HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 10 February 1993

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

A petition signed by 156 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to support the retention of the aircraft curfew at Adelaide Airport was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 1 958 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to extend permanent retail trading hours was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

DOGS

A petition signed by 1 550 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to extend dog registration concessions to members of the South Australian Canine Association was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

ENFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Education, Employment and Training): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This morning, a most unfortunate incident occurred at Enfield High School when a low brick wall of a shelter shed, which I believe supported seating, collapsed and resulted in injury to one of the school students. I have asked the Director-General of the Education Department to conduct an immediate inquiry into this matter and I understand that the Director-General is personally visiting the school this afternoon. I am deeply concerned that this unfortunate incident has occurred and I assure the school community that any safety issues will be given top priority. I should also like to express my concern for the injured student and to assure the family that my department will extend every assistance possible.

PRISONS SECURITY

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Correctional Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: In this House yesterday, the member for Bright alleged that there were serious faults in the electronic security surveillance systems at certain prisons. I have consulted officers from the Correctional Services Department and can now provide the House with a detailed response. I have been assured that there is no security risk due to the performance of electronic security systems at Mobilong, Port Augusta and Northfield prisons.

The perimeter system of a modern prison consists of physical barriers, electronic detection systems and effective and professional management of prisoners. Of these three components, the latter is most important as no physical or electronic system is infallible. An effective security system is one in which staff are adequately trained; where there is a positive, humane environment that recognises human rights standards; there are clear and specific rules and procedures; there are adequate support programs including medical, educational and mental health services; there are effective communications; professional management; and accurate and relevant information on prisoners.

To support these, physical barriers and electronic detection devices are needed. Each of the three prisons mentioned have substantial physical barriers in the form of high ‘weld mesh’ fences and stainless steel razor tape in various configurations. Each prison then has a number of electronic detection systems which indicate when a breach of security is taking place. All electronic systems are prone to alarm under some conditions other than human intrusion, such as strong winds or heavy rain.

One of the five electronic systems installed at Mobilong Prison has been generating a number of environmental triggered alarms. The level of these false alarms on this one system has been unacceptable and the system is still being fine tuned by the supplier to ensure that it operates within the performance specifications set out in the contract.

Mr Matthew: After how long—a year and a half?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The incidents referred to by the member for Bright happened as a result of testing after the sensitivity had been reduced to minimise the false alarms and after some alteration had been made to the configuration of the razor tape attached to the fence. These tests revealed that some of a number of individual zones required abnormal effort to activate the alarm. T h e Northfield Prison Complex has a security system on the perimeter of the cottages which has been installed to detect the entry of unauthorised persons to this area after hours. As this area houses pre-release persons who are outside during the day attending educational, work and other programs, the detection system is turned off during these periods. It is a common practice throughout the world to turn this system off during some adverse environmental conditions, such as strong winds and heavy rain. Under such circumstances management practices are adjusted accordingly.

The new Port Augusta Prison has the most secure perimeter fence yet built in South Australia. It has a number of electronic systems to detect breaches of security. One of these systems is still 'bedding down' and, while still functional, requires fine tuning to eliminate unacceptable levels of false alarms.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT SCHEME

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: This program was set up in 1991 to provide basic maintenance and home support services to people with specific disabilities, as an alternative to long-term institutional care. The funding for this program is provided through the joint Federal/State Home and Community Care Program, and last year, CSI received $3.74 million. It has been an innovative and successful scheme, with more than 3000 clients assisted in its first year. Unfortunately, audit reports provided by CSI's auditors of the accounts to last June showed some difficulties with its budget. Although these problems were brought to the attention of the board of the Community Support program on 30 October, I was concerned that the auditors did not fully address the problems in the program, and I ordered an investigation. This was carried out by officers within the Financial Services Branch of the Department for Family and Community Services, and they have made a number of recommendations about the future financial and administrative practices of the scheme.

The report into the operations of the Community Support Scheme recommends new financial and administrative arrangements and more accountability for the funds provided to the scheme. These are already being put into place. When the scheme was established, in the 1991-92 financial year, funding for a full year was available to distribute for clients in the space of nine months. However, this high level of client service was continued on into this financial year which has led to a budget over-run. Whereas the take-up in the first year in areas such as head injury was slow, once families realised that the scheme would help relieve their burden, and even help some clients achieve an independent lifestyle, demand increased. This demand eventually outstripped the capacity and resources of staff, and caused problems for CSI staff in setting in place appropriate financial and administrative systems.

There were also problems in terms of the experience, knowledge and skills of staff employed in key positions. This led to some agencies, for instance the Julia Farr Centre, over-committing their share of resources provided through Community Support Inc. These problems were exacerbated by the inadequacy of contact between the various agencies which are involved in the scheme and CSI. The report has made a number of recommendations to ensure this situation is not repeated, including new financial reporting guidelines, new controls over expenditure, improved financial systems and controls, and improved reporting mechanisms. The agencies which allocate resources and services to their clients will also refine the way they monitor their commitments.

I have appointed Mr John Barrett, the Director of Administration and Finance in the Department for Family and Community Services, to the board of CSI to help with the implementation of the reformed administrative and financial accounting systems. Officers from Treasury and FACS have been seconded to work with CSI to ensure these measures are introduced. My paramount concern in this situation has been the 1500 clients who depend on the services provided by Community Support Inc.

To continue the client services organised for Julia Farr the Government will provide an extra $157 000 so the centre can continue to meet the demands placed upon it. This will mean guaranteeing the continuation of services at their current level until the end of the financial year. Unfortunately, the announcement of the Federal election has meant negotiations with the Commonwealth to match these funds through the Home and Community Care program have had to be deferred. When the negotiations resume, I am optimistic that the agencies will be able to continue providing these very important services to their clients into the next financial year.

I am aware that a number of people have been affected by the decision late last year by the Julia Farr Centre to reduce its services provided through this program. It is unfortunate that Julia Farr moved to cut services to 27 clients and reduce services to another 141 clients. I am hopeful that this extra money will mean some of these services will be restored. The Community Support Scheme is a new approach in providing services for younger people with disabilities and their carers. It is an exciting concept and despite these recent problems it still retains the support of the disability lobby. It has been described by one advocacy group as one of the best innovations in services for people with disabilities in years. It is for this reason that I ordered the investigation. I now table the two relevant reports.

MEDICARE

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Members will know that the Premier recently signed the new five year Medicare agreement with the Prime Minister. This agreement takes effect on 1 July this year and has guaranteed funding to South Australia's public hospitals for the next five years. Medicare guarantees all Australians access to essential medical and hospital services, as well as necessary medicines under the pharmaceutical benefits scheme. Hospital Medicare is based on three principles: first, a choice of services—eligible people have the choice to receive public hospital services free of charge as public patients; secondly, universality of services—access to public hospital services is on the basis of clinical need, not ability to pay; thirdly, equity in service provision—as far as possible, public hospital services are available to people who are eligible, wherever they live.

These principles, along with a commitment by the Commonwealth and the State to efficient, high quality hospital services and the development of a public patients' hospital charter, have been incorporated in the agreement itself and also in the Commonwealth's Medicare Agreements Act 1992. During 1993, I intend to introduce a complementary Bill to enshrine these principles and commitments in State legislation. The new Medicare Agreement provides South Australia with up to $25 million in extra Commonwealth money next financial year. The final amount will depend on the State's population growth and our level of public patient activity.

It is estimated that Commonwealth payments in 1993-94 under this agreement will be up to $387 million. Major elements of the agreement include hospital funding, incentive funding, and a commitment to develop and implement national health goals and targets in consultation with the community and health professionals. Extra incentive funds will also be provided to South Australia for:

- the hospital access program aimed at reducing booking lists ($5.6m in 1992-93 and 1993-94);
- mental health ($l.lm in 1993-94);
- strategic capital planning ($1.4m in 1993-94).

These initiatives will mean an extra $4.5m for South Australia in 1993-94. Since its introduction in 1984, Medicare has been outstandingly successful in keeping health spending at a level that Australians can afford without compromising the fundamental principles which underpin it. Medicare is one of the most affordable and fairest health systems in the world and Australians are one of the healthiest people in the world, against all measures.

More importantly, the health of Australians continues to improve even though national spending on health has been maintained at around eight percent of GDP. Relative to other OECD countries, Australia is well provided with medical and hospital services. And Australians make above average use of their health services. Hospital admission rates in Australia in 1990 (the latest figures available) were the second highest among western countries, second only to Iceland. And admission rates to both public and private hospitals in South Australia are well above the national average. Despite the claims of the private health insurers, private hospitals have increased their share of total admissions from 22.4 per cent pre-Medicare to 28.5 per cent in 1989-90.

I acknowledge that many South Australians will continue to hold private health insurance and that the private hospital sector will continue to play an important role in the provision of health services in this state. I welcome the Commonwealth's pledge to spend an extra $1.6 billion on public hospitals over the next five years. As Health Minister in this State, I will do all I can to ensure that South Australians continue to enjoy high quality, accessible and equitable health services.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I bring up the fifth report of the committee on the inquiry into the continued existence of the West Beach Trust and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the twenty-third report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

CHILD-CARE

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Why should South Australian parents believe Mr Keating's latest unfunded promises to support child-care when the Federal and South Australian Labor Governments have broken promises made in 1989 to expand child-care services in South Australia? On 21 May 1989, former Prime Minister Hawke announced a $10 million three-year program for child-care in South Australia. Half of this, namely $5 million, was committed to capital spending to establish five new child-care centres and the remainder was earmarked to provide an additional 2 190 child-care places by 1992.

This promise was repeated during the 1989 State election by former Premier Bannon on 9 November 1989. Over the past three years Commonwealth capital funding of child-care in South Australia has been less than $1 million—rather than the $5 million promised—and the Director of the Children's Services Office, Mr Wright, has said that none of the five promised centres has been built. The number of additional places funded under the three year Commonwealth-State agreement was less than half the number promised.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question, because it gives me an opportunity to put the facts of the matter on the record, and I am delighted to do so. The question that I have been asked—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have been asked a question and I would be delighted to provide a very full and detailed answer, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will provide the response through the Chair.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The first part of the question was how many child-care places have been implemented since 1989 in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, it is most interesting that they want to ask the question, but they do not wish to hear the answer. This Labor Government in South Australia has expanded significantly the provision of child-care places in South Australia by more than 2 300, with a wide range of programs for families and children between 0 to 12 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would like to give the honourable member a full and frank answer to his question. Out of school hours care has seen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I have plenty of time and patience.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The out of school hours care program has provided 1 700 places in 51 new programs. The family day care program has provided 330 places, and child-care centres 22 places and extension to I1 existing centres, and 135 places in three new centres since 1989. In relation to occasional care, we have seen 132 places in 20 centres. That is an increase of 2 319 places since 1989.

The question has also been asked, 'How many places are yet to be implemented?' By the end of 1993, a further 118 places will have been implemented. This represents two new child-care centres, one at Prospect and the other at Cowandilla, and these will be completed by July in the first instance and November in the second instance. Four occasional care services in pre-schools will be fully implemented by the end of June.

It is interesting to note the amount of money which this Government has spent on the strategy between 1989 and 1992. An amount of $4.1 million capital has been either spent or allocated for the few remaining projects. The question I think the honourable member was trying to ask was, 'Why has there been some delay in the building of these community based centres?' In deciding where a centre is to be allocated, a comprehensive joint planning process is required to identify the areas of need for child-care places. Factors that need to be looked at are the numbers of women with dependent children in the work force, the current supply of places in the private sector for profit and the community-based centres.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: To answer the honourable member, anticipated future needs—such things as population growth and demographic projections—are considered. The actual siting of a new centre in an identified area of need is subject to extensive community consultation processes to ensure that the site is both visible and accessible to the community. It takes approximately nine months from the design phase right through to final completion and building.

I point out, for the edification of the honourable member who asked the question, that, while the strategy was first announced in 1990, the State and Commonwealth Ministers did not sign an agreement until December 1992. If he wants to score some cheap political points (they are not going to like this) perhaps he would like to take up the matter with his colleagues interstate, because not all the States and Territories have signed the agreement at this point: with the exception of the Liberal Governments of Victoria and New South Wales, all the other States in the country have signed.

Planning for the new program is under way. It is worth noting that 360 family day care places, of the total 890 allocated in the 1992 to 1996 program, have already been implemented. It is important that we recognise that child-care is a critical issue to the community of this State. This Government's record is second to none, and I would be delighted—and I know this was not asked of me in this question—to outline to the House, should I be asked a further question, exactly what the new announcements by the Prime Minister will mean for South Australia, because I think even the most hardened of Opposition members would have to agree that it is an enormous advance forward for all sectors of children's services and child-care for South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Minister that she does have access to a ministerial statement if she requires it.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is addressed to the Treasurer. What action is the Government taking to establish the amount of financial assistance that may be available to South Australia as a result of the Prime Minister's offer last week?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would like to enlighten the House on the steps that have been taken so far to negotiate with the Commonwealth any possible—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, I thought you would never ask. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Acting Leader, and I take the opportunity also to congratulate the Acting Deputy Leader on his promotion, and I say no more about that, however tempting. I want to outline to the House some of the steps that have been taken to try to find out quite specifically from the Commonwealth what package would be available to this State if the bank were not sold.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have restrained myself with the member for Bragg, but he is trying my patience. It is important to bear in mind, when a decision is being made about the bank's future, that the bank belongs to the whole community.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I stated yesterday in the House, the only figure we have to date is the one that the former Chairperson of the bank, Nobby Clark, gave us, and I am sure that that is approximately correct; it would not be a million miles out. However, we do require some authoritative figures and, as I announced in the House last year, we have asked Baring Brothers to undertake some investigations to give us some indicative

figures on selling the bank on various scenarios—as to what it would be worth, what the trade sale would be worth, the float and so on. The key and critical thing as to whether it is in the interests of this State that the bank should be sold is what tax compensation package the Federal Government would give, because it is unlikely that any private bank or organisation would pay a great deal more than the State Bank is inherently worth. People like Bond come around only once in a lifetime, and he is unlikely to be around to buy the bank, so it is absolutely of critical importance that we know this figure.

