice Paper until the matter of privilege has been decided upon. It is the Chair's objective to bring down a ruling at the earliest opportunity and if possible on the same day. That will depend on the circumstances; for example, bearing in mind that the *Hansard* pull is available within the hour, it may be possible to give an almost immediate response if the statements made are straightforward and easily connected. Or, it may require verifying crosschecking back issues of the *Hansard* and, depending on the time of the day, the Chair may chose to report to the House the next day.

On one occasion last year, although the issue appeared complex, the Chair was able to report to the House immediately that it believed a matter touching on privilege existed and to expedite a debate. This was made possible because I had had prior warning on the member's intention and, as the facts put forward in his argument to the House did not materially change from when the issue was raised early in the day outside the House, the Chair had sufficient hours notice to verify the statements and rule accordingly. Once I have formed a view I believe I have an obligation to acquaint the House of that view as soon as possible and, if it is a matter of privilege, to give the House the opportunity to bring on a debate and decide how it wishes to deal with the matter.

It should be noted that any member can bypass the Speaker when raising matters of alleged breach of privilege if they wish by seeking a suspension of Standing Orders which would allow the House to debate an urgent matter. I offered the House this course of action once last year on an occasion when I did not concur that a breach of privilege existed.

The Chair remains concerned at the perception by some members that I am required to conduct some sort of magisterial inquiry and call for and consider certain evidence and then rule if a *prima facie* case exists against the accused when giving my response. The taking and consideration of evidence is not the role of the Speaker but for the House itself or, if one is set up, a Privileges Committee.

In summary, my course of action remains as follows. First, to determine whether the matter raised is a matter of privilege and then at the earliest opportunity to advise the House. Secondly, if I have ruled that a matter of privilege is involved, to invite the member making the allegation to move

a suitably worded motion that will allow the House to decide the matter, including, if it chooses, referral to a privileges committee. Thirdly, if in my view no matter of privilege is involved, to afford the opportunity for the member to give a notice of motion in the normal way.

So that I do not delay the House, I refer members to the many privilege rulings which I made during 1998 and which are recorded in the *Hansard*, rather than rereading them to the Chamber. I believe that members will find them consistent with what I have said this afternoon. However, if any member remains concerned about Standing Order 132 as it applies to this House, I suggest referral of the matter to the Standing Orders Committee with an appropriate submission.

Finally, can I say to the House, without in any way diminishing the need to protect your privileges, without which the House cannot function effectively, that more matters of privilege have been raised already in the short 14-month life of this Parliament than in the previous five or six years. While a number of these have involved allegations of misleading the House, I remind members that the principle established at Westminster is of deliberately misleading. In this age of information technology, any member will need to think very carefully before commenting twice on the same subject for fear of being tripped up by contradictory remarks. I note that in more than one case last year the alleged misleading statements under which a breach of privilege was claimed ranged between weeks and years apart. I am concerned that, if the test becomes contradiction rather than as a result of wilful action, none of us can feel safe in the future.

Avoiding contradiction itself is more about efficiency and competence than of breaching privilege and being accused of misleading the House. Political strategies tend to be cyclical, and I conclude by saying that, historically, most of the allegations that have been raised over the past 14 months would once have proceeded by way of vigorous questioning, culminating in a censure or no-confidence motion. I would encourage members to return to that path.

QUESTION TIME

CRAMOND REPORT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Now that the Premier has accepted that he misled Parliament, based on an objective, independent assessment, will he release a full list of the conditions in his ministerial code of conduct upon which he believes it is acceptable for him or his Ministers to mislead this Parliament? Mr Cramond in his report found on page 44 that he was unable to accept the Premier's explanation of his answer to this House on 24 September 1994 and said, 'I find that component of Mr Olsen's answer to be false.' On page 45—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is an important question. I want the Leader to be heard in silence.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We know that there were a few selective interviews done yesterday for the media—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will continue with his question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —who were not given the full report, such as the dodgy state of the Premier's rule. On page 45 Mr Cramond said, 'In my view it was misleading for Mr Olsen to reply as he did.' In dealing with the Premier's

discussions with Motorola in 1994, Mr Cramond said on page 46 of his report, 'I believe that Mr Olsen was wrong in this.' And the Premier himself told the media yesterday, 'There is one error of fact, but that's in the context of an objective assessment.' When will we objectively or subjectively hear the truth?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member has asked his question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition is once again selectively quoting from the report, not looking at it in its entirety. What the Leader of the Opposition is somewhat disappointed about is that this matter was dealt with yesterday. What we now ought to be doing is moving on to the business of the day and what is in the interests of the public of South Australia. Members of the Opposition have shown no inclination whatsoever to develop policies, and they somewhat laugh about that fact in their discussions with the media in this town. They believe that it is rather smart not to have a policy position on a range of matters—that that is a good way for a political Party such as the Labor Party in Opposition to act. It would be well for the Opposition to do a service to South Australians by at least giving consideration to policy rather than political mayhem and political on-upmanship in this House.

BUSINESS CONFIDENCE

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is directed to the Premier—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Give me a chance. Will the Premier give an indication of the level of business confidence in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is no doubt that the South Australian economy is strong and is growing well. There is a very significant change in the economy now compared with the past decade and the decade before that. Last financial year, business investment in this State grew by 24 per cent, compared with the national average of just 5 per cent. That is a historically high level. Of course, the development of stage 2 of Olympic Dam played an important part in that result. However, other indicators also show the dynamic nature of our State's economy. In December, BankSA's regular State monitor showed a lift in morale and State pride in both consumer and business sectors.

That was reinforced last month by the National Australia Bank business survey for the last quarter of 1998, where South Australia recorded the strongest business conditions in the nation, ahead of Queensland and New South Wales. It is a long time since this State was outperforming Queensland and New South Wales in economic indicators. Business confidence in South Australia increased by 14 points on the National Australia Bank index compared with a national rise of 9 points, and respondents in South Australia expect another improvement in business conditions in the current quarter. The NAB survey also showed an increase in trading performance index of 18 points for South Australia—the largest in the country, I would hasten to add, and 50 per cent higher than the national average of 12 points. Respondents also expected an increase in this index for the current quarter.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I look forward to the honourable member's contribution in the jobs debate. For the benefit of the member for Peake, over the past five or six years this Government has put the economic conditions right for job

creation and job growth in South Australia. We inherited a debacle in this State financially and economically with respect to the condition of the economy. Through hard work over five or six years, a Liberal Government has turned that around so that it is outperforming the other States of Australia. However, rather than the member for Peake acknowledging the fact that we are outperforming other States, he wants to dwell on the negative—which is the constant carp of the member for Peake, and particularly regarding the electorate he represents—in misquoting circumstances that relate to his electorate.

Let me return to the point. South Australia recorded an increase of 18 points in profitability performance in the December survey, which is double the national average of 9 points and second only to Tasmania. Again, local respondents also expected profitability performance to rise in the March 1999 quarter. So, with respect to investment, profitability and confidence—in each one of those categories—we are well ahead of the national position.

Finally, there is some good news with respect to jobs—and perhaps the member for Peake would listen: 91 per cent of South Australian firms surveyed expect to either remain at their current size or employ in the first three months of this year—up from 75 per cent in the December 1998 quarter. So, business has confidence and is looking positively to the future to retain jobs and create jobs in the next quarter. That reinforces the BankSA's December monitor findings, which showed a 15 per cent increase in the number of business owners who were confident of being able to create additional positions or provide more overtime.

It also follows the findings of the Australian Bureau of Statistics Business Expectations Survey for the December 1998 quarter where the outlook for employment in this State was three times the national average, and that is capped off by today's Morgan and Banks Jobs Index Survey, which shows that the number of firms intending to take on new staff this quarter has risen to 19.3 per cent. That group of economic indicators from a range of organisations no less than the National Australia Bank and Morgan and Banks clearly indicates that the economy is in good shape and has good growth prospects. It is incumbent upon us to keep that momentum going, and then the member for Peake's question will really be answered. The confidence, the optimism in the business community to retain and increase employment, will actually be realised with jobs for South Australians.

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again directed to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of the nature and extent of the evidence given to the Cramond inquiry by the Minister for Human Services and the former Treasurer of the State? Will the Premier now call on Mr Cramond to release evidence to the Motorola inquiry provided by three Liberal Ministers, given that the report only includes in the appendices the written submissions of the Opposition witnesses, so that there can be a full and open examination of all the evidence before the Cramond inquiry?

The Cramond report contains only two written submissions in its appendix, and both are from the Opposition. Evidence not included was the oral evidence given by the former Premier, the former Treasurer and the former Minister of Information Technology. According to the Cramond report, both the former Premier and the former Treasurer gave evidence to the inquiry that they expressed in Cabinet

their reservations about the April 1994 offer to Motorola and queried the now Premier's risk in sending a letter to Motorola which they (that is, his Cabinet colleagues) believed 'might create legally enforceable obligations'. Mr Cramond said that he accepted the evidence of Dean Brown and Stephen Baker. Will you table the evidence?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition struck out yesterday, and the political witch-hunt continues. This is a Leader of the Opposition who cannot focus on the main game for South Australia. This is a Leader of the Opposition who for six months with his colleagues used and abused the processes of Parliament to further their own cause, and members opposite do not have anything of substance, because the inquiry clearly said that there were no side deals. In terms of the Leader of the Opposition's allegations that 'month after month there was a side deal', there was not a side deal. You might not like the independent umpire's—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will come to order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition might not like the independent umpire's decision, but the simple fact is that there were no side deals. The Leader of the Opposition has no substance in his further questioning in this House today; he just wants to keep the political witch-hunt going.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As I have indicated before, the Opposition ought to give us some policies in this policy free zone. What does the Opposition believe in? Where should South Australia be going? What should we be building for this State in the future? There is silence. I will tell you what this Government has done, particularly as it relates to Motorola: it has established a software development centre in this State which now employs some 230 people and which has the capacity and commitments to grow that to 525 people by the year 2003, I think. That is a new international investment in this State of which my colleagues and I are proud, having secured it for South Australia. What would you want us to do? Would the Leader of the Opposition want us to go to Motorola and say 'Go home'?

Is that what members opposite want? The way in which the Opposition carries on sends a clear message to every major company investing in this State: if you come to South Australia, the Opposition is so intent on political witch-hunts and so intent on pursuing political objectives rather than the State's interest that it will put anyone through the wringer. Members opposite are putting at risk the future of this State and investment in this State. I know why they are doing that: they do not like the current economic indicators and they do not like the growth we are now seeing in South Australia's economy.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, they do not. For reasons of political opportunism they want it to stall at the next ballot box. Well, carry on as you will, because there is one thing about which the Leader of the Opposition ought to take note: last Sunday's poll in the *Sunday Mail*. The primary vote for the Labor Party in that poll was the same as the primary vote for the Labor Party in 1993. Well done, guys, keep it up!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Peake and the Leader for the second time.

BUSINESS CONFIDENCE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Given the strength of business confidence in the State, will the Premier outline some of its broader impact?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In terms of the strength of business confidence in the State, I have already relayed some of those indicators to the House. I thank the honourable member for his question because it is well to record that the economic forecaster Econtech states that our gross State product rose by a healthy 4.1 per cent last financial year. Econtech further states that it will grow by 4.5 per cent in 1998-99 compared with a national average of 2.8 per cent—the fastest growth of all the States. Econtech also states that, on a *per capita* basis, South Australia's GSP grows faster than that in any other State.

In other words, South Australians will enjoy a sharper increase in their quality of life than will other Australians. This has already been reflected in other indicators, some of which I have referred to. Retail sales in volume terms rose by 5 per cent in South Australia in the last quarter of 1998, almost double the national average of 2.7 per cent. In the three months to November, dwelling approvals in South Australia were up 10 per cent on the figure for the same time a year earlier; nationally they dropped by about 1 per cent. At the same time new car sales were at their highest level since 1985.

In another sign of a stronger economy, people have stopped leaving our State. This is important because I am sure that members will remember that the Leader commenced his last election campaign by the tollgate, waving goodbye to all the South Australians who were leaving. As a result of some good policies over five or six years, and in another sign of a stronger economy, people have stopped leaving our State. Last financial year South Australia had its strongest population growth since 1992, an increase of 7 600 people; and the number of people moving interstate fell by almost a quarter. So, as well as the natural population gain, in migration terms South Australia is having positive population gain.

At the same time overseas migration to South Australia—and this is an important point which I am sure will interest the member for Hartley—also rose by almost 40 per cent. I am talking about skilled migration and other areas. Clearly, they are the right directions for South Australia's future.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): My question is directed to the Premier. Given that the tender arrangements for the Motorola contract in South Australia were coat-tailed to the New South Wales Government contract with Motorola, does the Premier intend to send a copy of the Cramond report and all of the relevant evidence given to the inquiry, including those documents and transcripts not included in the report, to the three bodies now investigating the New South Wales Motorola contract, including the independent commission against corruption? Four days ago it was revealed—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr CONLON: Mr Bean is interrupting—you are just like Mr Bean, except you are not funny. Four days ago it was revealed in the Sydney media that an aspect of the New South Wales Government radio network contract with Motorola—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will come to order.

Mr CONLON: —was being investigated by the Independent Commission Against Corruption, the Police Integrity Commission and the New South Wales Ombudsman.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Talk about the Opposition drawing long bows! The document released yesterday is a public document available to anybody.

STATE EXPORTS

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Will the Premier advise how the recent economic activity he has described has been reflected in the State's export performances?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank the honourable member for his question. South Australia's exports rose by 5.1 per cent or, in dollar terms, \$103 million in the first five months of this financial year to \$2.13 billion, compared with a national average of about 2.5 per cent. So our exports have almost doubled the national export increase. That performance is even more impressive in light of the Asian crisis. While State exports to East Asia fell by some 17 per cent, South Australian exporters have been able to diversify and find new markets for their products. South Australia exports to more countries than does any other State in Australia.

One of the key policy thrusts of the Government has been to focus on exports, for us to become an exporting State and to concentrate on diversification of markets to hedge against various national economies going through a cyclical difficulty. We have been able to build on the experience to ride out the Asian storm. Exports to the Middle East have increased by about 99 per cent and to New Zealand by 11 per cent, more than compensating for the drop in Asian exports.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The shadow Treasurer ought to know that General Motors-Holden's has just put in place a \$1.5 billion second production line for the world Vectra motor car, employing some 700 additional South Australians. It is exporting to the Middle East and South America and doing it very well. Does that answer your question?

The wine and automotive industries have continued to be key areas of export growth for South Australia. These two areas are particularly important as they represent our second and third single largest export items. Over the first five months of this financial year wine exports rose by 18 per cent and motor vehicles and part exports increased by about 14 per cent. The news also looks bright for this current financial year. Economic forecaster Econtech says that South Australia's exports growth will be the highest in the nation. Here is another economic indicator to say that we are outperforming the rest of this country. I cannot stress often enough that it has been a long time since South Australia has been able to demonstrate clearly, on a range of economic indicators, that it is doing better than other States of Australia.

Econtech expects our exports to grow by 6.5 per cent, while forecasting for the nation's exports overall is that they will not grow at all. While we have a predicted 6.5 per cent growth in the year ahead, the nation does not have a predicted growth at all, again pointing to a positive outlook in the future as well as on current statistics. That is a massive endorsement of the strategies of the Government and the ability of this State's business people. In terms of tourism—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is not a long bow because the quality of the work force in this State has enabled us to

produce the quality and range of goods that have enabled us to access the international markets on price, quality and reliability of supply with the best in the world. I would have thought the member for Peake would be proud of that fact, as indeed this Government is proud, and give credit to the work force in this State that is achieving this for the State.

In terms of tourism exports, South Australia has also been able to ride out the Asian crisis. The latest overseas tourism results show that the number of overseas tourists visiting South Australia grew by 2.5 per cent in the first 10 months of 1998 compared to the previous year, while it dropped more than 4 per cent nationally. Once again for South Australia, benchmarked against the national trend, it clearly indicates that in a range of areas in economic terms we are heading in the right direction.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Does the Premier accept the finding of former Chief Magistrate Mr Jim Cramond that Motorola did not accept his offer to become the equipment supplier of the Government radio network, and can the Premier explain who made the offer that was accepted by Motorola? All evidence contained in the appendices to the Cramond report indicate that the only Minister to seek Cabinet approval to offer the radio equipment contract to Motorola was the now Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I ask the member for Elder to read the report. If he reads the report, it will answer the questions he wants.

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Employment outline job prospects for South Australians in the months and years ahead?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I thank the member for Fisher for his question. In an earlier answer, the Premier alluded to the Morgan and Banks job index survey which was released today, so I thank the honourable member for following up the point raised by the Premier. As the Premier noted, employers in South Australia are optimistic in relation to employment growth over the next three months, according to that survey. It is interesting that, when we get off the frivolous questions and on to the serious ones, the Opposition goes into a torpor, but I am sure that there is interest on this side of the House.

Just under one-third, which is 29.8 per cent, of employers surveyed in South Australia reported that they were planning to increase permanent staff numbers, whereas only 10.5 per cent were planning to decrease staffing levels to any extent. That results in a quarterly net increase in the index of 19.3 per cent and, most importantly, an apparent shift away from casual work to a more permanent and stable work force. That has to be very good news for South Australia.

This quarter's result has reached the record level recorded last quarter, giving a net effect of a plus growth of 18.9 per cent. That demonstrates greater employer confidence and signals a potential for job growth in the South Australian labour market over the next three months. According to the survey—and this is interesting because it is exactly in line with Government commitments and effort—South Australian industries showing the strongest levels of optimism are information technology, food, engineering and the retail sector. Employers in South Australia deserve a pat on the

back, but so does this Government and the Ministers who are working so hard in difficult circumstances to create more permanent employment for the people of South Australia.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier. Why did the Premier accept the resignation from the ministry last year of his former Deputy Premier, Graham Ingerson, for misleading the Parliament, when the Premier has not resigned in the wake of an independent, objective finding that the Premier has done the same?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Opposition is showing its absolute vacuum in terms of major contribution to the policy direction of South Australia. The lack of substance and direction of questions from the Opposition never ceases to amaze me.

INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Minister for Industry and Trade outline what assistance has been made available to companies through the Industry Investment Division of DIT this financial year and what impact that has had on job creation in South Australia?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I thank the member for Schubert for his question. Following on both the Premier's and the Minister for Employment's comments about the improving strength of the South Australian economy, I am sure there is no better example than the member for Schubert's own area, where about \$700 million worth of investment has been identified in that area. A lot of that is from the private sector, with some Government assistance, but it is certainly a significant amount of investment.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Schubert advises me that it is not all from his own pocket.

The Hon. M.R. Buckley interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: A lot of that is in Light, as the member for Light quite rightly points out. It is important to realise that, with the investment arm of DIT, a lot of the business already goes to existing South Australian businesses. About 90 per cent of the companies that receive industry assistance through DIT are already existing South Australian businesses. The other 10 per cent are those involved in the new businesses coming to the State. DIT concentrates on a number of sectors but importantly in two key areas. One is obviously trying to retain jobs in South Australia; when companies are taken over or a company restructures it is important to try to retain the jobs in South Australia. The other avenue is to attract new jobs into South Australia.

Over the past seven months some 34 companies have been assisted, retaining about 5 900 direct and indirect jobs. About \$150 million worth of new investment over that seven month period has seen the creation of just over 2 000 direct jobs, the retention of about 650 jobs and the creation of 3 200 indirect jobs, making a total of about 5 900. That helps our gross State product, as the Premier referred to earlier, involving about \$1 972 million extra in gross State product and increased taxation of about \$118 million.

Some of these projects happen very quickly and others take a number of years to eventuate. An example would be the Berri project, where about \$28 million worth of investment will occur over a three or four year period. An example of something that happens a little more quickly is the TENIX

Defence Systems that have just taken over the military business unit previously operated by British Aerospace, and it will move some of its land systems and support division to Adelaide as well as some of the management team. So, there is a different mix in relation to how the investment attraction is handled.

It is interesting to note that more and more of the investment attraction has been narrowed into the sectors that the Government is targeting. The Premier mentioned earlier the wine sector, which has seen outstanding growth for the South Australian economy. I had a briefing the other night from members of the wine industry, whose 2025 vision involves planting about 40 000 hectares. They are already up to about 35 000, so the huge growth of that industry is very pleasing from a State point of view, but that offers challenges in supplying industry infrastructure. That is one of the challenges the Government faces in relation to how we plan investment in industry infrastructure to make sure that, for example, transport infrastructure is available for those industries. Certainly, it has been a reasonable seven months as far as investment attraction goes, and that is part of the reason for the South Australian economy showing improvement.

FIRE SERVICE COMMUNICATION CENTRE

Mr CONLON (Elder): Why is the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services keen on shifting the Metropolitan Fire Service central communication centre to Mount Barker within a high bushfire risk area (as defined by ETSA), which we understand would result in power being cut to the centre on days of extreme fire danger? The Minister has been reported as saying that the Metropolitan Fire Service communication centre should be shifted to Mount Barker because the current centre in middle of Adelaide is in the vicinity of a fault line and could be affected by earthquakes and, further, that the current location made it more susceptible to terrorist attack than would be the case at Mount Barker. Yet, the Minister is ignoring more realistic dangers.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: It is nice to get a question at last from the member for Elder, the shadow spokesperson. Given the obligations he has to the United Firefighters Union I am not surprised that he has finally asked a question at last after many months. The member for Elder might like to make a joke about this, because he seems to enjoy being a clown in this place. He can go on doing that, but on this side we are getting on with the business of Government. I remind the Opposition that the business of Government is serious to this Government, and therefore we consider all issues. I understand that they may well laugh. It was not a serious business to them for 11 years when they destroyed this State, but here they are laughing and carrying on with the sort of antics you would see at Disney on Ice. The fact is that I have not specifically made those statements that the member for Elder has mentioned. I want to get this clear. I have said that as the Minister on behalf of the Government I have a duty of care and a responsibility to the whole South Australian community, unlike the member for Elder who it appears may have a duty of care only to the United Firefighters Union.

The fact is that we are taking the emergency services down a new road that will be in the best interests of the workers and the South Australian community. It involves a brand new common computer aided dispatch network, and

expert advice given to me indicates that I should be exploring a number of areas where the second communication centre may be located. I am getting on with that job and, whilst they may laugh, I would suggest that some of that expert advice given to me so far indicates that it is potentially possible that there could be an earthquake in Adelaide in the future comparable to that of the Newcastle earthquake. I ask what the member for Elder would be doing next year if I ignored that advice and there was an earthquake similar to that at Newcastle. He would not be up there saying, 'Well, I tried to stop it on behalf of the UFU.' Of course he would not; the fact is that you would not see him for dust.

That is not the way this Government works; we are responsible and we are prepared to look at all the options. We will consult with the UFU and other people involved, but at the end of the day the decision that this Government makes will be the right decision for the safety of life and property for all South Australians. That is our commitment and we will honour it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the member for Elder and let you know you were warned during that last reply.

MOTOROLA

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I direct my question to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Is it true that Motorola is ceasing further development on the Datatech products? I am advised that the protocol to be provided for the GRNC data network is the Motorola Datatech or RD LAP system and that Motorola is considering discontinuing development of this protocol and therefore it will have a very limited life span.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will refer the question to the Minister responsible in another place.

Mr CONLON (Elder): I refer my question to the Premier. Is it the intention of this Government to privatise the management of the \$247 million whole of Government radio network? The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services last week refused to rule out the possibility that the whole emergency service communication service would be outsourced to the private sector.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I was simply saying that a business case is being developed. All options must and will be considered in consultation with the UFU. It is as simple as that, and we are getting on with the job of developing that business case.

CUTTLEFISH

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House what the State Government is doing to protect cuttlefish stocks in the Upper Spencer Gulf?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I know that all members will be interested in this, particularly the member for Giles, who has shown a great interest in this issue. Over the past couple of years we have seen a rapid increase in the number of cuttlefish caught. Four years ago it was a fishery of under 10 tonnes, and in the past couple of years 240 tonnes and 140 tonnes have been caught, plus a considerable recreational catch. That increase has raised some concerns as to whether the level of catch is sustainable. The major reason for the lift was that viable markets were found for the cuttlefish.

Unfortunately, one of the features of the cuttlefish fishery is that it has been confined to a small area around Point Lowly, adjacent to Whyalla, and that has put an enormous pressure on the stocks there.

To enable appropriate management, more research was required, as a result of which the three year Fisheries Research and Development Corporation-funded project was initiated. That started last year under the guidance of SARDI. The first year's results are available and have indicated a need for a conservative approach to be taken. I recently forwarded those results to the Marine Scale Fisheries Management Committee to provide some recommendations for appropriate management. At that meeting, the committee unanimously recommended the closure of the fishery during the spawning period, and I have agreed with that recommendation and announce today that, in order to protect the unique cuttlefish spawning grounds in the Upper Spencer Gulf, that closure will be implemented.

It will apply to the main cuttlefish spawning grounds for the period from 1 March 1999 to 30 September 1999, and from 1 March 2000 to 30 September 2000, both inclusive. During that period no body, whether commercial or recreational, can take any species of cuttlefish, squid or octopus within the waters of Spencer Gulf in an area enclosed by a line from the lighthouse at Point Lowly to the southern end of the Point Bonython jetty, then in a south-westerly direction to the southern end of the BHP wall near Whyalla, around the high water mark back to the point of commencement at the lighthouse. We will review that closure with the results of next year's stock assessment. However, the closure will remain in force until we can come up with a longer term strategy for the management of a unique fishery, which I am well aware is, as the member for Giles has said, a tourism plus for Whyalla.

This is proof of the Government's commitment to the ecological and economic sustainability of South Australia's valuable marine resources and fulfils the commitments we made last year to look at the research and act on it.

HEALTHSCOPE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Given Healthscope's announcement of continuing losses on the contract to manage Modbury Hospital and the announcement of the closure of the temporary Torrens Valley private hospital because of under-utilisation, is the Minister for Human Services satisfied that Healthscope will honour the company's contractual commitments to construct a new private hospital at Modbury, and can he tell the House when this will be completed?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The temporary Torrens Valley private hospital is not under the Healthscope contract with the State Government, although there has been a certain amount of media coverage that implied that it was part of the contract. In fact, the honourable member, from her very question, also implies that this temporary Torrens Valley private hospital was part of the Healthscope contract. In fact, I heard the interjection across the House about the contract.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It would appear that the member for Elizabeth will not accept the fact that the temporary Torrens Valley private hospital was not part of the Healthscope contract with the State Government. It was an initiative that Healthscope took 12 months ago—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth will be brought to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just over 12 months ago Healthscope took the initiative to set up this private hospital with 22 beds, entirely outside the contract, using spare facilities at the Modbury Hospital. As a result, it wanted to test what the private hospital facility would be like. It has found that, for the past month or so, it has had one patient per night on average in this 22 bed facility. So, it has taken the decision to close that private hospital. But I stress that there is no contractual right that the State Government has back onto that private hospital, because it is entirely outside the Modbury Healthscope contract.

The State Government has committed money to the redevelopment of part of Modbury, and that work is about to commence. I understand that it is either finalising or has finalised the first of the contracts there, and I can assure the honourable member that we are proceeding with the money allocated by the State Government for the upgrade of the public hospital. The Healthscope part of the project cannot proceed until the State Government part is finished, but we are proceeding with that and that work is about to commence.

TAFE GRADUATES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training advise the House on the recent employment outcomes for TAFE graduates in South Australia?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: This is another success story in terms of TAFE and the excellent level of education that it is giving our young people and those who return to education within our State system. The Australian National Training Authority recently released a report comparing vocational education and training performances of all States and Territories. TAFE graduation destinations in that survey indicated that 81.7 per cent of 1997 TAFE SA graduates were employed by May 1998, compared with a national average of 72.8 per cent. So, one can see the excellent outcomes from TAFE graduates and their ability to gain employment. Of those graduates who came into TAFE as unemployed people before commencing their studies, 60 per cent had gained employment by May 1998. So, they were unemployed before they came to TAFE SA: when they had finished their study, 60 per cent of them had gained employment by May 1998. The national average was 46.4 per cent, so we were some 15 per cent above the national average in terms of outcomes there.

In addition, 81.6 per cent of students reported that the course content from TAFE was highly relevant. The Government's commitment to TAFE and to further training and encouraging young people to undertake further training following their secondary school education is reflected in continuing capital works at Urrbrae and at Regency college. Of course, constructions commenced yesterday in Light Square for the Centre for Performing Arts—yet another commitment by the Government towards encouraging young people to undertake further training in our TAFE organisation. These results show that we are outperforming the rest of the country and augur very well for the future skill base of South Australia.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Is the renegotiated contract with Healthscope to manage the Modbury Hospital now in jeopardy following further losses by the company? Did recent budget talks result in additional funding being released for Healthscope and, if not, what guarantee can the Minister give that Healthscope will maintain services at Modbury while making substantial losses? On 21 November 1998 the Managing Director of Healthscope said that the company had lost hundreds of thousands of dollars on the Modbury contract and needed more money during budget talks it was having with the Government.

On 8 February—a few days ago—Healthscope announced that it will not be able to pay an interim dividend and has issued a profit downgrade for the full year due to problems with the contract to manage the Modbury Hospital.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Chairman of Healthscope has indicated publicly that the company has reported a loss on the operation of the Modbury Hospital for the first six months of this year, and the company has expressed concern to the Government about that. We have pointed out that there is no commitment under the contract for the Government to ensure that the management of the Modbury Hospital operates on a break-even basis. That is not part of the contractual obligation. The contractual obligation is for Healthscope to deliver certain services there and for the services that were there before to be maintained, which is what the Government is ensuring is occurring, and there has been no evidence that the contractual obligation has been breached. In fact, I am able to say that the physiotherapy services that were terminated, I think, about a week or two ago in fact will be reinstated by Healthscope, because I believe that that was part of the original contract and we have asked them to go back and provide, therefore, the original service. I might add that the—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth will contain herself.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, the services—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: She sometimes has trouble doing that.

The SPEAKER: The Minister should not inflame her, either.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am able to indicate that the physiotherapy services that were terminated about a week ago will be reinstated, because we believe that that was part of the original service provided, and there is no evidence outside that that the contract has been breached. Certainly, the Government will monitor the situation very carefully indeed.

The issue that the honourable member raised was in terms of the loss of Modbury Hospital. It is a private operation, and Healthscope is responsible for the management of that. It is responsible as to whether it makes a profit or a loss. It has asked that, as part of the public hospital system of South Australia, there be more money put into the public hospital system. I have acknowledged that all the hospitals have been asking for additional money. I have been arguing very strongly that the Federal Government must acknowledge that, through a range of—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth is constantly interjecting.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—significant events that have occurred, an increase in demand is occurring in the public hospital system. Let me remind the honourable member—because she seems to constantly forget—about, first, the decline in private health insurance and, secondly, the ageing of the population. I want to pick up this point about the ageing of the population as a percentage, because some very good evidence is now coming through that there has been a dramatic escalation in the use of the public hospital system by aged people within the community, particularly by people over the age of 50 years. Use of the system by people between the ages of 50 to 65 and over 65 years is increasing by a much faster rate than the proportion of the population and much faster than one would otherwise have expected.

The other problem that is occurring is that it is becoming difficult to obtain after-hours GP services at night. There is now only one locum service available in metropolitan Adelaide and, because of that, people are coming along to the accident emergency sections of our public hospitals. The demand escalation there has been quite significant. With respect to Flinders Medical Centre, in the first three months of this year there has been an increase of 12 per cent compared with the same period last year.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It impacts on Modbury as it does on all the other hospitals. I am highlighting the fact that, therefore, there is a need for the Federal Government to respond, particularly because of the demand caused by the drop-out of after-hours GP services. That is a cost transfer from the Federal Government directly onto the public hospital system funded by the State Government and, therefore, I believe that there is an obligation for the Federal Government to completely review hospital funding throughout Australia. It must be one of the major national priorities.

Quite clearly—and I said this at the time of the negotiation of the last Medicare agreement—the Federal Government does not understand the change that is occurring in health care around Australia and the need for additional money in the public hospital system. I have been arguing this with Canberra, and I will go and argue it again: in fact, I am to attend a Health Ministers' meeting, I believe, in the next month, and I will argue this very strongly indeed at that meeting. In the past month, I have written to the Federal Minister and highlighted many of these issues. So, naturally, Healthscope, as part of the public hospital system of South Australia, is also looking to share in additional resources, if we can find them, for the next financial year.

SCHLUMBERGER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide details to the House about the progress of the Schlumberger agreement and, in particular, what impact this agreement will have on the South Australian water industry?

Mr Atkinson: What about the one who missed out?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Bragg for his question about an extraordinarily important contract in the growth of the internationally recognised South Australian water industry. I note that the member for Spence interjected as I stood up, 'What about the one who missed out?' I wonder whether the member for Spence will think in a couple of minutes' time, 'Why didn't I bite my tongue?' The establishment of the Australian head office of Schlum-

berger Resource Management Services in South Australia, frankly, is a tribute to the strength of the local water industry and the successes of the Government strategy in positioning Adelaide and our water industry as an international centre for excellence. Obviously, I realise that the observable success of what is going on in the water industry may embarrass the Opposition, whose water strategy—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Yes, I am sure they are. The Opposition's water strategy consisted of funding an annual loss in the area of some \$45 million per year. That was the strategy: let us make the people of South Australia pay their water rates and, in addition, pay another \$45 million. That was the strategy of the previous Labor Government. I realise that this observable success is an embarrassment, but it is a poor reason for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to embark on a seditious and inaccurate campaign to malign a move which brings employment and general economic benefits to South Australia.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Minister for Government Enterprises has accused the Deputy Leader of the Opposition of a crime, namely, sedition, and I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The Deputy Leader happens to be in the Chamber. I am sure she would have reacted accordingly if she had been concerned.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It is interesting that the member for Spence did not take a point of order about the fact that I had said the campaign was inaccurate. Last year, Schlumberger won the South Australian water contract to provide 440 000 new water meters for South Australia and undertook to relocate its offices from Melbourne to Adelaide. It was expected that the contract would generate about \$45 million in local sales, resulting in up to 200 jobs for South Australians. Since last August, when the contract was awarded, Schlumberger has established a manufacturing facility at Wingfield, which is already employing—and I ask the members of the Opposition to note this—23 people (I will come back to that soon), and SA Water has taken delivery already of 1 500 locally manufactured water meters—and I ask the members of the Opposition to note that as well—many of which are already installed and working in South Australian homes.

Since mid November, the Schlumberger facility also has been busy producing about 3 000 gas meters a month, many of which the company is exporting to clients interstate. That is a great bonus for South Australia. To meet those requirements Schlumberger has also contracted many local companies to supply component parts, with over \$1.9 million in orders placed since last November. Indeed, it is now negotiating a contract for meters from the Adelaide plant, and that represents a 50 per cent increase in production.

Given all those developments since the contract was awarded, one wonders whether the Opposition has anything positive to say about such a great initiative for the South Australian economy. No. All they do is paraphrase the concerns of one of the companies that missed out on the contract. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition issued a media release on Thursday 4 February 1999—

Mr Atkinson: A good one.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Well, in certain respects it was, and I will come to that in a minute. The first paragraph states:

A manufacturer which has been operating in South Australia for 60 years has been forced to lay off 60 workers and reduce its

operations to a sales office only because the Olsen Government awarded a major contract to an international rival which was given incentives to move to Adelaide.

Quite clearly, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was saying that this contract caused the present company to downsize those 60 jobs—because of the use of the words ‘only because’. The facts are these: the other company employed two people in South Australia when the contract was let.

Ms Hurley: If they’d won it.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: That is not what you said. But let us analyse what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition says. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition says that if they had won it they might have increased the numbers of employees. Yes, they were in fact going to increase the number of employees. I am informed that they were going to increase the number of employees by five, and already the other company has employed 23 extra people with up to 200 jobs during the term of the contract. So, that is mistake number one. The second paragraph of the media release states:

Shadow Infrastructure Minister Annette Hurley says a long-established local water meter manufacturer. . .

In fact, the company is a wholly owned multinational subsidiary of Asea Brown Boveri, which is a European company. So, it is not a local company but a European company. That is error number two.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Two out of two. As to error number three, the paragraph refers to a water meter manufacturer, but it is not a manufacturer. It gets parts that are manufactured in Victoria, brings them over here and assembles them. The company to which we have given the contract is setting up a manufacturing base in South Australia. Is that not a bonus for South Australia?

An honourable member: Well done.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Absolutely. In the same paragraph the Deputy Leader of the Opposition went on to say that they have ‘downgraded to a sales office since a rival manufacturer. . .’. So, at least she acknowledges that the company to which we have given the contract is a manufacturer. She asks a number of other questions which, given the time remaining, I will not detail, other than this one: the Deputy Leader asks why Dobie Dico missed out on the contract. I would have thought that there was some pretty good information already, but the key information, not even taking into account all the economic benefits that the South Australian community and the water industry will glean from these 200 jobs and the international export of the meters, is that the net present value of the contract between the two tenderers in fact shows a \$1 million benefit to South Australians by going down the path we have gone. That is why it did not get the contract, because in fact South Australians would have paid \$1 million extra.

Given that the previous Labor Government’s policy on water was, ‘Let’s just make a huge loss and make the people of South Australia pay for it,’ maybe that is what they want. Perhaps they wanted us to award a contract to a company that would have cost South Australians \$1 million extra. It is absolutely ridiculous. I will guarantee that all the people in South Australia do not want that. I contend that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has a responsibility to do a couple of things: first, to get the facts right; and, secondly, not to malign an industry which is already internationally recog-

nised and which has huge potential for economic growth and employment in South Australia.