As late as last week—after the Prime Minister's visit and after their discussions—the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister about the issues and asked him in effect whether he could be a little more specific about what financial compensation package would be available and about a number of other issues, as outlined by the Premier at the time: the question of fiscal equalisation, the $385 million that I think was the figure the Prime Minister said the State gained, and a number of other things. I would like to see the Prime Minister give us some more definitive figures because, quite clearly, if the Prime Minister is saying that it is in the interests of this State to sell the bank, he must have a very clear idea of what financial compensation package would be available. Without that figure, nobody can say whether or not it is in the interests of this State to sell the bank.

According to Nobby Clark, we would be giving away an income stream of about $100 million, so it would have to be financially at least as good as that to make it worth while. That was just to indicate to the House the steps that have been taken. In conclusion, I did note that the present, absent Leader of the Opposition obviously did not think Parliament to be of sufficient interest to be here today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Treasurer to bring his response to a close.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —and is electioneering elsewhere, but never mind; that is a decision that is open to him. I noticed that the Leader has stated quite clearly that he wants at least $1 000 million in compensation out of the Federal Government. I know that the Leader is meeting with Dr Hewson today, and I hope that he is asking Dr Hewson, just as we are asking the Prime Minister, to be specific: 'What compensation will you give?' The Leader has stated that he wants at least $1 000 million. I wonder what Dr Hewson thinks about that. I hope that when he returns tomorrow the Leader will tell us, or at least the media will ask him, whether Dr Hewson agrees with him about that $1 000 million. It will be of interest to all South Australians and it is essential that we know these answers before anyone can make a sensible decision as to whether or not to sell the bank.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I direct my question to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. As the Prime Minister yesterday halved the Federal Government's forecast for employment growth this financial year, and as South Australia's unemployment rate has been above the national average for all but two months of the past 10 years of Federal and South Australian Labor Governments, will the Minister say when the South Australian Government expects the employment outlook to improve?

In response to the October 1992 jobless figures, the Minister told this House on 12 November that she would seek urgent talks with her Federal counterpart (Mr Beazley). Since then, South Australia's unemployment rate has increased from 11.4 to 12 per cent and the State has lost 8 600 jobs. Over the past year, the number of South Australians out of work for 12 months or longer has increased from 22 200 to 38 200. The average duration of unemployment in South Australia has increased over that period from 51.7 weeks to 67.3 weeks, which is 10 weeks longer than the average duration for unemployment nationally. For people in the 35 to 54-year age group, the average duration of unemployment in our State is now 86.3 weeks, which is 22 weeks longer than the national average.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This Government has never suggested that it is not seriously concerned about the level of unemployment in South Australia. I pay tribute to my predecessor in this position who implemented a range of State initiatives and who worked very hard with the Federal Government to redress the problem by introducing these initiatives. I should like to answer the honourable member's question and I will give him the benefit of believing that he asks it genuinely and not as some sort of political point scoring exercise, although my colleagues might think that my generosity is a little too much.

We have made inroads in a number of areas. I acknowledge that what I said about the figures that came through was that the situation looked promising. I was very tentative in my analysis of those figures, as indeed were the Premier and Deputy Premier, because as we come out of a recession obviously there will be a slight bumping along on the bottom, and we acknowledge that.

What has the Government done to try to engender confidence in the business community and the wider community to take up this employment challenge which, as the new Minister, I have thrown down? Under my predecessor, this Government committed itself to take on 400 new trainees in the public sector and, of those, 100 will be permanent employees. We will be taking on the remaining 300 I believe by June this year under the very generous provisions of Jobskills and the Australian Traineeship Scheme, and this will offer a range of young people up to about 24 years of age the opportunity to develop confidence in a working environment, to development skills and to get a work record.

I have met with representatives of the business community, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Employers Federation and the unions, and I have met with rural sector representatives to look at ways in which, through our own example, we can ensure that the private sector, whether in rural areas or in the highly industrial areas in the north and Port Adelaide, can pick up and take on a number of the positions that are being funded by the Federal Government. It is my intention very early next week to announce what I am calling an

employment strategy promotions committee that will be made up—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, Mr Speaker, if they are interested in hearing—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is a small group of private sector people who are actually achieving in their areas and who are prepared to put South Australia ahead of Party political point scoring, and I would hope that the kind of bipartisan support given by my shadow, the member for Fisher, might be translated into some other members of the Opposition front bench.

As well as this, we have looked at a number of other projects including the Kickstart projects. I can announce that under the Landcare and Environment Action Program (LEAP) I believe we have just won in excess of $2 million for the programs to continue the work started, again, by my predecessor in terms of the Conservation Corps, so that we can get the Conservation Corps concept out into the rural areas as well as based in the *ci*ty area.

There are a number of long-term unemployed youth measures, including the Landcare and Environment Action Team (under the LEAP program, to which I have referred). We are currently developing a number of programs which target women's unemployment. That again is an area which this Government is very concerned about, and we are working across the South Australian community to ensure that we address this issue of women's unemployment. As I said, we have the youth recruitment strategy for the public sector, and we have looked at working with the private sector to increase the number of apprenticeships across the South Australian community.

Mr Speaker, nobody pretends that this will be an easy task, and least of all do I pretend that it will be so. However, I can give a commitment to this Parliament and to the community of South Australia that I will leave no stone unturned to do my best in trying to ensure that we can increase, first, the number of jobs, the range of jobs, the skills and training of young people in our community and the retraining of older people in our community. I will work constructively with both the union movement and the business community to turn around the negative, pessimistic, knocking attitude of the Opposition and of some of its running mates in the private sector, because most people I talk to in the private sector want to see an engendering of a new confidence, a new vision and a new hope. This team on this side of the Parliament will give that to South Australia.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC INITIATIVES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): My question is directed to the Premier. Following his meeting with the Prime Minister last week, were there any initiatives included in the Prime Minister's economic statement which dealt specifically with regional economic problems in South Australia?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for this very important question. Indeed, he quite correctly identifies that I did canvass with the Prime Minister last week the matter of South Australia's being a regional economy with its own particular circumstances. It is an issue that I often talked about with him at meetings last year, both here in Adelaide and at the Council of Australian Government and on other occasions, to keep emphasising the point that an economy like Australia's is in fact made up of a series of economies, some of which are regional economies, and South Australia is one of those.

It is very important that that be picked up in any Federal Government response as to how the economy at large can grow. So, as a result of raising that last week, I have been very pleased to see in the announcement made by the Prime Minister yesterday the establishment of a special task force to address the structural adjustment problems faced by the southern States of South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria. That task force will be headed by Laurie Brereton, MP, and will include representations from business and unions, including key representatives from South Australia. The task force has the following challenges or issues to examine: first, to examine the nature and extent of the regional adjustment problem and to identify the regions which are most disadvantaged; secondly, to identify the impediments to adjustments in these regions; thirdly, to examine how existing Commonwealth programs may be mobilised more effectively in pursuit of the regional development objective and how the Commonwealth might enhance the effectiveness of State Government programs; fourthly, to examine whether any new Commonwealth programs are appropriate and, if so, to make recommendations as to the nature of such programs.

I can tell members that negotiations are currently taking place between my officers and Mr Brereton's office regarding the framework of the task force, including its time line, and to organise visits of those officers to South Australia as soon as possible. In the process of that, we are also discussing the names of people who could be considered for the task force.

Of course, other issues were discussed at last week's meeting and have been separately dealt with. Already, the Treasurer has identified one of those areas. Another key area is with respect to the budget assistance that was foreshadowed by the Prime Minister last week in his statement on the nature of assistance that was given to Tasmania and to the Northern Territory. That is a very important issue that must be pursued, and we are pursuing that. I hope we will have information on that in the weeks to come. I want to congratulate the Federal Government on this announcement. It is certainly very timely, and this State Government looks forward to working with the Federal Government on pursuing the objectives that are set out for this task force.

WRIGHT, HON. JACK

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Deputy Premier. Why has the Government sacked the former Labor Deputy Premier (Hon. Jack Wright) from the Lotteries Commission? The Hon. Jack Wright's

five-year term as Chairman expired yesterday. I have been told that he made it known to the Government that he was prepared to continue in the position after presiding over a period of significant growth in turnover and profit. However, as well as refusing to reappoint him as Chairman, the Government also declined to offer him a further appointment as a member of the commission, even though the Government has recently proclaimed amendments to the Act to increase the number of commissioned members from three to five.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I tried yesterday, in the interests of brevity, to answer the question in a single word. I thought that the whole of the House would be pleased about that and would not want to invite me to go on and explain the decision at great length. But clearly not, and I will take note that in future, if my answers are couched in single word terms, that will not be acceptable: they will have to be expanded. The position is quite clear: we did not sack Jack Wright at all.

An honourable member: You didn't reappoint him.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

Mr D. S. Baker interjecting:

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

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: What happened to mateship?

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If you pause long enough, the member for Coles always comes in: she cannot help herself. On this occasion, the interjection was, 'What about mateship?' Well, what about mateship? Without in any way taking my eyes off the member for Coles, I can see in my side vision about two people who ask that very question. They ask it on a daily basis, and they ask it very publicly. I would have thought that the last member in this Parliament to talk about mateship would be the member for Coles. I do not want to be distracted by interjections. The position is clear: the term of Jack Wright as Chairman of the Lotteries Commission was up. He has done a good job—not always uncontroversial, but nevertheless he has done a good job. The Government feels it is time for someone new to be Chair of the Lotteries Commission. There is nothing new in that whatsoever.

If the suggestion from the Opposition is that people will always be reappointed to boards, there will never be any change. All we are saying is that the Government thought it was time for a change, for someone else to be appointed as Chair of the Lotteries Commission. I cannot see that there is really anything to explain—except one thing: I can guarantee that, had we reappointed Jack Wright as Chair of the Lotteries Commission, questions would have been asked by members opposite, such as the member for Morphett. Members opposite would have said, 'It is an outrage that you have reappointed Jack Wright.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HOLLOWS PROFESSOR FRED

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs advise the House of the contribution to the well-being of Australia's indigenous peoples by the late Professor Fred Hollows?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure that all members of this House and the other place would join me in paying a tribute to the work that has been performed in this country and overseas by that outstanding Australian, Professor Fred Hollows. Sadly, today we heard of his death after a long battle and, I would say, an almost successful battle against cancer, because he has carried that disease for many years while continuing his tireless and selfless efforts to assist disadvantaged communities in this country and overseas, particularly in Eritrea and parts of Africa.

Professor Hollows made a significant contribution to Australia, particularly to our indigenous peoples. He worked with Aboriginal communities throughout Australia to improve the quality of their lifestyle. He could have demanded any price for his professional services in the high priced areas of Sydney or the eastern coast, but he chose to make his contribution to those communities that needed his support, advice and skills. Over those years he tackled trachoma within the Aboriginal communities and I am sure he assisted many young people who today, because of his work and his efforts, are healthier and happier people.

His work as an eye surgeon was world renowned and in 1990 he was named Australian of the Year. He will be sadly missed by all, and particularly by our Aboriginal communities. His contribution will be remembered by Australians as significant. I am sure I am joined by all members of this Chamber and the community of South Australia in passing on sincerest sympathies to his wife Gabi and his seven children.

MOUNT LOFTY PROJECT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. Does the Government intend to sell the St Michael's site adjacent to the Mount Lofty summit to a consortium for $1.6 million as part of its belated attempts to have the site developed into a communications tower, observation deck and restaurant complex, and is this sale intended to be carried out without making it available through public tender?

It is now almost 10 years since the disastrous Ash Wednesday fires ravaged the St Michael's and Mount Lofty summit sites, and subsequent invitations were made for expressions of interest on how the site could be developed. The Urebilla project emerged, but extensive changes have since been made to conditions for development and the scope of the project itself. I am told present discussions between the Government and the developer involve the sale of the site, no free access for

the public to the summit and vehicular access to the summit would be refused.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: No final decisions have been made on the matters to which the honourable member refers. When they are, I will advise the honourable member, and indeed all honourable members, of the details of this matter. I can assure the House that it is most certainly the intention of the Government to allow public access to the summit. That is one of the crucial elements in the development process and it is one of the reasons why it has taken so long for the project to come to fruition, that is, the desire to enable access to that summit and to provide a development that will enhance the environment of the area.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: All I can say is that the honourable member will have to wait until those decisions are taken.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Public Infrastructure advise the House on the impact of the Federal Liberal Opposition's proposed 15 per cent goods and services tax on the price to South Australian consumers of electricity, gas and water?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the member for Spence for his question, because it hits the GST tax nail right on the head. If a Hewson Government is elected on 13 March, South Australians will face a 15 per cent hike in their electricity, gas and water bills as a result of the introduction of a goods and services tax. This sweeping tax, affecting most of the ordinary necessities of this life, will undo much of the good work that our utilities and the Government have been doing to try to reduce the cost of the services from these utilities.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is out of order.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Let me go through each one of these individually. My colleague the former Minister of Water Resources last year announced that water tariffs for 1993-94 would be pegged at the same level as in the current financial year. This would mean a real reduction in water charges. However, with an addition of a 15 per cent GST, the average residential water bill, which was $260 in the 1991-92 financial year, will rise to $299—a rise of $39 to the average consumer. Also, the average residential sewerage bill can be expected to jump by about $35. Members also might have noticed that there was no increase in the price of gas at the beginning of the year when such price increases are normally announced.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is again out of order.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: This means that there will be a continuation of last year's tariff levels for gas, once again bringing about a real reduction in these charges in addition to the real reductions that the Gas Company has been able to bring about in recent years. A Hewson Liberal Government will again reverse that trend. With a 15 per cent GST added to the average annual domestic gas bill of $285 in 1992, the average consumer can expect to pay an extra $42 or more in a year.

Now let us turn to the effect of GST on electricity bills. No-one in this House would be unaware—because I have told them often enough—of the real reductions that have taken place in the price of electricity since 1985, and indeed of the real rises—the enormous rises—that took place between 1979 and 1982 when the last Liberal Government was in power in this State. The last increase in electricity tariffs at the start of the current financial year averaged four-tenths of one per cent—.4 of one per cent. Domestic tariffs rose by 2.5 per cent, and that was a continuation of the Government's policy of keeping such increases at or below movements in the CPI. Again, that policy of real reductions in electricity prices will be totally reversed by the introduction of a GST. For example, the average domestic consumer on the J and M tariffs with a current quarterly bill of approximately $214.85 (including supply charge) can expect, with the addition of the GST, to pay $247 quarterly—an increase of more than $32 a quarter. If the consumer has M tariff only, the average quarterly bill will rise from about $161 to approximately $185.

Those are very significant increases in costs which will hit every household in this State that is connected to water, electricity and gas. The aggregate of how much extra the average household will have to pay will be in excess of $200 per year, or $4 per week. These are not avoidable charges. While we can all attempt to minimise our consumption, we need water, heating, cooling, lighting and refrigeration. Fortunately, the GST is completely avoidable. The GST—

An honourable member: You are lying. You are a liar.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There is a point of order by the Minister of Education, Employment and Training.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to take a point of order. The member for Victoria accused the Minister of lying.

The SPEAKER: The Minister himself should take that point of order.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am so used to being called all sorts of things by the Opposition that I do not mind what they call me, but I can tell you that every fact I have quoted here today has been absolutely correct. Fortunately—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister may not take offence, but the Chair does: it is totally unparliamentary for that term to be used. The Chair heard it used and would request the member for Victoria to withdraw the accusation. Will the member for Victoria withdraw that statement?

Mr D.S. BAKER: What was the request, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The Chair heard the member for Victoria use an absolutely unparliamentary term regarding the Minister and asks him to withdraw it.

Mr D.S. BAKER: If it was unparliamentary, Mr Speaker, I withdraw it.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: After that graceful withdrawal by the member for Victoria, I will again state that every comment I have made here has been absolutely accurate, and I will say again that the GST is completely avoidable: all the people of this State have to do is to vote against the Liberal Party on 13 March.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the next question, I indicate that the answers today have been unbelievably long. This will not be allowed to continue. I ask that all responses be kept as brief as possible, otherwise Question Time will turn into a total shambles.

TEACHERS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I direct my question to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training.

Members interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland will address the Chair.

Mrs KOTZ: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. Will the Minister call for an immediate review of the implementation of staffing formula policy which, in its present form, is responsible for the removal of teachers from classes and disruption of entire school staffing allocations? In recent days and this morning the Opposition has been contacted by dozens of parents and teachers who are very angry that their school has been targeted for staff reductions following only marginal falls in student enrolments. In the latest of these moves, Ridgehaven Primary School has been advised that it must shed one of its teachers by the end of the week, because the school has nine fewer students than in 1992. Parents and teachers are furious that in the fourth week of the school term classes throughout the entire school will have to be reorganised to accommodate the lost teacher.

I have also been informed that the department was aware that a reduction in the number of students would occur in 1993 but that it chose to ignore that advice and allocated the staff on 1992 figures. I am further informed that the school already has two temporary teachers due to one being on stress leave for a period of three years, and therefore exempt from displacement, and a newly appointed member's not taking up the position due to a medical condition.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the answers have to be kept short, I would ask also that the questions be as brief as possible.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg is out of order. Does the member for Bragg have some problem with the Chair? If we manage to keep the questions brief, to the point and well explained and the answers the same, we will get through some questions. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would ask the honourable member to pay me the courtesy of providing me with the details of that case. However, I would like to address some of the general issues that the honourable member has raised.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have asked the honourable member to provide me with the particulars of that school. I will pick up on some of the general issues the honourable member has raised. Obviously, if there has to be a cut-off point in terms of a staffing formula, there will always be some areas where schools just miss out by a few students. I guess the Opposition is saying to me, 'Well, Minister, you should provide that extra teacher at every school.' Let me remind the Opposition that we would be talking about 750 work sites and 750 teachers extra, at a minimum of $50 000 per teacher on-cost. Let us look at this objectively. First, I have asked the Director-General to look at those areas where there is a small number of students above the allocation of teachers per number of students. I have asked the Director-General to look at that in the next couple of weeks. The final census will be in from the schools on 19 February. It makes sense to wait and see what is happening.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Is the honourable member saying that we should find something like $22.5 million extra for an extra teacher for every school just in case? Is that what the honourable member is saying? In answering the question, I should like to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume her seat. I remind the House that interjections are out of order. The member for Newland had more than adequate time to ask her question, and I thought it was a well explained question. If she has anything further to add, she can always ask another question. Interjections are out of order. The Minister will direct her response through the Chair and keep it as brief as possible.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I should like to say briefly that the department is doing everything in its power to provide for the requirements that it has agreed with teachers in terms of staffing and with the school communities. I remind the House that the honourable member is really suggesting that we find another $22.5 million against a background of the Opposition's publicly stated commitment to cut the same funding to the same department by between 15 and 25 per cent. I find that this is hypocritical in the extreme. I ask members to take a trip across to Victoria to find out what is happening to the education system there where—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is debating the question, which she has answered. The member for Henley Beach.

CHILD-CARE

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training inform the House how child-care in South Australia will benefit from the Prime Minister's statement yesterday about child-care cash rebates? Many constituents have approached me seeking to place their children in day care but, unfortunately, places are not available. I have already received telephone calls in my office from mothers in my electorate who are seeking information as to whether the new Commonwealth scheme will be of assistance to them.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson will not interject. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to provide—

Mr S.J. Baker: How about a short answer for a change?

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to inform the honourable member about this subject in my answer to his question. With respect to affordability, yesterday the Prime Minister and Mr Staples announced that parents will be able to claim a cash rebate of up to one-third of the cost of all work-related costs for child-care. That translates in a yearly figure to $1 466 per annum per child or a maximum of $3 182 for two or more children. For those people who feel more comfortable in dealing with figures on a weekly basis, it means $28.20 per week for one child or $61.20 per week for two or more children.

It is important to note that this is an enormous move forward and, counter to what was printed in the *Advertiser* this morning, I should like to put on the public record that this cash rebate applies to children who attend private for profit child-care centres as well as those who attend community-based and work-based child-care centres.

As well as this significant and monumental move forward in terms of providing affordable child-care, two other measures were also announced. The first concerns access to further places. The aim of the Federal Government is to meet all work-related child-care demand by the year 2001, and that means that there will be an increase to a total of 354 000 places nationally compared with the present 200 000 places. Secondly, I am sure that every member of this Parliament would acknowledge the need for quality of service that is guaranteed throughout the country. Therefore, the Federal Government has announced a $1.6 million per annum commitment to the establishment of a national accreditation system so that every parent of a child in this country will be able to go to a child-care facility, whether it is private for profit or publicly funded—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. First, I draw attention to the length of the Minister's reply and, secondly, I suggest that this information is more appropriate for a ministerial statement. The Minister should not waste the time of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair takes note of the time when a question commences, and it has now been four minutes. The question took part of that. There was a three-minute answer, and by today's standards that is by no means overlong. However, it will not be allowed to continue, let me add. The Chair has no discretion over ministerial statements. That is the choice of the Minister, but I point out to Ministers that the facility is there for long, detailed statements. I would ask the Minister to conclude very quickly.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The out of order interjection was that this was a waste of time. I wonder how the community of South Australia would view such an attitude, particularly young parents. In recognition of family responsibilities involving the care for sick or mildly ill children, $15.7 million will be provided for care options for those children. That will be very welcome by many parents who do not have an extended family in our South Australian community.

TEACHERS

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Will the Minister of Education ensure that the overhaul of the Education Department's teacher placement policy, including its 10 year tenure policy, is an independent review rather than one conducted by the department, unions and other parties with a vested interest? On 21 January the Minister announced a review of its teacher placement policy and, in particular, its policy that requires teachers to move to another school after 10 years service to the school.

This announcement was made contrary to numerous denials by the Minister and her office during January that there were problems with the placement system. These statements include, 'There are no major problems...all primary and junior primary teachers have been placed' from the *Advertiser* of 14 January 1993—

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you have already ruled on the length of questions. This is the second extremely long question that we have had from the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Henley Beach to resume his seat. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: A further statement, 'I believe all permanent teachers will be placed (when schools go back tomorrow)' appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 24 January 1993, and finally there was the statement 'Mr Lucas has inflamed a sensitive situation with his comments' in the *Advertiser* of 20 January 1993.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As I have already made very clear to the South Australian community, and particularly the education community, I am not just having a review: I am actually going to have an overhaul of the system. The difference in that is that we will actually look at some of those areas that require some fine tuning. It is most interesting that the honourable member seeks again to undermine what is the best system of education in the country, and I will not be party to that. In fact, I have made very clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —that this overhaul will be conducted by a very small group of people and, yes, I will be announcing who will actually chair it. It has always been my intention and that of the Director General that it would be somebody who is not directly involved in the system, for quite obvious commonsense reasons. The Opposition finds this quite an amazing political issue. It has never been my intention to do anything other than appoint somebody who will actually—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —coordinate this overhaul, to chair this very small group, from outside the system. That person will be announced at the end of next week. I have also made it very clear publicly—and the

honourable member chooses not to quote this part of what I have said—that I want to have a couple of teachers, perhaps at the deputy principal level, who are out there in the schools working with the current system and who have a hands-on, working knowledge of the system.

Let me put on the public record that I believe most teachers do support the 10 year placement policy, and they support it on the grounds of access and equity. On the basis of access and equity, now that we have been into the system for two years, it is appropriate to have a look at how it is working. If some changes need to be made, we will make them. I know that galls the Opposition, because it does not like people to be open and honest enough to assess the system. One representative on this small working group will be from the Institute of Teachers, but it certainly will not consist of a majority of people from either the Institute of Teachers or the department. I would be very happy to provide the honourable member and anyone else who is interested in education in South Australia with the further details when I release them.

I want to conclude by saying that it is very undermining, and teachers are telling me that they are not very happy with the kind of undermining that is taking place from the Opposition. In fact, a number of school principals told me this morning in a meeting with them. It might be worthwhile remembering that because, while the Opposition is undermining the best education system in this country, it must take some degree of responsibility for the actions it is trying to take purely for a Party and a Party-political motive.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Environment and Land Management inform the House of the general scope of review of the State's reserve system, which he has recently announced, and does he believe there is any validity in the proposal from the Leader of the Opposition for the privatisation of parks? In a press release of 19 January, the Leader of the Opposition proposed a two-part strategy for increasing resources within the parks system: first, allowing private interests to buy out reserves and, secondly, encouraging corporate sponsorship of parks.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Price for his question, because it is an important issue, particularly with regard to the national estate. I am sure that many South Australians were concerned to learn of the Leader's comments on the radio and also in the press release with regard to what I proposed in the review of the national parks system and what is envisaged. It is interesting to note the comments of the Leader in his press release. What he said there conflicts with what he said on radio, because he indicated in his press release that they were allowing private management and/or ownership of some reserves. There must have been a re-think between that release and what he said on 5AN radio on 20 January, namely:

> No, I am not proposing national parks be sold.

So, he has contradicted his earlier press release. Further, he said:

> I am proposing that some of those national parks or reserves, where appropriate, should come under private management agreements.

As to what has been proposed regarding conservation, it is important to consider what is required in terms of the extensive parks and reserves network that exists in this State and what financial means are available to offer proper conservation programs. Given the base line, if we invest in the parks and reserves systems the millions of dollars needed to offer proper conservation programs, the only way that can be done with private enterprise is by the price at the gate. That must be carefully taken into account by the electors of South Australia when they consider the Opposition's proposals.