The whole of this afternoon will be devoted to discussing the jobs summit. The water industry is one of our greatest success stories as far as generating employment is concerned. What does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition do? She puts out an absolutely fatuous media release which does nothing but try to bring down a great contract. The one thing that I would say about the Deputy Leader of the Opposition’s media release is that in about 15 paragraphs of errors she did in fact get the date right.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

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

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I bring up the sixth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS: I bring up the seventh report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I rise today to speak about a very serious matter that affects the electorate of Hart and, in particular, the residents of the northern part of Le Fevre Peninsula. The Government’s decision and announcement last Friday to build a 500 megawatt base load power station at Pelican Point was a very disturbing announcement as far as the local residents of my community and I are concerned. As I said to the media last Friday, the Opposition understands and obviously supports the need for further power supply to this State, otherwise we would have severe shortages in the summers to come. However, as the local member for Port Adelaide and Le Fevre Peninsula I made it very clear that the Pelican Point site was totally unacceptable, particularly given that my colleague the member for Giles campaigned very hard for such a power station to be sited at Whyalla. Indeed, if it had to be sited in metropolitan Adelaide, Torrens Island would have been a much more preferable site, particularly given that it currently has one power station on it which is well away from residents and houses.

I stand here today on behalf of my constituents and the people of Le Fevre Peninsula and Port Adelaide to condemn this Government on its decision to choose Pelican Point and to register very clearly, very loudly and without any misunderstanding that the people of Port Adelaide totally reject Pelican Point as a location. It is simply not good enough in this day and age, with modern technology, environmental standards and the quality of life that we expect all South Australians to enjoy, to put a power station in our backyard.

I will declare immediately a conflict. I live at North Haven and, as a resident, I will be affected by the power station, just

in case anyone wants to suggest that there may be some ulterior motive. There is. I do not want the power station but neither do many thousands of co-residents of that part of Adelaide. The people of Port Adelaide have been treated with utter contempt by this Premier, his Treasurer and this Government. I have just completed reading the Crown Development Report to see which organisations have been consulted prior to this decision; they include the Department of Transport, the EPA, the Coast Protection Board, National Parks, Heritage SA, Ports Corp, SA Water and the Fire Service.

Just about every possible Government agency known was given a chance to offer an opinion about the siting of this power station but they had neither the decency nor the good manners to consult the very people who will have to now live for the next 25 years, or more, with a power station literally in their backyard. Enough is enough. Why should Port Adelaide, time and again, be the dumping ground for industry? Please tell me why, in this modern day when we are trying to make South Australia, and in particular Adelaide, a lifestyle city and a city of great amenity, do the people of Port Adelaide have to have a power station literally in their backyard?

As I have said, the residents of Port Adelaide strongly oppose this proposal. I was able to collect signatures to a petition and, at my last count, the number of signatures was close to 7 000 and going higher. The people of Port Adelaide have conducted a telephone and fax campaign to the Premier's office. No other issue has ignited opposition and such anger and angst in my community as this. I am doing all I can, as the local member of Parliament, to ensure that all of my constituents make the Premier understand the level of their feeling about this issue, and we will continue to do it.

I understand that, last night, the Port Adelaide Enfield Council made a decision. I have not yet consulted with the Mayor of Port Adelaide. I understand that the council is looking at further legal action to challenge the decision. This is not about whether we need a new power station; that is an accepted fact. It is simply about the site. I appeal to this Government: let us have no community confrontation. Let us go for Torrens Island. I will ensure that everyone in my electorate reads this speech and understands that I stand with them.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I take this opportunity to refer to a most unfortunate situation that occurred in my electorate last week. I am sure that many members in this House would have taken the opportunity to drive through Clarendon, which is a most attractive town in the southern part of my electorate. It is a most attractive area and one which is part of a major tourist drive. In 1896 some trees were planted, and they have been referred to as silver poplars (I am not sure of their botanic name), to commemorate the opening of the Clarendon weir. Regrettably, these trees have been removed. I say 'regrettably' because they were removed without any consultation with the local community.

I would want to say at the outset that I support totally the work that is now being carried out by our catchment management boards throughout the metropolitan area. The improvements that have been made in respect of the Torrens River and the Patawalonga, for example, are very significant indeed. I am very pleased to see the riparian management programs that have been introduced by those boards, but in this case I have some concern because of the heritage significance attached to these trees. I wonder whether any

other options were considered—taking into account that it is a very short section of river and recognising the heritage significance of these trees—in terms of maintaining and managing the area appropriately without the removal of these trees. From what I can gather, the catchment management boards have been extremely good in terms of consultation with the local community. That is certainly—

Ms White interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The honourable member says, 'No, they haven't.' My advice is that, in the vast majority of cases, they have been very good in consulting. If the honourable member has examples where that has not been the case, she might like to refer to them on another occasion. I believe that public consultation has been an important factor when catchment boards have been considering programs in their own areas. It is a great pity. I have not been able to ascertain exactly how these trees were removed without appropriate consultation. I do know that the Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board, SA Water and a private company, which was actually responsible for the removal of the trees, were involved. How that consultation broke down, I am not sure.

A public meeting has been organised where a committee will be established to try to determine what happened. I would suggest that, rather than looking at what happened and recognising that the trees have gone, it is more important to ensure that this does not happen again, because it is vitally important that a community, such as the Clarendon community, should be given the opportunity of saying whether or not the trees should be removed and, if they are to be removed, what they will be replaced with, as well as other matters concerning its management program for this area. Again, I express my concern that this has happened. It is something that I intend to take further with the authorities that have a responsibility in this area. I certainly recognise the heritage significance attached to the trees that have been removed, and I would certainly want to see appropriate trees planted as part of a riparian management program for the Onkaparinga in the Clarendon district in time to come.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): Mr Speaker, I wish to raise a matter of concern in my electorate of Peake and, of course, in your electorate of West Torrens, which I will be contesting at the next State election. As a result of this State Government's and the Federal Liberal Government's actions to extend Adelaide Airport, the Patawalonga Creek has been filled. By filling in that creek this Government has put over 5 000 homes at risk from serious flooding. I have spoken to the Minister about this matter. I have spoken to representatives of the local council, as well as the local mayor and city manager. We have discussed long and hard what would happen if there was a one in five year rain event in my electorate.

Engineers from the City of West Torrens have informed me that, as a result of the extension of Adelaide Airport and the filling in of the Patawalonga Creek, a one in five year rain event would result in homes in West Beach and Lockleys being flooded. When the Government extended the airport and filled in that land it failed to include measures to ensure that stormwater run-off could be diverted into the ocean via the Patawalonga. The Government has basically washed its hands of the whole affair and is blaming it all on the local council.

Minister Laidlaw says, 'This is a local council problem. It has nothing to do with the State Government. It has nothing

do with the Federal Government', even though Robert Hill and the member for Hindmarsh, Ms Chris Gallus, were present when the ribbon was cut to open the third runway—putting at risk from flood 5 000 homes in the western suburbs. It is shameful. The Minister in the other place is washing her hands and saying, 'No, I can't do this. This is not my problem. The local council must pay for it.' In a very good article in the *Advertiser* by independent reporters Miles Kemp and James Wakelin—

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I do not want any bias—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That is right—ruggedly handsome and fiercely independent. In the *Advertiser* they claimed that 6 000 homes in the western suburbs are at risk of flood because of the Federal and State Governments filling in the Patawalonga Creek. It is a disgraceful event and they are throwing it onto the local council to repair their mistake and bad planning without looking to the future and considering the issues. They have been warned of this. Minister Laidlaw says that it was a pre-existing problem. I admit that there was a pre-existing problem, but not to the level where all of West Beach, Lockleys and Brooklyn Park would be flooded. There was localised flooding at Adelaide Airport, but not in the suburban areas.

This Government has failed the western suburbs again. The council estimates that to repair the damage that this State Government has caused to the western suburbs would cost about \$6 million, but the State Government is saying that the council has to find that money itself and that drainage, strictly, is a matter for local councils, even though the stormwater run-off is coming from outside the West Torrens council area—from council areas such as Norwood, Adelaide City and Unley. This Government wants a levy imposed on the western suburbs to pay for its mistake—a problem caused outside the West Torrens area.

The Premier should take this matter out of the hands of the Minister for Transport, as she has shown that she is incompetent and cannot handle this project, and hand it to the Minister for Local Government, the member for Unley.

Mr Hill: That would be a great improvement.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I agree with the member for Kaurna that it would be a great improvement, because the member for Unley can actually negotiate with all those councils to impose a levy not on the West Torrens council but on the Unley and eastern suburbs councils to pay for this. After all, it is your Government's mistake: you should be footing the bill, along with the Federal Government. Both should be footing the bill. The Premier was screaming for the extension of the runway, demanding it, and saying that it would increase exports: he said that huge Boeing 777 jumbo jets would be ready to take off every five minutes if we extended the runway. It has caused only extra flooding. The residents of the western suburbs deserve better than this, better than your Government and better than Minister Laidlaw.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: You have a house there? The member for Schubert has admitted that he does not live in his district but lives at West Beach. I look forward to representing him for the next four years. I ask him to speak to his own Minister and convince her, as they are very good friends.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): On Monday and Tuesday of this week the working group established by the Premier to investigate tourism infrastructure for Yorke Peninsula met at Minlaton and Kadina. I was pleased to give evidence to the working group on Monday and to highlight some of the peculiarities as they apply to Yorke Peninsula. There is no doubt that Yorke Peninsula is a unique geographical area from the viewpoint that all major transport routes bypass it. You cannot go through the Peninsula to get to somewhere else. In that respect, it differs from every other region in South Australia with one exception, namely, Kangaroo Island. Yorke Peninsula is, therefore, very similar to Kangaroo Island because, likewise, you cannot go through Kangaroo Island to get to somewhere else.

With other regions, such as the District of Hammond, you can head that way to get to Mount Gambier and Victoria, and such regions can capitalise on people going through. You can go through the District of Schubert—the Barossa Valley—and head towards the Riverland to get to many other areas. The area represented by the member for Chaffey, the Riverland, is a through route to Victoria and New South Wales. But Yorke Peninsula is unique in that you cannot go through it to get to somewhere else.

I highlighted many issues, and the working group will have to assess which are the most important. Probably the key issues relate to roads, water and tourism infrastructure as applying to new developments. There is no doubt that, once you leave the dual highway to Port Wakefield and head off to the Peninsula, the first thing you notice is the very rough road you have to traverse between Port Wakefield and Kulpara.

Mr Venning: I will back that up.

Mr MEIER: I thank the member for Schubert. I have pushed for many years to get an upgrade. Some years ago part of the road was resurfaced but it has moved considerably and definitely needs a complete revamp. I have been told for several years that the work should be on the forward estimates, but it never has been. I hope it will be a key priority. If we turn south and head down towards the Peninsula, the big obstacle is that, with weekend traffic, it is frustrating to be stuck behind a few other cars and not be able to get past. Passing lanes should be the order of the day for the area between the Port Wakefield turn off and Ardrossan. There would be a similar argument in terms of the road south of Ardrossan, between Ardrossan and Pine Point.

Another key area is between Paskeville and Moonta. Half of that road is sealed but the other half is not. It is frustrating and annoying. It is a council road but a major tourist road, and many people who have inadvertently used that road, with caravans and so on, and found that it is a dirt road have been upset. Moving further down the Peninsula, the road between Corny Point and Innes National Park is still not only a dirt road but a very rough road in many parts. Many people would like to do the triangular route between Warooka, Corny Point and Innes National Park but at present are ill-advised to do so on the coast road. I would hope that that also would have a priority in terms of sealing. I highlighted quite a few other roads and I hope that the working group will give full consideration not only to what I said but also to what many other people have said.

Because of time constraints, I will not have the opportunity to highlight what I put to the committee in relation to water and tourist accommodation. Hopefully, I will have another opportunity in the not too distant future to highlight that. I thank the Premier and wish the working group all the very

best in the next few weeks as it seeks to put down what it regards as key priorities for a most attractive area of South Australia, namely, Yorke Peninsula.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): Today I will refer to the Internet and its influence in our community and to some of the problems that at least one of my constituents is having.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HILL: No. As every member knows, over recent years the Internet has taken off as a means of gathering information in our community. It is something I did not know anything about until three or four years ago and now it is almost a daily part of my life and certainly a daily part of the life of members of my family, especially my sons, who are university and high school students. Both use the Internet on a regular basis for projects.

In my community, the schools have very much made a commitment to the Internet. Seaford 6 to 12 School, the council of which I am a member, has many Internet connections, and all the schools in my electorate and, I think, in all electorates in the State are plugged into the Internet. Not only are young people using it but also the older community. A couple of days ago I met with the Director of the Beachside Community Centre at Seaford and she was telling me of the huge growth in demand for learning about the Internet and about computers generally. The people most wanting that knowledge are older citizens so that they can keep up with their grandchildren and for diversion in their retirement, and younger women with children at school who want to know how the Internet and computers work in order to keep up with their children. There is a very strong growth in demand for Internet services and computers generally.

Towards the end of last year, I was pleased to open the Aldinga Community Centre's new computer section, where members of the community are taught how to use the computer and the Internet. This is happening throughout my electorate and I dare say it is happening right across the State. There is very strong demand and, as I said, a lot of the people who are using the Internet are elderly. The Seaford Community Library and the Noarlunga library have a number of Internet stations and each time I have been into those libraries I have seen those computers being used by citizens, particularly older citizens.

It is in that context that I raise a problem that has been brought to my attention by one of my constituents, a retired gentleman, Mr Doug Noble from Seaford. He wrote to complain about Telstra's behaviour in relation to the Internet. I will briefly explain his position. He wrote:

The Internet, which my wife and I use extensively for our amusement and further education, is one of the last affordable means of entertainment available to us. I also use the Internet on behalf of our housing cooperative in my position as Treasurer. An increase in fees—

and I will get to that in a minute—

as suggested, no matter how small, would create a real problem as to its affordability and possibly deny us the wonders of modern technology.

The increase in fees that he referred to had been brought to his attention by his Internet provider, which is Chariot Internet. It has provided Mr Noble and all other users of that service with the following information, which I will put on the record. Under the heading 'Telstra wants to make your net access more expensive', the document states:

Telstra is attempting to remove PAPL (Permitted Attached Private Lines) from its schedule of services for certain types of users. PAPL is the means—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

Mr HILL: The Deputy Leader is an extensive user of the Internet and understands it. The document continues:

PAPL is the means we, and many other ISPs [I assume that means Internet Service Providers] use to connect our service to the network access point. Telstra wants to make this low cost service unavailable to ISPs and other companies who use this technology for networking so that we and other companies will have to buy very expensive but otherwise similar services from—guess who?—Telstra. Since the alternative services cost around five times as much, and are wholly controlled by guess who, this will result in an increase in the cost of providing you with Internet access, so will probably result in price rises for you. This we think is a pretty uncompetitive practice, especially given the fact that the services are very reliable and that Telstra themselves are testing the services for other markets. It seems they only want to make PAPL inaccessible to markets they directly compete with! What good sports!

If that is the case, Telstra is behaving in a most unconscionable fashion and it should be brought to order.

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

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I should like first to address the issue of the 618 bus service which operates from The Hub shopping area to Marion. That bus service appears to be under some threat because of a decline in patronage in recent times, due I believe to the hot weather. More than 600 residents campaigned for that service and I was pleased to support them and represent them, so I was delighted when the Minister agreed to have that service put on. I understand that, as a result of TransAdelaide and others competing for contracts from the Passenger Transport Board, TransAdelaide is looking at routes which it believes do not carry enough passengers. That route carries 700 people a week and TransAdelaide says that it should be doubled, and I am keen to see that happen. The service operates only between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., which members would appreciate is a very limited service, given that many young people and others would like to access the picture theatre facilities at Marion Shopping Centre.

I have spoken with the Minister this week and I have written to her. I have met with senior people at Westfield Marion, along with senior people from TransAdelaide: I am determined to keep that service and I am sure that patronage will increase. After seeking that service for many years, it would be a retrograde step to have it taken away on the basis that such a bus route has to pay its way. I do not believe that many bus routes, tram routes or train routes in South Australia pay their way. I know that TransAdelaide is entering into a competitive contract arrangement, but there is a very strong case for community obligation. I reiterate my concerns and indicate that I have the full support of my community in respect of retaining the 618 service between The Hub and Marion Shopping Centre.

The second matter that I would like to address is the need for skateboarding facilities, and I have mentioned this in the past. I am pleased that the City of Onkaparinga, within which my electorate falls, is seeking to develop a large recreation facility on SA Water land at Happy Valley on the corner of Education Road and Chandlers Hill Road. I wrote to the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning recently, urging that, in terms of the disposal of that land, the City of Onkaparinga be considered for a fairly large parcel. At least 10 acres of land would be needed to set up a passive and

active recreation and sporting area to accommodate skateboarders and possibly in the future a swimming pool and other such facilities. Once again, I urge the Minister responsible for planning, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, to be supportive. I have appreciated her commitment when I have made requests in the past, and I am sure that she will do all in her power to assist in the reasonable request of the council for that land.

The school year has started and I was delighted last week to open the new junior computer centre at Aberfoyle Park High School, which I believe is now the largest high school in the State with 1 400 students. It has a waiting list and in large measure that is due to the efforts of John Gregory and the rest of the staff. The school has excellent computing facilities along with a whole range of other programs, and I pay tribute to that school. Without reflecting on private schools, it is interesting to note that many parents who were sending their children to private schools are now sending them to high schools such as Aberfoyle Park.

Similarly, Reynella East High School, which is the other big high school in my area under the leadership of Principal Peter Mitchell, is doing an excellent job. Both of those high schools demonstrate that, if top quality principals run schools with the support of a good, committed staff, parents will respond by enrolling their children at such schools. There is a case for giving school principals considerable power in order to drive their schools, but that also requires the support of a committed staff.

Finally, on a totally different matter, I urge Unley and Mitcham councils to get together to talk about amalgamation. It should have happened ages ago because there are benefits for residents in both areas. They could combine facilities, avoid duplication and avoid the need for new council chambers. I urge both those councils to start active dialogue.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES PROTECTION ACT REPEAL BILL

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Manufacturing Industries Protection Act 1937. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Under the Competition Principles Agreement of April 1995, the Government is committed to review and, where appropriate, reform legislation which restricts competition.

During the early stages of the process, the *Manufacturing Industries Protection Act 1937*, was identified as legislation which had the potential to restrict competition.

The process of legislative reform and review has led to this Act being redundant. In particular, the provisions of the *Environment Protection Act 1993* and the *Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986*, incorporate standards of design and operation for plant and machinery in industry. These provisions encompass the purposes of the *Manufacturing Industries Protection Act 1937*.

The *Manufacturing Industries Protection Act Repeal Bill 1999* makes certain provisions for the protection of the proprietors of factories. It provides that the proprietor and occupier of a factory in any area may seek that the Governor declare by proclamation that an area is a 'protected area'. In essence, such a proclamation would

mean that no person would be entitled to a civil remedy on the basis of any noise or vibration arising from any factory within that area. There are no regulations under this Act and no proclamations have been made. For this reason, no consultation has occurred beyond government during the process of review.

The occupational health and safety legislation of this State ensures that industry is facilitated in the conduct of work, and that the health, safety and welfare of workers and the public, are protected, not only in terms of noise and vibration, but also in terms of dust, fumes, etc. and other emissions, including egg effluent.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement of the measure.

Clause 3: Repeal

This clause repeals the *Manufacturing Industries Protection Act 1937*.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

RACING (DEDUCTION FROM TOTALIZATOR BETS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Racing Act currently allows for TAB and South Australian racing clubs to deduct commissions from bets, at rates set out in the Racing Regulations.

The commission rates for bets vary between State TABs and racing clubs. In an increasingly national and competitive market, TAB and South Australian racing clubs are finding the regulatory process of varying commission rates to be one of many restrictions of the *Racing Act* which hinder their ability to compete effectively, for the benefit of the South Australian Government and the South Australian Racing Industry.

This amendment will also position the TAB and South Australian racing clubs so that they can react quickly and effectively to market sensitivities.

The Racing (Deduction from Totalizator Bets) Amendment Bill attempts to address these restrictions and lost opportunities by providing TAB and the South Australian Racing Clubs with the flexibility to vary their commission rates, subject to approval by persons or bodies appointed by Regulation, with a view to maximising profit returns.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 68—Deduction of percentage from totalizator money

Clause 2 amends section 68 of the principal Act. The amendment will allow the regulations to appoint the TAB and the racing clubs as the persons to fix the amounts to be deducted from bets accepted by them. The amendment made by paragraph (d) is consequential on an amendment made previously to section 82A(4)(a)(i) of the Act.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT REPEAL BILL

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Shearers Accommodation Act 1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Under the Competition Principles Agreement of April 1995, the Government is committed to review and, where appropriate, reform legislation which restricts competition.

During the early stages of the process, the *Shearers Accommodation Act 1975*, was identified as legislation which had the potential to restrict competition. In addition, the Act had been rendered redundant with the passage of more relevant legislation.

It has been a Government objective for some time to ensure that legislation appropriately addresses the needs of persons in occupations where accommodation, mess facilities, toilet facilities and such issues take on a particular meaning in the workplace and areas associated with it. This applies to a wide range of occupations, including shearers.

The Shearers Accommodation Regulations, 1976 were revoked by the *Subordinate Legislation Act* in August 1996. In 1997, following a period of development in concert with industry, Workcover issued new 'Guidelines for Workplace Amenities and Accommodation' under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Regulations. The Guidelines support the regulations by providing practical guidance for the provision of reasonable access for all employees to workplace amenities and, where necessary, accommodation.

Since 1995, extensive consultation on the development of the guidelines has occurred with the National Farmers Federation (SA Division), the Australian Workers Union, the Shearing Contractors Federation and Workcover. Consultations took place before and after the repeal of the regulations under the *Shearers Accommodation Act 1975*, recognising that the Act itself would be repealed after the Workcover Guidelines were introduced.

The provisions of the *Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986* and Regulations, supported by the Guidelines for Workplace Amenities and Accommodation, mean that the *Shearers Accommodation Act 1975* is no longer necessary or appropriate.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement of the measure.

Clause 3: Repeal

This clause repeals the *Shearers Accommodation Act 1975*.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION (ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974 and make a consequential amendment to the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia Act 1995. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to make some amendments to the *Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974*. The changes will impact on the administration of the scheme without having any impact on the structure of members' benefits.

The principal change being sought in the Bill is the establishment of a formal fund, which shall hold assets to meet the liabilities under the scheme. The assets will reflect the balance of both member and employer contributions, and investment earnings on those contributions, necessary to fund the entitlements under the scheme.

The scheme had a formal fund up until the mid 1980's, when a decision was made to dispense with the fund as the scheme was largely unfunded with benefits guaranteed and payable from the Consolidated Account. Now that the scheme has been fully funded

by the Government, it is appropriate that a formal fund be established.

Without the existence at present of a formal fund, the Act refers to 'notional contribution accounts' being constructed in those circumstances where it is necessary to determine the employee component of a benefit to be paid to a former member.

The amendments included in this Bill will not only formally establish a Parliamentary Superannuation Fund, but also require the Parliamentary Superannuation Board to establish and maintain member contribution accounts for all members.

The Bill also provides for the balance held by the Treasurer in the special deposit account as at 30 June 1998, to be transferred to the Fund. As at 30 June 1998, there were sufficient assets held in the special deposit account to match the actuarially determined liabilities of the Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme.

The establishment of a fund will also provide for a more appropriate basis for crediting interest to members' contribution accounts, and will bring the scheme into line with a normal member contributory superannuation scheme.

The Bill also proposes an amendment to section 22A, in order to address a technical deficiency in the existing provision which deals with the entitlements of members of the new scheme who leave the Parliament with less than 6 years service. The amendment clarifies the amount of the employer component preserved for a former member who elects on leaving the Parliament, to take an immediate payment of the employee component.

The restructuring contained in this Bill will provide for more efficient administration of the scheme.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

It is important that the amendments relating to the Fund made by this Bill operate from the commencement of a financial year. The clause provides for the operation of the Bill from 1 July 1998.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 5—Interpretation

This clause adds two new definitions to the interpretational provision of the principal Act.

Clause 4: Insertion of Parts 2A and 2B

This clause inserts new Parts 2A and 2B into the principal Act. New Part 2A establishes the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund and corresponds to provisions in other superannuation legislation establishing superannuation funds. Part 2B provides for members' contribution accounts and is similar to corresponding provisions in other superannuation legislation.

Clause 5: Repeal of s. 21B

This clause repeals section 21B which has been superseded by new section 13B.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 22—Other benefits under the old scheme

This clause makes a consequential change to section 22 of the principal Act.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 22A—Other benefits under the new scheme

This clause amends section 22A of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) inserts a new subsection (2) which spells out in more detail than the existing provision that the employer component which may be paid many years after the employee component will not be reduced to zero because the payment of the employee component (which is equivalent to the balance standing to the credit of member's contribution account) has been debited against that account. New subsection (2a) deals with the position of the person who was a former member before 1 July 1998 and therefore does not have a contribution account. New subsection (4) gives the former member the option of rolling over the employee and employer components over to another superannuation fund or scheme. The remaining provisions added by this clause are consequential.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 39—Financial provision

This clause adds a provision that is found in the other superannuation Acts. The benefits under the principal Act are paid by the Treasurer from the Consolidated Account or a special deposit account and this provision allows the Treasurer to obtain reimbursement by charging the amount of benefits against the Fund.

Clause 9: Repeal of Schedule 1

This clause repeals schedule 1.

Clause 10: Amendment of the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia Act 1995

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the *Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia Act 1995*.

Ms WHITE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Stamp Duties (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 1999* seeks to amend the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* ('the Act') in respect of three separate issues.

The first amendment extends the current exemption provided for the inter-generational transfer of a family farm so that it will apply to situations in which the family farm is transferred to a nephew and/or niece of the transferor.

Several submissions have been received from practitioners, and the South Australian Farmers Federation raising particular concerns in this area where a niece or nephew was the sole surviving family member of the owner of a family farm. The existing exemption from stamp duty is not available if the family farm is transferred to the niece or the nephew of the transferor, even when this is the only avenue available to keep the farm within the family ownership. The proposed amendment will extend the concession to exempt transfers to nieces or nephews of the transferors.

The amendment also extends the inter-generational farm exemption to exempt stock implements and other chattels (farm and plant equipment), held or used with the land when transferred as part of the family farm within the family group.

These measures have strong support from the South Australian Farmer's Federation, legal and accounting practitioners, and the rural community in general, and reinforces the Government's commitment to encourage the ownership of family farms within the family group.

The second proposal amends the Act to provide an exemption from *ad valorem* stamp duty to ensure that members of prescribed interest schemes do not incur an additional layer of duty as a consequence of compliance with the new regulatory requirements of the Commonwealth's, *Managed Investments Act 1998*.

The *Managed Investments Act* represents the Commonwealth Government's response to the recommendations of the Australian Law Reform Commission, the Companies and Securities Advisory Committee and the Final Report of the Financial System Inquiry in respect of the managed investment industry. The *Managed Investments Act* amends the Corporations Law by adding new provisions dealing with the registration, management and regulation of managed investment schemes (formerly known as prescribed interest schemes).

A key requirement of the *Managed Investments Act* is that the existing two-tier structure of a prescribed interest scheme, consisting of an independent scheme trustee and a separate management company will be replaced by a single Responsible Entity that will combine the role of trustee and manager.

The proposed stamp duty exemption will apply to any conveyance or transfer of property by the prescribed interest scheme that is necessary for the purpose of the conversion of that prescribed interest scheme to a managed investment scheme, within the meaning of Division 11 of Part 11.2 of the Corporations Law as part of the new Commonwealth regulatory environment.

The third proposal makes a minor amendment to the definition of 'Broker' for the purposes of the on-market share provisions of the Act.

The Australian Stock Exchange (the ASX), demutualised its activities on 14 September 1998, changing its Business Rules to reflect its altered state of operation.

The definition of 'Broker' at section 90A of the Act relies in part on the now rescinded definition of a 'Member' contained in the ASX Business Rules. This Bill proposes that the definition of 'Broker' contained in the Business Rules be adopted for the purposes of Section 90A of the Act.

I commend this Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 71CC—Exemption from duty in respect of conveyance of a family farm

Clause 2 extends the exemption from duty on an instrument that transfers an interest in land used for primary production to an instrument that transfers an interest in land used for primary production and goods comprising livestock, machinery, implements and other goods used or acquired for the business of primary production conducted on the land.

It also extends the definition of 'relative' to include a child or remoter lineal descendant of the brother or sister of the person or of the spouse of the person.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 90A—Interpretation

Clause 3 amends the definition of 'broker' to mean a person who is a broker under the Business Rules of the Australian Stock Exchange.

Clause 4: Amendment of schedule 2

Clause 4 proposes a new exemption from stamp duties on the conveyance or transfer of property provided the Commissioner is satisfied of two elements. Firstly, that the conveyance or transfer is made as a consequence of the conversion of an undertaking (for which a deed had been lodged under Division 5 of Part 7.12 of the *Corporations Law* as in force before the commencement of the *Managed Investments Act 1998* of the Commonwealth) to a registered scheme within the meaning of Division 11 of Part 11.2 of the *Corporations Law*, and secondly, that the members have, after the conveyance or transfer, the same beneficial interests in the scheme property as they had prior to the conveyance or transfer.

Mr FOLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

JOBS WORKSHOPS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Standing Order 113 be so far suspended as to allow the following time limits to apply to the motion: the Premier, 30 minutes; the Leader of the Opposition, 30 minutes; one member nominated by the Premier, 20 minutes; one member nominated by the Leader of the Opposition, 20 minutes; and any other member, 10 minutes.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I move:

That the Summary of the South Australian Jobs Workshops be noted.

Too many of the nation's employment strategies are directed to the immediate or today's problems. We need to have strategies with stronger future orientation to overcome the irony of having a shortage in some skills and at the same time unemployment. Last year in May when I released the \$100 million employment statement our unemployment rate stood at 10.4 per cent. Since then the Bureau of Statistics monthly figures show that more than 25 000 South Australians have joined the work force. In May I said that most people want to work and since then the participation rate—the measure of people in work or looking for work—has also grown. In May I spoke of the challenges we face in creating jobs and how private sector decisions totally out of State Government control, Commonwealth policies and the vagaries and volatility of the global economy all play a part in contributing to our problem and our abilities to solve it. I also said that those outside forces should never mean that we stop trying and we have not, nor will we, ever.

In May I said that nothing can be more fundamental to ensuring that everyone can lead a fulfilling life than having a job and the self worth which that job brings. I said that the best way to deal with unemployment is through working in partnership with the private sector and the community; that the complexity of the situation meant working together is essential; that together we must keep adapting and seeking out the best options; and that is exactly what we have done

and are doing. In the last set of job statistics, national unemployment reached an eight year low. Around the country the number of people in work jumped by over 53 000. However, New South Wales grabbed almost 80 per cent of these, some 40 000 jobs.

Unemployment is a regional problem. Unemployment stands at 3.9 per cent in the Northern Territory and yet it is 10.3 per cent in Tasmania. It should be clear that where we live around the country makes a difference to our jobs—or lack of a job—and to our lives. The same applies to where we live around this State. Unemployment needs a local effort. Around the world approaches to employment have seen a devolution of power to local bodies such as development boards, local government, schools, industry associations and partnerships, and that is why last year the Government went back to the grassroots. Unemployment in South Australia has been above the national average for over 30 years. It has been a problem that both Liberal and Labor Governments have had to deal with, a problem that clearly needs a local solution. Last year the Government unveiled the largest commitment to tackling unemployment ever made in this State, the \$100 million employment statement.

At the same time, we also decided that fighting unemployment needed the broadest front possible, and we opened up that front. We embarked on the Jobs Workshops project. For three weeks we held 22 workshops around the State. This Government has always rejected the idea of any so-called jobs summit. Instead of listening to the usual voices, we went out and gave every South Australian the chance to have their say. Rather than spending time here or in some conference room at State Administration, the Hilton or the Hyatt, we went out to venues like the Tasman Football Club in Port Lincoln, the Gawler Tennis Club, the Port Adelaide and Mount Gambier TAFEs, the Kadina Uniting Church Hall, the Central Districts Football Club, the Paringa Community Hall, town halls and civic centres in places such as Murray Bridge, Campbelltown, Marion, Noarlunga and Clare, to hear what people had to say, not just about the State but also about their own communities.

We wanted to hear the views of as many people as possible, something that could never be done through a summit. Rather than holding a talkfest, we wanted to tap into the resourcefulness and creativity of the State's whole community. Today we are reporting back on the outcomes of this process. More than 1 500 people participated in the Jobs Workshops process, either by attending workshops themselves, using the 1800 hotline, submitting written submissions or through a Web site. In addition, special focus groups for young people and non-English speaking communities were held. The degree of community cooperation with the process was outstanding. In some instances, venues for the workshops were even donated free of charge because the issue was considered to be of such importance.

Today I would like to formally put on the record my thanks and the thanks of the Government to everyone who contributed. All up, the Government received some 3 000 suggestions through the Jobs Workshop process. As one would expect, the discussions and ideas the workshops generated were broad and far reaching. The Government is examining the matters raised through the Jobs Workshop process as we formulate the year's budget. Three main themes emerge from the ideas that we gathered: the need for rationalisation of Government services at all levels, Commonwealth, State and local; the importance of providing suitable infrastructure to enable the community to take advantage of

opportunities for economic growth; and the fundamental importance of the links between education and training and economic development, and a more holistic approach to the transition from school to work.

Despite all the external factors that affect the ability of this Government and this economy to provide jobs, we are committed to creating employment through high quality education and training systems, fostering industry growth, attracting investment and forging new export markets. Working with the community and drawing on its expertise at all levels is an important part of this. The Jobs Workshop process has clearly identified key issues for the Government's approach to employment creation and its interaction with other layers of Government. I would like to commend the Minister for Employment for the way in which he conducted the workshops around the city and in regional and country areas of South Australia. It was a job exceptionally well done in giving an opportunity for the community to talk directly to us.

The Government is working with these issues I have identified as we formulate this year's budget. However, today I wish to announce two immediate employment initiatives that the Government will implement. The first of these steps involves structural enhancements to Government services. The Government will create an employment council. The establishment of an Employment and Industry Development Council—a measure initially proposed in the submission from the South Australian United Trades and Labor Council—will be a major step in addressing the issues of better coordination in client service provision, one of the key issues raised in the workshops. The council will enable key public sector representatives to combine with unions and industry to advise Government on approaches to employment generation and industry development.

The Government will amalgamate the Regional Towns program (currently administered by the Department of Industry and Trade) and Community at Work (administered by the Department of Education, Training and Employment). These projects, both designed to increase sales, employment and economic activity, will be merged to form a Working Towns program administered through Employment SA. This merger will be an initial step in the State Government's plan to further integrate the employment and economic development functions of the three tiers of Government. The State Government will continue to improve its own service delivery mechanisms while also working with the Commonwealth and local government to improve the coordination of employment activities. The merger will save up to \$100 000, which will be directed to the program.

The Government will implement a Youth Pathways program to meet the needs of the increasing number of young people for whom the traditional education system does not offer suitable assistance. These students at risk are in danger of falling through the cracks in the current system, and the phenomenon has become particularly noticeable in the southern suburbs. These young people are desperately in need of an alternative education program that offers both academic and practical skill development components. This type of program is even more important given the introduction of the Commonwealth Youth Allowance and the Prime Minister's recently announced literacy requirements for unemployment benefits.

The State Government will fund the piloting of an alternative education program for students in this category in southern Adelaide. The project will deliver school, TAFE and

work-based components with the aim of assisting participants back into school or into vocational training or employment. The pilot will initially comprise 15 participants, but there is scope for it to be expanded to include additional students. The project will be integrated into both the Government's Ready, Set, Go strategy and the local secondary education system. Participants will be able to gain credit at both secondary school and tertiary level, as well as gaining work-relevant skills through work-based projects.

Although the pilot will be undertaken in southern Adelaide, the Government is currently developing another employment and training program with local government, the Northern Adelaide Region, Blair Athol and The Parks area. It is anticipated that a significant number of young people in that area will be able to participate. The \$50 000 program cost will be met within existing budgets. As I have already indicated, the Government is working on a broader implementation of ideas from the Jobs Workshop as part of the budget process. They will not be put to one side: we are determined to work with business and the community to create more jobs for South Australians. This theme of partnership was one of the key principles underpinning last year's employment statement. That package has not just been announced and then put to one side: we have been ensuring that it is fully implemented and with the best possible effect.

I am pleased to be able to tell the House today that over 4 200 positions of employment have already resulted from these initiatives since they were released in May. Successes from the employment statement have included:

- nearly 1 400 full-time equivalent employment outcomes through the Kickstart and Kickstart for Youth programs, which worked with industry bodies, business, Government agency and training providers to provide assistance for identified employment development activities;
- 2 265 approvals for financial incentives to take on staff through the Small Business Employer Incentive Scheme, a very successful scheme with the small business community;
- more than 400 placements or selections for referral to placements under the Regional Apprenticeship Support program and the State Government Youth Training Scheme, with a further 205 young people employed in August 1998 under the graduate program;
- support has been provided to 107 small businesses to ensure that jobs are retained and new opportunities created through improved human resource practices under the Human Resource Advisory Service;
- involvement of 169 businesses in community at work projects to stimulate local employment opportunities;
- 21 grants of up to \$3 000 per person provided under the Self Starter program to unemployed people to assist in the establishment of a small business;
- 114 participants in IT skills advantage and special employment initiatives (equity programs) going into employment; and
- 319 mature age people gaining employment through the activities of DOME.

These are strong successes for the employment statement to achieve. We hope the jobs workshop process can allow us to build on these and refine them further.

The extensive consultation of industry, interest groups, local government and the community afforded by the jobs workshop has identified key issues for the State Government's approach to employment and its relationship with other levels of Government. We intend to offer firm propo-

sals, not uncosted abstracts such as ill-defined enterprise zones. Unlike the Opposition, we are not grabbing at impressive sounding figures, such as a 40 per cent cut in BAD tax, or suggesting costly wage subsidy packages worth tens of millions every year without providing a single clue as to how these might be funded. Instead, we are attempting to be realistic. We are being honest with the people of South Australia.

State Governments are limited in what they can do. We cannot go for the spectacular big dollar programs, especially given our debt and the burden it brings. Indeed, these may often not be the best measures. The former Federal Labor Government's Working Nation program ran wildly over budget in its final year. In Britain, where the Blair Government has drawn on Working Nation for its own employment measures, figures produced by the Centre for Policy Studies suggest that the minimum cost for jobs created under the flagship New Deal program is £11 300—almost \$30 000, assuming a generous exchange rate—and may even reach as high as £37 700—or \$95 000—a job. These are impossible burdens for any State Government to sustain. Instead, we are offering a basic practical measure that concentrates on people, not targets. We are concentrating on programs that can complement the Commonwealth efforts and meet this State's specific needs, and we will keep on doing this.

As I said in the Employment Statement in May last year, the Government's number one priority must be more jobs. The statisticians call employment a lagging indicator. That means that the other measures of the health of our economy often strengthen before we see changes in employment figures. These other measures show us that South Australia's economy is strong and growing well. Earlier in the House today I identified how new private sector investment had grown by a massive 24 per cent, compared with the national level of 5 per cent. I have also advised the House of BankSA's regular State monitor survey, which showed a lift in morale and State pride. The National Australia Bank business survey for the last quarter of 1998 indicated that we have the strongest business conditions in the nation, ahead of Queensland and New South Wales, and business confidence in this State increased by 14 points, compared with 9 points at a national level.

Again, in a range of indicators with respect to trading performance we have seen that our index outperformed the national average. In addition, with respect to profitability performance, we are outperforming the national average: we are almost double the national average and the second highest in the country. We have seen Gross State Product increase by a healthy 4.1 per cent, with the forecast from Econtech that we will once again outperform many other States in Australia next year. I have also advised the House of retail sales and other indicators such as the export figures, where our exports last year rose to double the national average.

I mention those simply to underscore the point that, in economic performance, South Australia is starting to perform, and very well. It is not in just one indicator area; it is across the board, and I suppose the key area is that of population gain. Lack of population gain is a serious problem for a community in meeting its skilled resource base to meet emerging new industries and also to apply a stimulus within the economy itself. I am delighted to say that the trend line that we have seen emerging over the past two years has come to the position where we have had an increase in population of 7 600, and overseas migration to South Australia rose by almost 40 per cent. We will continue aggressively on those

indicators, because we want to ensure that the population growth in South Australia expands substantially towards and beyond the national average.

In addition, we would want to see that, instead of (as in the past) getting half overseas migration on a *pro rata* basis, we get our fair share, which means that we have to double the number of overseas migrants coming to South Australia. In the past, overseas migrants have not only acted as a very significant stimulus to the economy of South Australia but they have contributed substantially to the broadening of the economic base of South Australia into the establishment of new industry sectors here. In fact, our economy and the vibrancy and strength of the economy in this State would not be what it is without the contribution of migrants from around the world.

We welcome those results. We find those results are encouraging after six years of hard work. However, as I said last year, unemployment has been such a pervasive problem in this State for so long that we cannot afford to sit back and hope for improvement purely from having all the economic indicators move in the right direction. This Government has set out a strategy, established policy goals and directions and is steadily and consistently implementing them. Our achievements are not a matter of opinion: the results of our policy are showing in these steadily improving economic indicators.

As I have indicated, in most areas South Australia's recent performance has been well ahead of the national average norms. Now employment—always the last indicator to pick up—is beginning to respond, with six months of increasing employment trend results and positive predictions. I have said on a number of occasions in this House, particularly in response to interjections from the Opposition, that you have to have the sequence right: you have to get new private sector capital investment in first. That is the foundation upon which industry will grow and upon which we will be able to attract further jobs growth in South Australia. That has not been achieved by sitting on our hands: it has been achieved by a consistent effort right across Government to attract new industries to South Australia and giving encouragement to expansion of existing industries, and that is showing up in these now positive employment trends.

The better economic environment is showing up in community attitudes and confidence. People are more positive about South Australia's future. It is not only the statistical measures that point to this but also the enthusiasm for South Australian events such as Tour Down Under. And that encapsulates this new mood, this positive attitude that is starting to emerge in the economy, which we have a responsibility to keep driving forward. If we can drive that positive optimistic view forward, that will in itself generate greater economic activity, consumer confidence, retail spending and jobs being created. We need to build on that positive attitude in the broader community.

There has been a significant list of achievements in economic policy over the past few months that will play a role in creating those jobs. Let me talk about some of those that will underpin this momentum that I have talked about and keep that momentum moving, which is important. We have seen the launch of the business ambassadors, prominent and respected business people, who will assist in identifying opportunities for investment, exports and tourism and the remarketing of South Australia. They will start positioning this State as a sophisticated manufacturing society and an information economy enabled society—that is, a society that

is looking at industry sectors, such as Food for the Future, which have enormous growth opportunity in the future.

In relation to Food for the Future, it is interesting to look at the Morgan and Banks survey released today which said that, after information technology—which is just continuing in a path of employment well ahead of the national average—the food industry and the people it employs is now starting to expand. If my memory serves me correctly, in that area alone there was growth of about 31 per cent. If that is the case, the Food for the Future strategy that we have been working on now for 15 to 18 months is starting to see investment in food industry underpinning and going into the export industry.

In recent months we have also seen the release of 11 petroleum exploration blocks in the Cooper Basin and further consultation work by the Regional Development Task Force. I would hope that within a month we will get the recommendations from that task force which will look across country and regional areas of South Australia to show what consistent policy directions and thrusts Governments ought to be putting in place to ensure that country and regional areas are embraced as part of the economic rebuilding of South Australia. It is fair to say that if you take a range of country areas, whether it is the Riverland, the South-East or that associated with the aquaculture industry, to name but three, the sort of focus and growth in those regional towns and areas as a result of the new industry growth and investment has been extraordinary. In fact, some of those towns and regions have been outperforming the metropolitan area in growth and generation of jobs such that the infrastructure we have in those areas is no longer able to cope with the demand that is emerging.

Recently we have also seen the launch of the cast metal precinct, a new approach to creating and promoting foundries and ancillary industries based on our traditional strengths in metal industries. We have seen the release of the Adelaide Airport draft master plan, and \$15 million (we are pleased to announce) of tax rebates from the Federal Government for the terminal development. We just need to have the ACCC move forward on the PFC, sooner rather than later. I hope that that will not be too far away. I am sure that that will see us moving forward for the integrated domestic-international terminal to proceed in construction at the Adelaide Airport.

We have seen the expansion of initiatives under the Food for the Future plan to triple the value of food production, to which I referred a moment ago, from \$5 billion to \$15 billion, between now and 2010. We have the environmental go ahead from the Federal Government for the Beverley uranium mine, worth nearly 500 jobs and an annual \$40 million of exports for the State. We have the signing of a memorandum of understanding with Motorola for a \$70 million expansion of its software centre, creating 200 more jobs. At the same time, the Government is working to create jobs through new investment for the State and to keep these existing jobs. I note that this was a focus of the Deputy Leader's press release referred to by the Minister earlier today.

Over the last 25 years, according to the OECD, global foreign investment flows have multiplied some 14 times to an annual total of \$350 billion. We are doing what we can to catch as much of that as possible for South Australia. Despite what the Opposition may claim, this does not mean that our industry policy ignores local companies. We would be negligent if we did not do all we could to win investment from interstate and overseas. However, we would be just plain foolish if we chose to do so at the expense of our own

firms. That is why the overwhelming majority of companies that receive industry assistance, some 870 out of the 889 last financial year (or 97 per cent) are based in South Australia. That is important: 97 per cent of industry assistance has gone into the existing South Australian industry base.

At the same time, the program attracted \$336 million in investment last financial year, creating directly and indirectly some 12 000 jobs. The Government is also making sure that we develop the skills required by business in this State. Creating the right match between supply and demand of skills is essential in tackling unemployment. At the same time, the skill level of the work force plays an important part in sustaining growth. The Centre for Lifelong Learning, announced last month, will develop new partnerships between education, training and industry, partnerships that are essential to economic revival and future success.

Investing in education, particularly lifelong education, protects people against the inevitable changes they will face in a fast moving world. It can provide them with the skills that will keep them in demand in the work force and enable them to make a greater contribution to industry. This investment in lifelong learning has the unique potential to boost economic effectiveness by providing the best possible office workers in the fabric of a community by avoiding unemployment traps. The Government is also looking at the cost of labour. It is a simple rule. Increased—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier's time has expired. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): There is no greater test of a Government or of an Opposition than the calls of bipartisanship on jobs, because there is nothing more important to South Australians than jobs. Of course, bipartisanship does not mean the Opposition simply agreeing *carte blanche* with the Government on all its policies. Real bipartisanship, genuine bipartisanship, means a preparedness to engage and debate constructively, to compromise in reaching agreement, to recognise other people's views and also to recognise that there is nothing more important than jobs for South Australians. Of course, there are examples, which I know the Premier would be the first to agree with and to applaud, of bipartisanship working here in South Australia.

I remember the time in September 1994 when former Premier Dean Brown wrote to me asking for my assistance in a bipartisan way to go to the Federal conference of the ALP and to negotiate a special deal to allow a new runway and the upgrading of Adelaide Airport. That was achieved. There was also bipartisanship on the issue of tariffs. The Premier and I were in Japan, not necessarily together but in parallel unison, arguing the same case in trying to ensure that an odious tariff regime did not destroy the automotive industry. We also worked together to make sure that an odious tariff recommendation by a national council committed to destroying jobs did not destroy the textile, clothing and footwear industry in this State.

Then, of course, there has been bipartisanship on the issue of the Darwin-Alice Springs railway. I was disappointed that both Maggie Hickey and Shane Stone, both friends of mine I am proud to say, have resigned in the last week, because I know that they along with the Premier and myself have worked hard in supporting the Darwin-Alice Springs railway line which, of course, will go ahead. I am certainly pleased and delighted at the Premier's assurances about a go ahead this year.

Labor went into the last State election with a bold vision for jobs. During that election I said to the Premier that win, lose or draw I would work with him in a bipartisan jobs summit for more jobs for South Australians. I am sure that the Premier will remember our debate, chaired by our mutual friend Ray Martin, which showed a measure of bipartisanship when I made the offer to work with the Premier after the election in whichever roles that we had. I said that we did not want a talkfest or some kind of idle debate in some cynical gesture looking like words rather than action. I was suggesting a genuine jobs summit similar to the one that I had attended as an observer in May 1983, when people from all around this nation were invited to Old Parliament House in Canberra and were, essentially, locked in a room in working parties. There were people such as Sir Peter Abeles, the heads of unions, Premiers, the Prime Minister, the then Treasurer Paul Keating and people from the community sector. All these people were not just talking about jobs but actually signing off on a strategy for the reconstruction and regeneration of Australian industry—and that happened.

There was a 55 point plan that everyone, except Joh Bjelke-Petersen, signed up to. He sort of spat the dummy and took off back to Queensland, but everyone else was bigger than that. Everyone else, regardless of political Party and regardless of what part of the industrial relations sector they came from, knuckled down and knuckled under to work up a plan for regenerating and reconstructing the Australian economy. And that is what I would like to see here. Instead of us in this Chamber just being involved—and I am certainly trying to be positive about this—we should invite people from industry and from small business, who too often feel totally left out of the process because they feel that the Government listens to the big end of town but not to them.

Let us get small business, big business and the unions around the table, instead of adopting alibi and blame, or boasting or over-blowing each announcement. There is the classic South Australian syndrome: you hear about a proposition and you say, 'Let's announce it. Let's triple, quadruple or five-fold the number of jobs involved', which just helps to create community disappointment. Days after election day and after conceding defeat, I reiterated my desire to work with the Government towards an inclusive jobs summit and a comprehensive jobs and growth agreement. I wrote to the Premier; I did not get a reply. Weeks after, I again wrote to the Premier, repeating that commitment, and did not get a reply.

That commitment still stands and today I am happy to put before the Parliament seven ideas to help put South Australia on track to create more jobs and lower unemployment. I offer them to this Parliament and to the public of South Australia in the firm belief that, if we work together, we will achieve much more than we ever could while we remain divided. Certainly, today I call upon the Government to recognise that jobs and not selling the State from under South Australians is the key. I call for a complete reorganisation of the economic development bureaucracy and the establishment of a single jobs commission reporting to the Minister for jobs, who must be the Premier himself. The buck must stop somewhere on the key issue facing this State.

Today I call upon the Government to expand the Centre for Manufacturing into an integrated centre for industry that helps existing manufacturing and service industries to grow rather than be left to themselves while the Government simply chases interstate and overseas firms. Today I call upon the Government to make a genuine start in breaking the back

of youth unemployment by adopting Labor's first start youth employment policy. Do not be a policy free zone. We will give you some to work with. Labor's first start youth employment policy is a bold policy that would have given meaningful work and training to 6 000 young people over three years in the private sector, local government and human services.

Again, I call upon the Government to cease its policy of actively preferring overseas firms for Government contracts and locking out local firms that has cost South Australian jobs, such as in the water and IT industries. Government contracts should go out to open competitive tender. I also call upon the Government to adopt performance based industry assistance principles. Companies should receive their taxpayers' money on the basis of actual performance on jobs, not inflated promises. Today, despite what the Premier said earlier, I call upon the Government to accept that the Spencer Gulf cities need special status as enterprise zones to help overcome their regional disadvantage and high unemployment.

Today I call upon the Government to work with the State and Federal Oppositions in support of a specified package of Commonwealth policies for jobs and economic development in South Australia. While John Howard has been doing his level best, through his various competition and industry councils, to send South Australia backwards, it is time that the Premier took a stand for South Australia with his Federal Liberal colleagues. When one State is under attack from the Commonwealth Government and one's own Party, that is when the mettle of any Premier is tested, as the late Don Dunstan showed repeatedly.

The Opposition welcomes the opportunity to debate the Government on jobs as a first step towards a fully inclusive real jobs summit—not a sham summit—and a comprehensive strategy for jobs backed by a jobs commission to deliver that strategy. But it is only a first step. Unless the Government is prepared to go further and make the changes South Australia needs, this will be only a cynical talkfest. It will serve only to reinforce the public's cynicism about its politicians. A jobs summit will not focus on politicians: it will involve all the key players in an effort to make things happen, because they are the people who can make it happen.

It is time to get down to the nitty gritty in a summit of all the key players, rather than perhaps going out to individual groups so that you do not look exposed—or, even worse, the reason why this Government would not have a jobs summit is that it was proposed by the Opposition, because, unlike the Don Dunstans and others, the Government is simply not big enough for the test. Bipartisanship is not about supporting slogans or targets; and bumper plates do not create jobs in terms of South Australia 'Going all the Way'. Having a target for jobs is one thing, but the targets of this Government have been announced time and again and not met. They have been announced in election campaigns, and so on.

The Premier's saying that his target was to reduce our unemployment rate to the national average by the year 2000, without having the slightest idea of how to do it, is simply a cruel hoax. It is more about public relations than government, and today we are as far as ever from achieving that target. In fact, the gap in 1998 was 18 times wider than when the Liberals came to power in 1993. That is the jobs gap between South Australia and the rest of the country. Let us be serious about jobs.

I find it simply extraordinary that in five years of Liberal Government we have had four Ministers for Employment:

two of those Ministers were juniors who did not even attend Cabinet meetings. The member for Fisher, succeeded by the member for Newland, succeeded by the hapless member for Coles, succeeded by the member for Unley have all been appointments geared to shore up the leadership of either one of those two sworn enemies, Dean Brown and John Olsen—jobs for the Liberal Party number crunchers, not jobs for ordinary South Australians. How can Government members fight for the jobs of South Australians when all they really care about is their own jobs? How can the Government fight for jobs when the Employment Minister does not even carry enough weight to be allowed to sit around the Cabinet table?

How can the Government help the unemployed when the member for Coles hid in her office during Question Time to avoid being asked questions on her portfolio? That is no help for the unemployed. That is a sell-out of the unemployed. Under a Labor Government, the Minister for jobs will be at Cabinet meetings. In fact, the Minister for jobs will chair the Cabinet meetings. The jobs Minister will be the Premier, because nothing is more important to this State than jobs. But what are the basic facts about South Australia's performance on jobs? We need to look at what has happened to the South Australian economy without Party political blinkers.

We cannot address the central problem of South Australia if we are too afraid to confront the truth. My Deputy and shadow Minister assisting in jobs and industry will address the details of South Australia's jobs crisis, but the future will not be rosy if we do not work together, if the Government is weak and unable to lead, and if the Olsen Liberals keep on believing, or acting as if they believe, that selling the State from under the people of South Australia is the real issue. Every South Australian knows that jobs is the issue. We are poised at the beginning of a new millennium, and it is clearer than ever before that, for South Australia to go ahead and prosper, we can no longer be content to simply tinker at the edges. We need to start the design work on the bold strokes needed for a new century. We can no longer afford to be distracted by side issues or the divisions within the Government, nor can we afford the cargo cult mentality of believing that selling the State from under South Australians will somehow solve all our problems. South Australia has been a leader in the past and can be a leader in the future.

The centrepiece of Labor's policy is the abolition of the myriad of State Government agencies. We need a single jobs commission to coordinate all arms of government in the service of the key objective—more jobs underpinned by growth. Waste in such areas as the erstwhile Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism and other areas of the economic development bureaucracy needs to be wound back. It is ridiculous that the latest reshuffle has once again multiplied the number of State development agencies. Tourism has again been taken out of DITT after having just been put in, presumably to give the member for Coles something to do. After the South Australian Development Council, the Economic Development Authority, the MFP, MISBARD, DITT, Roger Cook's task force (now defunct), we now have the Premier's economic development committee No.7—the State development team. Instead of action, we have a new title, a new letterhead, a new masthead. We have the notion of progress rather than real progress.

A real jobs commission would properly integrate strategies for industry development and investment attraction with labour market programs that give the skills in demand to our young people and to our people already in the work force who face an uncertain future—that is, unless we as a Govern-

ment and as a community take an activist approach to such problems and new opportunities.

In December the Blair Government in Britain released an industry development white paper that represents a major shift away from the sorts of policies adopted here in South Australia of relying heavily on grants and subsidies to individual firms towards assistance that helps the whole regional economy to grow. Britain has had the bitter experience of giving large up-front grants to individual companies that then close their doors after the Government subsidy expires. The appropriate policy objective is to try to embed economic activity by having sustainable regional advantages such as a good skills base, good access to capital and good innovation policies. The Blair Government's white paper contains 75 policy commitments that are about creating an innovation-driven economy, and they include an enterprise fund for growing businesses, increasing spending on innovation, help in the development of industrial clusters, networks and so on.

The Irish Government did one of the things that I propose be done here in South Australia: it established a central industry development agency. Initially, its job was largely focused on attracting inward investment on the somewhat crude inducements of low wage and concessional tax rates for companies. But over time its agenda has broadened. Rather like some of this Government's ill-fated attempts at investment attraction, such as Australis, the Irish Industry Development Agency found that many of the companies it had succeeded in attracting were footloose and sometimes did not deliver the benefits proposed. So, it started to target key industrial sectors. It started to concentrate more on what we have been calling 'existing industries' to develop the clusters of indigenous firms around the bigger players.

I have long believed that the main strengths of any economy are to be found among our existing industries. Labor will not, however, turn its back on investment attraction. But many existing industries tell me that their main hope of getting help from the State Government is to close down, move interstate and accept the handout to deliver jobs, take the handout and then not deliver the jobs. Two of the other policy innovations that Labor proposes is to only provide assistance to firms on the basis of performance according to agreed performance benchmarks, particularly jobs, and to concentrate on support for existing industry.

A major part of our jobs commission would be the expansion of the highly successful Centre for Manufacturing, established by the former Labor Government with the support of John Button, to become a broad-based centre for industry. The centre for industry would concentrate on support for existing industry, providing practical assistance to businesses in the manufacturing and manufacturing-related service industries in our State. The centre would help industry to retain jobs and upgrade skills, apply new technologies and methods, and develop new products and markets for them and existing products.

That industry assistance be performance based is essential. I visited the United States Governors' Association in 1996 and again a few weeks ago. The National Governors' Association is based in Washington DC and is essentially both a lobby and a think tank on behalf of the 50 State Governors. It benchmarks what works in each of the individual States. Essentially it says, 'Okay, in health these programs work in these States and these haven't.' With economic development, ditto. When I told them how South Australia had been handing out grants, particularly to interstate

companies, without conditions or strings attached, they could hardly believe we were still doing that. They said, 'We learnt the hard way about that in the 1980s. The Governor would cut a ribbon at the opening of a new company, the company would promise 600 jobs and might give us only a couple of hundred, but everybody would keep quiet because the Governor, the administration and the companies involved would not want the embarrassment.' They said it was about ribbon cutting rather than jobs, and usually in the lead-up to elections. They went on to say, 'Now we make sure that we give them the money only when they deliver what they have promised to deliver and, if they don't deliver it, we get the money back.' They also leveraged the assistance according to the degree of value adding in terms of the jobs involved.

That is certainly what Labor would do: we would reward performance and not promises. If a company promises to create 500 jobs and does so, it will get the full assistance package but, if it creates only 250 jobs after promising 500, it will get only half the assistance. If it moves out of town, we will want back a portion of our investment. We must use education and skill formation to create the climate for innovation. The State still has the ability to use training, education and strategic research and development to promote economic development with the right leadership. None of us should pretend we have all the answers, and that has been one of the problems over the years. Only by working together can we get the best outcome for the State.

Getting back to the idea of the jobs summit, the jobs commission, together with all the players in the jobs summit, would implement the appropriate strategy, and each year the jobs summit would reconvene to assess progress achieved towards the agreed goals and objectives of the strategy and offer support as well as criticism. We must refocus effort and resources to provide practical assistance to South Australian industry, and that is why Labor proposes the establishment under the jobs commission of the centre for industry that I mentioned before.

Also, under the jobs commission, Labor proposes an expanded and proactive industrial supplies office to work with companies and unions to identify opportunities for Government and companies to buy locally. We would establish a jobs rescue task force to identify jobs at risk and devise practical strategies for keeping jobs here in South Australia. We would also establish trouble shooting teams to smooth the way for potential investors around Government regulations, not the current chaos that occurs in the EDA, where business after business tells me that from consultants they do not even get a 'No' let alone a 'Yes.'

Despite what the Premier said before, Labor supports enterprise State zone status for designated regions of high unemployment. I went to Whyalla last week, and the Whyalla Regional Development Board and people from the council and other organisations, including the private sector, were talking about the need for a special focus on Spencer Gulf. That is why they wanted a decent consideration of the rival project to Pelican Point in terms of either a power station at designated indentured land of BHP or at Point Lowly, because they believed that the extra advantage of a power station, although not employing many people these days because of high technology, would have been a significant industry attraction to their enterprise zone and would have guaranteed major suppliers in terms of BHP, Western Mining and, of course, Pasmaenco.

What we are suggesting under the enterprise zone is to provide exemptions from State Government taxes in designat-

ed areas for 10 years for value-adding industries that add to employment in our hardest hit regions. The Premier laughs at the idea, and cancelled the enterprise zone status for Whyalla immediately he became Minister for Industry, but I am pleased to see that the Howard Government has embraced the concept of an enterprise zone for Newcastle in New South Wales. I believe there should be negotiations with the Federal Government to give the same status to the cities of the Upper Spencer Gulf.

Labor supports the existing youth traineeship schemes. In fact, Labor started these in 1993 and supports their expansion into the First Start youth employment scheme, which could provide 6 000 apprenticeships and traineeships to our young people over three years. As I mentioned before, Labor's First Start scheme would provide large subsidies to local government and business to take on young people, in many cases providing a dollar-for-dollar Government subsidy. I am pleased that the Premier mentioned the success of Kickstart, which was launched when I was Minister for Employment and Further Education. The fact that it is one of the few programs that has been continued is a measure of its success.

It is also vital that we reintroduce open competitive tendering for Government work and contracts. On major Government contracts, the present Government has often preferred interstate and overseas firms and has excluded South Australian firms from consideration. In just two cases, those of EDS and United Water, the Government has awarded contracts worth more than \$2 billion to wholly foreign-owned firms. Despite all the promises, we have lost jobs from the water and IT industries as a result.

I was pleased to see some of these policy proposals supported at the jobs workshops convened by the member for Unley. Among the themes that clearly emerged from my reading of the report of the workshops were: first, the need for an economic and jobs plan for South Australia and recognition of the clear and evident truth that one does not now exist; secondly, the need to expand the youth traineeships; thirdly, the need for targeted infrastructure spending in regional areas; and fourthly, the need for more support for local firms in gaining Government contracts, among other ideas. I say 'amen' to all of that.

There is more, and that is why the State Opposition strongly supported Kim Beazley's announcement of a special economic and jobs package for South Australia. What is vital about that plan is the recognition that it gives to the principle that additional Commonwealth support for South Australia is needed. That is, a distinct strategy for South Australia as a region with special difficulties, supported by the Commonwealth. The type of economic challenges confronting our State cannot be addressed fully without the understanding and support of the Commonwealth.

There are some other areas that I want to address, as well. A few months ago I sent out a letter to industry and small business in this State about the impact of compliance costs. Compliance costs are those costs that industry faces, not including State Government taxes and charges. Essentially, compliance costs are the costs that industries and small businesses pay in order to be forced to comply with Government regulations. In New Zealand in a bipartisan way, there has been a massive and intensive effort by the New Zealand Government and Opposition through a select committee inquiry to identify the impact in terms of the cost on jobs and profitability of compliance costs and to set about the task of reducing those costs. I commend that strategy to the Premier

because it is an area where New Zealand appears to be setting the pace.

In addition, I believe that if the Government is serious about jobs it would drop its plans for another \$150 million in taxes on top of the quarter of a billion dollar hike announced in the last budget. Every economic commentator, particularly from the Government's own side of the political fence, acknowledges the dead weight impact of new taxes and their adverse impact on economic activity. The Premier should also pay heed to the information being extracted from the Senate inquiry into the GST. Evidence from the likes of Professor Peter Dixon that the GST could cost jobs while delivering no other benefits and the fact that the Treasury did no work to support the claims made by the Prime Minister and the Premier about the supposed economic benefits of a GST demand an explanation and a rethink by this Government.

I also call upon the Government to abandon its current industrial relations proposals, which are not only unfair but make people in work even less secure and less prepared to spend and make investments as a result. Those so-called reforms are anti-job and anti-growth. Then there is the ETSA hoax on jobs, and I will talk about that another day.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Scalzi): The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Employment): Today is a unique opportunity for all members of this House. It is an opportunity for the 47 of us who are elected to be community leaders to sit down and listen to each other and to engage in a constructive dialogue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The members who have spoken so far in this debate have been heard in silence. I intend to listen to all members of this House today in silence because I think this is a serious issue. If I extend that courtesy to members on that side of the House I hope it will be extended to me.

Mr Conlon: You are wrong.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I probably am, because the Opposition seems keener on playing games than on addressing this matter seriously. For that reason, I urge all members to listen carefully to the debate and to contribute constructively. Therefore I do not intend to dissect the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, suffice to say that, if he had listened carefully to what the Premier had said, he would know that some of what he put on the table was perhaps not necessary. The fact is that on Saturday, a need for a special focus on the regions, particularly the region of Whyalla, was announced. A joint focus between the State and Commonwealth Governments—an effort to work together—was announced on Saturday, and Phil Tyler, who I need not remind members sat in this place as a Labor member, congratulated the State and Federal Governments on their initiative. That is not a matter on which there is disagreement in this House but one on which there is agreement, and it is not necessary to try to score points over such matters.

Similarly, the point made by the Leader of the Opposition that any industry assistance should be linked to job creation is important, and I say in a bipartisan way that that is exactly why for the last two years the Olsen Government, in any development of that kind, has had claw-back positions and demanded that as a condition of any financial incentive package. If today is to be successful, we must listen carefully,

put the points on the table and then analyse them, as I promise members this Government will.

The Leader also is wont to say that the Premier should take the premier position on jobs. Let me assure this House that the Premier as Leader of the Government takes the leadership position on everything. He cannot necessarily attend to the day-to-day workings of all portfolios, and I would say that a Premier as busy as he is who tries to tackle the employment portfolio is underestimating what is required and selling that portfolio short. So I urge the Opposition, if ever it finds itself in Government, to think very carefully about where it places some of its portfolios, because the responsibilities of the Premier, the Minister for Human Services and other Ministers in this place are such that they cannot give due attention to every issue and therefore need to spread the load, and that is called good government.

The State Government is acutely aware that there is a variety of opinion among western economists as to what can be done by Government to stimulate employment growth. The most commonly discussed approaches—and we have started today—include keeping the wages down, stimulating economic growth, reforming the tax system, reforming the tax system, reforming the social security system, creating a flexible work force, Government spending and delivery of specific assistance for disadvantaged groups, for example, equity groups and long term unemployed. Every member of this House would be aware of many of those arguments and would be equally aware that on either side of the Chamber we have differing perspectives according to our mainstream political philosophies.

However, widespread academic opinion (and it was most sobering to read a report last year of a major conference commissioned by the Reserve Bank and held in Victoria) is that State and provincial governments are able to have only limited impact on employment rates and levels and that public work programs such as infrastructure, limited job creation activities and enhancement of the education in training systems, investment attraction and business growth comprised the main arsenals of a State Government, but they are of necessity limited in their impact in a world which is increasingly affected by global restructuring and the concept of the global village.

This is a theme which the Premier has repeated time and again, with the absolute assurance, however, that whatever lies in our capacity we must do. It is, however, important that this House acknowledge that the capacity of this Government to single-handedly come up with a single fixed solution for unemployment in South Australia is very limited. There is even argument that were this State to do the best it could do and were the Commonwealth to do the best it could do and we all got it exactly right it would not entirely fix the problem. By making those steps forward it would certainly have an effect, but in a global economy where every one of our industries is increasingly forced to compete on global markets, we have some factors impinging on all our service and industry factors that are largely beyond our control. All we can do is create in this society in South Australia the best possible situation we can for South Australians. It is widely believed that therefore provincial governments must think on a global scale, recognising the opportunities of national and international collaboration, but act at a local level by devolving services to the smallest workable region.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the State Government has a responsibility to work with the Commonwealth Government to obtain the best package of services for

South Australians in all areas, including employment. The State Government is therefore keen to enhance its working relationship with the Commonwealth Government and as a result is considering a range of strategies to achieve this. I think that today that should be a given: that you as members of the Opposition believe we should work strongly with the Commonwealth and we as members of the Government believe we should work strongly with the Commonwealth; and proof that we are already doing so is in the \$3 million for the pre-apprentice training recently given over two years in special consideration of this State. That is a cooperative approach whereby my predecessor, the Minister for Tourism and member for Coles, advised me of a problem. We went to see Minister Abbott about the problem and as a result a \$3 million package was given to South Australia.

As we heard yesterday in tributes to former Premier the late Don Dunstan, in many ways South Australia is a social laboratory for the nation. South Australia is ideally positioned because of its size and geography to continue to fulfil that role. I passionately believe that one of the ways forward in the employment dilemma is that, if we were to work together and come up with creative innovations, we can and should be going to the Commonwealth and arguing that as a social laboratory we should trial innovative practices. If they work they are a message that could go out to the rest of the nation. If they do not work, at least we have had an additional initiative and some money coming here to help our employment situation. I concur in the Leader of the Opposition's statement that South Australia is a special case. I do not concur in any way with any statement that South Australia is a basket case. There is a difference between a special case and special need and a basket case.

Yesterday we heard a great number of tributes to the late Don Dunstan. I think members on the other side of the House equally acknowledge the enormous contribution made by the Premier before him, Tom Playford, who built an industrial base for this State. One of the problems with that industrial base is that in a restructuring economy it is one of the areas that is hit most, so we in South Australia have particular problems in employment, related to that strong reliance on secondary manufactured goods which did so well for us under Sir Thomas. He did not do the wrong thing in building that sort of economy, but we in a different world now have to face different problems. The Minister for Human Services will doubtless acknowledge the contribution of Sir Thomas in the Housing Trust area, but that is not without problems.

Ms Key interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: It might have been a long time ago and it was a wonderful initiative, but that does not mean that the Minister for Human Services does not have problems related to the way the Housing Trust—good as it is—was then constructed. We have to work through them.

The State Government recognises that to tackle unemployment we have to work together; it is why we are here today. The partnership must include, however, not only this House but also the public and private sectors, and these sectors need to work cooperatively and without duplication of effort. The Government alone cannot fix the problem. The Premier has said this, I have said this and every thinking member of this House can repeat it almost as a mantra. It is community problem, and one on which we must show leadership but for which we cannot be held solely responsible.

At this point I particularly acknowledge the contribution from both sides of the House, particularly Opposition members, who took the time and trouble to attend jobs

workshops up and down the length of this State. It was a politics-free zone in the sense that neither Government nor Opposition members went to preach to people about what should be done: we went to listen. I was rather proud of what we did as politicians from both sides of the House, because we sat there and listened and talked to people. That was not confined to the Government benches: a great number of Labor members were present. I acknowledge their contribution in that and I hope they will bring forward some of the matters raised by their electors and unemployed people and various others. Others did not bother to go. They will probably get up and be the ones who know most about this area. I am glad they are such experts, but I am also glad that some of the my colleagues think to get out there and listen to their electors, because I trust my electors more than I trust instant experts.

The background to the jobs workshop was covered in the Premier's speech. The three main themes were touched on by the Leader of the Opposition: the rationalisation of Government services, infrastructure and special needs in better targeting education and training are recognised. It is these themes that the State Government will use to set broad directions for employment policies and activities. It is these themes which we are particularly keen to follow through in your thoughts today. Some of the key issues within these themes are the need for better coordination of Government services at all levels, a matter touched on by both the Premier and the Leader; and concern over withdrawal of Government and non-government services from regional areas. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about that, but he failed to acknowledge the Premier's absolute commitment to regional areas in the formation of the regional task force, which is about to report in three weeks, and his insistence that these job workshops be conducted not only up and down metropolitan Adelaide but also in Mount Gambier, Clare, the Riverland, Whyalla and other parts of regional South Australia.

Further issues are the need to increase the relevance of programs and services to local areas, which dovetails into regional services; and business not wanting to employ because of the complexity of the current legislative and administrative system. I know this is a difference between both sides of this House, so I implore members opposite to consider not our Party political positions but whether we can restructure industrial law and other industrial factors in a way that is more conducive to employment, not employer versus employee but how we can structure South Australia in a way that better serves the needs of our people in terms of employment creation.

I know that many members opposite will say that unfair dismissal is not a problem, but I know, and those of them who attended know, that at every meeting we had people raised it as an issue. They may be wrong: I am not taking a point on this, but I would put to members that even if they are—

Ms Key interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Yes, at every single jobs workshop that was raised as an issue. It is not whether they are right or wrong. If employers have the perception that there is a problem, I would say that we as a society have a problem. Either we have to address that perception or we have to do something about the law. Either is acceptable, but we cannot just leave it as is. The member opposite says, 'Yes, the workers have a problem, too.' That is true, but someone at one of the Elizabeth workshops put this very well. He said, 'What you people do,' meaning all of us in here, I presume,

and especially Governments, 'is build these walls and, in building these walls, you protect the people inside, which is fine if you have a job. But the higher the wall, the less able people are to go from one side of that wall to the other.'

People actually put forward the proposition that, in times of fairly full employment, if someone lost their job they went down the street and got another one. Nobody checked; nobody cared. You were judged on your merits. There might have been some unscrupulous employers, but there was more employment and it was easier to move about the work force. They claim that those times are gone. I put that on the table here not as my words but from someone in Elizabeth who is unemployed and who said that to me. It is an issue to which I do not necessarily know the answer but which I believe this House must address. While there is a perception in employees that they need protection, if that perception is bought at the expense of jobs for our unemployed people, then we owe it to all the people of South Australia to examine the issue—not necessarily to agree on the solutions but to examine the issue. I have spoken to Minister Armitage about this, because he is considering it. The Labor Party might not agree with the solutions, but I believe that we have to agree to discuss the problem.

Assistance to disadvantaged people in their search for employment, including pre-employment programs for indigenous Australians, is one of the matters that came up. Pre-training programs for women seeking careers in non-traditional occupations is something that I hope would be strongly supported by at least half the Opposition—actually, by most of the Opposition and by most on this side, I would think. Programs for pre-release of ex-offenders, and new arrivals needing support to enter the work force, were all valuable discussions that we can and should address.