The Leader went on to say that there would be some impact involving the price at the gate of the park or reserve. In fact, he confirmed that because he went on to say in that interview on 5AN on 20 January:

> Well, in most cases, no. I'm not saying that there wouldn't be some cases where there may be a rise in fees, but in most cases that certainly won't be the case.

I beg to differ because, if he is going to hand across to the private sector the operation of these parks and the ownership of these reserves, the public of South Australia will have to pay, and pay at the gate. That raises some very important fundamental threshold questions about access of the whole community to our national estate. The Leader is pitching to the electors of South Australia a price rise and a significant fee to enter their national parks.

I suggest to the community that people look carefully at what is being proposed by the Leader. What we are proposing within the scope of our review is along the lines of the continuation of those sponsorship programs and opportunities that we have already developed to offer financial support to our parks.

The scope of the review that I have asked the CEO of the department to undertake involves finding more effective ways of managing and conserving our parks, particularly the conservation programs, so that we look at the extensive way in which we undertake those programs within the parks and reserves systems. We have to look carefully at that. It means a number of opportunities, but it does not mean selling our national estate, as the Leader has suggested, and it does not mean enormous price increases and forcing community members who want freedom of access—

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You asked for a short answer. The Minister knew of the question, because he had the Leader's statement with him. The information could have been provided as a ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order concerns the length of the answer. I uphold the point of order. I call on the next question. The member for Bright.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Correctional Services consult with the police to determine whether there is a need to restrict access by prisoners to public phones in Yatala Prison because of crimes allegedly being orchestrated from within that

prison? The police have been conducting investigations into credit card fraud organised from Yatala Prison. Prisoners allegedly have obtained names and credit card numbers of people paying accounts by credit card to a very large organisation, and I am prepared to reveal the identity of that organisation privately to the Minister. There is concern that prisoners have also obtained information showing when credit card holders move house. In this scam the prisoners involved allegedly telephone major Adelaide retailers and order expensive items such as dishwashers and washing machines, giving the credit card number they have obtained.

The delivery directions require the goods to be left at the back door of homes which have later been found to have been recently vacated. Conspirators with the prisoners then pick up the goods. The owners of the credit cards find out about this scam when they are billed for products that they have not ordered. I have been told that police believe these orders are being placed from public telephones in Yatala Prison and the police are frustrated that prisoners have such free access to these phones.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members for Bright and Hanson are out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hanson is out of order again. I warn him about his actions. The Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for Bright for his question. As Minister of Correctional Services I am sure that the police properly conduct investigations that they wish to undertake in regard to criminal activities and, indeed, I would expect them to do so. I am starting to treat with some caution any allegations raised in the House by the member for Bright, because yesterday he claimed that he was reliably informed that electronic systems were not working. In his previous occupation the member for Bright was involved in electronics, so I would have thought that he would understand that any electronics or computer system when installed for the first time has to be worked through, tested and from time to time modified. However, if the member for Bright does not believe that because when he worked in that area he never had to adjust any system he worked on, he must be a unique person and so I wonder why he is in this place making mistakes all the time.

I am not too sure as to the truth of the honourable member's allegation, but one of the management regimes within the prison system is for prisoners to have the right to make telephone calls. The member for Bright has visited prisons and knows of this policy. He knows that calls have to be booked and he knows that calls are allowed only during certain periods of time. He knows that people are given phone cards to avoid gambling and trading in money.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Bright must have had a very deprived childhood, because he cannot be polite and keeps interrupting. His mother should have taken to him with a strap—she might have taught him some manners. I know he advocates that sort of activity for other people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will come back to answering the question he was asked as quickly and concisely as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide will cease interjecting.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Prisoners do have the right to make telephone calls. They are booked and I am not going to stop that practice because of allegations made in this place. When the police finish their investigations, and if people are charged, they will be treated appropriately.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright is developing this habit of asking a question and adding to it. That will not be tolerated.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I want to raise two issues this afternoon. The first is my concern that Labor Party material has been circulated in at least one TAFE institution of which I am aware. I hope the Minister responsible for TAFE facilities in this State will take appropriate action to see that this sort of material is immediately removed and not circulated again. A constituent of mine who had reason to visit the Port Augusta office of TAFE found, to his horror, that a sports policy document issued by the office of the Federal Minister for the Arts, Sport, the Environment, Tourism and Territories in September 1992 was on public display in that building. It is a very large facility and it is used by a lot of outlying groups to hold meetings.

My constituent picked up one of these documents and asked me why this Government institution was peddling Labor Party untruths. This document is not an official Government publication: Mr Speaker, this is a political document which is grossly misleading and inaccurate. Those who are responsible for putting it in that building are downgrading an excellent facility. I have had experience in the past with TAFE organisations. An officer at Peterborough used its facilities for the Labor Party to campaign against me. I know all about some of the tricks. I could name a series of Labor Party front men who are in TAFE. This eight page document—I have it here and I am happy to give it to the Minister—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Obviously. Look at what it says: 'Sport for all or sport for the wealthy. How the Opposition's GST affects sport.' Then it goes on with this misleading farrago of nonsense, lies, half-truths and misleading statements. It is a scurrilous document and the Labor Party obviously is running scared because it has to resort to this sort of misleading and inaccurate policy. The worst aspect of it is that it has been permitted to remain

for a considerable time in a Government institution which is there to further the education of the people who use it. It is an excellent institution, as are all TAFE institutions in this State: they play an important role. Their independence and the good work that is carried out in them should not be compromised or downgraded by Labor Party front people, stooges and fellow travellers peddling their untruths. If they want to resort to those sorts of tactics—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: If Mr Piltz and others want to do that and kick in the ruck, we will play the game—make no mistake about that We have not started yet. I believe in a fair go for all, but when this sort of material is circulated the game is on and the gloves are off. I call on the State Minister and others to ensure that it does not happen again and to apologise to the Opposition and our candidate for the indiscretion; or, if the Labor Party wants fairness, allow the Liberal Party to put its material in there. I know the sorts of tricks that the Labor Party gets up to. In 1982 when we were in Government I decided to pay a quick visit to the Community Welfare Office in Alice Springs—and what did I find? Reams of Labor Party propaganda in the shelves, and we did something about that and it was fixed.

Mr Lewis: What happened Graham? Did you burn it?

Mr GUNN: The office was closed down soon afterwards. It was no longer there. It was providing a considerable amount of entertainment for certain people—three weeks in Alice Springs and one week on the lands. We did something about that. The Premier of the day was not aware of what was going on. I have had experience with these sorts of people. This document was brought to my attention by a responsible citizen who was most concerned because his organisation and others used that facility on a regular basis, and it was providing excellent facilities. It should not be compromised by what I regard as unfortunate activities by devious people who want to promote the Labor Party come hell or high water and with no regard for the effect on the rest of the community. Today I was going to talk at some length about the difficulties of the Meat Hygiene Authority in South Australia, but I will save that for another occasion, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: You certainly will, and will resume your seat as well. The honourable member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): On 13 March the people of Australia, and indeed the people of South Australia, will be making a choice between two very starkly different alternatives. I think it is significant here today to bring in a couple of aspects of what is known around Australia as the Fightback program. On *Lateline* last night on ABC TV shadow Treasurer Reith bragged about the fact that, under a Federal Liberal Government, $20 billion will be taken off business taxation in this country—$20 billion will be shifted from the business sector—and placed on individuals in this country in the form of the GST.

Mr Lewis: That is a lie. He has never said that.

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Speaker, I take umbrage at a member calling a statement I made a lie and I ask him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Earlier today I did require a member to do so because that is totally unparliamentary and is not acceptable. If a member implies that a member has told a lie or is a liar, it is unparliamentary. I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr LEWIS: I withdraw, Mr Speaker. I withdraw the remark and say simply that it is untrue.

Mr QUIRKE: I believe that that is not a proper withdrawal; it is a qualified withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Because of what the Chair considers to be the seriousness of the use of unparliamentary words, I ask for a total withdrawal from the member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I withdraw.

Mr QUIRKE: In essence, the alternative to what could happen here in Australia is quite simple. Taxation is to be taken off business in Australia—that is the proposal—and is to be handed over to the tax paying community at large. A number of people who do not wish to pay tax in this country and those people who support members opposite in this Parliament and in Canberra seem to think that they will get away with this on 13 March. Indeed, it could well be argued that this is one of the worst examples of a change to the taxation mix in this country that we have ever seen—taxation taken from business and placed on individuals; in fact, placed on individuals at the taxation end of the spectrum where they can least afford it.

On a similar note, it is interesting to hear the debate on Medicare in this country. Since the early days of Medicare some nine years ago, more than four million people are now covered by public hospital insurance in the form of the universal Medicare levy.

We heard here today a statement made by the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services about hospital usage in Australia and, indeed, here in South Australia. Medicare is one of those great schemes that have come in which guarantee that, when the ambulance pulls up at the hospital, the private insurance is not checked first before that person is admitted. That is the scheme that works in America; that is the scheme that President Clinton has promised to change; that is the scheme that consumes 14 per cent of gross domestic product in America, as opposed to 8 per cent here in Australia; and that is the scheme that the Liberal Party in Australia wants to bring in. Liberal members are not keen about it: they are almost embarrassed about it, but they have so many medical specialists whose pockets they have promised to line after this coming Federal election that they have no choice but to look after them. It is the same old story. They ruined Medibank. Why did they do it? To increase the income of the doctors in this country.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to take these few minutes to express some of my concerns about the future use of the Mount Lofty summit. It is a matter which I have raised in this House previously and which I raised in Question Time a little earlier this afternoon. I want to say at the outset that I am not opposed to development generally, and I am certainly not opposed to the development of the St Michael's site. It is an extremely valuable tourist site—probably one of the most valuable in this State—and it is one that needs to be

developed. It has been disastrous that the Mount Lofty summit has remained in its original form since the disastrous bushfires 10 years ago almost to the day. No facilities have been available at all, and the Government has come under considerable criticism as a result of that situation.

To indicate further that I am not opposed to development in that area, I have supported and continue to support very strongly the development proposal put forward by the Mount Lofty Tourist Association to provide a low key facility, providing toilets and an opportunity for people to have a cup of tea or similar on the summit itself. So, I support development of the St Michael's site and I support the Mount Lofty Tourist Association proposal as well.

The fact is that, to a lot of people, the Mount Lofty summit can be classed almost as a sacred site in South Australian terms, and I am concerned, because that area is in danger of being isolated from free public access. As I said, 10 years ago the area was devastated by fire. After that, the Government determined that it should call for expressions of interest, to which four or five different developers replied and indicated that they would be interested in the future development of that site. My concern is that at least three of those developments could have been up and running almost immediately and could have been providing employment now and the much needed tourist facilities in that area, but the Government decided that it would go for what it referred to as its 'glitzy development'.

The consortium that was taken on board by the Government has now had to request four or five extensions of time to enable it to provide adequate funding for that development to go ahead. I understand it now has until the end of March in what I believe is the fifth extension (but it might be the fourth). It has until March to come up with the finance or, as the Minister has indicated, he will go to some of the other developers who expressed an interest to see whether they can develop that area.

It is only in recent times that I have learnt that the Government is negotiating with the present consortium to enable it to purchase the St Michael's site for $1.6 million, to be paid, as I understand, over a 10-year period from the time when the facility is made available to the public. I do not object to the private involvement and I do not object to the private sale, but I am concerned that the opportunity is not being provided for this site to go to public tender, to enable other people who may be interested in developing it to consider the price as well. I am further very concerned—and this is why I asked the question today—about the limited access that will be provided to the summit if the consortium is given the responsibility of looking after the summit itself. As I said earlier, the summit is a very special place to the majority of people in South Australia, and I believe it would be totally inappropriate for the Government or the consortium to have total rights over who can visit that site and when. I hope that the Minister will respond to this issue.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I think it is fair to say that, in the 13½ years that I have been in Parliament, overall, the media have been most kind to the member for Albert Park in terms of the issues I have raised and the support I have received in many areas. It is with some trepidation, I suspect, that I stand up and raise this issue, because it has not been my wont to criticise the media, but on this occasion I feel somewhat compelled to do so. In reading an article in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 1 December entitled 'House erosion threat: Legal move in row on beach sites', by environmental reporter Jenny Turner, I noted that in part she talks (quite properly) about the erosion along the beach front in the western suburbs. The part that I am concerned about is the following statement:

> The worst affected house at Bournemouth Street, Tennyson, has had sections of its front yard eroded.

This matter was brought to my attention six years ago, when I took up the matter with the then Minister for Environment and Planning, and I would have thought that, irrespective of where they came from, a reporter would have had the wit or intelligence, or both, to contact the local member of Parliament, because I think it is fair to say that, no matter what side of the political fence one is on, most members of Parliament have a pretty good rapport with and understanding of the issues within their electorate, and I do not think I am an exception. When I read this article, I thought to myself, 'Someone has not done their homework.' In my view, it implied that the Government was not doing its job. That is not in accordance with the facts because, in correspondence dated 13 February 1987 to a constituent of mine, the then acting Minister, Roy Abbott, stated:

> I am writing in regard to your complaint, to Mr Kevin Hamilton MP, on the location of a new home on Lot 6 Bournemouth Street, Tennyson. The owner of the property approached the Coastal Management Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning to discuss his building proposals for the site. Officers of the branch provided advice which included a set back distance deemed suitable for the location. This advice was also given to the Woodville council by the SA Planning Commission when the development application was referred to it. The set back distance was given in relation to an adjacent dwelling, which was found to be incorrectly shown on the developer's plan when an on-site inspection was carried out after construction had commenced. The foundation for the house is situated 16.5 metres from the front boundary of the allotment, which is well within the requirement of the Building Act. It is unfortunate that when the land was originally subdivided it was allowed to encroach so far into the dunal system. The property owner—

and this is the guts of the issue—

> has been advised by the Coastal Management Branch that the building is located in an area that is likely to be susceptible to storm attack and that responsibility for its protection and safety rests with him.

In my opinion, anyone with half a brain could have seen that, sooner or later, with the erosion that was taking place along the Adelaide beach front, this house would have been under threat, and indeed it has been. Whilst this resident has not come to me for support or assistance, I suspect that at some time in the future he or she will do so, and I will try to do everything in my power to help. When I read articles such as this, it

annoys me that the reporter has not taken the time to make contact with me as the local member. I do not mind reporters ringing me up, as they do on other occasions any time of the day or night, to ask me questions. On this occasion, this person was remiss in not doing her job properly.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): A very revealing article appeared in the *Advertiser* of Thursday 21 January this year. The article pointed out that South Australia's Government schools are Australia's worst maintained and, according to a national survey, their deterioration is extremely alarming. Whilst it was a revealing article, it was not news to me or to the Opposition. I was surprised that the *Advertiser* ran the article on page one, given that the Opposition has endeavoured to highlight the lack of maintenance in our schools over many years.

It was remarkable to hear the Minister, in Question Time today, say that we have the best education system in the country. Mr Speaker, you know, I believe all members of the Opposition know, and I hope most members of the Government know, that that is a blatantly incorrect statement. In this connection, I should like to highlight some of the things that occur from a maintenance point of view in South Australian schools.

Some 1 026 schools were surveyed and the survey revealed that, in South Australia, half the Government schools require maintenance. Some four years ago in 1988, only 39 per cent of schools in this State needed maintenance; yet time after time we have heard the Government say that it is attending to maintenance needs, that it is endeavouring to catch up and that appropriate money is being spent. I have always believed that moneys have not been sufficient, and that has been revealed in the national survey.

I was pleased to note that the Acting President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers (Ms Janet Giles) said that the Government had to recognise that the education system needs to be funded adequately and that education should be a priority in funding. In fact, Ms Giles said that, if one went to most Government schools, one would find a general dilapidation of buildings. I hope that Ms Giles and the South Australian Institute of Teachers will make their views known during the Federal election campaign and come out clearly in favour of a change of Government, because they have seen what has happened under Labor, where 50 per cent of buildings need maintenance compared with only 39 per cent four years ago. I hope that the Institute of Teachers sees the need for a change of Government so that something can be done about this disgraceful situation.

In my own electorate, schools from Port Vincent to Kulpara, and the larger schools such as Ardrossan Area School, Kadina Primary School and Balaklava High School, all reek of a lack of maintenance. In one case, it is believed that a building has not been painted for nearly 30 years and, having looked at the building, I understand what they mean. The playgrounds have potholes and large rises caused by tree roots in what should be flat surfaces. At Kadina Primary School, a massive lake appears when it rains for a certain period. Some days after rain, I visited that school and noticed that large pools of water had not drained away.

Inside, poor carpets cause a real safety hazard if children trip over them and there are cracks in buildings that have to be seen to be believed. Teachers often give up trying to open or lock windows because of their poor condition. At one school, some boards have been rotten for many years. It has become a standing joke to see how much further the rot has spread in that school. I can understand why parents and students are frustrated by these conditions. The worst thing is that so often good money is spent after bad. In other words, repairs are done when items should be replaced.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Over the years I have taken a keen interest in child-care, particularly within my electorate. Various Labor Governments can be extremely proud of the way in which they have advanced the child-care issue. Very little was spent by the Fraser Government and other conservative Governments on child-care and it has been only in the past 10 years that this matter has been given the attention it deserves. However, the edict from the Federal Government was that child-care places would be made available in areas of most need. Unfortunately, that has been to the disadvantage of my electorate, because we do not have vast numbers of poor people compared with the numbers in other electorates. Those people on the average wage, with an average education, having the average number of two cars in the driveway, and so on, have not been assisted by the money that has been flowing from Canberra for child-care.

The Hon. B. C. Eastick interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I have only a short time available to me, so I will not answer interjections. The statement that was made yesterday by the Prime Minister was of great importance to me and to the people in my electorate. I would describe it as a giant leap forward in the provision of child-care in South Australia and, in particular, in my electorate. Every year, the number of women entering the work force in a full-time or part-time capacity is increasing in South Australia. That is no different from what is happening in the rest of Australia and, indeed, it is a trend throughout the world. This is to be applauded, because it has meant not only increased benefits to families by way of increased income—

Mr S.G. Evans: Some families.

Mr FERGUSON: It has also meant that all the skills that have been acquired over time are not lost as people continue in industry. However, it has made the issue of child-care extremely important. Anyone who believes in equality should not interject in this debate but should cheer every move that has been made to increase child-care places. I am not sure that people have yet discovered the extent to which the announcement by the Prime Minister will benefit South Australians. It means that there will be an extra 49 500 places in Australia by 1996-97 and a further 55 000 places by the year 2001. That means a total of 354 000 places compared with the present 200 000 child-care places.

The relief provisions are free of means test and will be available to everybody. A subsidy of up to $16 per week will be provided for one child—and that equates to $1 466 per annum—up to an incredible $3 182

per annum for two or more children. The sales tax exemption for long day care centres now applies, because they are considered to be educational places. There will be a check-up on the quality of the service, because the Federal Government will be spending $1.6 million on an accreditation centre to make sure that the quality of child-care is kept up to standard. Businesses with employees will include cash incentives for centre-based children and the extension of the fringe benefit tax exemption to employer-sponsored family day care centres and outside of school care will operate from 1 July 1993. What a leap forward that is. Any employer who wants to provide child-care as a fringe benefit to his employee will now not have to pay the additional tax on that proposition.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SHOPPING TROLLEYS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 November. Page 1681.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): For a person who drones on *ad nauseam* about over regulation and financial restraints being placed on business by this Government, the Deputy Leader should be laughed out of this Parliament for having the temerity to introduce a Bill such as this. The Bill does have some merit in that it draws attention to the fact that not all people using the convenience of shopping trolleys at supermarkets routinely return them. The introduction of legislation which, in effect, fines a business offering trolleys to their customers imposes an unnecessary financial penalty on businesses in seeking to resolve this matter. As it stands, for those reasons alone, the Government cannot support this Bill.

Certainly, there are people who cannot be relied upon to return a trolley to the store and, in some instances, supermarkets themselves could do more to ensure that trolleys are collected. However, to attempt to introduce legislation that ultimately penalises a business for the wrong-doing of some members of the public, known or unknown, who might have taken and discarded the offending trolley will, I suggest, not solve the problem.

In introducing this Bill, the honourable member referred to the view that it is inappropriate at this stage to legislate that in all circumstances all supermarket trolleys should be restrained with a deposit system and that, if deposit systems were in place, we would not have trolleys littering our streets and footpaths. The purpose of this Bill, as I see it, is therefore to provide an inducement to supermarkets to institute a deposit system for shopping trolleys. While coin deposit systems on trolleys can assist with their return, this does not totally eliminate the problem of trolleys being taken and abandoned. If coin deposit systems were effective, all supermarkets would no doubt introduce them voluntarily, because the cost of installation would soon be recouped.

We have had instances of that in my own electorate in the past five years. Where it is convenient for customers, most trolleys will be dutifully returned to the supermarket surrounds, and this can be encouraged with sensible management practices and good design of parking bays. As I say, the Elizabeth Town Centre management does that effectively in conjunction with the two major supermarkets at that centre. Whilst there may be genuine concerns in the Mitcham shopping area about trolleys being abandoned in public streets, it is not yet clear whether the problem is so apparent in other areas of the State as to require the introduction of such legislation.

If I may digress, I would suggest that the Deputy Leader is so keen to get a headline that, because he sees one supermarket trolley outside his electorate office, he has a brainstorm to come into this House and introduce this legislation. I am sure that most other members of the House would agree with me that, in the major shopping areas in their electorates, that problem does not exist or, if it does exist, it exists in a minimal way.

As the honourable member explained, the Bill seeks to treat shopping trolleys in much the same manner as litter. This means that a person found abandoning a shopping trolley on a public street, road or footpath is littering and is to be fined, similar to their dropping a piece of paper. There is no difference whatsoever. Section 748a of the Local Government Act 1934 currently contains provisions that allow councils to fine and prosecute persons discarding waste matter, which is defined as including any discarded object. Shopping trolleys are taken from the business and then discarded. Councils already have the power to fine a person caught in the act of discarding an object such as a trolley, and clearly fining the person caught abandoning a trolley may act as a disincentive, but this does not solve the problem.

If the person abandoning the trolley is not found, the Bill provides that, where a shopping trolley is abandoned on a public street, road or footpath, an authorised person may remove the trolley and take reasonable steps to notify the business. If the trolley is not claimed, they may dispose of the trolley. The business is entitled to the return of the trolley, but only if it pays a fee to council set by the by-laws of that council.

Representatives of the Retail Traders Association have expressed concern about the financial imposition on business. Is it not strange that so often from members on the other side we hear that the Retail Traders Association has come to them because of draconian legislation or regulations being introduced by this side, but surprise, surprise, I can inform the House that the Retail Traders Association thinks that this Bill, which was introduced by the Deputy Leader, is a load of rubbish. I sincerely hope that any member opposite who follows me in this debate will inform the House what the Retail Traders Association has said to them.

Supermarkets do not willingly discard or abandon their own expensive trolleys. It is considered unfair by most fair-minded people that the supermarkets should have to pay for the return of their own property. Clearly, a definition is necessary to determine in what circumstances a trolley can be deemed to be abandoned. Will this mean that, if a trolley is not picked up within 24 hours, it is considered to be abandoned? Some store

managers control tightly trolleys left in the vicinity of the store, whilst the housekeeping of others is less fastidious. Again, I give a guernsey to the Elizabeth City management. The control of trolleys in that area is so tight that it is virtually impossible to pick up a trolley outside a parking bay. The parking bays are located all over the car park, and there are people putting trolleys into those parking bays and restocking them into the stores on an hourly basis throughout the trading hours of those stores.

Further, it is difficult to see how authorised persons would be able to identify the relevant proprietor of the trolley unless it was clearly marked. This may place an additional onus and expense on the business to place identification on the trolley. Again, that involves more cost to the business, coming from the member for Mitcham—the so-called champion of small business in this State. Whilst some businesses may place identification on the trolleys for marketing reasons, it is not currently a requirement. This provision would appear to make full identification necessary to avoid disposal provisions.

This Bill imposes a penalty for the return of the business's own trolley which has been illegally taken from the store in the first place. Where retailers want to adopt the policy of offering small rewards for the return of trolleys, it no doubt works quite well as an unofficial system, but this is not a sufficient reason to impose it on every operator.

It is also unlikely that local government would welcome this as a new statutory requirement. The Bill provides for a $100 fine for the offence of abandoning a shopping trolley. There will be considerable difficulties in proving the offence. If a person is close enough to the apparently abandoned trolley for an authorised officer to identify them with the trolley and attain their name and address, they will probably be able to claim successfully that they had not abandoned it. Can you see, Mr Speaker, the courts being filled up with innocent shoppers who have had the heavy hand of the law placed on their shoulder, having to go in and prove that it was not them? The mind boggles at this stupidity of the Deputy Leader who, most likely flushed with his 3 a.m. coup over the member for Bragg, decided that he must live up to this image and come in with this legislation.

I very much doubt whether the Deputy Leader intended that all such offences should be prosecuted through the courts, with section 749a of the Local Government Act allowing the offence to be designated a prescribed offence by regulation and an expiation fee to be set. But it goes to show that it had not been thought out. The Deputy Leader comes in with a rush and, with Liberal Party policy on ripe back of a lunch wrapper—the traditional method—inflicts on this House something that we have to research to be able to refute it.

The simple problem is that shopping trolleys are not always collected by the supermarkets often enough, and they may accumulate around streets. That is the problem in individual areas. If the shopkeepers in Mitcham are too idle to make some effort to get their trolleys returned, it is their fault. We do not have to impose a cumbersome measure on the rest of the shopkeepers of this State. If the member for Mitcham's constituents, the residents of Mitcham, consider themselves too much above the simple process of returning a trolley and abandon it outside the member for Mitcham's electorate office, they need an education process inflicted upon them.

My constituents, who are not exactly blue rinse, who are not exactly owners of Volvos and BMWs, do respect the common decencies that other people expect of them. If they finish using something they return it to the place where they got it. I am sure that I can say that for every other member on this side because, although we might not represent wealthy people, we do represent people who are honourable and who take care of other people's property. Representatives of the industry have advised that they are aware that trolleys are being taken and discarded and are exploring ways to reduce this from happening, but they were horrified to think that this Parliament would inflict on them such legislation as we have before us before they had a chance to work it out.