Although we are here to participate in an open forum on employment and I do not wish to pre-empt any decisions within the current process, I can reinforce my portfolio's commitment to creating jobs. Within existing resources, Employment SA and the Department of Education, Training and Employment will undertake the following activities in 1999-2000. A \$600 000 Aboriginal employment and training action plan will provide a range of locally delivered programs in the key focus areas: community development, business development, infrastructure development and justice projects. Projects at the grass roots level will assist at least 300 indigenous people.

A regional small business network employing CD-ROM and later an Internet site will provide a coordinated resource concerning a wide range of issues such as employment legislation, recruitment, performance management, training and Government assistance and, not least, measures that will at least address the realities of things such as unfair dismissal. There will be an expansion of the Regional Training Industry and Employment Program. That was a small business cluster project recently piloted in the Adelaide Hills small business food processing industry—an outstanding success in developing clusters of businesses. We will now offer that scheme to other industries and regions across the State.

The South Australian and Australian economies are increasingly being seen as part of the global marketplace. The opening up of markets and global trading brings significant opportunities for Australian importers and exporters. However, declining protectionism also exposes domestic markets to the economic impacts of world economic effects, such as the Asian economic crisis and the fluctuation of currency values. These factors are clearly influential on the

ability of South Australia to develop its people. However, since we came to power in December 1998, almost 45 000 people have participated in programs, with 25 000 gaining employment and others going on to further training.

Is it enough? No. This Government acknowledges that it wishes every day to do more, which is why we come before this House in a bipartisan way, saying to every member of this Chamber, Opposition and Government alike, 'What more can we do to create sustainable and long-term jobs for the people of South Australia? And where we cannot supply them with the jobs (because there simply are not enough), how can we rethink our community in a way that makes them the valued and important South Australians they really are?'

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

During his contribution, the Minister for Employment quite rightly said that the Government alone cannot fix this problem, and he went on to talk about how the intention of this debate was that it would be bipartisan and that we should all get together and talk about some of the difficult issues to be solved in the employment debate, including industrial relations issues and flexibility within the workplace. That is all very well, but I suggest to the Minister for Employment that the very nature of this debate precludes any constructive discussion about these sorts of issues. Set-piece 10 minute speeches by members on either side are merely a talkfest. They are not sitting down with the players involved—with industry, with the unemployed and with other groups in society—and talking through the problems, making commitments and reaching decisions.

Why are we in this talkfest? Let us go back to how this started. When the Minister for Employment was a new Minister, he was asked in media interviews whether the Labor Opposition's idea of a jobs summit was a good one. The Minister, being keen and acknowledging the nature of the massive task that he was facing, acknowledged the seriousness of the job situation and said that it was a reasonable idea and he would have a look at the possibility of a jobs summit, that he would look at Labor's idea of having a jobs summit that might actually make some progress on this issue. The Premier was overseas at the time (this was the same Premier who had consistently rejected Labor's idea of a bipartisan jobs summit). Somehow, when the Premier arrived back in Australia, the Minister for Employment decided that the jobs summit was not a good idea and, in back peddling and twisting and turning to explain his backflip, he came up with this idea of a parliamentary debate on jobs—this Mickey Mouse version of what a jobs summit really should be.

The Opposition's idea was and is for all parties to be involved in the debate; for actual decisions to be made; and for commitments to be made in this debate. We acknowledge that it is not a problem that the Government alone can fix. There do need to be innovative approaches to this employment crisis in South Australia. Certainly, the Government has shown no ability to deal with it by itself. We have offered bipartisan support in this. The Leader of the Opposition has just now offered a series of solutions and a series of steps that could be taken to solve this jobs situation.

The Premier in his address seemed to be saying, 'This is what the Government has done so far. It has not fixed the problem, so let us do more of the same. Let us continue along the same track that we have always taken but just do that little bit more and see if that works.' I say to the Premier that, if what he has done in six years has not solved the jobs problem yet, maybe he should look at other ideas—maybe he should

look at Labor's ideas or at some of the ideas of other people in our society to solve this jobs problem.

Let us talk about the South Australian situation. We have just heard the Minister for Employment say, at quite some length that, in fact, there is very little that the State Government can do. He is making excuses before we even arrive at an outcome. The present Premier, in fact, announced a target for the Government to reduce South Australia's unemployment rate to the national average by the year 2000. However, his own Government budget papers show that, on present policy settings, this target will not be achieved. Employment growth in South Australia is expected to be well below that of the rest of Australia until well past the turn of the century. We need economic growth of around 4 per cent to make inroads into unemployment. We need economic growth of 4 per cent to absorb the increase in the number of people coming into the labour market each year and to counter the effect of growth in productivity which displaces labour.

The Olsen Government's budget papers expect our average growth rate to fall well short of this, despite the fact that the budget papers have ceased to provide estimates of forecast unemployment. At no time in the next four years does the Olsen Government's budget forecasting have South Australia exceeding Australia's growth rate. As a consequence, it is simply not credible that we will reduce our unemployment to the national average under this Government's policies. Therefore, I suggest that, rather than doing more of the same, the Government look to doing something different.

It is true that unemployment has recently shown some signs of coming down, and this is unambiguously a good thing. However, it is no cause for complacency. In recent years, we have seen the pronounced deterioration of South Australia's performance compared with that of Australia. The South Australian economy has been badly under-performing in recent years and a terrible jobs and unemployment gap has opened up between us and the rest of the nation. That gap has become much worse over the past few years.

Let me be quite clear. During the late 1980s and the early 1990s, South Australia sometimes did better than the national economy and sometimes worse. However, never before have we seen the enormous gap between the jobs created here and those created nationally, as seen today. Unemployment has been far higher than it is today. I am delighted that unemployment is today lower than, for example, in 1992. However, in 1992 we were in a national and international recession. What has marked the past five years is that, in spite of sustained economic and employment growth nationally, that sustained recovery has not been seen in South Australia—and I would like to bet that many people in the jobs workshop attributed some of that employment downturn to the fact that this current Liberal Government came in just as the national economy was improving, slashed jobs and put a dampener on any recovery in South Australia.

In trend terms, the difference in South Australia's measured trend unemployment rate and that of Australia has grown from an average for 1990 of .7 per cent and, for 1992—which was the height of the international recession—of .9 per cent to, today, a whopping 1.8 per cent under the Hon. John Olsen in 1998. Certainly, we have a serious problem. For the year 1993 (which was Labor's last year in office and the first year of the recovery from national recession), South Australia's unemployment rate was just .1 per cent above the national rate. I seek leave to have inserted

in *Hansard* a table of a statistical nature on South Australia's rates of unemployment compared with those of the nation.

Leave granted.

Annual Average Unemployment Rates (Trend) South Australia and Australia			
	South Australia	Australia	Percentage Point Difference
1990	7.6	6.9	0.7
1991	10.1	9.6	0.5
1992	11.7	10.8	0.9
1993	11.0	10.9	0.1
1994	10.6	9.7	0.9
1995	9.8	8.5	1.3
1996	9.4	8.6	0.8
1997	9.7	8.6	1.1
1998	9.9	8.1	1.8

Ms HURLEY: At no time since 1993 have we ever been below the national level of unemployment. In fact, we are currently trending up—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: No, since 1993. We are currently trending up, so that our unemployment rate is almost 2 per cent above the national average.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: When did the bank go broke? What year was that?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Scalzi): Order! The Deputy Leader will address the Chair.

Ms HURLEY: During both election campaigns, this Government promised to create jobs and targets. Today we have heard the Premier boasting about economic criteria that show that his Government's policies have worked. I am saying that this Government's policies have not worked. We have been in a deteriorating situation since 1993, and that is tragic. That is tragic for my constituents.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: I don't know about yours, the member for Bragg, but it is tragic for my constituents.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Ms HURLEY: During the early 1990s, our job performance was well in touch with that of the nation. However, in the five years to December 1998, South Australia's rate of job growth has been an anaemic one-third of the rate of job creation nationally. Even that poor figure includes an improvement registered in recent figures. There is a crisis with respect to full-time jobs. As at December 1998, we still had around 30 000 fewer full-time jobs than was the case more than eight years ago, with under-employment estimated by Access Economics being more than 20 per cent. Our work force participation rate is 2.1 per cent lower than Australia's, reflecting just how depressed our labour market is. There are thousands of hidden unemployed, and if it were not for our terrible participation rate—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. The Deputy Leader has the call.

Ms HURLEY:—our unemployment rate would be even higher.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! This is an important debate. I ask members to stop interjecting.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: I want to emphasise to the Minister for Employment that this Government has been refusing to recognise the situation in South Australia. It continues to talk

up jobs figures that it creates and will not recognise the current crisis state of our employment situation, which is amply illustrated by the participation rate. People are dropping out of the jobs market because they have lost any hope of getting a job here in South Australia—and we all know anecdotally of friends and colleagues who have moved out of this State in order to get a job. So, let us first register what are the facts before we start talking about how we deal with it.

With respect to youth unemployment, South Australia consistently registers the highest and second highest levels of youth unemployment in the nation. We have had the distinction of topping Tasmania regarding youth unemployment—the worst in the country. In addition, once a person is unemployed, they will be unemployed for longer. In South Australia, the average duration of unemployment is nearly 68 weeks, the second highest duration in the country. We also have one of the worst ratios of unemployment to advertised job vacancies. The bottom line is that, once a person has become unemployed in South Australia, they have amongst the worst chances of anyone anywhere in the nation of finding another job: that is the stone cold truth of unemployment here in South Australia, and many commentators are forecasting worse for the future. Even the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, headed by the Premier's close and trusted adviser, Cliff Walsh, projects that we will have 11.5 per cent unemployment by June this year, with a .5 per cent loss of jobs.

On the centre's analysis, this would give us an unemployment rate 30 per cent higher than the national rate. So, that is the situation. Members opposite ask what we would do about it. The Leader of the Opposition has outlined a comprehensive plan of attack on this, but we are open to a bipartisan jobs summit to discuss further what we will do about it. All the Government has come up with some far is this talkfest and a report on the workshops that were conducted. This report on the workshops is no more than a listing of the ideas that came out of those workshops. There was no analysis or collation of those suggestions other than a rough subdivision under 'headings'. I think that that is an insult to the people who participated and who put a lot of thought and preparation into their own submission. This is the result of what happened to it; this is what the Government did.

The Government just put out the raw data, almost in an indigestible form. Having it on CD and in a hi-tech format does not improve things whatsoever for the unemployed and is little more than a waste of money. The Government has just grabbed these ideas, dumped them on the table without any explanation or thoughtful study of the contents and just presented raw data. I have read through it. It does contain some very good suggestions—some are contradictory, some are very close together, some might be indicating a trend—but we have no idea or analysis of that material. There is no indication of whether there are differing city and regional views, and there is no analysis of where the views came from—outer areas, city areas, professionals or the unemployed themselves.

This report is an absolute disgrace. We are standing here in Parliament debating this so-called 'report'—and this is little more than a talkfest. At least the Opposition has offered some positive suggestions instead of more of the same.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: The member for Bragg can read the Leader of the Opposition's suggestions in the *Hansard* tomorrow morning. The honourable member is not good at

listening—we all know that—but perhaps he can read it tomorrow.

In addressing these situations we must address one more salient point, a point amply highlighted in a report released on 8 February by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The ABS research shows that the highest level of unemployment occurred in two categories of workers: those who did not complete high school and those who left formal education aged 15 or younger. The research states:

Individuals in these two high risk categories recorded unemployment rates of 13 per cent, compared with 4 per cent for workers in possession of higher degrees, postgraduate diplomas or bachelor degrees.

The report on that survey in the *Financial Review* of 9 February went on to say:

Consistent with previous labour market research, the new ABS paper confirmed that young people, residents of rural areas, people with limited English proficiency and Australians not born in major English-speaking nations experienced relatively high unemployment rates.

Another critical finding of the report was that 'being unemployed today increases the likelihood of being unemployed tomorrow'. This, I believe, is an issue that we must address first and foremost. We must ensure that our young people are properly trained, otherwise we are dooming them to a life where employment is uncertain, where they might be employed for a brief period of time and then find themselves once again on the job market. The lower the standard of job, the more chance they have of being at the mercy of our current difficult job market, a job market which the Government is about to try to make more difficult with its industrial relations propositions.

I shall briefly refer to the Premier's hoax about the ETSA sale generating more jobs. It is sad that the Premier has exploited this issue for base political motives. There are not more jobs proposed from the sale of ETSA: there are fewer, especially if John Olsen were to use the proceeds of the sale on a \$1 billion spending spree. What he is now promising in terms of capital work he has promised before. With John Olsen's record of dishonouring his promises, why would anyone believe him now? The Premier may promise some figure to be earmarked for jobs, even though once ETSA is sold he would not have had the money to pay for those jobs; but he has promised it all before anyway. In the 1997-98 budget there was to be a spending program of \$145 million over four years called the Priority Funding Package, made up largely of capital works. In that one year alone John Olsen underspent his capital works program by \$172 million, according to the Government's budget paper No. 5. Forget the \$145 million over four years—here was underspending of \$172 million in one year alone. So, \$170 million was not spent on job creation in one year—and so it has been throughout the life of this Government.

Finally, I would like to say that South Australians are as clever and creative as anyone else. We are as hard working as other people. We are ingenious in the face of adversity. South Australia has been a leader in the past and should be a leader again.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I begin by congratulating the Minister for Employment on the way in which he has gone about this job. The Minister has travelled the State and has brought back a lot of input from a lot of people who attended those workshops. It has been a pretty good exercise, and the Minister has provided us with a lot of

information that the Deputy Leader and some of her colleagues ought to have a good look at, because the Minister did tell us before what would happen, namely, that the results of those workshops would be presented to us to allow every member of the House to debate them and to put forward any ideas that they have on behalf of their electors. Listening to the Deputy Leader, I thought that it was almost as though she was trying to get people to leave South Australia. If the Deputy Leader had listened during Question Time, she would have heard the Premier outline the good news in terms of what is happening with South Australia's net migration. People are actually starting to come back, something one would certainly not have garnered from the previous comments.

In this contribution I shall concentrate on my portfolio and electorate in relation to the issues of regional employment within South Australia. As a general comment, the Regional Development Task Force will report soon. We look forward to that. Certainly, the linkage between that and the jobs workshops is absolutely vital. Once again, the Minister and the task force worked very well together to hold some joint hearings, because there is absolutely no doubt that within regional South Australia jobs are tied to development. We are after real jobs, and that does need development to take place. There have to be long-term, viable industries. Preferably, this needs to occur where there is value adding and transport and where other services are required. They are the ones which really add value to country areas.

A lot of very good development is taking place. I will touch on the good and the bad. The export focus, which has been brought about through Food for the Future and several other programs, is working extremely well. As the Premier said earlier, the food, beverage and wine industries present massive opportunities. They really do create some enormous opportunities. This is something that we do well, and in many areas of the State we do have the natural resources which we have not used as well in the past as we possibly could have. It is variable out there, but the positives really come through horticulture, viticulture and aquaculture. Ironically, it is all about the better use of water, be it river water, ground water or our coastal waters. We are very conscious of the fact that whatever we do with any of those resources must be done in a sustainable fashion.

The areas with those resources are extremely fortunate. I will mention a few of those areas because it is where things are really going ahead. I mention the coastal areas of the State and the rapidly growing aquaculture industry. In terms of coastal Eyre Peninsula, a fair bit is happening in Port Augusta, and the member for Bragg has been very helpful in that respect. I also mention the Yorke Peninsula as well as Robe. In relation to aquaculture in various areas of the State, particularly on the Eyre Peninsula, we have seen towns that were going backwards as a result of what has happened with farming and the bigger farms being given a new lease of life.

That industry has not only introduced some new people to the area but it has also given the existing populations something else to focus on. It has been a massive boost for many small businesses in those towns. The Riverland is going through a period of growth which has not been seen for a long time. That growth has not just been driven by the viticulture industry but also by horticulture. There are some real positives in the Riverland, and the Riverland Rural Partnership program is also helping. The Mallee was wheat and sheep country but it is now growing crops, such as potatoes,

and that has really helped with employment. Many towns in the Mallee area have virtually no unemployment.

The problem for that area is obtaining labour and providing housing for that labour. In fact, in some of those areas, as well as areas in the South-East, people are being bussed in to do that work from either Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Millicent or from across the border. That is a situation which has not been seen in rural South Australia for many years. Certainly, areas to the north and south of Naracoorte are going extremely well. Some terrific things have been happening in Virginia over the past couple of years as the area has turned its focus from the domestic to the export market, and that has made an enormous difference. I mention the Southern Vales and Clare, in my own electorate, which is going along very well.

Certainly, we are seeing low unemployment in those areas, but the Government faces some other challenges in those areas from which we will not back off—challenges such as infrastructure, training and, as I have said, housing for the people who do the jobs to ensure that those developments go ahead. The variation across South Australia is pretty much mirrored in my own electorate of Frome where, at one end, we have the Clare Valley, which is doing extremely well and which is driven largely by the wine industry, but some other industries are starting to employ more people. In contrast to the Clare Valley are the towns of Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta, which have all suffered a major blow from mechanisation over the past couple of decades.

We are all very aware of that problem and I do not think that anyone, not only here but interstate and overseas, has all the answers. As those large industries have mechanised it has left many towns in those regions, and elsewhere, with very high unemployment. Some major structural problems exist in those areas. They do not have the natural resources on site that we see in those other growth areas to which I have referred, so their problems are both difficult and an ongoing challenge for all of us to meet. One ray of hope for those regions is in the area of mineral exploration where the Gawler Craton and other areas of the State are showing enormous prosperity.

Unfortunately, commodity prices are down at the moment, but I believe that they do give us some hope. We have to look only at what has happened at Roxby Downs and the \$1.96 billion investment of Western Mining. We see a town which did not exist a few years back but which has actually grown, and that shows what can happen with minerals, mining and processing. We are working hard to ensure that a magnesium plant is a real possibility for Port Augusta. That project has a real opportunity to create a lot of jobs in a place such as Port Augusta and cause the sort of turnaround which will make a big difference.

Of course, we need to find more feed stocks for Pasmenco at Port Pirie. Thankfully, Pasmenco has invested very heavily in recent times and it is very much committed to staying in the area and bringing in feed stocks if it cannot obtain them locally. Of course, BHP Whyalla has faced many challenges. It is meeting a lot of those challenges but the steel industry is rather depressed at the moment. One other possibility for those areas is a fly in/fly out proposal with the mining enterprises which will, no doubt, come on line within the Gawler Craton. If we are to take up that opportunity it will mean retraining people in those towns, as well as the opportunity for new people working in those areas to fly in and out.

As I said, I look forward with some expectation to the report of the regional development task force. I have had the opportunity, through my portfolio responsibilities, of extensive briefings on the results from the task force. I have certainly had a good look through the findings and submissions of the task force. There is no doubt that people in the regions are trying very hard to solve some of their own problems and to come up with ideas as a way forward for those areas. As I said, real jobs in country areas is not about short-term solutions: it is about long-term solutions to ensure that we find greater use for our natural resources which will then translate into jobs.

Hopefully we can grow crops in these areas and achieve some value add and all the industries that flow from that. I look forward to that. As I said, as far as the regions are concerned, that is closely tied to the jobs debate. I again congratulate the Minister and hope that, for the rest of this afternoon and this evening, we will hear some good ideas from members on both sides in a way which will help us with the unemployment problems of South Australia.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): This is a very significant debate, partly because it should have occurred well over a year ago when Mike Rann offered to work with the Government regardless of the election outcome on a jobs summit and a comprehensive jobs growth agreement. To fight effectively for the jobs of South Australians we must be bigger than a Premier who is too frightened to take an unprecedented offer of bipartisanship and support from a constructive Opposition. None of us has all of the answers and that is why we must come together on this issue. It is also significant because, regardless of recent signs of very modest improvement, the situation of people in our labour market, either unemployed and looking for work or in a job with fewer protections and less job security, is getting worse, particularly when we compare our State to the nation.

We need to look at a range of barometers, such as the jobs gap. As the Leader pointed out, there has been a continuation of South Australia's under-performance compared with the rest of the country. When we compare ourselves to the rest of the country we are falling further behind. As the Leader said, unemployment has been higher than it is today, but nearly six years after Australia came out of recession South Australia has not enjoyed anything like its share of the benefits of that sustained national growth. We have been left behind. In terms of unemployment, in 1993 our unemployment rate was a mere .1 percentage point higher than the national rate.

Today it is nearly 2 percentage points higher than the national rate—a full 2 percentage points higher. In terms of employment the same point applies, not only to measured unemployment but also to the rate of new job creation. During the early 1990s our jobs performance was well in touch with that of the nation, but in the five years to December 1998 South Australia's rate of job growth has been just one-third of the rate of job creation around the country. Even that poor figure includes an improvement registered in recent figures. With respect to full-time employment we have fewer jobs than the rest of the country. Those new jobs we have created have been overwhelmingly part-time jobs.

The last figures indicate that all our new jobs were part-time jobs. The latest figures indicate that we still have around 30 000 fewer full-time jobs today than we did pre-recession—a full-time employment high of 507 000 in June 1990. As the Leader has already said, this points to South Aust-

ralia's problem of under-employment, which Access Economics estimates to be over 20 per cent. Over 20 per cent of people in South Australia are under employed. Remember that Access Economics is a conservative think tank, no great friend by and large of the Labor Party, the author of 'Fightback', and here we have this think tank telling us that South Australia has 20 per cent of people under employed. Under employment is defined as the unemployed plus part-timers wanting to work longer hours plus full-time workers on short hours, plus an estimate of discouraged workers who have ceased to look for work. The figure of 20 per cent, I well image, is also an underestimate.

It needs to be recalled that the ABS labour force survey that is used each month to estimate employment and the level of unemployment counts a person as employed even if they have only worked one hour in the previous week. To quote Access, under employment is over 20 per cent in Tasmania and South Australia. In Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania there are fewer full-time jobs than at the previous peak and under employment is a substantial problem. If we look at participation rates, there has also been a widening of the work force participation rate between Australia and South Australia. On the latest figure there is a 2.1 percentage point difference between South Australia and Australia. We get that common figure coming through all the time—around 2 per cent—a significant difference between what South Australia is achieving as against the rest of the country.

This is simply an index of the level of job seeker discouragement and likely hidden unemployment arising from slow growth in available jobs. There is a very high level of hidden unemployment in South Australia as the conservative Access Economics has shown us. Our low participation rate means that there are many more people out there who would work if they could find or get a job, but they do not appear in the data because they have given up, given away the search. South Australia now has the lowest participation rate of any mainland State. Are these the figures we want, the figures that indicate that South Australia is performing well? Of course not! The Premier's favourite think tank—the Centre for Economic Studies—has called it 'a hefty, deteriorating, lagging market'. They are the words of Cliff Walsh. If it were not for our terrible participation rate, our unemployment rate would be even higher.

If we look at youth unemployment, we have another indictment upon how South Australia is performing. The figures for youth unemployment, while volatile and not smoothed for seasonal factors, South Australia has consistently had the highest level of youth unemployment in the nation or the second highest if you take account of some of the figures we get from Tasmania. In December 1998 South Australia had the second highest youth unemployment rate in the country—a figure of 31.4 per cent. The Deputy has already spoken about the duration of unemployment—the length of time that people are out of work—and it goes up as people get older. If we look at the unemployment to job vacancy ratio, we have more damning figures for South Australia.

Since the abolition of the CES by the Howard Government, which has no idea about how to manage the job market situation, and its replacement with the already discredited job networks, data on the number of job vacancies to the number of unemployed has been hard to gather. This is deliberate on the part of the Howard Government. However, we can be certain that in May 1997 South Australia had the worst rate of unemployment relative to job vacancies and only improved

to second worst after Tasmania in May 1998. How do we go about this? What should we do? There have been significant contributions this afternoon and there will be many more.

In the short time I am allowed, I will pick up on one or two important proposals already put forward by our Leader. One of the best economic initiatives of the previous Labor Government was the Centre for Manufacturing. It was not perfect but was going down the right track. It helped firms upgrade their products, their skill bases, their technology, to find new markets and to enter into strategic alliances with other firms. It concentrated on existing industry. This is what we are all about. We are going to concentrate on existing industry, recognising that the sort of 'beggar my neighbour' policies adopted by the Olsen Government, of waving a big carrot in front of an interstate firm for jobs often not delivered, is self defeating when we have many good South Australian firms right under our noses. I am sad to say that partly because of a leaderless Government with no economic strategy it has allowed the centre to be diminished by some of the bureaucratic tsars. We will turn that around. I strongly support an upgrade of the centre as proposed by South Australian Labor at the last State election and by the Beazley Labor Opposition at the October Federal election.

With no disrespect to the many hard working people in John Olsen's economic bureaucracy, a centre for industry, guided by a jobs commission and informed by a decent analysis and strategy, endorsed by an inclusive jobs summit, would give a better return for jobs in South Australia, a better return for the community. That is what we have to be about in this debate. We have to put behind us the baggage of the past and adopt a bipartisan but meaningful approach.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): Let us recognise that unemployment is the biggest single issue and problem confronting western society and certainly confronting Australia and South Australia. It is an issue about which a great deal has been said by members of Parliament, and politicians, but over which less than satisfactory progress has been made. As the Minister for Human Services I first acknowledge the huge social cost of unemployment within our State so that members of Parliament, in looking at solutions, understand what the beneficial impact will be if we can create a lot more jobs.

It is well known that those people who are unemployed suffer much higher health problems than the average for the population. It is well known that those who are unemployed find it much more difficult to get housing compared with the rest of the population. It is well known that, where there is unemployment in the family, invariably the family relationship breaks down as a result of unemployment. It causes personal stress, it causes family stress, it causes social problems and, as a community, we pick up the cost of those social problems. We as a Parliament need to understand the hundreds of millions of dollars that costs this State. I do not wish to expand on that except to say that in looking at solutions we must be prepared to make a commitment to those solutions that reflects the huge cost in both financial terms but, more importantly, in social terms of unemployment.

I have not even mentioned the impact of the loss of morale and the loss of self-esteem unemployment causes, particularly of a younger person who has been through their schooling, they have tried hard, but at the end of their schooling they have found that they cannot get a job. The impact is also felt by older people, and I pick the two extremes because that is

where the biggest unemployment problems exist—among the younger and the older people. I take the case of a person who has been in the work force, someone who has been a diligent and competent worker for much of their life, who finds at the age of 50 that they have been retrenched for some reason and they find it very difficult to get back into the work force. It is those two age groups that we ought to concentrate on particularly—the mature unemployed and the young people coming out of the school system. We see daily in the press about the explosion in the use of drugs within the community and an explosion in mental health problems within the community. I believe that unemployment is a major contributor, if not the major contributor, to both of those problems in the community.

During this debate, many ideas will come forward. Whilst it is not my prerogative today to go over all the details in this broad-ranging debate, I consider that the most important emphasis should be on training or retraining within the workplace. The best way of creating job opportunities is to make sure that we have a work force that is appropriately skilled and available. If we provide in-company training to companies, then invariably—

Ms Thompson interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: With security. Invariably, it is those companies that will expand. One has only to look at North Carolina and at the emphasis that was put on training and the growth in industry that has resulted to see the benefits that can occur.

The other important thing is that we as a community spend time planning where the growth will be in terms of future job opportunities. This House knows the many times that I have raised this issue in the Parliament. In late 1993 I saw an opportunity for information technology, and for the new technology in that area, and we made a major thrust into that sector. For the last two years, information technology has been the fastest growing industry sector in our economy. It is also interesting to note that in percentage terms South Australia has had the fastest growing information technology industry of any of the States in Australia. Drake and Morgan and Banks regularly comment to me that they are amazed at the impact that information technology and the growth of information technology has had in terms of job creation in this State.

I understand that the projections for the next 15 years at least, if not for a much longer period, foreshadow that there will be significant shortages worldwide in the field of information technology. We have done a great deal in this State, and positions in some universities have more than trebled. In a very short time we have emphasised the importance of getting computers into schools, and the opportunities in those areas will be very significant.

I want to touch briefly on the initiatives being taken in the Department of Human Services. Firstly in housing, several major urban renewal developments are under way. One that the Premier and I announced last week was The Parks redevelopment, which is a 15 year project. As I announced last week, we expect to help younger unemployed people who live within The Parks catchment area that is being redeveloped to take on training positions and to be part of the rebuilding, redevelopment and renovation of The Parks area, not just in terms of housing but also streetscaping, gardening and other services. That will start to build up a very strong affinity. We will make sure that the contractors who win jobs in that area take on some of those young people.

We have not done this only in The Parks area, where our target is to have 50 people employed from within the region who have been previously unemployed and help them take up traineeships. We are also doing that as part of the Salisbury North housing redevelopment. A couple of months ago I announced a \$16 million redevelopment over a 15 year period of Salisbury North. That initiative has been taken up with the expectation that about 20 young people will be involved and that jobs will be created for them constantly over that 15 year period. Again, that is not just in the building area but in a range of other areas.

One of the issues that must be looked at is how we recognise the work of volunteers within our community as part of the legitimate work effort of our community. About 300 000 people are volunteers in our community and approximately 120 000 work in the area of human services. Many of those people work very close to, if not more than, 40 hours a week. Many of them make a significant contribution to the services available. We need to recognise that, we need to make sure that the social security system recognises that, but we need to use it as part of the retraining and reskilling of people through volunteer effort to help them get permanent positions within the work force.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The other important issue is to make sure that we have specific employment programs across a whole range of country areas. I think it is the rural parts of South Australia that need the greatest emphasis to help retain people within those communities. In the human services area, we are doing that particularly in health care. We have training programs for medical students in rural health education scholarship schemes and training programs for Aboriginal communities in many of the rural and remote areas of South Australia. I would like to see this Government, particularly through my own department, put an even greater effort into making sure we are dealing with training needs, especially for older people in the country. We need to make sure that those people are able to remain in the community and that there are people trained to look after them.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Many of us will come to this debate on unemployment today to declaim how distressed we are about the problem. The title of my contribution is 'Why the economically powerful are not distressed about unemployment'. While many of the speakers have referred to specific programs, I mean to get to the core of the problem. The issue of unemployment in our society is the most crucial social issue facing this State, this country and, indeed, the world as a whole. Surely it is one of the essential marks of a civilised society that each one of its members is given the opportunity to explore their talents and human potential to design, build, maintain and artistically reflect the world around them. It is a travesty of our humanity that we allow so many to be denied the opportunity of making a constructive contribution to society. Throughout the world the armies of unemployed suffer depression, marriage breakdown, and alcohol and drug abuse, and many turn to crime. Unemployment is economic leprosy, undermining social cohesion and our respect for each other. Why has this been allowed to go on for so long?

The problem stems from heartless economic ideology which has dominated public debate over the past 20 years. It has been called economic rationalism; it might be called

economic Darwinism; it is, in fact, economic insanity. For 20 years we have been told that the marketplace is the best means of allocating our human and other resources. If market forces result in Mitsubishi closing down in South Australia, for example, the economic rationalists would just tell us to accept the result in the name of restructuring, regardless of the personal pain and social disruption that such an event would cause. For over 20 years we have been fed the line that government intervention in these matters is wrong. We are told that government intervention is almost always wrong: the market knows best.

Technically, 'the market' refers to the coming together of buyers and sellers in respect of a particular product or resource. In practice, when economic rationalists refer to 'the market', they mean the preferred results of the economically powerful—and let me tell you, Mr Deputy Speaker, the economically powerful usually get their preferred results. Like religious zealots, the free market thinkers have told us that one magical day it will all fall into place and we will experience the ideal state of perfect competition. Like mediaeval priests, the free market thinkers tell the common people to suffer misery now for their place in some future economic heaven. We are told it will all work out in the long run.

The last time we had such a high level of unemployment for such a sustained period was in the 1930s. The orthodox economics of the time would sound familiar to us: cut spending, balance budgets, the market will always return to equilibrium, all will be well in the long run. But then John Maynard Keynes came along. He observed that the only thing in this world we can be truly sure of in the long run is that we will all be dead. He proposed a new theory which argued that the market mechanism is flawed. It does not return to equilibrium: indeed, it tends towards extremes. Equilibrium theory was far too simple a model to apply to a complex world. He argued that government needed to actively manage fundamental macro-economic policy in order to provide enough demand in the economy for full employment. His theories have been perfectly vindicated. In the United States, President Roosevelt followed the Keynesian prescription with his New Deal. Unemployment fell and the ultimate cure for the unemployment of the 1930s was the massive and sustained public expenditure prompted by US involvement in the Second World War.

For 30 years after the Second World War, Keynes' policies were implemented throughout most of the western industrialised world. For those 30 years, we had the long boom, the so-called golden years when unemployment in Australia seldom exceeded 2 per cent, yet the so-called economic rationalists called Keynes a lunatic. His views are considered old fashioned. However, I unashamedly advocate a Keynesian approach and I do so simply because his policy prescriptions worked. How ironic that Keynesian views are criticised for being old fashioned when, in fact, the free market policies of today are far more old fashioned than those of Keynes. The free market policies of today are those that were in vogue in the United States in the 1920s and in Great Britain in the mid nineteenth century. These policies are over 100 years old and have their roots in the philosophies of Adam Smith and David Ricardo. In both cases, they failed. In Britain the free market so undermined its social cohesion that by the First World War the British Government had felt compelled to substantially re-regulate industry again.

The devastating social impact of unrestrained industry was perhaps best illustrated in English literature by the novels of

Charles Dickens. As for the United States in the 1920s, the 'greed is good' free market philosophy produced an overblown stock market which collapsed and ushered in the Great Depression. And what has the free market agenda achieved in our own time? Once again, we see an overblown stock market in the United States which many observers are expecting to slump this year. Other countries which embraced the free market agenda have not blossomed forth with economic prosperity. In both Mexico and Thailand, for example, Governments privatised, deregulated and cut spending only to have their economies dumped by unregulated and fickle financial markets. Brazil and Russia provide two drastic illustrations of the corporate sector, free of almost any effective regulation, leading those nations to social and economic disaster where a majority of the population are left to suffer in abject poverty.

Except for a handful of months in the late 1980s, unemployment in Australia has been above 7 per cent since 1982. The gap between rich and poor grows ever wider. Real wages have dropped through the 1980s and 1990s while net profits have increased in the corporate sector. And here lies a clue as to why economic rationalism has dominated for so long. Despite wrecking the lives of a million Australians and condemning millions more to hardship and insecurity, our high levels of unemployment suit some people very well. Ask the more mercenary and cynical of our corporate chiefs if it suits them to have a dog eat dog work force, with everyone constantly striving to prove themselves for fear of the scrap heap. Ask them if it suits them to have a pool of unemployed as ready replacements for any workers who insist on a greater share of the spoils. Just think of Patrick Stevedores last year and you will have the answer to that.

Through right wing ideology peddlers, through their political representatives currently in Government at both State and Federal level and through the daily press, the economically powerful pump out the so-called rationalist message. At the same time, the message of 'blame the victim' finds growing acceptance among the growing number of disaffected and disenfranchised people. It is as if an elderly Aboriginal woman in central Australia is being blamed for having glaucoma. It is as if the 50 year old factory worker in Mitchell Park has disgraced himself by being retrenched and being unable to find another job. It is as if the teenagers unable to find apprenticeships are somehow to blame, no matter how many dozens of interviews they attend, no matter how many hundreds of applications for employment they make. And, in the latest cruel blow to the dignity of unemployed people, Howard's Liberal Government is now talking about taking away the dole from those who cannot read and write properly.

It is no coincidence that the free market agenda has coincided with the politics of hate. Unfortunately, it is a natural human urge to look for scapegoats in hard times, and the less charitable and less responsible politicians and media operators have made sure that the spotlight is well and truly on the unemployed, the recent migrants and indigenous Australians.

Rarely is the role of corporate and finance sector leaders questioned. I am not saying that they necessarily contribute to our unemployment problem in some sort of conspiracy: mostly, they are just acting out of self interest in pursuit of corporate profits and personal gain. Individually they cannot be judged harshly for that, but collectively these economically powerful chiefs produce policies that lower wages and reduce employment. Individually it is not in their job

description to care for society. For these reasons, I believe in a positive active role for government.

I denounce the free market agenda, which serves only the powerful. I am appalled by the pain that this agenda brings to the great majority of our community who are less than wealthy. History has shown this free market agenda to be a social failure. The free market thinkers have had 20 years to prove their case, and the results show that they have failed. We cannot afford to wait for the perfect market to arrive. Policies to alleviate unemployment will not be effective or sustainable until we reinvigorate the role of government in this State and in this country. If the Liberal Party will not do it, then we will.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): This debate is about employment, but it is not about employment to satisfy political ends, in my mind, and it certainly ought not to be. The debate is about employment, because of the fundamental importance for individual South Australians to have work. Why? It is because, in my very strong view, people who are employed have a great dignity. They have the dignity of contributing to the advancement of their community; they have the great dignity of providing for their family members; and they have the great dignity of bettering themselves. All those lofty features belie people in this Chamber who might have chosen to debate employment using it for their own base political ends.

I say all this very proudly as the child of a man who was brought up during the Depression and who certainly knew great financial hardship in his own family. He was a man who battled all his life, beginning his working life aged 15, one who worked diligently for more than 50 years for one South Australian company, rejoicing in the successes of the company and of his workmates. That is the sort of hard working life, with great dignity, that I seek to provide as a member of the Government for all South Australians who wish it. The Government approaches this debate with the greatest intent of improving our employment situation, and I wish to take this opportunity to outline just a couple of the very positive initiatives that I think will actually help in this area.

There are, of course, a number of different items on the agenda within my portfolio responsibilities that already do have or will have an impact on employment. First and foremost of these initiatives, I believe, is the Liberal Party policy on industrial relations which it took to the last election. An information booklet on this matter, detailing the policy, was recently launched. I believe that the booklet frankly outlines very critical strategies for South Australia that will allow workplaces an increased flexibility to engage more employees. Put simply, it will make South Australia a more competitive place in which to hire, and I believe that it will encourage a greater number of enterprises to view South Australia competitively, hence to make the decision to come to South Australia, to set up shop and thus to employ South Australians.

Employers have identified the unfair dismissal laws as severely restrictive, and an example of this was quoted in an article in the *Advertiser* recently, detailing a retailer who was reluctant to hire any more staff and who instead prefers to provide overtime to existing staff because of the rigidity of the unfair dismissal laws in this State. We hope to overcome that disincentive to employment. But the focus on workplace policy I think ought not to be an 'us versus them' case amongst the stakeholders but should, indeed, be viewed as a

way of increasing flexibility and, more importantly, of providing a competitive advantage for South Australian employers to employ more South Australians. The discussions in the recent jobs workshops demonstrate clearly that there is considerable confusion amongst employers as to the legislative and administrative framework governing the employment of new staff members. The aim of the Government is to reduce these dilemmas so that new staff can and will be employed.

As I have told the House on many occasions, we continue to be one of the beneficiaries of the increasing importance of information technology. I acknowledged in this place last year that for much of the past few years there has been great focus and attention on the large multinationals and their various roles in this State. They continue to be very important, but there are a large number of small South Australian companies that continue to grow dramatically, often from very humble beginnings. They must be encouraged, because they—hopefully soon in South Australia—are, to quote a truism, the firms from which the next Microsoft will grow. I meet on a regular basis with many small Web focused businesses whose target market is the entire world from day one. It is important for us as a Parliament to provide them with the right employment framework.

Obviously, people know about the Morgan and Banks survey that has indicated that in South Australia employers are experiencing a higher level of optimism in relation to employment growth over the next three months. That is very important. Particularly in the IT area, the Morgan and Banks survey indicates an enormous opportunity for South Australians if we do things correctly. I would ask both sides of the Chamber to look at our industrial legislation in that framework. There is a labour shortage in the IT&T industry. Mr Alan Baxter, President of the Australian Information Industry Association, stated last year that the AIIA conservatively estimates the need for 30 000 skilled people each year: that is, 30 000 skilled people could be provided. Anecdotally, only 30 to 40 per cent of that shortage is hands on in the computer programming and immediately computer-interested area. The balance is in various business areas, all backed with some degree of technical skill, business analysis, customer services, marketing and so on.

So, the future is there, and we must ensure that it comes to South Australia. But we need to be mindful that it is likely that this shortage will be exacerbated in Australia as the United States opens up restrictions on visas, and all our highly trained people might well be drawn into the United States vacuum, which has the same sort of numbers.

I am pleased to say that our universities have shown great enthusiasm for developing and presenting a number of courses in conjunction with major companies, particularly those that have well developed education programs and intellectual property which is world's best and which they are willing to share. I acknowledge the Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer process, which basically guarantees people employment the minute they come out with that certificate. In one of my discussions with Mary O'Kane, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, I was informed that 1998 signalled the first year at that university in which the entry scores for a range of IT courses were in many respects higher than they were for entry into medicine, which had long been the benchmark (I am not sure that that was the case in 1968).

What that means is that engineering and computing are now extremely sought after and the marketplace is voting

through its enrolment applications. The Government has put \$900 000 into IT-clever scholarships so that the young people of South Australia are encouraged to stay here to develop their skills, hopefully to then go on and do the intellectual property commercialisation course which has been set up with the university following a visit I made with the university to Austin last year. It is to be hoped that they will go on with their extraordinarily clever ideas and then develop businesses and make them successful.

I am delighted with the response from people in my electorate to the jobs workshop initiative. When I publicised the day upon which the job workshop was to be held in Adelaide I understand that the 1800 number that I circulated was inundated with people interested in contributing ideas to help generate employment. One of the key themes in the jobs workshop in Adelaide included a need to promote a positive image of ourselves in the State, and I call upon the Opposition to stop knocking the good things such as the water industry, which is employing more people and provides a traineeship. I call on the whole of the Parliament to look at re-training. I believe obviously the on costs faced by employers are important—and, indeed, the WorkCover scoping study said that if we do those sorts of things better we can have a \$2 billion annual effect on the South Australian economy. The people want incentives to be provided specifically for exporting and they want incentives for inventors. It is an important issue: we must get it right.

Mr HILL (Kaurana): Before being positive in my contribution I want to talk a little about what is considered to be, I suppose, the attitude problem in South Australia, because there is no doubt that in South Australia at the moment (and this has been the case for some time) there is a very gloomy, negative attitude about our hopes and our future. I believe that this can be connected to the obsession in South Australia over the past eight or nine years with our debt problem. No doubt, the State Bank has a considerable amount to explain on that score and the Labor Party, of course, has guilt and has paid the penalty for that over a number of years. But I believe that the Liberal Party, in running campaigns over the last two elections and running campaigns in this Parliament every day that Parliament sits on the State Bank and on the issue of the debt, has overplayed its hand considerably. Rather than focusing on debts, we should be focusing on assets in South Australia. We should be focusing on the positive, not on the negative. Over on the Government benches, members talk about the Labor Party knocking and talk about how positive we should be, but all the time underneath all that is the idea of debt and what a big problem we have in South Australia. That is the message that gets out into the community all the time. It is a mistake, and members opposite should get over that mistake.

The Government talks about options. Rather, I believe that it should be talking about opportunities, because options is a way of limiting things. The Premier says that we can sell ETSA or we can put up taxes or we can make cuts. They are limited; there are limits. He is talking about options but he should be talking about opportunities. Yesterday we heard about Don Dunstan in great detail, and many members compared him with Playford and Kingston—the three great Premiers of South Australia. They were all men of vision, they were all bold and they all took great initiative, all using the resources of the State, and I believe that that is what we need in South Australia today—a person of vision who is able to take bold initiative and use the resources of the State, not

try to sell off the resources of the State. We need a Premier and a Government that is positive and creative. We need a strong leader who has his or her Party and the public behind him or her, and we do not have that. In South Australia in 1999 the opposite is true. We have a weak, divided Government with limited public support. It has a negative agenda. Its agenda is the sale of assets, obsession with cuts and obsession with closures. So, I have 10 positive suggestions to make to the Government, and I am glad that the Minister for Employment is here to listen to them.

First, the Government should get its act together. Members opposite should unite behind their Leader. If they cannot unite behind that Leader, they should get a new Leader. The public is sick and tired of the struggles within the Liberal Party over leadership. It is a running joke. When I go out into my electorate, people say, 'When will it be finished? When will Olsen and Brown get their act together?' I know that Government members try to say that there are leadership contests within the Labor Party. That is absolute nonsense. The last leadership contest in the Labor Party was in 1967, when Don Dunstan was elected Leader—and that was not knocking over an existing Leader: it was a ballot for a new leadership position. We have a track record of unity on this side. We have a culture of consensus on this side. The people of South Australia need us because they need that unity and they need that consensus, and they are not getting it from this Government.

Secondly, we need to develop a positive agenda based on our strengths, not on our negatives. The Leader of the Opposition suggested a jobs summit to bring all South Australians together to help develop a consensus and get the community behind us. But members opposite refused to do that. They do not want to take the community into their confidence because they do not want to hear what the community is saying, because people in the community do not agree with the Government.

That brings me to my third point. The Government should drop the idea of selling ETSA. The people—the Parliament—do not want it to happen. The Government will not get the Bill through this Parliament. It has now wasted one year on this issue, when it could have been doing positive things for the State—positive things about employment. If there are genuine problems with the risk management issue of ETSA, let us talk about that and let us work out how to do it, but within public ownership. That is what the Parliament wants and that is what the people want. The Government will not get the Bill through this Parliament. Members opposite should stop wasting our time and get on to a positive agenda.

The fourth thing I say to the Government is to be bold. Use the strength of the State to get things done. Do not privatise, do not outsource. Use the strength of the State and, in particular, I am referring to public infrastructure and housing. I believe that the situation regarding housing at the moment is chronic: it is an absolute crisis. The number of people coming into my office who cannot find housing for themselves and their family is growing by the week, and it is because the private rental market, certainly in the southern suburbs, is overcrowded and there is very little public housing. There is a real problem there.

The fifth thing I say to members opposite is that, if they want to spend \$100 million in business welfare, do not give it to back office operations: give it to companies, manufacturers and enterprises that have an export focus. I agree with the Minister for Government Enterprises who said that we should be emphasising export. That is the key to what we should be

doing. The fact that we spend tens of millions of dollars encouraging back office operations to come to South Australia is, I believe, absolutely pathetic. What a puny vision for South Australia—the back office capital of Australia! The real weakness with this idea is that, in 10 or 15 years, the Philippines or Malaysia or somewhere else will be bidding for these same companies. They will have no loyalty to South Australia, because they are just renting offices, anyway, and they will take their offices overseas. We should be investing in export.

Sixthly, this Parliament needs reform—Government operations need reform. I suggest two things to the Government. First, abolish the Legislative Council. It irritates the Liberal Party when it is in Government and it irritates the Labor Party when it is in Government. Let's get rid of it. If you do not want to get rid of it, let's reform it so that it cannot block legislation from the Lower House. You all agree with that, but take it to your Party room and get it to be policy. It is our policy: you do that. The other thing I would say about reforming Government operations is that the Opposition should be given better access to information. It is pathetic how Opposition shadow spokespeople cannot get briefings from departmental officers without spies from ministerial officers being there. If you make us stronger, we will make you stronger.

The seventh point I make is with respect to the issue of education. This Government should invest in education, invention (as the Minister said), training, the arts, science and research. We should truly make South Australia the centre of educational excellence in Australia. We should be a university town. It is talked about all the time: let us do something about it. We should have students coming from all over Australia and from South-East Asia. We should build cheap student housing, attract the best professors here, award scholarships where necessary and really create a culture of learning in this State.

The eighth good idea for the Government is to start attracting talent to South Australia. We have had two really good examples in the past few months. Meryl Tankard, who was absolutely outstanding in her field, had a disagreement with a bunch of bureaucrats. What did the Minister do? She supported the bureaucrats. The Minister should have sacked the bureaucrats and kept Meryl Tankard here. Instead, she is now off in Europe, the whole company is gone and that institution is lost to this State. That is pathetic.

Secondly, with respect to the head of tourism (and I am glad that the Tourism Minister is here), the Minister came in here and praised the Secrets campaign, and yet the next week, or two weeks later, she sacked the creator of that Secrets campaign. We should be attracting talent to this State.

The ninth issue is that we should be investing in regional development. The Leader of the Opposition has talked about the need for enterprise zones. In the southern suburbs we could certainly do with an enterprise zone. The local council is prepared to cooperate; the State Government should be putting in as well. The tenth thing we in South Australia should be doing is creating a sense of excitement. We should be aiming for excellence and trying to be world beaters and world leaders. Average is not good enough.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): In this debate it does help to look back a little as we look forward. Some 20 years ago, when many of us in this Chamber left school, South Australia had a heavy manufacturing base, and the public

sector, banks and insurance companies were the major employers. I remember finishing school at what was the Leaving standard at that stage (what is now equivalent to year 11) and going into the employ of the ANZ Bank, but could have accepted a job at either the Savings Bank of South Australia, as it was at the time, or at Westpac. There were many of us in that situation, with ready made jobs when we left school. It was a time of growth, a time when banks concentrated on service to customers and a time when a lot of those jobs were available. There was a clearly defined job market for school leavers.

As I have indicated, young people entering the work force had a huge choice in what they could do. During that time schools were not required to train young people for jobs. Their training was on the job. When I began work my training started immediately with a two week training course at the ANZ Bank in Grote Street as it was at the time. As a junior in the bank you learnt about all the dockets and everything else that was involved; the bank did the training. The schools were geared to matriculation. Basically, the range of subjects offered in those days included two maths, English, either Latin or French (or German in our school), geography, biology, and a few others. Perhaps 10 subjects in all were offered. Now we have a plethora of subjects offered across schools. Schools did not look to prepare young children for jobs at that stage. The concentration was on reaching Leaving standard, which was suitable for a job in business or that sort of area, or going on with matriculation, which led you to university. So, it was different.

However, things have changed over that period of time. There is now no true, defined market for job leavers. We do not now have a heavy manufacturing base in South Australia as we did then. Our public sector is smaller and technology has decimated labour demands for banks and so on. Look at automatic teller machines: a number of people, myself included, use them on a daily basis rather than lining up for a teller at a bank to access our money. School leavers must now compete with experienced adults for jobs. It is a disadvantage for school leavers because of the fact that the question is: 'Have you got any experience?' Coming out of school they obviously do not have the experience of somebody who has been in the work force and who is looking for a job, so they are at a disadvantage.

I am pleased to say that schools have responded to this challenge and to this changing environment. Schools are now giving students the skills to be competitive in the work force and are providing the State with a skilled work force in response to market demands. The South Australian Government has introduced many vocational education training programs into schools. In 1998, just under 9 000 students in more than 100 schools across the State were involved in education and training programs in the arts, entertainment, automotive, engineering, mining, tourism and hospitality areas—every one of them working hand in hand with local industry.

Let me provide a few numbers in terms of the sorts of courses that were undertaken. In arts, entertainment, sport and recreation, 517 were involved in vocational education training; primary industry, 437; in tourism and hospitality 1 702 students undertook vocational education training in schools; business and clerical, 1 820; and computing, 320—just to name a few. Local businesses, industry, community and training providers have been working in close partnership with schools to manage and coordinate the vocational education training in their regions. Let me provide a few

examples. I know that I have mentioned a couple of these in the House before, but I just want to highlight the work taking place in our schools.

The Australian National Training Authority each year provides \$500 000 to each State to develop a vocational education training project. Twelve months ago the Naracoorte High School received about \$240 000 to develop a vineyard at the school. They did so with a lot of help from an irrigation company at Naracoorte and from BRL Hardy, the wine-makers and vigneron at Naracoorte. They have developed an excellent vineyard that is run by computer technology. They can undertake watering by computer; they can fertilise the vineyard via a drip system; and they have undertaken the latest in technology in terms of using polypropylene posts rather than wooden posts in the vineyard at the same time.

When I spoke to the manager of BRL Hardy and asked, 'How do these young people who have undertaken this course stand in relation to getting a job with your company or any other wine company in terms of vineyard management?', he said, 'They will get a job at the snap of a finger, because they know the technology and the terminology. We can send these young people out into the vineyard and know that they will be able to do the job.' That is an excellent recommendation from BRL Hardy.

Other projects have been undertaken at Loxton High School, which won a grant of about \$240 000 to develop a mobile classroom that will develop vocational education training in the transport industry and in the horticulture industry in the Riverland. Xavier College at Gawler has won a similar sized grant to develop a horticulture program for the Northern Adelaide Plains. In their grant that vocational educational training unit will be available to all schools in the area—not only Xavier students. So, Gawler High School students, Trinity students and Xavier students will be able to make use of that.

In addition, many school based apprenticeships and traineeships are operating. One which has been extremely successful is the Engineering Pathways program run at Hamilton Secondary School and at Millicent High School. When I was at Millicent High School last year I looked at the past five years of this program. Some 200 students have undertaken that program. The technology teacher has actually tracked the students after they have left Millicent High School to see where they have gone: 195 of those 200 students have got jobs—an excellent result.

Other programs include: stable hand track rider at Grant High School; skilled farm worker and animal husbandry studies at Kingston High School, training young people on host farms; irrigation and engineering involving five schools in the Upper South-East; retail, involving K-Mart, Harris Scarfe's and Woolworths; and fishing and seafood involving the Kingston Area School. So, we have a tremendous program in vocational education and training which is really taking off in this State, giving young people face-to-face experience with industry, involving industry in our schools and ensuring that our young people are gaining training at school which is relevant to that industry.

What that highlights—and what OECD statistics have highlighted—is that Australia is behind in terms of training relative to other OECD countries. We have a work force which is not high enough in its standard of training in comparison to other OECD countries. This means that when our young people leave school we have to encourage them to continue on with the training, and that is exactly what is happening, because the TAFE colleges that are signing

memorandum of agreements with our secondary schools are providing results.

As I said in Question Time today, 81 per cent of TAFE graduates are getting jobs compared with 72 per cent nationally; 60 per cent of those people who enter TAFE and who are unemployed are getting jobs at the end of their certificate as against 46.4 per cent nationally. This Government's focus on training and getting young people to start that training in secondary schools is having a definite effect and young people are getting outcomes from that training in terms of employment, and that is the important aspect—the outcomes that eventuate from that training.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I want to offer a constructive contribution on my thoughts on jobs. First, I make the point that this exercise that commenced at about 4 o'clock this afternoon would have to be one of the most ridiculous exercises I have witnessed in my short period as a member of this Parliament. We are having what is called a jobs debate, but all we have heard from members opposite is a simple list of what they have done, what the Government has done and, indeed, what they have contributed to government in the past few years. The only contribution of any merit was the second half of the member for Adelaide's speech when he started to talk about some very innovative ideas for the future.

I find it somewhat distressing that, following the 10 minute contribution by the Minister for Education, I would not have a clue about his vision for the future of our children and young people. Given the very importance of education to the future growth of our State's economy, I would have thought that the Minister for Education could have done a little better than the 10 minute guided Sunday drive he took us on as he mentioned Naracoorte and other parts of the State. If that is the calibre of the Minister for Education in this State, no wonder we have problems.

I say that in the sense that I appreciate that the Minister for Education is a hard working Minister, but we need vision in this State and I would have hoped that, for the past 10 minutes, we might have got a little better from the Minister than we just did get. I also want to point out, to show that this exercise by the Government is a Mickey Mouse exercise, that as a belated response to the Leader of the Opposition's continual call for a jobs summit we had the new, over-excited Employment Minister committing his Government to it until the Premier found out. I think he was overseas at the time. The new and enthusiastic Minister had to do a backflip and we had what were called employment jobs meetings, or something. Talk about Mickey Mouse! People—not many because not too many people went—gave me some feedback and I was told that they were some of the most boring, irrelevant discussion sessions that have taken place. But what did we get from this Government's exercise in job creation? What did the junior enthusiastic Minister for Employment get? What did we get? Lo and behold, tonight it was announced on statewide television that one of the outcomes from the 3 000 ideas that this Government received was that we will have a committee of employment. We will now have something called the Employment Council. After three months of hundreds of meetings, wide consultation and 3 000 suggestions this stunningly brilliant Government forms a committee. I thought that that was about as ordinary as it gets, but I should have known that with this Government it can only get better, because not only do we get a talkfest here tonight to which no-one is listening and not only do we get

a committee but guess what else we get? We get a CD. Every MP has been given a free CD called Jobs Workshops. That will be a number one seller at my local CC Music shop at Port Adelaide tomorrow, I can tell you. What a lot of nonsense that the Government would actually produce a CD!

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The Employment Minister says that I am too illiterate to use it. If the Minister wants to get down and hurl abuse such as that, good luck. I can dish out as good as I receive. I must say that if, after all the efforts, the great, stunning result of John Olsen's leadership on employment and jobs is to have a committee backed up by a CD, it is no wonder our State faces the very difficult future that it does under this Government. Having got that on the record, I would like to add a contribution about my ideas and vision for the future.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: This won't take long.

Mr FOLEY: No, it will take about six minutes, because that is all I am allowed to speak for. In 1992 the then Labor Government decided—and I acknowledge that many members opposite endorsed the then Labor Government's initiative—to engage an international consultancy firm called Arthur D. Little to undertake a report, which was called New Directions for the South Australian Economy. As I said, it was produced in August 1992.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal: And you proceeded to ignore it.

Mr FOLEY: We lost government about a year later; we did not have time to implement a lot of its recommendations.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: We did plenty actually, but this is not about what former Governments have done: this is about the future, Minister, and you just might learn something. The Arthur D. Little report was not without its faults and, in some areas, it lacked substance. However, the importance of the Arthur D. Little report for the time was that it got people talking about the economy and what was needed to stimulate the economy in South Australia. At the end of the day, what Governments must do—Labor or Liberal—and what this Parliament must be about is developing the right economic structure for South Australia, an economy that will grow and offer real jobs in the long run in South Australia.

The reality, which was highlighted by the Arthur D. Little report and which has been commented on by many, is that we are going through a very severe and significant structural reshaping and restructuring of our economy. Tariff walls have come—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: If you were listening, Minister, you would understand that I was using it as an illustration and simply saying that what we are facing in this State is a restructuring of our economy—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The chat across the Chamber will cease. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. The economy is—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Sir, I will give up now. If Graham Gunn wants to keep interjecting in this manner—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY:—give him the call. Sir, do I have the call or does the member for Stuart?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hart has the call and will proceed.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. The important requirement for our economy is that we must get the economy growing, and under this Government, indeed for many years, our economy has not been able to match the national growth targets.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Sir, I did not hear too many Liberal members being constantly interjected upon.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hart has the call.

Mr FOLEY: If members opposite want to set the standard for the rest of the evening, go right ahead.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart has the call.

Mr FOLEY: If you want to set the standard, go right ahead.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The requirement for our economy to restructure is very significant. The point I want to make tonight, in the very few minutes left, is that one of the very significant criticisms of the Arthur D. Little report was that for too long—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I will leave it at that and someone else can take the floor.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage): It is interesting to note that all members of this Parliament were given quite considerable notice that the jobs debate was about to come before the Parliament.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: No, for some considerable months. It was announced and certainly members were notified some time ago that this debate would take place. Of course, the expectation that it would not be a talkfest but that it would bring about some innovative suggestions and bipartisan support has certainly been washed right out of this particular Chamber since members opposite, including the Leader of the Opposition, started the debate this afternoon. In listening to the Leader of the Opposition and his comments, I almost had a sense of *deja vu*. In several areas it was quite surprising and depressing that the Leader of the Opposition was admitting to the fact that he was unaware of some of the programs that this Government has already undertaken to ensure that job opportunities are available for all young South Australians and for many other age groups. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition put on record some of his supposedly innovative suggestions, which were in fact just take-offs of Liberal Government programs that are already out there and working very well.

I wish to correct one of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition when he talked about previous Ministers for Employment who were junior Ministers and not members of Cabinet. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that I, the member for Newland, as I held the portfolio of Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, was a junior Minister. I put on the record that that was totally incorrect. In fact, I was a Cabinet Minister and have been since I was appointed a Minister, and I am still a Cabinet Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: That is exactly right. There was a sense of *deja vu*, in terms of the Leader of the Opposition not being fully *au fait* with some of the programs across the State in which young people can become involved today. It reminds me of conversations I had with leaders of industry

when I was Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. At that time I understood that many of the leaders of industry were unaware of programs that had been very successful for the Government. It was through that understanding that there was obviously a lack of communication that we took to the road and started the employment forums, of which 10 were held across the State. We talked to some 1 000 people, mainly members of small business and leaders of industry across the State. Out of that program we were extremely successful in encouraging industry itself to take a step forward and actually move to put in its own youth employment programs in many areas.

Ms White interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The honourable member interjects in terms of jobs figures. I would be happy to supply the honourable member with jobs figures that came out of that period of time, including traineeships, which unfortunately the Labor Government never took under its wing quite as successfully as it should have. This Government was determined to ensure that every training program it put out would mean there was a job at the end of it. It also meant that, when we trained a young person to have skills in looking for a job opportunity, we were not just training them for the sake of training, as had been happening for many years. It seemed to be quite the successful thing to enable young people to be accepted into a training college to gain a certificate which never took them into a job opportunity.

One of the very determined efforts of this Government was to ensure that every program out there was vetted the whole time it was in operation. If it did not work, it was pulled. On the whole, the majority of these programs did work, but every person who took taxpayers' money to train young people was expected to be accountable for the fact that these young people were trained, given skills and directed into jobs at the end of it. The majority of those training programs run at the time produced 80 per cent of employment.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The Deputy Leader seems to forget that, in terms of the Leader of the Opposition, who stood here and completely lambasted the Government for apparently not doing a great deal, this was exactly the same member who stood here prior to 1993 having just lost, under his leadership, as Minister for Employment, 30 000-odd jobs to this State.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: We can have all the excuses that the Opposition may like to present, but the fact remains that this Government in its short term at this stage, unlike the decade of Labor, has produced more jobs for young people and others in South Australia and certainly we have not got to the point of having lost 30 000 jobs in one year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: It was not long ago that the conventional wisdom that was employment and inflation could not have an inverse relationship. This is no longer the case, and the United States today has proved that it has employment at high levels and inflation runs at a very low 1 per cent. Australia has now produced low inflation, and the Federal Liberal Government is continuing to give serious attention to the other half of the new relationship, which is employment and jobs.

In the Australian tradition, I suggest that we continue to present the attitude that we must pursue full employment. If

that is to occur, the economic reforms to be supported at a national level are four fold: that is, we require strong economic growth, a flexible labour market, the elimination of work disincentives from the welfare system and the elimination of work disincentives from the taxation system. The sooner these policy settings are fully in place, the sooner the State will get an improved response to its efforts to increase jobs, whether in a new industry or in a growing small industry. The social imperative must be an all out attack on poverty and able-bodied welfare as a way of life.

We live in a community where improving job opportunities is considered the best way to go. Labour market experts often point to unemployment being linked to where you live, where you are born, how old you are and, most importantly, to your level of education and training. In most respects, it provides little comfort to be reminded of what you already know and believe. We know that secondary industry often loses jobs as it modernises in line with productivity requirements imposed by competition in a world economy. We know that many rural centres are depopulating as their historical products, for example wool, have provided diminishing returns. We know that new arrivals, for example from the Middle East and Vietnam, suffer high unemployment rates. English language skills are determined to be a significant problem here. Even more distressing is the plight of Aboriginal people who as a group suffer the highest unemployment rates in this nation.

We know that the young—under 20 years—and the older people—over 50 years—are finding it increasingly difficult to find permanent jobs. The young are caught in a rotation between casual jobs and unemployment, and complicating this is the trend of young people over the past five years not to complete their year 12 at school. If there is a single major message for people in the 1990s, it must be to restore experiential forms of learning to their proper status and, clearly, most young people given free choice would not choose academic forms of learning. They have a yearning for what is relevant to their future life, for what produces the challenge of a project, the excitement of something practical and the pleasure of creative participation.

Therefore, I am exceedingly pleased that at last some Government has taken the initiative to bring back what were the technical high schools. Shortly, the Windsor Vocational College will be opening.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Good. I am pleased and I compliment the Minister for Education for bringing it in. It is a good time for you to go to university. Many young people have slipped into this gap over the years, and I am exceedingly pleased to see that this new move, which has been long awaited, is now about to happen, once again under the auspices of this Government. I do not have much time to speak about my passion for literacy. My attitudes are well known in this area.

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

Ms KEY (Hanson): I have not had the benefit of looking at the CD, so I will not comment on it, but I am certainly prepared to keep an open mind on it. However, I refer to the document we received yesterday entitled 'Job Workshop Ideas', about which I will make a couple of comments. The Minister for Employment and the Minister for Government Enterprises referred to the need to re-evaluate and change our unfair dismissal regulations. The justification for this

comment—and I refer particularly to the Minister for Employment—is that industrial legislation, for example unfair dismissal regulations, are a hindrance to small business and need to be reviewed. It has the number 36 after it, so I presume from the report that Minister Brindal gave to us that this issue was raised a number of times. I hope that is what that means, although it is difficult to tell from the document exactly what it does mean. That can be found on page 7.

I also refer the Minister to page 10, which says, 'Make it more difficult for people to work overtime and consider shorter working week', and in brackets is the number 40. If the figure 36 means what I think it does, that is, that it was raised 36 times in the Government forums, I wonder why the Minister did not refer to something that was raised 40 times in the forums. Was the Minister making a political statement or was he setting us up for what we are to receive next week, namely, legislation dealing with industrial relations? I hope that was just a comment from the feedback. On page 34, the report states:

Employers want it simple. Regulations are a complete disincentive—just needs a system of checks and balances to enable the process to be simplified.

Again, that rates 31, but it did not get a mention. I agree that 36 is a high number, but I wonder why those other points were not raised, either by the Minister for Government Enterprises or by the Minister for Employment. Another comment which I will mention can be found on page 59, which says, 'Use retired people as a resource in mentoring and training'. I wonder why that has not been raised by anyone. I might have missed it, but I have listened carefully to the contributions that have been made.

In light of the discussion that we had yesterday honouring the late Don Dunstan, many speakers made a point about his support for the public sector. Rather than repeat some of the contributions that have been made, I should like to refer to what is happening on the job front in the public sector. There is some good news and some bad news, and I will start with the good news. When talking about the public sector, I point out that in June 1998, under the Commissioner for Public Employment, there were 17 administrative units operating under the Public Sector Management Act 1995 and 81 other public sector organisations, and that includes public corporations, statutory bodies established under individual acts of Parliament, organisations that are owned by Government, and organisations that are controlled by Government.

The statistics from midway through last year show that the number of full-time equivalent employees in the South Australian public sector at June 1998 was 77 600.7 or, when counting the persons involved, 91 818 employees. Since June 1997 the work force has shown an increase of 1.6 per cent in full-time equivalents in the Public Service, and I greeted that statistic with some joy because at least that seems to be a positive move for the public sector. However, I found out that the increase is due largely to the increase in the numbers of part-time and casual employees within the public sector itself. Because of the downturn in work possibilities in South Australia, the Public Service has a slightly bigger share in the number of people employed in South Australia. As much as I thought it was good news, it is probably not so good and we really need to look at it.

I then looked at where the increases have occurred, and in Government administration, the defence industry sector and the education sector there have been increases of a reasonable number. That does not count the fiasco that the Education Minister and the Australian Education Union have recently

been through, where they wanted to knock off 1 000 workers from the education sector. Putting that to one side, I decided to look at the agencies where the increases had occurred.

The Attorney-General's Department has had an increase of 34.7 full-time equivalents, which is a 4.2 per cent increase in that department. I am pleased to say that that is a result of the continuing establishment of the native title unit (I hope that is a positive thing), and general recruitment into the Crown Solicitor's Office. I am a bit dubious about whether that is good or bad, but it is certainly an increase in the number of workers.

The next agency is the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, which has had an absolutely fascinating increase of 206.9 full-time equivalents. That 217.1 per cent increase is due to the incorporation of a number of agencies, including the Commissioner for Public Employment, Office of Multicultural and International Affairs, Human Resource Division of the Department for Industrial Affairs, and International Business Division of the Economic Development Authority.

I turn now to the Department of Treasury and Finance, and I am sure that the member for Hart would find this interesting. In that agency there has been an increase of 126.9 full-time equivalents, which is a 29.8 per cent increase. It is predominantly due to the establishment of the Electricity Reform Sales Unit, the budget reform team, the transfer of electorate officers from the former Department of Industrial Affairs, and the restructuring of the superannuation office.

There have been increases in some of the public sector organisations. For example, the Adelaide Convention and Exhibition Centre has had an increase of 30.7 full-time equivalents; the Ambulance Service has had an increase of 70.7 full-time equivalents; the State Theatre Company has had an increase of 19.8 full-time equivalents; and the TAB has had an increase of 77.6 full-time equivalents. That is positive news, that the number of jobs in the public sector are increasing.

However, I also looked at the places where jobs have been lost, and that is what I find of great concern. I am a great supporter of the public sector and I make no apologies for believing that the public sector is crucial in increasing this State's economy. In the electricity, gas and water providers, mainly as a result of targeted voluntary separation packages, there was a 6.2 per cent decrease. In property business services, which includes the Housing Trust, about which we heard from the Minister, in cooperative housing and as a result of the amalgamation of the Mines, Energy, Resources, Research and Development agency into Primary Industries and Resources, there has been a 64.5 per cent decrease in full-time equivalents.

In the cultural and recreational services, which includes the amalgamation of a lot of areas, including Arts SA, and the new super department of Transport, Urban Planning and the Arts, we find a 25.5 per cent decrease in full-time equivalents. In personnel and other services, again through the amalgamation process and through people taking voluntary separation packages, 12.3 per cent of full-time equivalents have gone.

There are a number of areas where we can improve. We need to look at job security. We do not need to kick workers around the head but rather we should look at their job security. We need proper access to full-time work or part-time work with proper *pro rata* entitlements. We need training and retraining. I say that we should bring back the training levy and make sure it is accessible to everybody. We

need to look at the major responsibilities of Government, which include living standards, providing services, regulation, fairness, equity and rights. We need to increase the public sector, shorten the time between people not having jobs (which on average is about 68 weeks), shorten working hours, and appreciate and support people who have to live on the social wage.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I am very pleased to speak on this report and I would like to do so from three different perspectives: that of a local member; that of a former Employment Minister; and that of Tourism Minister responsible for what I believe to be one of the industry sectors that has enormous potential to grow employment in South Australia. The broad industry of travel, tourism and hospitality is clearly one of enormous potential, and it already has a great deal of activity internationally.

I will detail just how immense that is before I focus on some of the specific points relating to the tourism opportunities here in South Australia and some of the results of the jobs workshop that have been conducted by the Minister for Employment. The travel, tourism and hospitality industry, which is predominantly a service industry, has truly boomed in the latter part of the twentieth century as countries have opened their borders, businesses globalise their markets, consumers have used their increased leisure and disposable income, and technology has produced faster and obviously cheaper transport. In fact, in the past 25 years international travel and tourism have grown more than 500 per cent, with most forecasts pointing to a continued growth rate of at least twice as fast as the global GDP. The travel, tourism and hospitality industry, which encompasses transport, accommodation, catering, recreation and travel related services, is actually the world's largest industry and generator of quality jobs. It is estimated to have generated \$US4.4 trillion of economic activity and 231 million jobs world wide in 1998, and it is expected to grow to be worth \$US10 trillion, sustaining 328 million jobs by the year 2010.

Globally we know that these industries are estimated to generate either directly or indirectly one job in every 10.7 and, more importantly, most of those are in small business or in urban or rural areas, where structural economic change has caused some of the greatest social unemployment. We know that the broader tourism industry is also credited with being a major catalyst for world wide construction and manufacturing, with capital investment in travel and tourism amounting to about 10 per cent of total investment capital and infrastructure investments. The great significance of this industry to employment is its human resource intensive nature, as we know, creating many diverse jobs across the full employment spectrum. It is well demonstrated by the fact that some hospitality courses conducted here in South Australia advertise that more than 50 career options are available in our own State.

Tourism also frequently involves other people's money, and therefore it is a major exporter, bringing international visitors to our State and injecting foreign exchange directly into our own economy. During 1997-98 our own State attracted 286 000 international visitors, who spent 4.3 million nights here, and that represented an increase of 10 per cent in visitor numbers and 24 per cent in visitor nights over the previous year. In fact, as our economy has undergone significant structural change, more than 90 per cent of all new jobs created in South Australia over the past 20 years have

come from the service sector such as finance, community services and hospitality and tourism.

Many forecasts show the enormous strategic role in revitalisation played by the tourism industry sector for our own State. Generating an income impact for our own State of about \$2 billion a year and estimated to grow at \$40 million a year, it directly employs about 26 000 people and contributes to the employment of more than 40 000 South Australians. Tourism is obviously one of our most important industries, and I think we should be yelling about it from the rooftops. As the tourism industry enters an era which I confidently expect to be marked by both dynamic growth and stable forward planning, I believe and know that the tourism industry can stand alongside other vital State industries such as manufacturing, mining and retail. Of the expenditure that is generated by tourism, international visits to South Australia are estimated to contribute \$363 million per annum, or 19 per cent of the total expenditure associated with the industry. So, based on this expenditure it is estimated that over 5 000 jobs directly supported by tourism can be attributed to international visitors.

A clear focus of ours is to attract tourists to our major events. We now see that South Australia has a very full calendar of successful and beneficial events and I thank members for their active support of them over the past few months. Events such as the Adelaide Festival are estimated to have generated about \$13 million and created employment opportunities for about 270 full-time equivalents, including some in the operation of the Festival and others in hotels and restaurants. We can also look forward to a couple of important job creating events in the very near future, and they are the Masters Games and up and coming Sensational Adelaide 500. The Masters Games, to be held in September and October, works on the principle that visitors will spend 10 days here in Adelaide, with an estimated economic impact of \$30 million, equivalent to 410 full-time equivalent jobs, and those positions will impact by bringing more people into South Australia. Benson Pacific Corporation has estimated that Sensational Adelaide could generate new expenditure of about \$10.8 million and could create about 240 full-time equivalent jobs.

Out of the thousands of comments that come out of the jobs workshops I have noted that we should develop innovative ideas to attract more tourists to our State, which is exactly what I would say we are doing in the tourism and major event area. As we know, the highly successful Tour Down Under is a perfect example of that, where the Government took a concept, an idea and a risk and made it into a stunningly successful and impressive event, the likes of which has never been staged before here in Australia. It has turned out to be unique and specially South Australian and a huge economic bonanza.

Clearly, the broad tourism, hospitality and events industry is an important and growing industry sector world wide, and here in South Australia it is no different. Our Government is determined to work with the industry to get it to reach its full and vast potential, and I am delighted that the announcements made by the Premier and the Minister for Employment as a result of their jobs workshop program will assist this both directly and indirectly. Upgrading education and training programs to improve skills, productivity and service quality which employees can use to develop their skills and pursue their career paths across the travel and tourism hospitality industry is vital to ensure that an appropriately skilled work force for our burgeoning tourism industry is there when it is

needed. This important approach, combined with a further focus on developing skills and private sector partnerships, is needed across all aspects of the industry.