The proposed amendment does not offer an equitable and effective remedy. The solutions to the perceived problem offered in the Bill would impose an expanded regulatory role on local government which seeks to penalise the owners of the trolley, namely, the supermarkets and other small businesses, merely because a third party has discarded the business's property in a public place. That is the crux of the problem. That is where we need to address it: not by making a regulation that will not solve the problem. We will just end up giving local government and our Police Force more work to do, which will obviously put a savage financial burden on those people in the business community who are seeking to make a quid and serve the community at the same time.

Finally, the intent of the Bill seems to be out of step with the whole notion of Government working at all levels cooperatively with business and the community to assist businesses to operate in ways which would add to the amenity of their area. It would appear that the perceived problem of discarded shopping trolleys is being approached in the punitive way rather than in the spirit of a balanced inquiry and cooperative problem solving. In short, the Bill is using a sledgehammer to crack a nut. Perhaps that is the way that the member for Mitcham sees this Parliament approaching its problems. His attitude is, 'If you see a problem, don't work around it; don't talk to the Government, the Retail Traders Association, the supermarkets or small business; go for the instant headline, the 30 second grab on TV, and create this massive legislative sledgehammer to overcome a very small problem.'

As I said, I would invite the member for Mitcham and any other member of this House at any time to go to the Elizabeth shopping centre and say that what I have been outlining about its means of control is not accurate. I congratulate all the shopping centres in the northern suburbs on the way they cooperate with the community, with local government, with the members for Elizabeth and Briggs, and also with me, and on the way they have resolved the problem. It is a pity that the Deputy Leader does not listen to anyone, except possibly to some pillow talk that may occur, but if he does that he will continue to go on the wrong track.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (EMU FARMING) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 668).

Clause 2—'Insertion of Division VA in Part V.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 1, lines 15-33; page 2, lines 1-45; page 3, lines 1-40; page 4, lines 1 and 2—Leave out clause 2 and insert the following clauses:

Insertion of Part VB

2. The following part is inserted after Part VA of the principal Act:

PART VB
EMU FARMING
DIVISION I—PRELIMINARY

Interpretation

68f. In this Part, unless the contrary intention appears—

'the Board' means the Emu Farming Board constituted by this Act;

'emu' means an animal of the species: DROMAIUS NOVAEHOLLANDIAE;

'emu farmer' means a person who carries on the business of emu farming;

'the Minister' means the Minister of Primary Industries.

DIVISION II—EMU FARMING BOARD

The Emu Farming Board

68g. (1) The Emu Farming Board is established.

(2) The board is a body corporate.

(3) The board has full juristic capacity to exercise any powers that are by their nature capable of being exercised by a body corporate.

(4) Where an apparently genuine document appears to bear the common seal of the board, it will be presumed in legal proceedings, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the document has been duly executed by the board.

Constitution of the board

68h. (1) The board consists of eleven members of whom—

(a) nine will be emu farmers who have been elected to office in accordance with this Act by emu farmers; and

(b) two will be appointed under this section.

(2) Of the elected members—

(a) at least one must carry on the business of emu farming to the west of the longitude of the Town Hall at Port Augusta;

(b) at least one must carry on the business of emu farming in the Yorke Peninsula region;

(c) at least one must carry on the business of emu farming in the Upper North region;

(d) at least one must carry on the business of emu farming in the Mid-North region;

(e) at least one must carry on the business of emu farming in the Lower North region:

(f) at least one must carry on the business of emu farming in the part of the State that lies to the south and east of the Murray River;

(g) at least one must carry on the business of emu farming in that part of the State that lies to the south of Anzac Highway, Greenhill Road and the South Eastern Freeway and to the west of the Murray River;

(h) at least one must carry on the business of emu farming in the area of one of the councils comprising the South East Local Government Association.

(3) The regions referred to in subsection (2) will be defined by regulation.

(4) If possible at least two of the elected members must be women and at least two must be men and therefore—

(a) all the women or all the men who nominate for election to the board will become members of the board without election notwithstanding the part of the State in which they carry on the business of emu farming if the resulting number of women or men comprising the board would not exceed two;

(b) if paragraph *(a)* does not apply and if in an election the application of subsection (5) *(b)* would result in at least two women and two men as members of the board the election will proceed in accordance with subsection (5) and the regulations but if an election would not necessarily provide that result then the number of women or men required to make up the minimum number who receive the most votes of the women or men who nominate will become members of the board notwithstanding the part of the State in which they carry on the business of emu farming.

(5) Subsection (2) is subject to subsection (4) and to the following provisions:

(a) if there is no person amongst those who nominate for election to the board who if elected would satisfy a particular requirement of subsection (2), that requirement will be ignored;

(b) if there is only one person amongst those who nominate for election to the board who if elected would satisfy a particular requirement of subsection (2), that person will become a member of the board without election;

(c) if there is a group of two or more persons amongst those who nominate for election to the board, each of whom, if elected, would satisfy a particular requirement of subsection (2) the member of that group who receives the most votes at the election will, subject to subsection (4), become a member of the board.

(6) One member of the board will be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister and must be a person who has knowledge of and experience in the farming, biology or pathogenesis of emus.

(7) One member of the board will be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister of Environment and Land Management and must be a person who has knowledge that is relevant in assessing the effect of emu farming on the population of wild emus.

Term of office

68i. (1) Of the nine members who are the first elected members of the board, three will be elected for a term of one year, three will be elected for a term of two years and three will be elected for a term of three years.

(2) Of the two members who are the first appointed members of the board, one will be appointed for a term of two years and the other will be appointed for a term of three years.

(3) Members elected or appointed to the board after the election and appointment of the first board will be elected or appointed for a term of three years.

(4) Where the office of a member becomes vacant before completion of the member's term of office, the Governor must appoint a person (nominated by the board in the case of an elected member or nominated by the Minister in the case of an appointed member) to the vacant office for the remainder of the term.

(5) A member whose term of office has expired is eligible for re-election or reappointment.

(6) The office of a member becomes vacant if the member—

(a) dies;

(b) completes a term of office and is not re-elected or reappointed;

(c) resigns by written notice to the Minister;

or

(d) is removed from office by the Governor on the grounds of—

(i) mental or physical incapacity to carry out official duties satisfactorily;

(ii) neglect of duty;

(iii) misconduct.

Presiding officers

68j. (1) The Minister will appoint a member of the board to be the presiding officer of the board.

(2) The members of the board will appoint a member to be the deputy presiding officer of the board.

Procedures at meetings of the board

68k. (1) A meeting of the board will be chaired by the presiding officer or, in his or her absence, by the deputy presiding officer, or in the absence of both of them, by a member chosen by those present.

(2) Subject to subsection (3), the board may act notwithstanding vacancies in its membership.

(3) Six members constitute a quorum at a meeting of the board.

(4) A decision in which a majority of the members present at a meeting concur is a decision of the board.

(5) The board must not meet between the close of nominations for the election of members to the board and the election.

(6) Subject to this Act, the board may determine its own procedures.

(7) The board must keep minutes of its proceedings.

Functions of the board

68*l*. The functions of the board are—

(a) to administer the Emu Fund;

(b) to maintain a register of emus;

(c) to fix the emu registration fee;

and

(d) such other functions as are assigned to the board by this Part.

DIVISION III—EMU FARMING

Taking and dealing with emus

68m. (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other Act or law to the contrary, a person may for the purpose of or in the course of emu farming—

(a) take an emu from the wild for breeding purposes pursuant to a permit granted by the board under subsection (2);

(b) keep emus, and have possession or control of emu eggs in any part of the State;

(c) sell or give away an emu or the carcass or eggs of an emu;

(d) export an emu or the carcass or eggs of an emu to a place outside the State;

(e) import an emu or the eggs of an emu from a place outside the State.

(2) The board may grant permits to take emus from the wild for breeding purposes.

(3) A permit—

(a) is subject to such limitations, restrictions and conditions as the board thinks fit and includes in the permit;

(b) may, if the holder of the permit has in the opinion of the board contravened or failed to comply with any limitation, restriction or condition of the permit, be revoked by the board by instrument in writing served personally or by post upon that person.

(4) The board must, by notice published in the *Gazette,* fix in respect of each year the number of emus that may be taken from the wild pursuant to permits granted by the board under this section.

(5) Royalty is not payable under Part V in respect of an emu, or the carcass or skin of an emu, taken under subsection (1).

Registration of emus

68n. (1) Where an emu has been taken from the wild under this Part or has hatched in the course of emu farming, the person who took the emu or who owns the hatchling must apply to the board for registration of the emu.

(2) The application must be made as soon as practicable after the emu was taken or hatched and must be made before ownership of the emu is transferred to another person.

(3) Where ownership of a live emu is transferred, the new owner must apply to the board for registration of the emu in his or her name within 14 days of the transfer.

(4) An application under subsection (2) or (3) must be in a form approved by the board, must include such information as the board requires and must be accompanied by the emu registration fee.

(5) Upon registration the board must issue to the owner of the emu a device of a prescribed kind which identifies the owner and the emu.

(6) The owner must fix the device in the prescribed manner to the emu.

(7) A person must not remove an identification device from a live emu except when fixing a new device issued by the board.

(8) The owner of an emu that has been slaughtered or has died in any other manner must remove the identification device and return it to the board.

(9) The board must make the register of emus available for public inspection.

(10) A person who contravenes or fails to comply with a provision of this section is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Division 7 fine.

Emu registration fee

68o. (1) Subject to subsection (2), the emu registration fee may be fixed and may be varied from time to time by the board by notice published in the *Gazette.*

(2) The fee must not exceed $10 during the first year after the commencement of this Part.

Credit of part of registration fee

68p. (1) Where a registered emu dies before reaching breeding age, the owner of the emu may apply to the board—

(a) to credit 75 per cent of the fee paid on the last registration of the emu against the owner's liability for emu registration fees in the future;

or

(b) if the owner has ceased emu farming—to refund 75 per cent of the fee paid on the last registration of the emu to the owner.

(2) The board must grant an application under subsection (1) unless, in the board's opinion there is good reason for not doing so.

Slaughter of emus

68q. (1) A person who slaughters a registered emu with the intention of selling the carcass (whether before or after processing) is liable to pay to the board the emu slaughter fee prescribed by regulation.

(2) The board must pay emu slaughter fees received or recovered by it into the Emu Fund.

DIVISION IV—THE EMU FUND

The Emu Fund

68r. (1) The Emu Fund consists of—

(a) emu registration fees paid on registration of emus;

(b) emu slaughter fees paid on the slaughter of emus; and

(c) interest and accretions arising from investment of the fund.

(2) The board must apply the fund—

(a) in the payment of compensation to an emu farmer who has suffered financial loss arising from an order under Part III Division III of the Stock Act 1990 in relation to the business of emu farming conducted by that person;

(b) for research into improved methods of, and practices in, emu farming;

(c) for the purpose of instructing emu farmers in the latest methods of, and practices in, emu farming.

DIVISION V—GENERAL

Entitlement to compensation

68s. An emu farmer who suffers financial loss arising from an order under Part III Division III of the Stock Act 1990 is entitled to compensation from the Emu Fund in accordance with the regulations.

Movement, etc., of diseased emus

68t. (1) A person who moves an emu, or the egg of an emu, that the person knows, or has reason to believe, is infected with a prescribed disease from the property on which the emu or egg is kept is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Division 4 fine.

(2) A person who imports into South Australia an emu or the egg of an emu that the person knows, or has reason to believe, is infected with a prescribed disease is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Division 4 fine. Regulations

68u. (1) The Governor may, on the recommendation of the board, make such regulations as are contemplated by this Part or as are necessary of expedient for the purposes of this Part.

(2) In particular the regulations—

(a) may prescribe the class or classes of emu farmers who may be elected as, and who may elect, members of

the board and may provide for other matters relating to the election of members to the board;

(b) may prescribe fees in relation to the administration of this Part.

Amendment of s. 75a—Defence

3. Section 75a of the principal Act is amended by inserting after its present contents (now to be designated as subsection (1)) the following subsection:

(2) It is a defence to a charge of an offence against this Act if the defendant proves that the alleged offence was not committed intentionally and did not result from any failure on the part of the defendant to take reasonable care to avoid the commission of the offence.

I do not propose that the entire debate on this matter should proceed today, beyond my explaining the context in which the amendments are made. They are amendments of structure and framework within which the industry can operate and they cover 11 pages. I simply place the amendments before the Committee in the form that gives definition to a board. They define what 'emu' and 'emu farmer' mean. The Emu Farming Board itself would comprise nine duly elected emu farmers from around the State and two appointed by the Government, and they would have the responsibility of administering the industry and funds collected from the emu producers for the purpose of advancing the interests of the industry.

These amendments follow extensive discussion with all those people who are presently owners of emus held under permit as pets, and those other people who also wish to become emu farmers, whether they be of Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal extract. To that extent the proposal is to remove the racial consideration from the measure altogether.