A number of today's announcements also relate to some of the outstanding employment programs that our Government already operates, the expansion of the Regional Industry Training and Employment program and the huge potential that has and the impact that will have on our regional areas. I also welcome the establishment of the Working Towns program announced by the Premier following the amalgamation of the Community at Work and the Regional Towns programs. Some members may recall that I frequently lauded the Community at Work program. I happen to know the enormous impact and ripple effect it had in areas of regional South Australia. It will be a very positive area that will benefit from some of the enthusiasm that tourism activities generate.

There are many other projects I would like to pursue as Minister for Tourism. However, we do have this little problem, namely, that the Labor Opposition combined with the Democrats will not pass the ETSA sale Bill. Therefore, the huge and valuable infrastructure programs on which most of us would like to spend some of the \$25 million so far have been put on hold. We believe that an important priority is involved in this. I feel quite distressed that the Labor Party will not move and see the benefit that these huge infrastructure programs could have, not just in confidence, optimism and identity for our State, generating huge doses of pride, but also in generating thousands of jobs. Listening to them, I cannot believe that they will not move forward.

Mr CONLON (Elder): To a degree it is a very sad debate, for a number of reasons. The first reason it is a sad debate is that, for those who are suffering the depressing state of unemployment and who have as little hope of achieving a job as they have in the current environment, it will I am sure be of absolutely no comfort to them (and it is sad that it is of no comfort to them) to know that this Chamber is devoting an afternoon and evening to solving or at least discussing their problems.

It is understandable that it will be of little comfort to them, when one attempts to analyse just what it is we are doing here. As far as I can ascertain so far, we are either engaging in some sort of self justification in the way in which we have dealt with the problem, some criticism, or some sort of vague philosophising about it. I do not think that the public and the unemployed will be satisfied with the justifications, impressed with the criticisms or at all interested in the philosophising, which makes me feel a degree of despondency, but I do want to make some observations about this important matter. One of the other things I think very saddening is that I believe the public, if they knew of this debate today, would think not only the things that I have said but that we do not actually really care that we are being hypocritical, and I think that is very sad because I do believe that members on both sides of this Chamber care in different ways about unemployment.

I am a honest man. Therefore, I have to say, grudgingly, a kind thing about the junior Minister responsible for this, given the very limited resources and very limited priority the matter was given. In this and in his other areas he has at least worked assiduously, albeit for little result, and if the rest of his Government and the rest of his more senior colleagues applied themselves in the same way we would have an unspectacular but at least competent Government, and that is

not something we have at the moment. When I say that both sides care, one of the things that I would like to bring out, and I guess I will be engaging in the philosophising side, is the fundamental difference in the way that we care. I do believe that people on the other side care. The problem is, they just do not get it; they do not understand. They care about unemployment as some sort of academic political issue, and they do not understand. And there are a number of reasons why they do not understand.

While I do not claim that we have any monopoly on a more working class background, if you will, one of those reasons is the case that you do not understand because you do not understand what it does to your lives. By and large, on that side of the Chamber your lives have been those of opportunity and choice. You may have suffered unemployment as some sort of temporary place between jobs, but you have always been raised with the expectation that the world is one of opportunity and choice for you and unemployment is something that you may get into but you will get out of.

The second reason why I do not think you get it at all is because of your basic Liberal philosophy, in the ideological and philosophical sense, the philosophy of the individual, your centering on the ability of the individual to make choices and to find their way out of difficulty. You have never been able to see a cooperative view of the world. You have never felt that sense of collective responsibility for those who find themselves unemployed. It is a Liberal philosophy in which you see the individual as being able get out of unemployment and you just do not get the big picture. You do not get the picture of those who are suffering from the dislocative effects of structural change in our economy. You do not understand them. I think you care: you care at an academic level. Some of you are very nice people, but you do not get it. That is why in your Government unemployment will never get the priority it deserves.

The Labor Party, on the other hand has, since its inception in the Colonial Labor Parties in the 1890s, had at the very core of its being the understanding and the desire for every ordinary Australian to have the dignity, the ability to make an income, and security into the future. Because we do understand where we come from, from the trade unions and from the places we come from, we do understand what it is like not to have the belief that you have an opportunity and a choice to get yourself out of your current situation, that you have the privilege of considering it as no more than temporary. For some of the people I have represented in trade unions over the years you have to understand that their job, be it what you would consider small and demeaning, is the most important aspect of their life, of their identity and of their dignity. How often have we heard a conversation that starts with, 'What do you do?' If you do not do anything, it is not real flash.

Those people who are at the bottom of the scale, who are suffering from the dislocative effects of structural change, do not have the luxury of adopting a sort of small 'I' liberal philosophy of the individual being able to trade his or herself out of it with their merits and skills. That is my philosophising. That is the fundamental difference between us. We have had Prime Ministers—who later ratted on us, I must say, during the First World War—Labor Prime Ministers who have known how central employment is to the entire Labor ethos, the ethos of collective responsibility, and who have written books. As I understand it, Billy Hughes wrote a book back in about 1912 about the right for every man to have a job. It has always infused the Labor Party as a central tenet.

To you it is some sort of academic political issue at the side of your economic development or your EDS or your backroom deals, and that is why you have never given it priority. You do not get it; you do not understand it; you just do not have the capacity to do it. That is why we hear the Minister for Tourism—what is it that she finally has that she is not too incompetent to handle? Tourism? That is why we hear her get up, having said all that, and say to us, ‘That is why you have to pass ETSA.’ How many jobs are created by selling ETSA? Goodness, gracious me: it is no wonder they do not believe you out there. It is your obsession with selling ETSA and with debt, and with blaming the Labor Party for the debt, for all your shortcomings in your current Government. It is that obsession that makes it impossible for you to see the things that need to be done in this State.

Of course debt is very important in a balanced economy, but I have to tell you something. Go down to Whitmore Square tonight, take a van and collect 20 homeless men and women, and I will bet you that nearly every one of them is debt free. Debt is part of a balanced economy. If you do not have a growing economy, if you do not have activity in the economy, if you do not have dynamism, if you do not have confidence, getting rid of debt makes no difference; it will not create a single job. Get your mind above it for a while. Stop blaming us for all your problems, and move on.

I do not have much time left, although I could talk about this all night. I can give one personal example of the failure of this Government ever to get its mind above its metaphorical waist. I used to work for the Minister for Immigration when we had leaders in this country about immigration, at a time when we recognised how important it was to our economic wellbeing in this country, before our Prime Minister used it as a shallow political tool to win very cheap, very tacky votes. Back when we recognised how important it was, we devised a business migration scheme. We devised a business migration scheme that was taken up by every State in Australia except one, which was so involved in divisiveness and infighting and its own agenda and its own preoccupations that it did not sign up until a year later. That was South Australia. I can tell you today that, in terms of employment, on our figures after the first year, for every business migrant that scheme created 4.5 jobs.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I cannot tell you. Before 1996, obviously. That is why I say that you cannot give it priority; you do not get it. It is sad, because I think you do care: you are just not capable of it. This is not going to make any difference to your viewpoint, but at least I have got it off my chest.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Industry and Trade): I will not speak for long, but I want to make a few comments in what is an important debate. First, I congratulate Minister Brindal on the way in which he has handled the community consultation process with the jobs workshops, and on the way in which the paper has been developed and distributed to, basically, float ideas about how the community can work in partnership with the Government to look at the way to create more employment within the South Australian community and, indeed, the Australian community generally.

I was not going to comment on any of the speeches from members opposite, because I do not see any point in making this a point scoring exercise in any way, shape or form. But I do, from a personal perspective, take some objection to the assumption that, because one happens to be a Liberal, one somehow comes from a position of privilege or from a family

of privilege and does not understand unemployment. That was the general tenor of the remarks for some of the member for Elder’s contribution. My father started out, essentially, as a wood chopper—an axeman, if you like. His business cleared the Mount Bold reservoir. He left school at 14 and built the business up and employed about 76 people.

I have some objection to the inference that, because he was a Liberal and I happen to be a Liberal, we may come from a position of privilege. In fact, he was a garbage collector immediately prior to entering politics. I just do not believe that the concept holds water that, because you happen to be of a particular philosophy, you are boxed into a certain background. So, I object most strongly to the inference that, because people on this side of the House happen to support a particular philosophy, their families may be of particular privilege. I personally reject that. From my own point of view, I rode a pushbike from Stirling to Adelaide for three years for \$2.10 an hour for a job to put myself through university, and for someone to say that we do not understand employment or how to create employment, I believe, is a ludicrous suggestion.

One of the issues that was raised in the papers distributed by Minister Brindal was the importance of long-term investment in infrastructure for the long-term security of jobs. I believe that one of the key things that Governments can do, in partnership with the private sector, is to invest long-term in infrastructure. There are some good examples of that on the macro scale, if you like. The Adelaide to Darwin railway line is just one example of what would be a good investment in infrastructure. On a less macro scale, if you like, is something such as the cast metals precinct, which the Premier launched in the past six months and which is an example of a Government intervening to provide an infrastructure for an industry so that it can compete on the world market and provide jobs locally. With respect to the Adelaide Airport, the extension of the runway has had obvious benefits to business and, ultimately, the development of the terminal upgrade has obvious benefits. It is those sorts of interventions and partnerships that Government can be involved in with respect to infrastructure that ultimately will provide long-term jobs for South Australians and long-term competitive advantage for South Australian businesses.

I believe that another important investment for long-term job creation and sustainability is the investment in people through the appropriate education structure. The recent announcement of the Centre for Lifelong Learning is just one example of the Government trying to better link industry and education so that the products coming out of the various institutions are more focused on where industry is heading. One of the great challenges for any Government of any philosophy is trying to predict today what industry will need in five or 10 years’ time by way of training. That is one of the difficulties facing all Governments that, obviously, Governments are trying to address.

A micro example of that with respect to a local issue is the announcement of the return, if you like, of trade schools—or call them whatever name you wish: the old Goodwood Tech., as some would remember it. That is an example, in a micro sense, of trying to match skills to industry needs. As someone who comes from a building background, I know how difficult it was, for instance, when I was in the building industry to get wet plasterers. It is still very difficult to get plasterers, and that is just one example of trying to match training skills and education skills to industry needs.

Some of the other ways in which Governments can be involved in helping businesses and helping people with employment are implementing measures such as employment schemes. Probably one of the more successful of late has been the Small Business Employer Incentive Scheme, which scheme has had something like 2 265 approvals over the past 12 to 18 months. That shows just how successful that sort of scheme is, where the Government provides some incentive to help people gain employment in the small business sector—and there is no doubt that further development of the small business sector is something that was brought out very heavily in the course of the workshops. The small business sector is a huge employer, and by freeing it up there is obviously an opportunity there to develop further employment.

Over time, the Government has, essentially, concentrated on a set number of sectors and, more and more, the number of investments, or number of industry attractions has been restricted into certain sectors where the Government believes the South Australian community has a particular competitive advantage, or a future. One example of that, for instance, is Food for the Future, where a program will be undertaken over the next 10 years to increase the exports from \$5 billion to \$15 billion. That is just one example of how we target the various sectors within—

The Hon. M.K. Brindal: You are ahead of your target.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: As the Minister quite rightly points out, we are ahead of our targets at this stage. There are other ways in which communities themselves, in a micro sense, are involved in helping their own in trying to find employment. I cite the example of a committee with which I am involved in Victoria, which is involved in jobs shops, and that is through the service organisation known as Apex. Apex has gone out with the local Chamber of Commerce, the local business groups and the local major employers. They have targeted the long-term unemployed and they have set up a brokerage service. Through the creation of these jobs shops initially in Geelong, then in Ballarat and other places, they are now placing about 400 children a year in each of those communities into local jobs. It is simply a networking service, essentially, through the service clubs and the community groups. They know the local business people, they know which jobs are coming up and they communicate with each other. They simply say, 'If you have four or five jobs at the local Woolworths, or Target, or whatever, here are five or six local children who are looking for a job.' That simple program, with some support from Government—similar to our small business incentive scheme here—is placing hundreds of local children in local jobs, and it has worked very well. I note that similar concepts have been brought out in the papers that I read in relation to the job workshops, and I have already raised this matter with the Minister previously, that maybe it is worth looking at that sort of concept here. There is no doubt that it certainly worked there.

Another aspect is the various mentoring schemes. As the Minister involved in small business, I awarded the prizes for something called Operation Livewire, which is a very good mentoring scheme organised through the Rotary organisation. That, essentially, places young people who have a small business idea and who wish to go into small business with the local business leaders in their own community. They develop a business case for their own small business and the winners are awarded some money to help them kick off their own small business.

So, all those sorts of mentoring projects that are mentioned in the job workshops are out there. I believe that it is a matter of coordinating and building on them. Governments cannot do everything. I believe that there certainly has to be a joint partnership approach. There are very good programs already available to Government and the community but I am not sure whether everyone in the community knows of their availability. I believe that there is some role for Government in picking up some of the schemes and promoting them more and possibly enlarging them, because they are very well run by community groups. The good thing about it is, of course, that there is a partnership approach to it. So, it is not just the companies, it is not just the unemployed, it is not just the Government but there is a real partnership trying to work on providing those people with employment. I again congratulate Minister Brindal and his staff for the job they have done. I look forward to hearing the rest of the debate.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): The Labor Party has prided itself on sensible economic management of the economy, sustained growth, budget surpluses and, of course, it is committed to full employment. We have witnessed a conservative Government which has total disregard for former parliamentary procedures and principles, which has failed the State on State debt reduction, job growth and a growing economy.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I wrote this. Why don't you just sit down and listen. This Government, in every year it has been in office, has overseen an increase in the unemployment rate. In fact, this Government has won the unworthy prize of surpassing Tasmania with the highest youth unemployment rate and the highest unemployment rate in the country.

The best remark we can get from the Minister for Year 2000 Compliance is, 'Who wrote the speech for you?' If this represents the member for Bright's commitment to reducing unemployment, I pity this Government. In its first term this Government promised 20 000 jobs—and it failed. This Government has presided over the largest unemployment rate in the nation. Labor has called for bipartisanship support to tackle the jobs issue. We have asked the Government to involve us so that together we can tackle the largest cancer on our great State—unemployment. When I say that the unemployment rate is a cancer, I mean that it is a cancer which has been festering and growing for the last five years without any treatment. It eats away at the soul of our economy; it eats away at the dignity of people who do not have jobs.

The member for Elder was quite to right to say how important a job is to someone, how much pride and dignity it gives you. It defines who you are. Without work, you really do suffer in our community. It is so important. My father raised me to believe that a man without work is incomplete. We cannot prosper—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Or woman. You are incomplete without work. It is our number one priority. At the last election, Labor Leader Mike Rann said that his Government would make jobs its number one priority. We talked of enterprise zones and of tax relief for small business. This Government is now committed to privatisation of one of the largest employers in South Australia—ETSA. This Government has talked about its program. Today the Premier today talked about how for the last five years the real game plan has been to set up a set of economic figures so that we can now

tackle the unemployment rate—not at the beginning of this Government's term but now. The Government has waited for five years. This reminds me of a five year plan that perhaps even Stalin would not have introduced. The Premier wanted a five year plan, after which we might start to get some real results. The Government has let down the State for the last five years.

To make matters worse, this Premier and this Government have thrown their full support behind a Howard Government plan to introduce a GST. This week we have heard economic experts say that this tax will stifle the fastest growing industry in South Australia—tourism. Economic experts and the Government's own economic advisers have to consider that the GST will adversely impact on tourism, risking retail and hospitality jobs. We have heard the Minister for Employment and the Minister for Tourism talking about tourism creating all these new jobs, but economic experts giving evidence to the Senate committee investigating the GST say that it will stifle growth in tourism, reducing the number of people who travel to Australia and thereby reducing the number of people who will visit South Australia. Yet this Government is committed to a GST.

The greatest danger will be to our young people, who fill the majority of retail and hospitality jobs. With South Australia having the highest youth unemployment rate in the nation, this Premier and his Prime Minister in Canberra, John Howard, will cost South Australians jobs. Why must this Premier, simply because he is ideologically loyal to this job-costing tax, support the idea when he already knows that it will cost vital jobs? We on this side have become the Party not only of the workers but of the largest employer in the country—small business. This Government continues to attack small businesses via the impost of a new tax—a GST—payroll tax and, of course, its push for Sunday trading.

Small business is continually saying that Sunday trading will cripple their businesses, but this Government is deaf to the calls. Only one Party—only one Leader—understands small business and can revive this backbone of our economy. In 1993 John Hewson claimed that 900 000 Australians were employed by small business. He claimed that the Liberal Party and the Coalition were the champion of small business, but this Government has continually attacked small business. At every opportunity, it slowly edges away the market share of small business. It continually falls into the arms of the large multinationals, be it Coles-Myer, Woolworths or Westfield.

A number of small business owners have come to my office protesting that their complaints fall on the deaf ears of Liberal Ministers and Liberal backbenchers because, basically, Government members have forgotten whom they are meant to represent. These small business owners and operators are approaching us, because we are the only ones who will listen to their concerns and who understand that small business is such a huge employer in this State, whether it be in cafes, restaurants or tourism based industries. This Government wants to impose a 15 per cent GST on them. It wants to take away the one trading opportunity where they can compete against larger companies, yet the Government claims to be the champion of small business. Members opposite are nothing but hypocrites.

We in the Opposition have called for a jobs summit to bring together business, union and Government leaders—the best minds South Australia has to offer. In a spirit of bipartisanship, the Minister for Employment embraced the idea, even if it was an Opposition idea, because it would help

bring down the unemployment rate. I congratulate the Minister for that, because I believe that the member for Unley has done a good job as Minister for Employment. I believe that he does care about the unemployment rate. I believe that he does want to tackle it. It is not because he wants to score political points: it is because he believes that we need to do this for the State. But the Minister has a Premier who hijacked the issue from him, taking an Opposition idea and making it his own. Good on him. We have been doing it for ages. I have no problem with the Government taking an opponent's idea and saying, 'That's a good idea; we will make it our own.' What is so evil and wrong with that? If it benefits the community, what is so wrong with that?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The Minister says nothing. If the jobs summit was such a good idea when the Minister first announced it, why did the Premier cut him off at the knee-caps? Why? The Premier called the Minister into Cabinet (when he let him into Cabinet) and said, 'No, this is Mike Rann's idea; we cannot have that; we could not possibly have a jobs summit; we are giving too much credit to the Opposition; we will stifle the debate for the next six months; we will form a committee.' What a great Leader! This Premier has shown, by taking such a stand on these issues, that he is recalcitrant and has an inability to function as a Leader with the best interests of the State in mind. I believe that this Premier has let down this State. I believe that his actions have been grossly improper. I believe that he will be held in contempt by generations to come because of his inaction. I believe that this Government will go down as the worst Government in South Australia's history.

In 1993 the Liberal Government received a beautiful mandate to repair this State, but it became so focused on debt that it has stifled every other attempt. Members of the Liberal Party were so bitterly divided that they could not see the forest for the trees. This Government has wasted five years on infighting and backstabbing rather than getting on with the main game. I do not take pleasure in that. I do not think it is good for the Opposition to have a Government crumbling in front of it because of its personal infighting as it actually hurts our State. If you want good Government, you need good Opposition. But you cannot have good Opposition with bad Government. And this Government is terrible: it is the worst in history.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: You are much worse than we were, Ivan. The backbench is littered with failed Ministers. We had a Deputy Premier who misled the Parliament; we have a Minister for Year 2000 Compliance; we have the Employment Minister outside Cabinet.

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

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Year 2000 Compliance): During the debate, speakers on this side have referred to broad State programs, to opportunities for the future. That is what I hoped we would hear tonight from the Opposition. Regrettably, the member for Peake has been no exception. We have heard nothing but negative whingeing, carping, knocking and bashing.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member interjects that I always say that. Regrettably, it is because it is always true. You had an opportunity as an Opposition to positively and constructively contribute to this debate. There

have been, in part, some exceptions but, in the main all we have heard is destructive knocking, carping and whingeing.

As part of my contribution tonight, it is my intent to, first, focus on part of my own electorate, namely, the suburbs of Hallett Cove, Sheidow Park and Trott Park and, in doing so, I will illustrate to the House how work that has occurred for those suburbs is about to be put to the advantage, I believe ultimately, of others throughout the State. The three suburbs that I mentioned are particularly important in terms of examining youth unemployment because not only do those suburbs have a significant proportion of young people but, as those young people continue to grow and are added to, we find that the suburb has a considerable percentage of people about to enter the job market.

By way of illustration, the 1996 census tells us that in that year 19 per cent of the residents of the suburb of Hallett Cove were aged between five and 14 years—2 162 youngsters, in fact. Of course, those youths are now aged between eight and 17 years, with a considerable number determining what their future will be and preparing to enter the work force. Similarly, in the suburb of Trott Park, 20.7 per cent of residents are aged between five and 14 (620 youngsters); and, in Sheidow Park, 21.2 per cent of residents are aged between five and 14 (729 youths). As I said, three years on this group is now aged between eight and 17 years. Therefore, it has been important to ensure that constructive youth programs are in place in those suburbs, as well as options and alternatives, to assist their entering the jobs market and examining their options for the future.

Much of tonight's debate has focused on the high standard of tertiary courses that are available for people entering the training and jobs markets. Indeed, fine tertiary courses and also fine certificate courses are provided through further education institutions, such as TAFE. However, there are those who fall out of that net. They are not sure that they want to go to university; they are not sure that they want to undertake a TAFE course; they are really not sure what they want to do; and so they finish up joining the unemployment queue.

Last year I had the privilege of seeing the results of a special program undertaken by 12 unemployed young people at Hallett Cove. The program was run by the Hallett Cove Youth Project and was funded through Employment SA. The program, over 13 weeks, had amazing results. It was effectively an introduction to information technology, being titled Information Technology Bridging Program. The course took young people through the basics of computing, including an introduction to the PC; how to use Windows 95, Office 97, the Internet and e-mail. It also included a range of job seeking activities to encourage students to enhance their communication skills to give them more confidence and to improve their presentation skills.

The program provided the students with 10 accredited modules through the Onkaparinga Institute of TAFE and totalled 265 hours of study. I am pleased to report to the House that all those 12 young people successfully completed the modules. I would like to share with the House the words of their instructor who, after the completion of the course, said:

During this course I have observed these students going through many changes. Some have rediscovered themselves; some have gained a whole new confidence in themselves. They have all made good friends. They have all successfully achieved competence in 10 accredited modules through the Onkaparinga Institute of TAFE. They have shown respect and consideration toward myself and the Hallett Cove Youth Project staff and environment, and they have

learned how to apply themselves to a very worthwhile cause—their future.

I took particular heart from the comments made by some of those students at the end of their course. To give examples, I place on the record, without attributing names to the students, some of the comments they made. One student said, 'I found the course excellent as it gave me back the confidence to look for work again.' Another said, 'I now feel confident using computers whereas before I did the course I would not have even have approached a computer out of fear.' Another student said, 'I felt that I gained a lot of self-confidence and learned a lot about computers and working in a team.'

We all know there can be many feel good courses that people will undertake and, at the end, they do not have the result, and the result, obviously, in this instance is not only giving young people confidence but getting them into either the employment market or training. I am pleased to report that this course had some extraordinary results. Bearing in mind that the course was undertaken at the end of last year—and I had the privilege of presenting certificates to the students at the end of last year—I am happy to report that as of two weeks ago, of those 12 students, two now have full-time employment; three have traineeships; one has part-time employment with part-time study; four are undertaking full-time further study, including one undertaking software engineering as a tertiary course (and I am delighted to see that student follow that path); and two are still seeking employment.

That is an extraordinary result in just a few weeks from a truly unique program. The question could then be asked: where to from here? For this particular reason, I would like to commend, first, the Minister for Employment and, secondly, the Premier for the program that he announced today. Today the Premier announced the Youth Pathways program, which will provide alternative education for young people in southern Adelaide. Principally, that program, as a pilot in the first instance, I am absolutely delighted to say, while being administered by the Department for Education, Training and Employment, will be delivered by the Hallett Cove Youth Project, which I have just mentioned, in the Hallett Cove area.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The Minister indicates that I drew attention to it initially. I am pleased to say that, yes, while I did, the credit for the program must go to the people involved—the Hallett Cove Youth Project—for the effort they put into it, and also to the Minister, his department and the staff for assisting in funding and development of this course. I believe that this pilot program can be a real trail-blazer for the whole State, because it is providing an opportunity for those students who are falling through the cracks—those who are not fitting neatly into the jobs market from school or to further study from school. They are direction-less and aimless, and they need help in finding themselves.

That 13 week course had such a marvellous outcome for that small group of 12 students. I am quite confident that the application of this course, through the Youth Pathways Program, will have similar benefits. It is a fabulous partnership with the Onkaparinga Institute of TAFE and the youth project. The Minister and the Premier deserve full credit for being prepared to take it on as a pilot, and I look forward to seeing it expanded. As an advocate of technology as opportunity, I look forward to other programs picking up other

opportunities for technology. There is no doubt that the future employment growth in this State in the field of technology is without limit.

There is no limit to the application of the human mind to technology, excellence, advancement and achievement. That is employment generating and, as a Government, we have achieved much in this area. We can achieve a lot more. We have achieved perhaps 5 per cent of the total that we can achieve. I would encourage all members of the Parliament to embrace technology and its opportunities and to advocate the opportunities in technology as we move the State forward. I, for my part, either behind the scenes or up front, will continue to advocate technology as a huge solution to a big portion of our unemployment problem in this State.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I am very pleased that tonight we have a jobs debate, because there is a lack of jobs but there is certainly no lack of work that needs to be undertaken in our community. To some extent, the challenge is to match the work that needs to be done with the people who are available to do it. There is much work that needs to be done in my electorate of Reynell. People are living in poverty. Every day people are battling to be able to get up and dress themselves—sometimes to get their children to school. There are jobs in helping them.

Environmental degradation needs to be addressed along with the whole process of building a stronger community. There is plenty of work to be done and plenty of people in Reynell able to do it. Many are doing much of it now on a voluntary basis, but this does not pay the mortgage or give the same sense of dignity and self worth as does a paid job.

In my contribution I will speak mainly about issues for the south, particularly for Reynell. I was pleased to note that the Premier announced a Youth Pathways initiative for the southern region, but only for 15 people so far and there are thousands of people in Reynell who need that help, so I hope it is coming very soon. Across the City of Onkaparinga the unemployment rate is generally in line with that of the State, but there are significant variations within that, both by age group and location. It is important that we look at just who is unemployed rather than think of unemployed people as a number on a scratch pad.

The City of Onkaparinga has produced a statistical bulletin that enables its employment initiatives to be directed where they are most needed. I commend the city both on the production of the comprehensive bulletin and on the many initiatives they are undertaking. They are providing a model in looking at who needs the help, when and where, that this State Government could well follow and that the Labor Opposition in the program it has put forward has followed.

The 1996 census showed that 92 771 people were unemployed in the City of Onkaparinga. The breakdown by age showed unemployment percentages as follows: 15 to 19 years, 22.1 per cent; 20 to 24 years, 17.5 per cent; 25 to 34 years, 10.7 per cent; 35 to 44 years, 7.1 per cent; 45 to 54 years, 6.8 per cent; and 55 to 64 years rose to a horrible 14.6 per cent of the work force unemployed. I note as I go around door knocking and meeting some of these people that the older people are so often ignored in our quest to develop jobs. They are often people who have given their life to building this country. Many left their homeland in order to come here and meet our needs. An incredible number of them are carrying workplace injuries. They have been paid out and now have nowhere to go. Their sense of dignity and self-worth is absolutely destroyed. We have to look at programs

that will support them as well as supporting our young people.

An analysis of the youth figures illustrates the locational variation. At a time when the metropolitan average youth unemployment rate was 18.53 per cent, in the City of Onkaparinga the variations were from 11.05 per cent in Clarendon to 34.4 per cent in Aldinga—a scandalous rate. In my electorate of Reynell the suburbs of Christie Downs and Hackham West had unemployment rates around 30 per cent, with Morphett Vale—the largest suburb in the State (therefore any figure for Morphett Vale conceals a massive variation)—having 18.59 per cent, slightly above the city average. It was against that background that many people from the City of Onkaparinga came to the jobs workshop.

They identified barriers to their being able to get or provide jobs and came up with key ideas about what was needed. The barriers included the way the employed people are working longer hours. Again it refers to the work being there; it is the jobs that are not. They all knew people working 70 to 80 hours a week for pay that notionally should relate to a 35 or 40 hour week. In small business it does not matter whether it is 35 or 40 hours, you just keep on working and there are many small business people in Reynell.

They also criticised the use of labour hire firms and looked at the way that prevented people from being able to get mortgages or loans. If you only have a job for a three, six or nine month contract you cannot get a loan. You are therefore not buying a house, car or furniture and thus stimulating the economy and buying many of the things produced in the south.

The issue of job security was also seen as a major barrier and the proposed industrial relations legislation will simply alarm these participants even more. Again they saw that you need to be confident that your job is there and not feel that you will be subject to dismissal at any time that you displease the boss. If you are to make decisions of investing in your long-term assets, including your long-term learning, if you are going to incur the onus of HECS fees, you want to be sure you can pay for them and that your job is there.

Enough of the barriers. I move to two key suggestions: first, the establishment of a job bank to assist small businesses that need extra employees but do not have enough work for one full-time staff member. Something along the lines of the group training scheme was suggested and something that would enable small businesses to get some assistance in identifying how they can package together a part-time job that makes sense and where people are not put at risk of injury through lack of experience on the job. The second proposal was closely linked. Again it related to practical support for small business to make it easier to employ people. The types of initiatives here included assistance with the paperwork, with looking at the health and safety issues, in looking at how to define a job and at what might be a useful program of introduction to the work force with the training component required, whether it be on or off the job.

People also saw a need to better integrate the social support systems and intermittent work force experience. They saw that many people had access to one or two days work a week, but the difficulties of managing this and their social security benefits often meant that they did not take that work and therefore missed out on the opportunity to enter more secure employment through the experience they gained. In South Australia we have a responsibility here too for the people who are tenants of the Housing Trust. When they earn

some money their rent goes up, so they see this as an additional disincentive to their taking work.

They were also concerned about the brain drain from South Australia and saw things like the water contract outsourcing and the possible sale of ETSA as signals that we in South Australia are not good enough to be able to manage our own resources. Comments in my work group were made such as, 'We have managed our water for years—why do we need to bring in foreigners now in order to manage our water?' 'We have been exporting water services for years—why can't we keep on doing it ourselves?'

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

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): When I looked at the subject of this debate about the job workshop the first thing that came to my mind was 'talkfest'. To be quite honest, I am not too sure that that thought has not been reinforced as the debate has gone on. Nevertheless, I will contribute to the talkfest and my contribution may be no grander than anybody else's contribution. There are serious problems in South Australia. I suggest that these serious problems are no different from those that have been addressed by Governments for many years.

We certainly have a higher unemployment rate now, and have had over recent times, than we have experienced for many years, but the answers do not lie in some new system or in some new approach. The answers lie in looking at employment and unemployment and going back through history to see how they have been tackled in the past. We must learn from history, both the good things and the bad things that have been done.

We in South Australia can look at the role that Sir Thomas Playford played in moving this State from an agrarian-based economy to a manufacturing-based economy. How did he get industries such as Holden's, the Whyalla steelworks and shipyards, British Tubemills, Chrysler, and the whitegoods manufacturing industries into this State? How did he bring together the necessary inputs for those industries, that is, capital, land and raw materials? It depended on a good freight network to bring materials to the manufacturing centres. There had to be energy, power, electricity, gas and, last but not least, a skilled work force. That is probably one of the big factors that allowed Sir Thomas Playford to bring South Australia into the twentieth century.

One of the mistakes that Governments have made in recent times is to give handouts to specific industries, indeed, to specific companies, where the role of Government should be to provide the infrastructure and the environment where companies can flourish of their own accord. What we have to maintain in South Australia is the natural cost advantage that we have had for many years. That is understood by everybody here tonight, but we do not have the commitment to maintaining that cost advantage. We do not have the commitment to ensuring that Government charges do not militate against employment.

As an example I mention business licensing fees. We have licences for a plethora of things to regulate business, and instead of individual businesses having to go to the various Government agencies to fill out application forms for a whole range of licences, why do we not have one application form which has a box for each different licence? We could have one application form that contains all the information about the different licences. The businesses can go through the form, tick the licences they need, fill out the appropriate

information, and put it in one envelope with one cheque with the expectation that in a few weeks time they will have their licences, rather than having to chase around and be chased around.

One of the things that came out of yesterday's Cramond report was the interaction between various Government agencies, and there was an acknowledgment in that report of the jealousy between Government agencies and of a lack of teamwork. There was an acknowledgment of the competition between the bureaucrats in those agencies. If we are to do something in a bipartisan way—and that is one word that has been overused tonight—as a Parliament we should tackle that problem, because that is one way that we can move on and do something positive for unemployment in this State.

I have addressed a number of initiatives before in this Chamber, which I will briefly reiterate. I believe that information technology can be used to move production or work out of the metropolitan area into regional areas where the costs are lower. The costs of providing housing for the skilled work force and the costs of providing work sites are much lower in regional areas than they are in the central business district of Adelaide. It has been demonstrated today that it is possible in at least two areas.

The Minister for Emergency Services in answering a question today referred to the placement of the Emergency Services call-out centre at Mount Barker rather than in the centre of Adelaide. In a committee meeting this morning, I heard that the Transport SA control centre for the Southern Expressway is at Norwood, where the metropolitan transport control centre is located. We do not need to put all the Government services in the central business district of Adelaide; we can move them out. The term is devolution, and through devolution we can move people and the economy away from the centre of Adelaide.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I just gave a couple, but there are lots of them that do not need to be in Adelaide. Because of time constraints I will not go through them now. I am often told by people, especially people outside South Australia, that we should not write off what South Australians are already doing in a blind rush to attract new businesses and new industries. We have considerable expertise in this State already and we should build on that expertise and build industry and employment around what we already do very well. We should not try to reinvent the wheel; rather we should place a pneumatic tyre on the wheel to make it more efficient.

We are very good at forestry and converting forest products into value-added timber products. The Federal Government is moving to increase the area of plantation forest by a factor of three between now and the year 2020. We in this nation are net importers of forest products to the tune of about \$1.5 billion a year. Currently in the South-East of this State about 4 000 people are directly employed in the forestry and value-added industries and I do not see why it would be difficult to expand that to 10 000 people. However, there are disincentives, and one of those is the Native Vegetation Act. Instead of planting new forests in South Australia, growers go across the border into Victoria, which does not have the rigorous native vegetation controls that we have in South Australia.

Victoria also does not have a problem with water allocation policy like we do, and growers are free to plant forests in that State. Mark my words, the next time there is major investment in that part of Australia in milling, value-adding technology and value-adding production, it will be in

Victoria, because that is where all the new forests are being planted at a much greater rate than we are because of direct Government intervention.

There is considerable disquiet in my electorate about the proposal to declare marine parks all along our coastline. We have a strong and viable fishing industry, and I can assure the House that the fishermen down in my part of the world are not very happy about proposals to lock up large sections of our coastline, given the effects that would have on their industry. The environmental controls in this State more often than not create a lose-lose situation, but there are plenty of examples where we can have a win-win situation.

Last weekend I had the pleasure to be at Banrock Station for the launch of the wine and wetlands centre along the Murray River upstream of Waikerie. That is a prime example of industry doing something very positive about the environment, and we should take up that point and have a serious look at what we do with the environment and the lose-lose scenarios that often eventuate.

Governments for many years have ignored the rural industries in South Australia. Today we have about 12 500 farmers, but we are losing 400 a year, and that has been going on for years. If a major industry employing 1 000 people in Adelaide looked like it was about to close, there would be a huge public outcry and an instant knee-jerk reaction from the Government in power, no matter what political persuasion. That is happening to our primary industry sector, and the Government's response—

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I move:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr De LAINE (Price): Our Labor Leader, Mike Rann, has been calling on the Government for several years to conduct a jobs summit, a mechanism to draw all agencies and people together as a giant think tank to make a major concerted effort on unemployment in this State. This offer by the Leader of the Opposition has been ignored by the Premier and his Government to a large extent. However, I congratulate the Government on setting up and conducting the recent jobs workshops around the State. The information and ideas which these workshops generated will prove very useful as a base from which to start a process of investigating some new and innovative ideas to reduce our appalling level of unemployment. Some of the ideas from the workshops are pie in the sky stuff, but others are certainly worthy of further investigation and perhaps extension into worthwhile initiatives to expand our States' economy. I believe that the ideas contained in the jobs workshops report would act as a good base reference for a jobs summit. In other words, Labor's idea of a jobs summit is still required to further refine and develop new concepts.

In early December I attended a Regional Development Task Force public forum in Mount Barker, and the member for Flinders was on that task force. I sat through the whole day in the public consultation process and I was very impressed with the submissions presented to the task force. There were many good oral submissions from the region, including Kangaroo Island, but I thought one oral submission

was excellent. This submission was given by Mr Neville Salmon, who identified himself as an innovation researcher.

I believe that small business is the backbone of our State and indeed our nation and that Governments at all levels must do a lot more to support and assist small business generally. This is where the jobs are. Governments tend to look at and listen to the big companies, which sometimes need a lot of Government funding assistance, perhaps in the order of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars to set up and provide perhaps 100 to 300 jobs. This is fine but, especially after listening to Mr Salmon, I am sure that Governments can inject money into assisting innovative ideas and create a lot more jobs in total. They may involve small business enterprises which employ between one and 20 people but overall, for a small outlay in my view, many more jobs can be created in niche markets than in relation to some of the big amounts that are needed to try to give incentives for the big businesses to set up and come here from interstate or overseas.

I thought Mr Salmon presented a very good submission. He backed it up with a written submission which I have not seen, but I hope that the task force and the Government will look closely at his written submission, where he gave a lot of detailed information on how he believed some of these innovative ideas and concepts should be initiated and run. He started his submission by saying that to prosper we must innovate. I certainly believe in that saying. He went on to speak about the need for the Government to fund or perhaps in other ways to assist people with innovative ideas in start-up ventures. I was most impressed with Mr Salmon's submission and believe that, with small amounts of Government investment in dollar terms, significant job opportunities can be created. These small businesses employing from one to 20 people can be set up at very low cost compared with the large amounts of money Governments sometimes need to inject into attracting large companies to the State.

Mr Salmon outlined various examples of innovative projects, some for the provision of services and the manufacture of goods in niche markets. These innovative projects create jobs and wealth for our State. They cannot get off the ground initially, because there is lack of funding. Sometimes not even funding is needed but perhaps assistance with knowledge to set up and market some of these products and services. He gave examples of some of the products and services which were very well thought out and which would no doubt be successful but which just needed a bit of a kick start in terms of knowledge or funding. Sometimes the funding needed to start these initiatives was only of the order of hundreds of dollars; sometimes it was a few thousand and very rarely it was \$5 000 or \$10 000. He had a breakdown of the potential of these initiatives, showing the amount of money and assistance needed to start them off and get them going; the gestation period for getting a certain innovative idea into production; the marketing of that product, locally at first and then expanding the markets by going interstate, which would then employ more people; and then, if the product was wanted, the overseas export markets. Again, there were projected figures to indicate how many jobs these three stages of development of a certain innovative idea would create.

I was very impressed with Mr Salmon's arguments and the way they were put up, and I am sure that, if the State Government were to take those ideas seriously—and I hope it does—we could create many hundreds if not thousands of jobs from some of these brilliant innovative ideas that South Australian people have. I must add that South Australia has

a very strong record of innovative ideas, and there have been many inventions by South Australian people over the years. These people just need a bit of a kick start, and this is where Government needs to come in. I thought his ideas were excellent. He provided a written submission outlining his views on how to implement these initiatives, and I hope that the Government will take these submissions seriously and come up with some good mechanisms to assist these people.

Mr Salmon said he had been to State Government departments and agencies, including the Centre for Manufacturing, the EPA and a lot of other agencies and, although they were keen to assist, they said they had no funds to do so. In general, he said, the State Government told him that the concepts were not advanced enough for funding yet, when he went to the Federal Government, it said they were too advanced. So, these initiatives often fell between the two: for one they were not advanced enough to attract development funding and for the other they were too advanced.

Another problem that Mr Salmon raised was that, if people cannot get funding, they seek assistance by approaching private sector businesses. The danger with that is that the private sector sees some merit in their ideas and take them on. Then, over a period of time as they develop those products, they gradually take over the ideas and eventually freeze out the innovator altogether. The person who has come up with the idea and done all the hard work gets pushed out into the cold and gets nothing out of it. He emphasised that, in tandem with this sort of assistance and funding, if these people seek private assistance, some protection is needed for their intellectual property and ideas. I feel that this is an extremely good concept and with very little input from Governments will create enormous opportunities for jobs and for bringing wealth into South Australia.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): First, I would like to put on the public record how much I appreciate the genuine efforts of the Hon. Mark Brindal, Minister for Employment, to get around the community and work with the community to further develop opportunities for serious job creation. Having said that, tonight I want to speak as a local member as to how I see opportunities for creating jobs. I have always been very proud and pleased that, prior to coming into this Parliament, I was directly able to be involved in creating real jobs as a farmer and in small business. I feel that I have some understanding of some of the impediments that cause problems and concern when it comes to job creation.

Most members in this House would agree that the Federal Government has a major role to play when it comes to job creation but, at the end of the day, no Government, no individual and no private industry working alone can create real jobs for Australia. It has to be a team approach and a partnership. In highlighting that, I would like to say that I believe one area in which the State can make a big difference when it comes to job creation is by all political Parties in this State sitting down, taking the politics right out of some key issues and being very serious about what we need to do to fix the concerns in this State. I am not going to put blame anywhere: I simply say that we have some crucial issues that need to be addressed.

It is a fact that we have a major core debt and a major recurrent debt problem. It is a fact that there has been a culture developed in South Australia for far too long that is anti-development. It is a fact that, when you look at industrial issues, particularly when helping to create jobs for young

people, we might need to take a different direction, and I will talk about that in a moment. Frankly, the flashing lights are out there when it comes to ETSA, the current value of ETSA and the potential reduction in the value of ETSA over a five to seven year period that could at the end of the day see ETSA being devalued, and that is a net equity devaluation of a real asset that can be at any time cashed in to the equivalent of what was lost in the State Bank debacle—and I am talking about \$2 billion to \$3 billion.

The serious way in which South Australia could actually get things going would simply be for the Leader of the Opposition to sit down with our Premier and agree that these four or five key issues are issues that will help to get this State going; that those issues will be addressed and supported on a bipartisan basis; and that where we make mistakes or where we do good things as a Government with all the other issues, then bring the politics into it. If we could actually get that one agreement and treat it a little bit like the war Cabinets of the First World War and the Second World War, we would go a long way to fixing the problems in this State. I throw down the gauntlet to every member of Parliament and the community to put pressure on the leaders to ensure that this sort of thing can happen and that we can sit down and agree that these are State issues and that they are above Party politics. That is the big picture, where I think we can see the real opportunities occurring.

All of a sudden we could see a situation where between \$1.6 million and \$2 million a day could be freed up to help create additional real jobs and take imposts off small business, particularly, which a Liberal Government has a commitment to try to support. I note in a bipartisan way the comments of the member for Price, who also highlighted the issues around small business. We are all aware of them. We need some head room and the only way we can get that head room is to reduce the debt.

I was not fortunate enough to be born into a rich family but I was fortunate in being born at a time when cadetships were around. With all the programs that I have seen put in place, some of which have been very good, I have not seen a genuine cadetship such as we used to know, with the banks and stock firms and all those industry sectors in the past. That cadetship gave me the opportunity of earning a small income and also put me through college and allowed me to get the additional education I needed to stand on my own two feet. I believe that we need to go back into the past with this one (because it did work), have a good close look at cadetships and encourage those genuine cadetship partnerships between the Government and the private sector.

Work experience is another very valuable way in which we can get people job ready and give them a chance to understand where they should be positioning themselves for the workplace. Having taken on many work experience students myself, I know that, unfortunately, there is no assistance whatsoever from Government when it comes to that issue. If there was a little bit of assistance and encouragement, it would help.

In relation to intelligence as to where the future jobs are, a lot more is happening in that area at the moment but more needs to be done. There needs to be more transparency between those people in the senior parts of the employment areas of this State, in Government departments, in getting the message right down through to middle school and upper years of high school that this is where the opportunities for jobs are, and encouraging those people to track their courses into those specific jobs. As an example, electronics engineers are clearly

needed at the moment, as are speech pathologists. In a few years we will need teachers because of the situation changing, but how are we getting that message to young people and how are we getting them to track their education properly? There is room for improvement there.

As to planning issues, one of the biggest things that I see over and above this negative development culture that has been built up for too long in this State is that, at the local level, the planning issues, the planning Acts and the planning assessment reports are too inflexible and far too longwinded in getting approvals through and being able to let people who want to invest know whether or not a particular parcel of land can do the job for them. I have witnessed thousands of jobs being lost over the past 10 or 15 years as a result of planning issues. Whilst efforts have been made to improve that situation, we still need to do a lot more, as does local government. I hope that the message will finally get through to local government that the most important job it can do is to help free up this issue of planning.

In terms of further value adding, we can look to Food for the Future as a classic example. The core of this State is agriculture; the core of this State has always been agriculture; and the core of this State will continue to be agriculture. People are going to get hungrier. We will be short on land for agriculture. We should be looking at more research and development money being channelled in from Government, an area in which I am critical of the Federal Government, particularly: it is not putting enough money into research and development, particularly in food and those sorts of areas. If we can fully value add what we do, and we do it very well, including in industry and manufacturing, clearly we can keep a lot more jobs in this State.

As to the issue of large business support and small business support, it is easy to throw down the political gauntlet and say that a Government looks after only big business and not small business. That is not right, but we have to get one thing into perspective: we have to be prepared to look after both the large and the small businesses and encourage more of a core group of large businesses to come into this State because, by virtue of their major capital investments and major work force employment opportunities, that then filters down into the small businesses, which can piggyback on the back of those big businesses and further enlarge or create new small businesses.

I do not want to speak for much longer tonight. I could talk on job creation for hours and hours, but the bottom line is this: I believe that, if you look tomorrow at the points I have raised, and if we are very serious about them—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I appreciate the member for Hammond's listening to this debate tonight so that he will not need to read it in the morning. But the bottom line is that, if you look at what I have said, particularly regarding the first issue, and if once and for all we agree to take the politics right out of this and say that these are four fundamental issues in the best interests of all South Australians, we will get on as a Parliament and do these things together. I can assure you that we would then get the debt down, that we would get the head room that this Government has been trying to create for five or six years and, at the end of the day, we would be able to create some real jobs and opportunities.

I finish by saying that, if the Leader of the Opposition will not sit down and agree to support these four key, fundamental planks for recovery in this State with our Premier, nothing

else that comes around that is warm and fuzzy or plays around the edges will create any real jobs or give this State a future, and we will continue to battle to lift up from where we came from back in the dim, dark 1993 era.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): In the northern suburbs of Adelaide, where my electorate is, we have a youth unemployment rate well over the State average, of 31 per cent, and we have an overall unemployment rate of 12.8 per cent, as of August 1998. Every day the issues, the hopelessness, the alienation, the despair and the wasted resources are brought home to me, and I am sure it is the same story for all of us in this House.

I have done some thinking, and these are my suggestions—and the Government members are the people who are in power and who have the responsibility to put this into action. First, we need to return to a community wide view that our most valuable assets are our citizens, that is, our families, their children and individuals, who all wish to contribute to the welfare of South Australia. I believe that that is the case. We need to acknowledge that all people, particularly unemployed people, should be valued and treated with the same respect and it needs to be understood that they should have the same rights and potential as others. They should not be treated as losers (as they are now often referred to by some sections of our community) and something which Governments, by their blame the victim rhetoric, encourage and inflame. So, the first point is to return to a community wide view that our most valuable assets are our citizens.

Secondly (and this point has been made before but I believe it is extremely important), the Government needs to move away from the narrow focus that it has had since it was elected in 1993 of debt reduction being its prime consideration. It needs to take a more balanced view and think in a broader, more holistic manner about what South Australia and South Australians need and want. The very focused debt reduction approach has meant that there has been a restriction in thinking, there has been a mentality of cutting, cutting, cutting, and it has cut out any ability for creative thinking and problem solving in the way that we need to do to lift ourselves out of this situation. I noted with interest that even Cliff Walsh said the same thing in the paper a couple of days ago. I believe that that is absolutely important: a change in headset. We need to understand that we may even have to spend some money as an investment in the future in terms of—yes, gasp—this debt reduction climate. We must spend some money. If we need to raise extra money to do so, so be it. If we were to ask members of the community if they agreed with this job creation strategy, I would guarantee that they would say they agreed.

Next, I believe that we have to formulate a plan. Once we have the plan, we need to follow it. I commend the Minister for getting out in the community. I have looked at what he has produced. We have lots of suggestions—pages and pages. However, the hard part is the next part, which is to put those suggestions into a strategic plan. This plan is more than just those suggestions. It will involve hard yakka negotiations with the Commonwealth Government, local government, the business community and the not for profit sector in our community. It needs to be done. I believe that South Australia does have particular issues, particular problems and particular challenges. I believe that there ought to be a Federal approach. Labor was prepared to do it, and it took that to the

Federal election. I believe that members opposite have to get their side to do the same. We need it. We cannot do it on our own: this is a national problem. We need all sectors, but we especially need the Commonwealth Government on side with us. So, we need to get a plan, we need to ensure that jobs are our priority in that plan and we need to ensure that that plan is coordinated. I believe that that is why Labor's suggestion of a jobs commission, or something that could drive the plan so we do not have separate departments trying to do their own thing, is one way of making sure that plan is achieved.

Fourthly, we need to cut the red tape. When I attended the jobs workshop in Elizabeth—and I suppose that I was not surprised, because I have heard this before—this problem was really brought home to me again by representatives of a very big training provider in the northern suburbs, Nastec (which was training provider of the year, I believe), whose representatives were absolutely frustrated when telling me about the red tape that existed. Those representatives brought out a chart (and I believe that it had a big triangle or circle on it) that showed job seekers on one side and employers on the other, and in between was a myriad of training providers, groups, processes, and they said that it was a complete black hole: that things disappeared into it never to be seen again. I believe that it is time we sorted it out. This whole issue about red tape, hold-ups, duplication and lack of coordination is not new: it has been said for a long time. It needs to be sorted out once and for all.

Fifthly, I believe that we need to re-look at and revamp apprenticeships. Over the past six months I have had my own personal experience with a member of my family in relation to an adult apprenticeship, and it has resulted in that apprenticeship ceasing, simply because there was no business able to provide the on-the-job component of the apprenticeship. I have been staggered to hear of the need to import those skills. We need to go back, look again and give realistic incentives for employers to employ apprentices. We need to make sure that there is proper support in the workplace for young people in apprenticeships. We need to ensure that that system works. It really means people putting their heads together, working out where the problems are and fixing them.

The next point is that we need to make education a priority. There is absolutely no doubt that we cannot continue to downgrade our public education system if we believe that we will have a skilled community coming out at the other end—and this is primary, secondary and tertiary education. We need literacy and numeracy, work skills, team work, access to technology and realistic vocational education. Just having scattered focus schools across the State is not good enough—great, Windsor Gardens: what about Fremont Elizabeth High School and the kids there? It is not good enough to have just focus schools. All the kids in all the schools need to have access to high quality vocational education. That needs to be taken seriously, and that is not happening now.

We need to think about new avenues of employment in growth areas and we need to implement programs to develop employment opportunities. I make particular mention of Labor's community mentor services, which we put forward as a job creation initiative in our human services policy at the 1997 State election. The scheme provided care and support to vulnerable people in our community. This is a growth area for the frail aged people with disabilities, young people at risk, families under stress, neighbourhood houses, etc. It has been well received, it is worth looking at and I make an offer

to talk with the Government about this idea. I believe that it is an opportunity that certainly should be taken up.

Finally, I believe that public infrastructure programs are very important. I urge the Government to spend its capital works budget. We have seen \$1 billion set aside every year in the State's capital works budget. We know that it is not spent. I believe that that is disgraceful, and I want to see that the money that the Government sets aside each year in its capital works budget—about \$1 billion—is spent every year. I am sure that will make a significant difference.

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I rise to contribute to this debate in the hope that this Government has the courage to act upon the initiatives identified not only tonight but in the recent jobs workshops and the many consultation initiatives and reports that have been written on this issue over the past decade and before. Many of the specific jobs workshop ideas are new and creative. However, those that have been suggested before are worth another look. All the ideas published in the framework document demonstrate one inescapable point: South Australians, in common with all other Australians, regard unemployment as the primary social and economic problem for Governments at all levels to tackle and solve.

It concerns me that the absolutely basic policy requirements for effectively tackling unemployment continue to be ignored or dismissed as 'too hard' by Governments at every level. So, tonight I would like to summarise or at least touch upon what I believe is the basic policy framework that must be put in place before we as a nation can begin to put a serious, long-term dent in the current and unacceptably high level of unemployment, particularly in respect of young Australians and those in rural towns and cities. The framework that I believe represents Australia's best and only chance to put a serious dent in current levels of employment has been briefly, and I believe persuasively, set down by Professor Helen Hughes of the University of Melbourne. I commend her writings and recommendations on this vital policy issue to every member.

The first point that must be made is that there are no quick fixes. Limitations on work hours, extra levies on employed workers and increased public sector employment of the 'make work' variety will not lead to long-term economic growth improvement or job creation. The same is true of job sharing or work sharing and similar schemes. The essence of employment growth is rapid and sustainable economic growth. So, the policy agenda has to address existing obstacles to growth and remove them, rather than construct new obstacles or to develop policies to create jobs for the sake of job creation without contributing to economic growth. The point has been well made by Professor Hughes that at the high point of the business cycle, which is where we are at the moment, the public sector should be in surplus. In fact, through fiscal mismanagement the South Australian public sector is in debt substantially. Only by reducing our debt and creating a budget surplus can our dismally low savings rate be improved quickly.

Of course, the importance of this is that, while we continue to mismanage our State finances, our State infrastructure ages and deteriorates to the point where we are more and more uncompetitive compared to other Australian States and to neighbouring countries which have continued to pour massive investment into creating world-class economic infrastructure in their countries. It goes without saying that a full overhaul of the present taxation system and the way tax

is collected is one of the essential foundation stones on which long-term employment growth relies.

On balance, I believe that if we are to achieve sustained economic growth high enough to bring down unemployment to less than 5 per cent, we must continue to pursue an open international trade policy. I have great concerns about Australian markets being used as dumping grounds by producers of other countries. Nevertheless, on balance, I believe that the advantages to Australia from open and growing international trade are so important to us that we have to do everything we can to keep the current trading system viable.

As a State we must lower our infrastructure costs if we are to attract and hold business and, hence, jobs. I do not believe that this requires wholesale privatisation of our publicly owned asset business enterprises. What it does mean is that the businesses must be as efficient as best practice private sector operations and must operate in fully competitive environments. Monopoly exploitation of State consumers is bad for everyone, including the unemployed. Costs of essential services must be kept down to levels which are nationally and internationally competitive.

I am totally opposed to the Government's using increases in charges for essential services as a means of subsidising and covering up budget black holes. Trade unions must represent the interests of all workers, including employed and unemployed workers. If trade unions were to become champions of work force productivity growth, their declining membership base would rise rapidly in line with the wage levels of their members. For too long trade unions have exploited the system and used their influence to increase the wage conditions of unproductive employees. Improved wage conditions must be based upon improved productivity levels to ensure that economic growth can be sustained.

Clearly, our secondary and tertiary education systems are failing too many of our young people. Too often I hear employers complaining of low literacy and numeracy standards among school leavers, and wage and conditions expectations are unrealistic, particularly for small business. Too often I hear employers say that the attitude of school leavers is just impossible and that it is too hard to employ school leavers.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs MAYWALD: That's exactly right. Students these days expect as their right to have an income far beyond the productivity for which they contribute, particularly to small business. Their expectations are far too high. Gone are the days when it was expected that you started at the bottom and worked to the top. You are now expected to supply young people with the same opportunities that you give someone with 10 or 20 years' experience. This is not acceptable for small business and cannot possibly be maintained by small business. Small business is an integral part of the training of young people, but it cannot bear the brunt of all the costs associated with doing that. It costs a lot of money to train young people. It costs a lot of time and effort. I know from personal experience. In the past I have trained many people, and in doing so I have taken advantage of some Government incentives that to my business were absolutely worthless.

We took on those young people because of the contribution that we felt we needed to make in our community to bring those people into the work force. We spent hours of our time training those people without recompense. What we got through training programs certainly did not recompense for the effort that we put into those young people. I believe that

training wages are vitally important to small business to encourage it to employ young people and to train young people. If we do not have training wages and small business is expected to cop the brunt of training these people outside the education system, in the long term, this will not be a solution.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs MAYWALD: Well, it's not going to be an advantage for young people, and it will not keep them in the work force. In my experience I know that one of the disadvantages of employing trainees is that, once you have trained them up, they will move on. You put all this work and expertise into young people in your small business with no return for the first 12 months, if it is a 12 month traineeship for example. At the end of that traineeship they then have a certificate which enables them to say, 'I have a piece of paper', to find another job and to move on. In business, a small business operator has spent 12 months of their valuable time working with a young person to give them the opportunity to move forward. We as a society need to look at recompensing those small businesses for doing just that and not the token programs that we currently offer, because they do nothing to encourage businesses to take on more people.

For young people especially, social security benefits are sometimes a more attractive option than the hard grind of learning basic literacy and numeracy skills and working for a living. The social security system needs basic re-thinking and reforming so that the contributions of individuals are expected, valued and rewarded and so that the critical importance of families whose members work and contribute to society is recognised. There are many problems in solving the unemployment issue. The most difficult one, as I see it, is taking the next step; I agree with the member for Elizabeth. It is the most difficult step that any Government faces, because it will not be easy. It will have to take on enormous reform in attitudes, in legislation, in thinking outside the box. For too long we have looked back and not forward, and that is what we need to do.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): In contributing to this debate on a very important topic, I do so with a fair degree of cynicism. It is pretty hard not to feel cynical about what we have been doing here this afternoon and this evening—a bunch of politicians talking about a problem after not being able to provide solutions and hope to people of South Australia, and particularly to the young people of South Australia. It is pretty hard not to take on some of the cynicism of South Australians when you have spent the years I have living in a little house at Paralowie in a neighbourhood where constantly I am reminded of the hardships that people in that area suffer due to unemployment and the lack of employment opportunities.

Taking even a short walk around the neighbourhood exposes one to shouting matches coming from residences over money and lack of jobs. Of course, all my colleagues who share the experience in the northern suburbs are familiar with the destitution, poverty and stress that is the daily lives of some of our constituents, all brought about because they are unemployed and finding it difficult to become employable. We have failed these people, yet we seem to be making ourselves feel very warm and fuzzy about having this talkfest tonight. It is very hard also when visiting many schools in South Australia not to feel the cynicism, particularly of high school students who hold little hope of finding work, or who have a very high level of cynicism about their opportunities to find work.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Ms Stevens: If only.

Ms WHITE: If only that were true, Minister. In the northern suburbs, where we have an extremely high youth unemployment rate—much higher than the 31.4 per cent that is the State's youth unemployment rate—that cynicism is particularly high, but I do find it in all areas of the State, and no wonder. The Minister for Environment and Heritage (Minister Kotz) indicated a quite valid reason for that when she talked about the extremely high drop-out rate from South Australia's high schools. In 1992, under the previous Labor Government, 92 per cent of our South Australian school students finished high school. Now, only 57 per cent of our public school students even finish high school.

Nearly one in every two students in our public school system drop out. That is outrageous. As the Minister admitted today, it is appalling, yet we have not been able to avert it and it has been a decline that has not halted. The drop-out rate has been increasing over the past five years at an alarming rate. Until we can do something about that I find it a little desperate that we have these talkfests on jobs, even if a lot of high industry jobs were available (the sorts of jobs that this Government says it is trying to attract to the State), because those students dropping out of school will not be able to get them because they will lack the skills to get them.

So, in a State with extremely high youth unemployment, the highest in mainland Australia, those students are voting with their feet and saying that the education system in this State, particularly the public school system, has failed them; and they are choosing not to drop out of school to go into work or training but to just completely drop out and go on the dole. That is their choice and, in my view, that is the number one issue we must address, in conjunction with the employment problem, because what is the use of creating vast numbers of these jobs if a whole section of our next generation will not be skilled enough to take them up. That is very important.

I also feel very cynical sitting on the Industries Development Committee, as I do as a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, and examining submissions that come to us from Government Ministers, approved by Cabinet, for grants and subsidies to business in this State. Very rarely do small and medium sized businesses come before our committee and afforded some attention by this Government in terms of subsidies. So often it is big companies that intend to expand or do whatever they intend to do. They put out their hand for some incentives and this Government pours the dollars into those companies.

We could be using that money much more effectively to create jobs. We are not. The Premier and several Ministers have talked about this new Centre for Lifelong Learning—this wonderful initiative of the Government. Well, what is that truly? It is a place to put a chief executive that the Government wanted to get rid of. How long will we be subsidising this position? The Premier is quoted as saying, 'Never before have we had links between industry and education and education institutions.' I ask the Premier: what on earth are the industry training advisory boards? What are two dozen, or so, industry training advisory boards meant to do? That is what they are meant to do.

We have those structures in place. This Centre for Lifelong Learning is clearly just a place to stick an extra public servant. We even have an Act of Parliament for one of those industry training boards: the Construction Industry Training Board. The Premier does not seem to have heard of these mechanisms before. Their very charter is to provide

appropriate training that delivers industry's requirements, yet suddenly we have this Centre for Lifelong Learning. The Minister has been congratulated by a number of members of this House for his jobs workshops. Talkfests and ideas are all very well, but I do remember that the former Minister (Hon. D.C. Kotz) held workshops and that a marginal Liberal member was given a platform on a youth task force to look for ideas. We have had lots of these ideas generated.

I ask the Minister: how many jobs did he create? He had a wonderful opportunity to talk directly to employers. He had an absolute golden opportunity to create jobs. Why could not the Minister have done what Simon Crean did under Working Nation, who created an enormous amount of jobs by physically going out with a cheque book and creating jobs and getting employers and unemployed people together? It was a wonderful opportunity wasted. Not one job has been created by this Minister. A third task force, workshop, whatever you like to call it: it is just a new focus for the media; it is a new focus to make out that the Government is doing something about unemployment. It is not, but it should be. As my colleague the member for Kaurua said: you had better get your act together because the people of South Australia need you to.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): The real question tonight is not jobs because jobs are a consequence, an outcome. The real question is wealth generation. It is out of wealth generation that we create economic activity and out of economic activity we create opportunities for South Australians and call it job creation. So the real question is, 'What is our vision?' Where do we want to be in some key industries into the twenty-first century? Where do we want to be as a State? Where do we want to be in the water, wine, IT, food processing, tourism, defence, horticulture and dairying industries? I go could on, but the problem with going on is that we will spread ourselves too thinly over too many industries and we cannot go to the pinnacle or the leading edge if we are going to spread ourselves too thinly. That is the predicament in which we find ourselves as a State.

The other problem is that there has been too much talk and not enough action. Everything has been said and written. We need to go back to Arthur D. Little's 'New Directions for South Australia's Economy' in which he said everything in 1992 that is being said again today. It has been there. He has helped formulate the vision. The problem has been putting policies in place to achieve that vision. I will not say too much about Arthur D. Little. Everybody ought to revisit the report. It needs to be updated a little as the global marketplace has changed a little and IT has had an impact in the interim. Arthur D. Little's report is still a bible, a gospel and a stepping off point.

A year later along came Professor Fred Hilmer. We have had too much of Hilmer and have over reacted to him and competition policy is now creating opportunities for others at the expense of Australians. However, it is worthwhile briefly reminding the House of what underpinned Hilmer in terms of the elements of competition policy. Hilmer was on about limiting anti-competitive conduct of firms, reforming regulations that unjustly restrict competition, reforming the structure of public monopolies to facilitate competition (and do not read into that the sale of ETSA), providing third party access to certain facilities that are essential for competition (and that would be okay in terms of transmission and distribution of ETSA), restraining monopolistic pricing behaviour and fostering competitive neutrality between

Government and private businesses when they compete. Again, what a great stepping off point for opportunities for South Australians. We have not truly embraced it or truly translated that into action. We have not put rubber on the road in terms of Hilmer.

The next significant document is 'Enterprising Nation' by Karpin. If members have not read Karpin they ought to do so because Karpin got it right when he said that job creation depends on better management skills. He touched on a point that it is small and medium sized enterprises in this State that will create most of the job opportunities into the next century and, as he said, that job creation will depend on better management skills. He set out five challenges, and I hope members in this place know the five challenges, although I suspect that many members of this place would not even know about Karpin and that is an indictment on all of you. The challenges are:

Challenge 1. Develop a positive enterprise culture through education and training;

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: You know about Karpin—you are one of a few. It continues:

Challenge 2. Upgrade vocational education, training and business support;

Challenge 3. Capitalise on the talents of diversity;

Challenge 4. Achieving better practice management development; and,

Challenge 5. Reforming management education.

If we embrace that we would have to ask the Minister for Education why in the next two budgets he will slash \$7 million and then \$9 million out of TAFE. It does not add up. The budget and policies are going in one direction and the creation of our vision is something quite different. So, Karpin in 1975 set out the strategy we needed to adopt in terms of the deficiencies in middle management across Australia holding back wealth generation and job creation.

Along came 'South Australia—Productive, Creative, Competitive'. This is very practical, with many pretty pictures and not a lot of substance, but a document that will help South Australia focus on and clearly identify the points of difference we want to create to be competitive in a global marketplace. It is the points of difference that give us the market edge. We are not on about sameness but about taking something different to the leading edge and it is there.

The next one is McKinsey. McKinsey was particularly important to those of us who embraced the regional development strategy of the Keating Federal Government. McKinsey actually identified that the one common denominator of all under-performing regions in Australia was lack of local leadership. Karpin had said the same thing in referring to lack of middle management skills—one and the same thing. So, here we had Karpin on about the global marketplace and about understanding how in regional and non-urban South Australia we needed to put a whole lot of effort back into leadership and supporting regional and local leaders. We needed to upgrade their skills and give them the opportunity to embrace the natural opportunities in our regions and take them forward. Again we have done nothing in the budget process to underpin that challenge.

The last of the gurus is Michael Porter. Michael Porter has been writing for a while about clusters and the new economics of competition. Michael Porter has been applying his skills in a practical way around the world. There are a couple of classic examples of clusters working particularly well. We ought to spend more time examining the Californian wine

cluster. Arthur D. Little said in 1992, 'Expect a wine led recovery.' Everyone damned him at the time. Look at where we are in 1999, but look at what we have not got. We have not got a wine cluster. We are still planting grapes; we are still on about being process and product driven. We are not on about a cluster. If you go to see what is being done in California you will understand what it is to have a cluster.

As another example of clusters one can go to Italy and look at the leather fashion cluster. It is a classic example. You can go on the off chance that you stay (and we will be delighted to fund your trip). The Italian leather fashion cluster is another example of bringing elements together, achieving economic growth and achieving job opportunity.

Since 1992 we have had all the studies, all the substance we need. The challenge for us is to translate it into opportunities for wealth generation and job creation. The real challenge is to identify up to half a dozen clusters based on those opportunities that Little identified back in 1992 and put our resources in behind them in terms of building the human skills base we need and the physical infrastructure we need, as that is the responsibility of the State. If we put those two things in place, encourage the cluster, step back and wealth generation will occur, out of which jobs will occur and the money will start to go round and you will get exponential growth. Without us showing the vision or the leadership, in five years time we will be having another talkfest and again asking the question, 'Why we are suffering such high levels of unemployment, particularly youth unemployment?', and again it will be another opportunity lost. That is the challenge.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): We have heard many members tonight describe the social dislocation and despair which unemployment causes the people of our State. Clearly we have a responsibility to our community, to the young unemployed, to older workers who have lost their jobs, to Aboriginal Australians, to non-English speaking migrants and to our regional areas that are suffering so badly to take real and positive action. We need to provide jobs that provide ongoing social as well as economic benefits to our State, and we need to do this in two stages. First, we must provide immediate relief, that is, jobs now. We cannot afford to lose the drive, energy and commitment of another generation. We must also develop proper long-term strategies for sustainable jobs into the future.

It has been acknowledged several times tonight, and quite rightly so, that Governments cannot do it all. They cannot go it alone, but there is much they can do and much they must do. First and foremost, this State needs a Government with a vision, and I do not mean a Government that simply manages the economy and manages employment issues but a Government that provides real leadership. We need a Government that has not only a vision but a vision with values. We need a Government that is prepared to show courage and commitment that is balanced with care and compassion.

Governments have a real responsibility to support research and development. The areas of employment, the products and services that will provide the jobs for South Australians in the new millennium, have yet to be devised and we need to recognise that, if we simply try to hold onto jobs that have reached their use-by date instead of reaching out to the future, we will have none. Publicly owned enterprises involved in telecommunications, health and education, to name a few, have been at the forefront of research and development. Amazing developments have emanated from the DSTO at

Salisbury, for example, not only in defence but in a range of areas that have then been taken up by private enterprise. We must renew this commitment with vigour.

Our State Government must start to show confidence in our people and in our State. We need to send the right messages to those who want to invest in our State. I have said it before, and I repeat the statement, that it is pointless to try to attract investment into South Australia, it is pointless trying to sell our expertise, our educational institutions and our way of life, if at the same time we are sending the message that we do not have the skill base to run our buses, let alone our water services, our power utilities and our hospitals. Sadly, if the philosophy of this Government is pursued, the list will continue to grow.

It is time to recognise that a healthy private sector is reliant on a healthy public sector. They quite simply go hand-in-hand. We cannot slash the Public Service to the extent that has occurred in this State and not have it impact adversely on the economy and employment levels. Many industries are now suffering a real shortage of skilled tradespeople. That is because the biggest providers of apprenticeships—State and Federal Governments—have slashed their programs virtually out of existence, again adversely affecting private enterprise.

Our Governments must stop seeing education and training as a burden. If we are to ensure the future of this State, and nation, for that matter, education and training must be seen as an investment, not a cost. Many of our further educational institutions, in conjunction with secondary schools, are providing vocational training and pathways to jobs programs. They are providing excellent opportunities for many young people but, while recognising that, I want to issue a caution. Education must provide more than jobs-based skills. Peter Ellyard makes a very valid point in his latest book: we need our education system to produce job makers, not just job takers.

Governments also have a responsibility in debunking some images, and the image of the dole bludger is one. To a large extent, Governments are responsible for that image. It was much easier to blame victims than to take responsibility and admit that there simply were not enough jobs for everyone who wanted one. I believe most strongly in the people of this State. They want to be valued, they want to make a worthwhile contribution to the society in which they live, and I do not and will not accept that it is the life choice of young Australians to be marginalised, to be branded as bludgers and to have nothing to look forward to.

In his speech, the Minister also mentioned another myth which needs to be well and truly debunked, and that is that unfair dismissal laws are somehow preventing or restricting employment opportunities. Quite simply, that is nothing new. Employment conditions, wages, occupational health and safety requirements—anything that has provided working people with fairness and equity—have since settlement been accused of inhibiting employment. As I said previously, we need a Government committed to a vision, but a vision with values. We must ensure that, in striving for a healthy economy, we do not negate the need for an equitable and fair society.

The Minister for Human Services has recognised tonight the social cost of unemployment, a cost which must be taken into account. I believe quite strongly that we have enough work within our community to keep everyone well and truly occupied. What we have to do is be prepared to convert this work into jobs, and it is within the area of human services that much of that can be achieved.

A program currently being considered by the Tea Tree Gully council, in which I understand the Minister for Employment has expressed some interest, goes some way to achieving this. Working Proudly, a concept developed in New South Wales, promotes the creation of another sector of employment, and that is the community sector. I have not had the opportunity to be fully briefed on the program but what I support is the recognition that, within our community, we have the opportunity to provide real jobs with real benefits. The architects of Working Proudly have recognised that growth alone will not solve the unemployment problem. They use as an example the 70 per cent economic growth in Europe over the past 25 years with only a 10 per cent growth in jobs.

The Tea Tree Gully council has recognised that job training programs have been of some value but, at the end of the day, they are of limited impact on the large number of unemployed in our community. While the council has supported the work for the dole program, it acknowledges that it does not lead directly to employment. The Tea Tree Gully council is an advocate of ensuring that people are given the opportunity to be productive and provided with a steady income and a dignified life.

What the Government can do is gather together people with knowledge and expertise. It can call it what it likes. If it is uncomfortable with 'jobs summit' and with the idea that the Leader of the Opposition might get some credit, it should make up another name, but it must get all the stakeholders together. Let us get their input, let us get their ideas, let us get their commitment and let us get their agreement. The Government must develop a clear strategic plan, a plan for the future. It needs to look at and properly assess our assets and our strengths. It needs to recognise our weaknesses and work around them.

Sadly, I have to agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The report handed down by the Minister for Employment leaves a lot to be desired, and I was personally disappointed. It clearly is just a listing of ideas with no assessment or evaluation. We have to do better than that if we are to have any chance whatsoever of moving forward.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I have listened with interest to most of the remarks that have been made tonight, whether during the time that I have been in the Chamber or otherwise at work in my office. I am largely impressed by the measure of common ground in the contributions that have been made, predominantly by Ministers to date and those speakers from the Opposition who have already contributed. It is not surprising that we all agree that it is necessary to have more jobs and we all agree that it is necessary to have a common strategy in discovering where those jobs can be created in the South Australian context and the framework of policy through which they ought to be created, provided, established—call it what you will.

Unquestionably, the jobs that we need cannot be obtained by simply taking in each other's laundry. In other words, it is not appropriate for us to waste time examining what service industries can be established here to look after ourselves and thereby expect that in any way we will reduce the level of unemployment to a significant degree, if at all. What we therefore must do is look at ways of making problems into resources and, at the same time, discovering those things which we can do in South Australia more efficiently—that is, at less cost—than can other places on earth that currently produce those things, and sell them what we produce at lower cost than it will cost them to go on producing them them-

selves, or alternatively sell it to their customers at that lower price that we could afford to offer it for. That is where the jobs will come from: from exports.