The amendments provide that the board, as the meetings I have attended with prospective emu farmers and the committee members of the new Emu Farming Association would want provided, includes at least two women and two men of those nine who are elected, notwithstanding the gender of either of the two people appointed by the Minister of Primary Industries and the other by the Minister of Environment and Land Management.

They would come from regions which would roughly be the west of the State—west of the Port Augusta Town Hall, one from Yorke Peninsula, one from the Upper North, one from the Mid-North, one from the Lower North, one from what is generally called the Murraylands and one from the South-East. The specific definitions of those boundaries would be provided in the regulation. As I said, at least two of them must be of each gender and then the rest are elected according to locality.

It is a matrix on two axes. We simply provide that, if only two men are nominated and some extra number of women in excess of the number required, then automatically the two men would become part of the board and the election would be conducted only in those other regions in which all the women had been nominated, or the converse.

There are then the usual provisions for termination of membership of the board and, in addition, a third of them would retire each year so that there is a constantly rotating producer membership on the board and it has continuity as well as a democratic function in determining how to allocate funds for research into emu production, disease control and recruiting emu stock from the wild. Of course, the board would not meet while an election was in progress, and that is provided for.

Other aspects of interest in the amendments are that one does not have to register an emu the moment it is hatched, that is, while it is still a hatchling, but one cannot sell a hatchling until it is registered, and in the process of registration a device must be fixed to each of the birds so registered so that they can be identified. Just as we put ear tags on sheep, cattle and pigs and tags on the collars of dogs to identify them, the board is right up to the minute with its notions of how best to identify emus, rather than putting rings on legs or bangles on beaks and/or necks, but implanting a passive microchip in the waddle.

That is already being done with dogs and cats now, where microchips are being lodged between the shoulder blades and read from a distance of several metres. They do not need to be transponders. If members want to understand how the technology works, it is fairly simple. They are more or less magnetic, and it is like a bar code on an item on a supermarket shelf; as one waves it past the reader it automatically picks up the identity of the item and other details about it that are held in the records such as its price, weight, date of manufacture, use-by date, and so on.

That same information can be held in a microchip that can be smaller than the size of the smallest tooth in any of our heads, and there is no problem at all to fit it into the wattle of an emu, as they would not even know it was there. They would not peck it. Emus are curious creatures and, if we were to expose any means of identification that we might put on them, they would most certainly be inclined to go and peck each other's identification disc, and that would cause problems. They would peck their own if they could get at it. If we put it around their leg they would pull it off. If we put it around their neck, others would peck at it, and that is an unpleasant experience, I am sure. So the microchip alternative is probably the answer.

The registration fee would be merely sufficient to provide the board with adequate funds to keep the register, and that identifies wild stock as being separate and distinct from commercial stock, so that no-one can cheat and, at the time of slaughter when there is some gain to be derived by the owner from the sale of the animal itself, a further fee would be payable to the board in the same way as applies to animals in slaughter yards when animals are kept for commercial purposes.

Those funds provide the means by which, without recourse to the public purse, the industry will be fully self-funding. There are other general provisions about how to prevent the spread of disease and providing compensation, as legislated for already in the Stock Act 1990 as it applies to ovine or bovine disease in commercial species. Members will then know that a person who would need to have an emu slaughtered would get some compensation from it. Otherwise, if one needs to move an emu around and it is infected with a prescribed disease, it is an offence to do so, as is the case for any other species that is commercially farmed.

We do not want to see the industry put at risk. When I say 'we', I mean those people who came to me and gave me the benefit of their discussions and insight into the kind of structure they wanted for the industry. I believe

that they have done an excellent job, putting in an enormous amount of time and demonstrating much patience in dealing with each other's views about things and sifting through the entire process of how ideally to structure their industry to make it accessible to everyone, thus ensuring equity of access and an industry capable of independent existence or non-dependence on the public purse in any way, shape or form. The rest of the provisions are to enable a grandfather clause to operate so that those people who have emus currently held under the pet permit system with NPWS can transfer them into the commercial flock. In addition, they allow the Meat Hygiene Act 1980 to apply to their slaughter and preparation for market.

All in all, I think that that is a very sensible and comprehensive approach to the establishment of a sound structure within which this industry can get off to a flying start. By that I mean no pun, because we all know that emus are ratites and are flightless—it is the industry we are talking about, not the species. I commend the amendments to the Committee and trust that in fairly short order we can give them our earnest consideration and provide those several score of people, who have already become members of the association, the opportunity they so anxiously await—that is, to begin trading in the industry in which they cannot trade at the present time.

As you know, Mr Chairman, daily we lose millions of dollars in this country because we do not have a realistic commercial framework within which this species can be farmed, whereas the Canadians and North Americans generally, including people in the United States, can, and their industries have gross incomes annually of millions upon millions of dollars. We could be in there obtaining benefit from the production and export of these products from the emu.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That the second report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee (Mount Lofty Ranges planning issues) be noted.

(Continued from 25 November. Page 1685.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I appreciate what the committee has done in relation to this matter. It spent quite a considerable amount of time looking at the regulations that were likely to apply to the Mount Lofty Ranges planning area and the issues that were likely to confront people in the future; and in particular it looked at how multiple titles and so on would affect landholders. I do not wish to say very much about the report because I think that members put in the effort and it is quite a good report, taking into consideration the evidence that was available and how it could be used.

I want to mention briefly what is still happening because it revolves around the report. In a society where money is time and investment is money, an investment by poor or average people in allotments to build homes is important and interest on that money is money that they can never recover. It is a cost placed upon them by delays, and they can never recover that money. I am not out to attack anybody or any department; I just want to say that after all the effort that has been put into this by the committee the House should be aware that we still have the problem of terrible and expensive delays.

People of all ages buy allotments—there are even people in this building who are not members of Parliament who have been involved in this—of perhaps a couple of acres, mainly in bushland, and the native vegetation people say that they cannot clear any further than 20 metres from where the proposed building will be. The CFS (which also has a say in it) says that it wants it cleared 30 metres or it will not approve the building and, if they happen to live in the Hills face zone, that authority says that they cannot clear at all or that there can be only very limited clearing. Then you have the Health Department saying that waste cannot be disposed of near a stream—and what they call a stream must be seen to be believed. Honestly, a drunk man and woman at a beer party would most probably urinate more than the amount of water that would travel down some of those streams, even in high rainfall times. They are tiny tributaries that flow, only if they do flow, for a month or six weeks of the year—and they do not really flow to the extent of causing any great stream down below.

People who understand the area and understand the problem become frustrated because officers take the letter of the law to the nth degree. Part of the reason for that is that people are frightened of being sued later. It really is a humbug to the whole process at a time when we are trying to encourage more jobs. We want people to get on and build their homes so that they employ people and all those things, yet we have this humbug. When I attend various functions I am asked, 'What are you useless mob doing in Parliament with all these regulations and rules when really the end result, after it is all settled, is that the clearance is either 20 or 30 metres or something in between?' They put in effluent systems that create very little waste—they just pump it out from their bio unit.

After all that hassle, where commonsense tells us to apply six months earlier (and that is how long it takes sometimes to get approval), if one does not know all the rules and happens to apply early, thinking one will build in the summer, when one starts the confounded building it is in the middle of winter and then it costs a lot more and one does not end up with a satisfactory job. All I am saying, Sir (if you give me some latitude), is that it does revolve around the area. Again I congratulate the committee on its efforts and I just hope that whoever is governing in the future will say to these officers, 'For God's sake, use commonsense because, if you don't, we will change the rules.'

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): In closing the debate I would like to thank all those members of the House who have taken part. I would like once again to inform the House that the Environment, Resources and Development Committee lives up to its intention of being a bipartisan committee, and I think that this interim report that we put out on the Mount Lofty management plan and supplementary development plan reflects just that, inasmuch as our recommendations to the Minister

have completely overturned the general thrust of the supplementary development plan and have taken note of the main recommendations and guiding theories of the management plan. We have picked up the views not only of residents who live in the Mount Lofty Ranges but also, more importantly, of local government, the Conservation Council and all those many people who either gave evidence to the committee or made written submissions.

I would like to pick up some of the points that the member for Davenport made, and I would like to reassure him about the final report of the plan itself. As the House will recall, the interim report just dealt with the planning issues. The one problem that was causing real concern was the transfer of titles or development rights, and I am hopeful that the Government will respond to our recommendations because, if the Government does respond in a positive way, some of the many issues that the member for Davenport talked about in relation to investment will be overcome. I think the problem of delays must be worked out by all Government agencies and local government and, in my view, as it works its way through legislation, the planning review will overcome those problems.

I refer to the more tangible, physical points that the member for Davenport made in regard to the problems of people who buy scrubland, even if they comply with the criteria of the supplementary development plan, on which the recommendations of the report are based. The member for Davenport is dead right in saying that, if they meet all those requirements, they still have to confront the conflicts between the Country Fire Services' requirements, putting in buildings in bushland areas, native vegetation and health. They all have to be overcome.

I would like your forbearance, Sir, and that of the House in referring to another committee which is working in this area and which is currently still sitting, which is to say that those areas of native vegetation and Country Fire Services are being addressed by the Select Committee on Bushfire Protection and Suppression Measures. That is all I will say, but that is being picked up by that committee. I think that the member for Davenport and a lot of the other members who represent country electorates who have come to our committee and raised those points will be well satisfied with our recommendations in that area.

As for health, it may be of interest to the House that the problems in health are not related to the installation of new septic systems. As the member for Davenport said in his speech, the new septic systems are well able to meet all the requirements of the Mount Lofty management plan and the supplementary development plan in regard to water quality.

Mr S.G. Evans: It takes the Health Department eight to 10 weeks.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That is right. So, the new system is well able to meet those requirements. The problem is with the timing and the delays. As I said earlier, one can sometimes get delays in relation to any form of application, whether it is in the Mount Lofty Ranges, the western suburbs or the northern suburbs that I represent. What compounds the situation is the many restrictions on those people who wish to build in the Hills, and that is what the member for Davenport is really on about. Those people living there have more government regulations to deal with as opposed to those who live on the plains, and the member for Davenport is quite correct in saying that those things need to be addressed. It could be said that, if people must adhere to certain criteria to live in that area, all the help and assistance should be given to them if they meet that criteria, but that is not recommended in this report or the final report that we are in the process of bringing down. I would agree with the member for Davenport that it certainly does need to be addressed.

Another problem with the septic systems is that about 41 per cent of existing septic systems in the Mount Lofty Ranges do not work adequately. I would suggest that, as well as the Health Department insisting that those people who wish to build in the Hills area speed up the process as long as they are putting in the correct system, there is some form of checking to identify existing systems that already fail to meet the requirements. We have the unfortunate situation where people who have been used to mains sewerage go and live in the Hills and who think that, if they put in a septic system, they can forget about it for ever and a day. A septic system, depending on family size and water usage, can be used for about four years before one has to go through the relatively simple process of removing the sludge that builds up. I know that basically that does not relate to the first report, but I felt that it should be placed on the record. The member for Davenport is quite correct in saying that there should be some form of fast tracking, but as well as that the Health Department, local government or whoever must involve itself in an education or inspection process to ensure that existing systems work adequately.

I will leave it at that, Sir, because I do not like to talk about waste disposal when you are in the Chair. I thank—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the member for Napier is not reflecting on the Chair.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, Sir, I have too much respect for you. I thank all members for their contribution and I invite them to read with avid interest our final report, which will deal with the whole issue of agriculture, viticulture, the quality of residential life and all the things that make the Hills such a unique area, but at the same time ensuring that the quality of water supplied to the people who live on the plains is maintained.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BUSHFIRE PROTECTION AND SUPPRESSION MEASURES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Wednesday 17 February.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Wednesday 28 April.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEEE ON RURAL FINANCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Ferguson:

That the report be noted.

(Continued from 25 November. Page 1692.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to speak in this debate because I wish to compliment the members of the select committee. Before doing so, though, I draw your attention, Mr Speaker, to the fact that only four minutes are shown on the clock.

The SPEAKER: That is correct. The honourable member has spoken previously.

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that, according to Standing Order 113, speaking to a select committee report entitles a member to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER: I advise the honourable member that sessional orders take precedence in this matter.

Mr MEIER: I take it that sessional orders have overruled the 20 minutes and permit only 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER: Sessional orders are agreed to by the House.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Sir. Since I last spoke to this report, the tragedy is that the farming community has been through a traumatic and trying time. Whereas it looked as if they were headed for a record harvest in most areas of the State and were to reap fields of gold, in some areas that gold turned into mud. One hoped that this harvest would have helped pull the State out of recession and helped pull the farming community out of debt. However, in some areas the harvest is average, and in many others it is below average. In a few areas it has been above average, but it is only a holding harvest and many of the problems that have been identified by the committee continue.

On a tour with the Minister of Primary Industries two weeks ago in the electorate of Goyder I met with various people who are having difficulties. It is clear that the problem of farm debt is still raising its ugly head, and still has to be addressed. I hope that the Government will act on the recommendations of the report as soon as possible. Many of the recommendations make a lot of commonsense and, when I was shadow Minister of Agriculture, I advocated some of them. Unfortunately, they have been left unattended for far too long.