Toward the conclusion of his remarks the member for Gordon advanced an idea, and I must commend him for the initial framework through which he suggested we should develop our strategy—the science, if you like—and to which he drew our attention in those first seven minutes of his remarks. That is the cluster approach, involving a network of interrelated skills that are relevant to an industry, ensuring that it continues to be pretty much world's best practice. The sort of thing he referred to is the leather industries cluster in Italy, and I do not recall his mentioning Silicon Valley in California. I do recall his mentioning the wine industry in California. I could add to that by saying that around Toledo in Ohio the finest glass in the world is made, for no other reason than that it is a cluster enterprise for which it obtains traditional recognition for the level of excellence achieved.

Not far from there in Michigan is a place called Tecumseh, which makes the best air conditioning plants in the world and provides them to the aircraft industry based elsewhere in the United States and in the world, as well as the automobile industry. Tecumseh has been famous in that respect for four decades now and continues to provide work for the people who live there. Each of those enterprises to which I have referred relies upon Ann Arbor, which lies to the north just over the border across the Maume River from Toledo Ohio in the State of Michigan, just out of Detroit. It is a university city on the outskirts of Detroit, and it is another cluster to which people come from all over the world. In this case its relevance in the context of my remarks today is that it teaches the arts which the glass industry uses as well as the science and technologies. It also teaches the engineering science and technologies relevant to the Tecumseh engineering of air conditioning plant and equipment, as well as the enormous production from General Motors in Detroit.

In addition to that, further up the peninsula in Michigan is a place called Kalamazoo, which most people know for its simplicity and fame in producing an office single entry accounting system. That has now been superseded by computer accounting systems for sure, but it was state of the art. I illustrate in that respect what South Australia has had and needs to continue, and that is creativity, inventiveness and innovation.

Now I want to turn to something that is relevant in the context of comments that are being made outside this place but by people who are nonetheless thinking—the *Adelaide Review*. This month's *Adelaide Review* has two articles, one by Chris Kennedy entitled 'Boosterism and optimism', which is an excellent article relevant to the thoughts we are contemplating here today. Equally, in another article I read about the kind of cluster we could establish here by a young man who has established such a cluster in Adelaide in the information technology arena, providing the software necessary to be successful in marketing on the Internet. I believe that we could do that kind of thing—and we have already identified that. Dean Brown showed that vision back in the early 1980s when he established Technology Park and we all agreed upon it. We had a similar debate to this, in which I participated, on social change and the adoption of new technology that was relevant. When he became Premier he pursued that again, and the current Premier continued with that general thrust in the information technology arena.

The article to which I was referring in the *Adelaide Review* was written by Anthony Coles, who is the principal of Empire

Ridge. It is entitled, 'Adelaide leads world in Internet marketing'. That is where there is a great future, not only by marketing on the Internet and doing so from South Australia but also doing the things that will make marketing on the Internet for the rest of the world simpler and more efficient, and selling them the software tools to do that. Clearly, that is the way to go. Having drawn attention to the fact that innovation is as alive and well in the South Australian community today as it ever was, beginning in our early history with our first inventor and innovator—the man who had great optimism, and that was Ridley, who invented the stripper and whose name was given to the seat I represent before its name was changed to Hammond—I emphasise that we have been innovators. There was the stump jump plough; I could list off hundreds of inventions which have come from the small population of South Australia, where necessity, scarcity, sparsity and the adversity of the natural surroundings has made us become inventors, necessity being the mother of invention.

I am suggesting that these clusters need to be around education. In their contributions tonight members have identified that point, and it was amplified in detail by the Minister. We need education not just for ourselves. We need to teach our children that going to school is not a social experience; that is not the purpose of going to school. Going to school is to learn—to acquire the basic survival skills of literacy and numeracy. The mistake we allow in our school system at present is to ignore that basic truth. Too many children are at school in the belief that they are there to enjoy themselves, without making any commitment to learning. Learning can be fun and enjoyable. School is not about socialising: it is about study. Education then needs to be an export. That is, we need to bring people here and teach them and we need to sell our system overseas, as the Adelaide University has done, for instance, with the Sepang Institute in Malaysia. That is worth hundreds of millions of dollars. There is a great number of jobs in that and all our students here will be better off from the competition and the greater diversity of the options offered through out institutions that are then made possible by those fee paying students from elsewhere.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I think it is true to say that the community now has little expectation of full employment. I guess that is no wonder when we consider that this and the Federal Governments have shed so many jobs from the public sector and give little incentive to the private sector, particularly small business, which plays a major role in employing people in our community. Business—certainly those I have spoken to—do not want words that say nothing. The community has stopped listening, because they have heard it all from this Government and they know that words do not create jobs. The community want to see some positive action; they want the Government to show leadership by creating real jobs so that their kids can work. As we know, in South Australia—and we have heard numerous people mention the statistics—we are second to Tasmania and have the highest unemployment rate of any mainland State. The current ANZ job advertisement index for January shows a 10.5 per cent fall in job advertisements for South Australia. It is too early to identify the ABS employment statistics for January, but the ANZ job ad figures do not give much room for optimism in the short term, as many of the jobs gained in the summer and

over the Christmas season were casual or part-time or were temporary, seasonal types of work.

We have a Government that appears to accept that casualisation of the work force is acceptable, but to accept that ensures that unemployment will increase and remain at an unacceptably high level. Another omen that will be a problem for South Australia is emanating from Canberra, and I am talking about the GST. Reports from another leaked Treasury document show that a GST will not create any job gains in any sector of the economy. In fact, there is every reason to believe that the imposition of a GST on small business will see even further job losses. Although the State Government has set up a jobs summit, which basically ignores Labor's opportunity for participation, there is obviously no genuine commitment to deal with the ever-increasing unemployment levels and it is, as has been said before, simply a talkfest.

We in this Parliament have been allocated 10 minutes each to talk about jobs and job creation, but there is very little that you can say in 10 minutes. There is no real opportunity for a debate where we can actually expand our ideas. In 1994—

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: I will take you up on that offer. In 1994 I spoke of our children leaving this State to go elsewhere to find work. I am not the only member on this side of the House who has raised this issue. Earlier this evening the member for Hart said that the so-called debate tonight was a farce, and I agree with his comment. Job creation and, importantly, job security, which is fundamental to our society and to our families' wellbeing and future growth, is given little importance by this Government. The bottom line is that we want jobs for our kids and actually want to be able to work past 40 years of age. But for our children we want those jobs to be full time, so that they can plan their lives, buy a home, raise children of their own and plan for their retirement.

We know it cannot be the same as it was for our parents, because times change and we must adapt. But we will not accept that times have changed so much that the best we can expect is casualised work, holding two or three jobs at once to earn a decent wage, juggling family life to make life fit around holding a job, so that we can pay the bills and eat. We do not want our family life to revolve around the job, and the quality of our family life to be dictated by the job. That cannot be in the best interests of our society, let alone our family life. All that does is contribute to the further breaking down of families. We are tired of the Government's promises of jobs that never come to fruition, that end up being the news of the day because they detract from media coverage of the Government's mismanagement of our State's economy or some strife that it happens to have got itself into yet again.

We had the Government's announcement of a touted 1 000 Teletech jobs, and I think the Premier said that it would be 'a Teletech coup'. These jobs have disappeared off the horizon, somewhat like an Irish mist. Then there is the loss of State public sector jobs and Commonwealth public sector jobs, all under the Liberals. In December 1998 South Australia lost 1 700 full-time jobs, and nearly 6 000 full-time jobs from September to December 1998. Clark's Shoes is just another casualty of that. As I have said in this place many times, one wage packet lost to the metropolitan or rural community means that at some point it results in a deli closure or the closure of some small business, because the less capital people have to spend, the less they buy.

Of course, thankfully, there are some positive events that give one inspiration and hope of better things to come—provided that people are given the assistance and capital support to develop a sound business development proposal and, hopefully, to create employment. In my electorate a rather enterprising family have rolled up their sleeves and developed a puncture eliminator called Gloop. This product is not imported, where the profits go overseas, but marketed here to retail outlets that specialise in hardware, particularly for repair materials for all types of tyres. It is apparently environmentally friendly, safe to hands and clothing, non-flammable and water soluble. I am also told that only Australian chemicals are used in this product.

Gloop fixes leaks in all types of tyres by rolling around the tyre in a liquid form, identifying the leaks and rapidly blocking them. If the Government had given some money to this group it might have fared better and actually could have used some Gloop to plug up some of its own leaks. This family has spent thousands of its own dollars over the years developing this product through the University of South Australia. To date they have had little or no assistance from the State Government. I guess a bit of—

Mr Lewis: You can already buy it in K-Mart.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes. I guess some research and development assistance would have been helpful to them, but they have battled on and are doing incredibly well. We are hoping that they will do even better and be able to take on some employees. The member for Hanson spoke of incentives for training and traineeships, something that I am very interested in, so I will not raise again all the issues that she raised, other than to say that without Government incentive, encouragement and direction we cannot expect the private sector to take the lead. Why should it when that is actually part of the Government's role? It is the Government's role to show the way and to show business that the Government has confidence in its own State's economy; or we would like to think that it had, since it is determining it.

It is about time that the Government stopped fighting with the Opposition and the union movement and worked in a bipartisan way to deal with this very serious and growing problem, because that is exactly what unemployment is—a growing problem. This Government was elected to govern in the best interests of the people of this State, elected, as union officers are, to best represent the interests of their members or, in the case of the Government, their community. If the Government is serious about job creation and job growth it will involve all parties. The unions are not the enemy and should be given the respect that they deserve, the respect that they actually have from their membership (that is because they are doing their job). So, if the Government wants respect from its community, it should also get out and do its job and be inclusive about involving all people in the discussion about resolving this very serious problem.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I welcome the opportunity to contribute to this debate, since I understand that I am the largest employer who is currently a member of Parliament, employing 50 people (about 25 full-time employees and 25 casuals). I do not think that too many others employ that number. I must say that it gives you a particular perspective of the unemployment debate when you are an employer, because you realise how difficult it is to hire, how difficult it is to make ends meet in any business and how difficult it is at times to fire. We will talk more about that later. You get a feel for the red tape. You get a feel for

the costs of WorkCover and you get a feel for the effect of taxation. You get a feel in very real terms for the constraints put upon you by our industrial arrangements, and at times you sit there with your hands on your head thinking: why do it? Why be an employer? Why go out and create jobs? Why not just stop this, put yourself out of your misery and go on unemployment benefits or go and get a job working for some safe employer in some big company, if you are lucky enough to be able to find one, and just stop creating jobs?

If there is one single major problem we face in our economy here in South Australia it is that we have created a mountain of disincentives for small and medium size businesses to create jobs. I will keep coming back to that point as I speak. As I have listened to the contributions being made today, I have heard a lot about what must be done but not a great deal about how it should be done. In making this observation, I understand that an Opposition will of course seek to criticise the Government and point out the weaknesses in what the Government is or is not doing, rather than making a constructive list of contributions on how we might create more jobs. That aside, however, I would have hoped for more constructive ideas on how we might create jobs, because I agree with many of those who have spoken that it is about cooperation.

It is about cooperation between employers, capital, the unions, the ALP and the Liberal Party. In the time that I have been a member of Parliament, I cannot help but think that all too often it is very easy while in Opposition to sit there and let the Government face alone the problem of unemployment and not make a constructive suggestion as to how problems might be solved, even when one has good ideas to offer. It is very nice to be able to beat the Government around the ear with the unemployment stick. Frankly, I would welcome a more active contribution from the union movement and the Opposition benches on how we might solve the problem of unemployment. Unfortunately, I have not heard it on the floor of this House today.

Let us get back to basics. If we really want to improve employment prospects for young people and others in the community today, we need to help business to create jobs. Is high tech the answer? In my view, that warrants further exploration. We are going down the high tech road. The problem we are facing is that computer technology and high tech is doing away with jobs so swiftly and not replacing them that we are coming up with an even worse bottom line in terms of the human cost of unemployment. High tech is not the answer on its own. High tech will create new jobs but it will do away with more than it creates. We really need to get our academics onto exploring the real impact of developing a high-technology economy before we continue to charge down that road at the exclusion of other options.

Should we look more closely at value adding? Should we be dropping our iron ore and our natural resources on ships, sending it off to Japan and other places virtually raw and unwashed, or should we be turning it into steel? Should we be exporting our wool to be turned into fine fabric in places such as Italy, or should we be manufacturing the textiles ourselves? I believe that we should be doing it here and we should look at ways to diversify our economy and create new job opportunities by adding value to those natural resources. In doing so, we should build on our successes, by all means—build on our horticulture, our agriculture, our light manufacturing and, as mentioned earlier, our high-tech industries. By all means, build on success but, at the same time, explore new possibilities.

I say again that we need to get back to basics and really encourage business to create jobs, and the only way to do that is to keep the cost of doing business down. I am talking about keeping wages at an affordable level, and I made this point some time ago in a debate on unemployment. If South Australia is the most expensive State in which to hire a work force, let us not be surprised if capital decides to set up shop in another State: it is simply business. We need to ensure that the costs of hiring in this State are competitive. We are competing with other States for capital. If we let our wages spiral in an unbridled manner, we will pay the price. The insiders who have jobs will be fine: the outsiders will remain outside, unemployed.

We need to keep fees, licence costs and red tape at a minimum. We need to keep the costs of WorkCover down. I am a great supporter of our WorkCover system, I believe that it is essentially a good one, but there are some problems with it and it is extremely expensive for business. We keep hiking up superannuation. Business cannot afford it. We need to get rid of payroll taxes. Power and utility costs are too expensive. We have heard the Premier explain that we have large manufacturers here saying, 'Cut our power bill. We want power bills that are as competitive as Victoria or New South Wales.' Our industry is paying too much for its utilities and our industrial arrangements need to be simplified.

The unfair dismissals framework that we are currently working with is a joke. I have had to deal with it several times in the Industrial Commission. It is out of control, it needs to be fixed, and there are a number of other changes that need to be made to our industrial framework. I welcome the announcement that we will be reviewing our industrial legislation and introducing a new Bill in the near future. But most importantly, South Australia needs growth.

A growing economy is a vibrant economy, and a vibrant economy is one that creates jobs. We need to grow our population. The attitude that South Australia should remain a little backwater with a small number of people living in it is antiquated. We need more people in this State—and I mean a lot more people. If you look at the ABS projections for population growth, South Australia looks like remaining stagnant while other States experience substantial growth. We need more immigration into this State. People may ask what comes first, the chicken or the egg. Do we have more people first and hope that the jobs will be created, or do we try to create the jobs and get more people? I put to members that we need the people first and that the jobs will follow. We certainly need to explore the issue of population growth as a determinant in job creation.

I also spoke earlier in this House about the need to enter into close economic cooperation with the north of this country—in particular, the Northern Territory and Western Australia. We need to encourage and promote further settlement and development in the far north of Australia and South Australia needs to fuel that growth using our railway, infrastructure and industries.

We need to remember the tools of economics. The non-accelerating inflation rate of unemployment that I mentioned earlier needs to be kept down, and the only way to do that is to contain wages growth, to ensure that benefits and welfare do not spiral out of control, to have an effective training system and microeconomic reforms. The road ahead is through growth, growth, growth and microeconomic reform, again, again and again. If we tackle these problems with vision and energy we can create jobs. But the only people who will create jobs are those in business. We cannot expect

the public sector to become the solution. Private investment and private enterprise must provide the answer.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I know it is late and I know that people are tired, but I feel obliged to speak on behalf of my electorate—my region—so members can bear with it. I fully support the suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition today, particularly in relation to regional development, the enterprise zones and a number of other suggestions that I felt related particularly to my region. However, the Minister has heard all this, so I will not repeat it again at this time of night. The Minister is interested in new suggestions: I am interested in jobs for my region. I have some concerns about this jobs debate, coming from a local government background, a training background and an employment services background. I know that we are always talking about jobs in the regions but not a lot ever happens in my part of the State. We have some of the highest unemployment rates in the State. At present, we are seeing our long-term residents leaving Whyalla. Something like 500 homes are on the market in Whyalla at present: our young people are having to leave our region. We have had task forces, job creation workshops, inquiries into job creation *ad nauseam* but we have managed to obtain few jobs out of all these measures. So, of course I am cynical, but I really want to see some jobs in our region and some employment creation come out of this exercise today, and from what has been done over the past few months.

First, I want to thank the Minister—and I quite genuinely mean this—for coming to Whyalla for the first job workshop. I know that the Whyalla community really appreciated his attendance and his accessibility on the day and the opportunity for Whyalla residents to express their opinions and make suggestions to the Minister. Reading through some of the suggestions, I felt that they were very interesting to note. Of course, I had some concerns about some of the suggestions: if it were that simple to create employment, would we not do it? We can certainly all do it after two or three bottles of wine at this time of the night. However, I believe that there are some real issues and suggestions that need following up, and I believe personally that the Minister does intend to do this.

I was interested to read the Premier's comments in Saturday's *Advertiser* regarding regional development, particularly in the Spencer region, and I can assure him that the people of Whyalla will be making sure that he sticks to his word, as quoted in the paper.

If the Premier is serious in his statements—and if they are not just platitudes—I can assure him that I will be happy to put aside Party issues and work side-by-side with him on this, as Whyalla faces the most serious situation in its history. I have lived in Whyalla virtually all my life. I have seen a number of crises in Whyalla, but the situation there now is really serious. It is crucial that Whyalla find alternatives to the steel industry. The press has given Whyalla quite some publicity in recent days and weeks. Everyone knows that we need new industry, that we need new jobs. We have to do something about this.

First, I suggest to the Government that we should not focus on projects in our area which in the past have been short term or Mickey Mouse. I emphasise the need for real projects, such as a titanium dioxide plant. Members may not be aware that in recent years there was an opportunity for a large industry—a titanium dioxide plant—to be established at Whyalla. Studies were completed, the planning process was completed and the site was selected, but the project fell over. ICI was

involved in developing the project, but it changed tack and pulled out of Whyalla. At the time, a Liberal Government was in power, but I have to say that it was not the Government's fault. I would like to blame the Government for everything from a shortage of toilet rolls to whatever, but in this case the prevailing international market caused the project to fall through. ICI has now been taken over by Dupont and we have another opportunity, because Dupont is looking for investment opportunities in Australia.

But the State Government must assist Whyalla in this. We cannot do it alone; we do not have the resources. We need to look at long-term, sustainable industries. We have to target industries which will adapt to our particular environment. We need to target industries with a long-term, strategic approach to get them into regional areas. The Government may have such a strategy, but I feel that, if it does, it is one of our best kept secrets. I ask the Government please to consult and to revisit this issue.

I return to the jobs debate and the workshops. The Minister might have detected a feeling that many participants felt that this issue has been done *ad nauseam*. We have continually debated these issues over many years in regional areas, and much of it has been regurgitated. But the overriding issue has always been that we require the financial infrastructure to get these programs going. For example, in the South-East there has been some job growth because money has been made available, but it has not been made available in my region. Special efforts must be made to support regional development and jobs growth. Investment in regional programs will mean real jobs and real investments, but we need money.

My region has plenty of programs and projects but we have no money. We attend meetings where we see the same people and hear the same ideas, but there is no money. It is a wonderful opportunity which in the long term, I believe, will save money for the Government, so invest wisely in our region. Where will the money come from? I will go out on a limb and embrace a sacred cow in Whyalla. BHP in Whyalla does not pay the local council any rates. It pays an agreed amount to the council of approximately \$90 000 a year, but that is far short of the millions of dollars paid by other large companies throughout Australia to local councils. The reason for this is the 1958 indenture Act under which BHP operates. On top of this, no other business located on BHP land pays rates to the Whyalla council. There are firms such as Pacific Salt, Betatene, numerous engineering firms, supply firms, maintenance firms and other companies which do not pay rates to the Whyalla council. So, what should be a rich community with money for infrastructure lacks any real capital, apart from that raised from ratepayers. We cannot change the indenture Act quickly, particularly given the present economic climate in Whyalla and BHP's situation, but the State Government should look at compensating Whyalla—and it needs to compensate Whyalla—for this major loss of revenue. I am not being unreasonable, because over many years millions of dollars have been paid in royalties by BHP to the State Government from iron ore supplies. Santos pays incredible royalties to the State Government, and we do not see any of this money—

Mr Lewis: What about your schools?

Ms BREUER: Schools do not pay royalties. My strong suggestion is: look at the formula, find out much has been paid and how much is now being paid yearly by BHP and Santos, and put some of this money back into our community. We are desperate and we will beg for this money. I believe

that it is a real option to consider those royalties. I also believe that the State Government needs to show confidence through the public sector. Over the last few years we have lost 500 jobs in the public sector. This shows no example to the private sector of confidence in our community. The Government needs to look seriously at its programs in that area.

Finally, I cannot sit down tonight without talking about the power station; I cannot let John off that easily. I truly believe that the State Government has missed out on a unique opportunity for real regional development with its decision to locate the power station at Pelican Point. Today's news was not good in terms of the Government's plans for Pelican Point but, in the long term Whyalla should get the power station, it will be in spite of the State Government, not because of it. Whyalla will step up its campaign to supply four of the State's largest energy customers in the national power grid. Regardless of what happens at Pelican Point, there is a huge case for a new power station in the Spencer Gulf region at Whyalla. If the controversial Pelican Point site does fall over, Whyalla can step up to do the job immediately and without fuss. Discussions have already been held between National Power and Whyalla's power station task force, which includes the council, the Economic Development Board and the Chamber of Commerce. National Power has made several visits to Whyalla to inspect potential power station sites. Whyalla is also briefing other potential power station operators.

On a separate front, BHP and Western Mining are proceeding with planning a new Whyalla power station. Recently, the companies submitted an application to the Development Assessment Commission. But, with one-fifth of the State's energy consumption on our doorstep, a new station at Whyalla will further ease the pressure on energy during periods of high demand, regardless of whether Pelican Point is ready by its deadline. There would be many other benefits to the State in terms of building a power station at Whyalla.

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

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I, too, wish to contribute to this important debate. I commend the Minister on the workshops and the Government on taking this initiative. I will not take long, because a lot has been said. No doubt, many members have reached the conclusion that there is no easy solution to this problem. It is true that it is a complex problem, and there are various causes of unemployment: frictional, structural, as a result of technology or as a result of changes overseas. Nevertheless, we have to deal with them. To say that the issue is complex and that there is no easy solution is only the first step. We must never lose our passion to do something about it. The time we have spent today demonstrates that as a Government and as a Parliament we have focused on an important issue. We have focused on what matters to the people in the electorate.

The electorate knows that we cannot find solutions to unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, today or in the near future. But what they want to know is that we can focus on that important issue, that we are prepared to look at the various causes of the different types of unemployment. For example, the causes of unemployment in rural areas are different from those in the city in terms of centralisation or the shut-down of offices, be they Government or private enterprise. The solutions do not lie in Government regulations

or in having a complete market solution. There are no such solutions, because history has proved that Government intervention and market forces at different times will fail the community. Therefore, we must be more creative; we must have a combination that suits a particular problem and a particular group.

I believe that the Government is realistic enough to understand this. As I said, I commend the Minister for the initiative that he has taken. Statistics from December 1988 to December 1998 reveal that the South Australian labour force has increased by 39 700, or 5.8 per cent; total employment has grown by 27 500, or 4.3 per cent; full-time employment has fallen by 4.7 per cent, where there has been a significant growth in part-time employment up to 50 000, or 34.9 per cent. Things have changed. The level of part-time employment has increased. That is not necessarily a good thing. There remains the problem of lack of security—young people having a secure job and being able to save for a deposit on a house, and so on.

There is that frustration, but that has not been brought about by any single Government: it has been the result of world and, indeed, Australian trends, and the way in which production has manifested itself. If we look at the reality of employment, we should ask ourselves why it is that with this growth in employment South Australia still has an unemployment rate of 9.2 per cent, whereas the national average is 7.5 per cent. As a Liberal, I admit that but, for the past 30 years, it has been the case that South Australia has always had a slightly higher rate, and equally in terms of the youth unemployment rate at 26.5 per cent Australia-wide and 31.4 per cent for South Australia. That was the case when we first came to power and it is the case now.

The problem will not go away overnight but we must, as I said, have a passion to do something about it. In simple terms, I believe that the creation of jobs lies in economic growth. It lies in producing more goods and services. Australians can produce only so much for the local market, and part of the work force produces for the export market. To really reduce unemployment, we must increase that part of production that produces for people overseas. If we look at countries such as Singapore and Japan, we see that in the past the reason for their high levels of employment was that they were producing not just for the Japanese or Singapore markets but for the rest of the world.

I commend this Government for its emphasis on exports, because that is where the solution lies. Only so much can be produced for Australia and we can have only so many people working to produce for Australia. We must have more people working to produce for the region and, indeed, for the world. That is the ultimate solution, I believe, for employment. For example, in the past some people have commented that we have three universities and that that is too many for a State such as South Australia. I argue that, if Florence had had only one art school, it would not have had a renaissance.

We must take advantage of the particular strengths of our tertiary institutions and, indeed, our education system, so why put levels, for example, on the numbers of doctors and lawyers? Why do we not produce doctors and lawyers for Australia and, indeed, in the future for the region? Let us not limit ourselves, because ultimately we can produce only so much for ourselves. We must export and we must be creative in what we do. Different metropolitan areas and, indeed, regional areas of South Australia must look at their particular problems and find niches that can provide employment.

In 1996 I visited Italy with the Premier and I noted a village in San Marco Di Cavuaoti that had no unemployment. It was a rural setting but the village was producing clothing for Benetton, as well as confectionary. Somehow that village had attracted those industries. So, you have manufacturing and a rural community side by side producing and creating jobs for the community. There must be solutions and we must work cooperatively in order to find them. I believe that today has been important, because we have concentrated on what the people of South Australia believe is of prime importance to them, and it should be to us.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I welcome this opportunity to speak on the topic of employment. I have often thought that we in this place should devote more time to debating the issues that surround full employment and employment opportunities for all. Work for the dole or voluntary work are not the sorts of employment opportunities that must be provided for, although we applaud people who willingly work in their community on a myriad of tasks, I see the dependence that has developed on voluntary work as an example of failure and an abrogation of responsibility by Government.

With the Government's withdrawal from the provision of basic services, we see churches and retired and unemployed people taking up the tasks that have to be done for the community to operate, and we will soon see the relevance and role of Governments made obsolete as we continue to sell off and outsource all the things that Governments have historically been responsible for overseeing and managing. Unemployment remains the most persistent and endemic problem confronting the Australian economy at the moment. Unemployment is also a problem in other countries. There is no question that the effects of unemployment are now being felt by ever widening sections of the community.

Not only is unemployment and job loss having a devastating effect on the working class but its loss of purchasing power is also having an effect on the position of small businesses of all types in the community. As an example of that, I see the deregulation of shopping hours as being crucial for, as we allow the market share to drift to the larger multinational businesses, we reduce the capacity of small business to employ. While it is true that more people are now employed in retail than ever before, there are actually fewer full-time positions in the workplace.

Australia is committed to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, where it is enshrined that every person has the right to work, for work is the basic ingredient of being involved in society and the community. It allows people to participate in and contribute to society and to consume and pay tax in a fair and equitable tax system, which we hope we will all have in the very near future. It is stimulating those two areas that will do more to encourage a healthy economy than will anything else.

While wide sections of the population, including political Parties of various persuasions, trade unions, church and religious leaders, community and social groups and organisations, have all expressed concern about lack of jobs, no action of real substance has yet been taken to rectify the problem. Of course, not all sections of the economy are experiencing hard times. The banks, oil companies, monopolies and transnational corporations are, in most cases, enjoying record profit. A common claim that is made in some quarters is that the solution to the lack of jobs is the development of an export industry. Just how this is to be done is not explained and, because many of these export orientated mass industries

are downsizing or dismissing entirely their Australian work force and exporting their capital to low wage countries, they are adding to the problem and not qualifying as good corporate employers.

From time to time we hear statements by politicians and others that, to solve the problem of unemployment in Australia, there must be a change in the structure and nature of Australian society. Most honest and sincere Australians will agree with that proposition. The big problem is the method and direction that the restructuring is to take. The costs of unemployment are horrendous. We must recognise the enormous cost to the community. Mental health and suicide rates are soaring; poor health outcomes for low socioeconomic groups are well documented—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: That is right; poor. Drugs and drug taking is a huge problem which sees an enormous waste of human potential, and law and order issues continue to cause community concern. We ignore these rising problems at our own peril. Prevention is definitely better than cure. We will pay the cost of looking after the casualties of poor policy, so would it not be better to invest in the people of the State instead? We need to identify areas where we can develop expertise not only for export potential. I make mention here of Don Dunstan's Whitlam Lecture where the origins of the *pinus radiata* industry, begun in the late 1890s, were outlined, where we identified a need within the community and invested in and committed the time and resources to create a successful industry. We need to identify areas that will become real earners of revenue—a sort of niche marketing. We need to identify and implement large scale public employment.

A multitude of public works are required to be carried out in Australia, from railway modernisation and construction, water conservation, highway modernisation and construction, housing construction and, one of my favourite projects, the undergrounding of wires. I particularly like this because it would allow for a large number of jobs in all cross sections of employment. We could rent out the space created by the new network, which would create revenue.

Schools are becoming more involved in job placement and in finding jobs for students. I do not see this as the core role for schools—they should be about education. If we had a large amount of work waiting for students there could be a call for demanding that they be job ready by the end of year 12, after they cram a great deal into a couple of stressful years that often prove to be the toughest of their lives. We need to revisit the necessity for TAFE and tertiary education to prepare our people for work and need to make a greater commitment to apprenticeships.

The definition of 'work' has changed and has to change again. There must be a commitment to full employment and job security. A worker must be able to secure full-time permanent employment. Workers need to know they can repay a mortgage so they can have a home. We need to tackle the issue of reduction of hours in the working week. The role of unions will be understood fully in times to come as workers realise they are not able to negotiate workplace agreements without assistance. I see much of the current climate of our reducing wages and conditions and the word 'productivity' often meaning 'exploitation'. More people are working overtime more often—and unpaid overtime at that—while a great number of people have no work at all.

I would like to see the abolition of unemployment benefits to make way for the introduction of a method to recognise the

amount of real work that exists, especially in what is being dubbed the 'community sector'. I am appalled that domiciliary care hours have been cut from three hours a fortnight to three hours a month. It defies belief that aged and infirm people are expected to survive without assistance for a month, and who would be the worker charged with the task of cleaning the results of a month's daily living in three hours? That is definitely an example of a new productivity.

The jobs summit held in Modbury was reasonably well attended. I was there and at the end of the discussion period group consensus identified the creation of a third or community sector as a worthwhile objective, as there is clearly a great deal of work in the community. The problem seems to be that we do not want to pay workers to do that work. Some time after the summit a letter arrived from the local council talking about a program called 'Working Proudly' or 'reinventing employment'. We need to acknowledge that calling work for the dole anything else legitimises paying less than a fair wage for a fair day's work. It is the thin end of the wedge and will establish the low wage as a minimum wage. We will all then realise the functions of unions and their role of representation of workers in workplace negotiations.

The Tea Tree Gully council is to be commended for its initiative in looking to stimulate employment opportunities. Local government is an area starved for funds and where the unemployed can be offered work immediately on projects that add to the quality of life for everyone. The Tea Tree Gully council should add its voice, prestige and influence to that of the trade unions, church and religious leaders and all those organisations and people of goodwill to urge the Australian Government to make finance available to carry out real job creation projects which pay a real wage.

Everything comes full circle. I noticed some time ago a good example of this. Garbage collection, once done by a team of men in a truck, is now undertaken by one man with a sophisticated vehicle, so several jobs were lost. However, recycling has now become an important part of council activity and is carried out by a number of men and the old style of truck with different compartments. It is here that we must acknowledge that, while some types of work have disappeared forever, other jobs do appear.

While it has been termed 'the technological revolution', it is a reason for the loss of jobs and the growth of unemployment. Machines are replacing human labour on a large scale and creating a crisis for the capitalist system. Capitalism strives for a continually higher level of productivity and this is bringing with it an escalating level of unemployment and pauperisation of the population. At the same time the rich are getting richer and producing huge profits for large companies. This new technology is replacing workers in all basic mass production industries.

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the House to sit beyond midnight.

Motion carried.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Many men and women in the electorate I have the honour to represent are unemployed or under employed. Unemployment rates in the Hindmarsh,

Croydon and Woodville areas are well above the State average, as they have been throughout the century.

Since the 1970s crime has increased sharply and now reached a high plateau. The memory of people in our area who were adults in the 1950s and 1960s that our area was then a much safer place is not mistaken.

Changes in employment since then have resulted in high rates of unemployment for young men, that is, males aged between 16 and 30 years. Men in this age group were once valued for their physical strength and valour. They pioneered British settlement in Australia and they fought and died in wars for Australia. Until the 1970s they were in demand to do the heavy labour necessary in our economy and to provide security in public places. Until the 1970s we had thousands of labourers, including farm labourers, bus conductors, stationmasters, porters and caretakers. They were paid award wages in a full employment economy. This security of employment and income enabled them to marry and father children. By these means they were socialised into the community. Parks and schools were patrolled by caretakers; railway stations were supervised by stationmasters or by guards on the trains. Incidents on buses did not get out of hand because a bus conductor was there to keep order.

Young men, because of their testosterone and physical strength, have the capacity to be wild men. Most the crime in South Australia is committed by men in the age range I mentioned. Our prisons are full of young men—not old men and not women. They were of course wild men in the 1950s and 1960s; it is just that there are many more of them today both in number and as a proportion of the population. Not only are there more house breaks, burglaries, robberies and drug-related crimes today: there is also more incivility on the streets and in public places and there is vandalism and graffiti. Many people in my area do not like to walk the streets at night, catch a train or bus or use a public park because of the risks that young men will behave in a way that, although not necessarily criminal, will frighten them. It might be swearing, threatening behaviour or horsing around in a manner physically dangerous.

Although many people in Kilkenny and Croydon go out for a walk on hot nights, many more stay indoors because they do not feel safe in public places. Beautiful parks created by the City of Charles Sturt, such as the M.J. McInerney Reserve in my area, are not used as they might be. We have turned inwards into our homes, installed security doors, movement activated lights and high fences. We have abandoned many of our public places, our parks, our railway stations, our public transport, our schools after hours and our streets to an underclass of wild men and their consorts that we as a society and an economy have created in the past 25 years.

[Midnight]

We the public could win back many of these public spaces by going there in great numbers and enjoying them by day and in the evening. The wild men would have to find other, more out of the way, spaces in which to practise their lumpen culture.

We could also do something to ensure that we do not beget another population of wild men. My nine years as a member of Parliament has convinced me that there is a small percentage of the population that will never work because they are not suited to it. In some cases their parents did not work, they do not work and there is a great risk that their

children will not work. The important challenge for the Government is to save the next generation. Other unemployed people I meet have the capacity to work honestly and unsupervised, but they have not acquired any useful skills in a State education system dominated by so-called progressive educational thinking. The worst thing is that they cannot write a simple business letter or transfer their thoughts to another person by writing or keep records or a log. Much of my work as an MP is fulfilling the ancient office of the scribe by writing business letters to be signed by the people who seek my help. I am not complaining: I am a well-paid scribe. I believe that the State of South Australia ought to be creating unskilled jobs for these young people. I am sufficiently pessimistic to think that a certain proportion of the next generation will be unskilled whatever educational and training nostrums are applied and it is the role of the State to find work for these people albeit on modest wages and conditions and with work disciplines stricter than elsewhere in the public sector.

These unskilled jobs would be of the kind that have been made redundant in the last 25 years. I refer to school caretakers, park attendants, stationmasters and bus conductors. Perhaps a corps of young farm labourers could be subsidised to help our ageing farmers. Young South Australians facing a bleak employment future would be given steady full-time work. They would be introduced to the disciplines of employment, such as punctuality, obedience and politeness. With the security of this employment, they could begin to plan their lives and those who grew in confidence and benefited from the job could look to opportunities outside this sector. At least young people would have a start and what they made of it from there would be up to them.

Young men in these jobs would have a chance to be socialised in the way the immediate postwar generation were. They would be less likely to be involved in criminal gangs and counter-cultural pursuits such as drugs. Older people could again enjoy public spaces. We would have someone to speak to if we felt threatened, or if something was amiss, in

a park or public garden. We would feel protected in buses and trains at all times of the day or night. We would feel safe waiting for a train or walking home from the station after dark. Public spaces would be liberated, although I suppose it would only be a gradual return by the public to them.

How is this expansion in public sector employment to be funded? If the people of South Australia want this program, they will have to pay for it. It cannot occur without taxes for households going up. The State cannot afford more debt. I am a Labor man but I am a pay-as-you-go Labor man. It is no good taxing business for these kind of programs because they will just move their operations to another jurisdiction and more South Australians will lose their jobs. I think that people in my electorate would on the whole be willing to pay the taxes necessary for such a program if they could see young people in our area working in our schools, our parks and gardens, our railway stations and on our buses. They would support it if they knew these jobs were granted subject to strict discipline.

It would be popular, especially among the elderly, but I rather doubt that this program would be supported by the well-off baby boomers who have acquiesced in high rates of unemployment and who are happy to retreat behind their high fences, imported cars, security doors and surf the Internet. Because the baby boomers hold power in the Liberal Party, the Labor Party and the Democrats, my proposal will not happen. The truth is that our political elites do not have the will to create employment for the unskilled. They are comfortable with the globalisation of the economy. They do not see the electoral advantage in sharing the benefits of globalisation with the underclass, especially now that One Nation is no longer a threat. In fact, they rather like their equivalents overseas more than they like Australia's long-term unemployed.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.5 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 11 February at 10.30 a.m.