The work of rural counsellors continues to increase rather than decrease. Some farmers are in a state of despair and small businesses are finding the going increasingly tough in the rural community. After the Prime Minister's statement yesterday I had a call from a small business operator who said that his statement had done nothing for his business or for virtually hundreds of rural businesses in this State. He wanted to know whether someone intended to address the problems. The recommendations in the report represent a step in the right direction and I hope that the Government will not procrastinate in implementing them so that it can help the rural sector of this State.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I thank all members who have contributed to this debate. As Chairman of the Select Committee on Rural Finance, I am sympathetic to what the member for Goyder has just put to the House. As you know, Sir, the committee toured most of the major country towns and many of the problems that were put to us are not solvable. Unless the Federal Government is prepared to put its hands in its pocket and produce millions and millions of dollars to support rural industry, I am afraid that we are looking at a very large downsizing of the number of people who are employed within that industry, and that is very sad.

We spoke to seventh, eighth and ninth generation farmers who are facing a diabolical situation concerning their debt, and many of the problems are not their fault, they are beyond them. The drop in commodity prices and the very swift increase in interest rates were something that the average farmer could not accommodate and it had nothing to do with the situation in which they found themselves.

In my earlier remarks, I was very critical of the banks and I remain critical of them in the way in which they handled rural finance. In the 1980s, bank officers went around in motor cars from farm to farm trying to convince farmers to borrow more money without regard to the way in which that money could be repaid in the event that the situation with which we are faced developed. Immediately there was a sniff of a recession, they gathered the money back as hard as they could. Much of the advice that was tendered to farmers by the banking institutions was completely wrong. We heard evidence that one farmer was advised to turn from wheat farming to sheep farming. The price of wool collapsed and, in the meantime, the bank had convinced the farmer to sell his tractor in order to try to pay back some of the money that was owed to the bank. The banks made farming management decisions where they really had no right and they have placed some people in our rural communities in a diabolical position.

Our recommendations, many of which have been taken up by the Government, are cognisant of the fact that we need to provide additional educational opportunities to people in the farming communities. There has been a change in the circumstances with which they are now faced with regard to things they have never had to worry about before, and I refer mainly to the accounting side of farming. Farmers are very good at producing wheat, wool and horticultural products, for example, but problems have arisen with respect to the accountancy side. Farmers now have to look after cash flows and to make predictions concerning budgets. They have to take into consideration the vagaries of world markets. That sort of education was not presented, and many farmers did not have the opportunity to engage in it. I have much pleasure in supporting the proposition before the Chair. I thank all members who have entered into this debate.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr HERON (Peake): I move:

That the first report of the committee (social implications of population change) be noted.

In looking at the social implications of population change in South Australia, the committee has come up with approximately 20 recommendations. I would urge all members, especially Ministers, not only to study the report but to consider the recommendations very seriously. This report shows not only the change in size of the population of South Australia but the altering composition and location areas which are factors in the level and demand of our social services throughout our State.

Figures from the 1991 census indicate that South Australia has a population of 1 400 656, an increase of 54 711 since 1986. South Australia's rate of population growth for the 1986 to 1991 period was half the national average of 1.6 per cent. After Tasmania, South Australia has the lowest rate of growth of all States. The fastest growing State was Queensland, with an annual growth rate of just over 3 per cent. South Australia's current low rate of population growth is vastly different from that in the two decades following the Second World War. Between 1947 and 1966, South Australia's population increased between 2.5 per cent and 3 per cent annually. The growth rate was higher in those years mainly due to the baby boom and the level of immigration. Even so, all expectations are that South Australia will continue to grow for at least the next several decades. By the turn of the century, it is expected that South Australia's population will have reached approximately 1.7 million, and by the year 2021 it is likely to have grown to at least 1.9 million.

The committee also looked at figures which showed that nearly three-quarters of the State's population are resident in metropolitan Adelaide. Compared with other States, South Australia has the highest proportion of its population living in the State capital. The remainder of non-metropolitan South Australia declined marginally between 1986 and 1991, mainly in the sheep and wheat areas of the Eyre Peninsula, the Mid and Upper North, and the Murray Mallee. Most of these areas have been losing population for many decades. The reasons include increased farm mechanisation, which has reduced the demand for labour; farms becoming larger to be more economical; and increased mobility has enabled people to shop in larger urban centres rather than locally.

Fertility trends were looked at by the committee, and they showed that over the past 2½ decades there has been a marked decline in fertility levels. This was due to many factors, mainly unemployment, the changing status of women, reliable contraception and, of course, higher levels of education. However, since 1988, there has been a rise in the fertility rate, mainly due to the increased number of births among women aged in their mid to late 30s who have delayed having children. The committee also received evidence that many women from higher socioeconomic status groups are in professional occupations, and their later fertility levels stem from their incompatibility between the continuation of a career, successful advancement and child bearing.

The committee also noted that a growing proportion of children are being born into low income families and that an increased proportion of children are living in poverty. The most outstanding implication of population change in South Australia is the rapid ageing of our population. Before I outline some of the figures, it is worth noting that we are not alone. In all developed countries, population ageing is occurring. In 1901, only 4.1 per cent of the South Australian population was aged 65 years or more: by 1947, the proportion had doubled to more than 8 per cent. In the 15 years after the Second World War, population ageing was halted by high birth and immigration rates. During this period, the proportion of the population aged 65 years and over slightly declined. However, from 1971 there has been a rapid growth in the size of the older population, from less than 8 per cent to 12.25 per cent of the South Australian population in 1991. This trend is expected to continue, reaching nearly 14 per cent by the turn of the century and 19 per cent by the year 2021.

We have the oldest population of any State in Australia, and indications are that we will remain above the national level until at least the year 2021. Evidence was given to the committee that there is concern that the working aged population will not be able to supply a large enough tax base to support the elderly, particularly in relation to their need for institutional care and medical services, bearing in mind that public spending on the aged is approximately three times more per individual than for the young. The reason for the growing number of older people in the South Australian population is increasing longevity. The older South Australians in 1993 can expect to live four to five years longer than an older South Australian 20 years ago. This increase has been due mainly to the reduction in the death rate from heart disease, which has almost halved in the past 25 years because of our changing lifestyle and, of course, medical technology. What we must recognise is that we are living longer, but it does not mean that those extra years will be healthier.

Of the 181 681 South Australians aged 65 years and over in 1990, 104 635 or 58 per cent were women, and 77 046 or 42 per cent were men. Of people aged 85 years or more, approximately three-quarters were women. Females are outliving their male counterparts by some seven years, and the report explains the reason why. Of South Australia's population aged 65 years and over, one-third were born overseas, and 40 per cent of those people were born in non-English speaking countries. The report is very clear regarding the implications for all South Australians and what has to be done, with special attention being given to community care services for our elderly.

The committee also received evidence on South Australia's Aboriginal population. Estimates of Aboriginal life expectancy in 1985 were approximately 55 years for males and 65 years for females. This compares with an average life expectancy for all Australian males born in 1985 of about 73 years and approximately 79 years for females.

Public transport needs for older people was also covered by the committee, as many older people, especially older women, are reliant upon public and community transport as their only means of transportation. Areas to be considered are access, the routes, hours of operation, driver awareness of the needs of elderly people, safety and, especially, costs. Evidence was received by the committee on the change in the housing requirements of older people. Maintaining local social ties is important for the well-being of older

people, and an enforced move to an unfamiliar area can cause serious health problems to our elderly. Older people remain in the family home long after it is manageable because of the lack of suitable alternative accommodation in the local area.

It was suggested to the committee that housing suitable for older people should be built in the suburbs where the young/old presently live so that, when they need to move into alternative accommodation, they will be able to remain locally. If this approach were taken, older people might be less likely to remain in the family home when it was no longer manageable. One of the factors impeding this is the resistance of some councils to urban consolidation. The committee, while agreeing in principle with the benefits of urban consolidation, also agreed that open space should be provided for the future need of the current population as well as for the present in any new housing development. The committee also received information on the changes in household and family structures. Over half all households in South Australia now contain only one or two people; the two person household is the most common size. There is a vast growth in the number of single parent families. From the 1986 census, it is apparent that 16.5 per cent of all families in South Australia were single parent families, and they are currently the fastest growing family type today.

One interesting aspect of this report was the evidence given in relation to hospitalisation and surgical rates in South Australia. South Australia leads the nation in the use of hospital services, and the South Australian Health Commission was unable to explain the higher than average hospital admission rates in South Australia, but it did say there is a positive relationship between hospital bed supply and use and that South Australia has more beds per head of population than the national average. Evidence also shows that the Elizabeth, Salisbury, Munno Para and Gawler areas have high surgical rates for tonsillectomies, adenoidectomies, appendectomies, haemorrhoidectomies, prostatectomies, hysterectomies, cholecystectomies, caesarean sections and female sterilisation. Interestingly enough, a working party set up by the Health Commission was unable to explain the elevated surgery rates in those areas.

I commend this report to all members. It contains material which I hope is used, because it looks at areas that can only help the community of South Australia. In winding up, I would like to congratulate all the committee members for their input into the report, and special thanks must go to the committee staff, Ann McLennan, John Wright and Vicki Evans. I ask members to support the motion.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ARNOTT'S BISCUITS LIMITED

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I move:

That this House condemns the opportunistic, unsolicited and unwelcome attempt by the Campbell's Soup Company of America to take over Arnott's Biscuits Limited of Australia in an effort to gain control of what Campbell's President described as 'those fabulous brands [those] precious jewels that we see incredible value in' as a basis for Campbell's expansion into Asia to benefit American shareholders regardless of the impact of its takeover on Australian employees of Arnott's, including those working in the Marleston biscuit plant.

In view of the circumstances that took place a few days ago and because of the outcome, I contemplated seeking leave of the House to withdraw this motion. After I thought a little more deeply about the sell-out and the eleventh hour betrayal of Australian interests by the AMP, I decided that I would leave it on the Notice Paper to provide an opportunity for members to express their feelings on this subject and for Opposition members to stand up and be counted on the action taken by the AMP, which really ought to change its name to the Renegades in Arnott's Takeover—RATs for short, because it was the AMP's last minute switch that eventuated in this tragic decision.

I draw members' attention to an advertisement that the AMP placed in yesterday's *Advertiser* as a special message to all its policy holders—perhaps out of a sense of guilt because of what had transpired. It pointed out that the AMP did make a profit of $48 million, which it would re-invest in other companies. I suspect that this urge for profits which overcame its support for Australian interest probably resulted from the fact that it is the majority shareholder in Westpac and suffering badly as a result of it. The very same stock market crash of 1987 that sent so many other people involved to turn to real estate instead (and I will appear to digress momentarily) caused many financial institutions to direct their interest instead to the real estate market in a big way—in such a big way that when the big crash came it disastrously affected so many financial institutions, including our own State Bank, along with Westpac, the ANZ and others.

In a documentary that I saw concerning Westpac and the AMP share in that financial institution, it was pointed out that, as a result of the real estate boom of the late 1980s, in the central business district of Sydney alone, the equivalent of 40 30-storey buildings were lying completely empty, returning no rent and as a result returning no interest or repayment on the debts that had constructed them. In addition, there was an equivalent number in north Sydney and the outer metropolitan areas of Sydney. That then takes it to the equivalent of 80 30-storey buildings sitting empty in Sydney, an equivalent number in Melbourne, and an equivalent number in Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth put together. Australia-wide, that adds up to a total of approximately 240 30-storey buildings lying empty, paying no rent and as a result paying no interest on those loans. Since these were all underwritten by institutions such as Westpac, ANZ and the State Bank, it is no wonder that we had this huge financial crash involving these institutions. The AMP, being the majority holder in Westpac, is twisting and turning as it hangs in the breeze. Perhaps that is the explanation for its eleventh hour betrayal.

In the *Weekend Australian* of 6 February, Bryan Frith, the financial writer of the business pages, suggested there was something a little bit untoward about the way in which Campbell's had not made it quite clear until the very last moment that a particular clause was attached to its operations. The relevant paragraph states:

Campbell's received foreign investment approval on 7 December, almost two months ago, yet it was not learned until Thursday night, with one day of the bid remaining, that Campbell's support for the expansion of Amott's was conditional upon achieving a shareholding of more than 50 per cent.

In other words, there was a bit of blackmail there in the sense that, if it did not get what it wanted, it would partly take its ball and go home. The article continues:

Throughout the course of the bid Campbell's has held out to Arnott's shareholders that it intended to provide support for Arnott's without any indication that there were strings attached.

It appears that Campbell's may have used the possibility of not providing the proper support to pressure the life office AMP Society into accepting for a majority of its 8.5 per cent, after earlier deciding not to accept the bid on the grounds that the offer price was too low.

Arnott's itself, in a document that it sent out to its shareholders, made a very strong case why shareholders should not support this attempted takeover by Campbell's. It pointed out that there was a great deal of benefit for Campbell's in a takeover but there was no benefit for Arnott's. They pointed out, and I will read some of the relevant points:

Arnott's does not need Campbell's Soup's capital, technology or distribution.

Arnott's has the brand name and strategy to build sales in Asia.

Amott's does not need Campbell's Soup to succeed in Asia.

Arnott's strategy for Asia is already well developed. Ultimately it will be based on joint venture manufacturing and distribution relationships with local biscuit companies.

In the words of Bill Purdy, Chairman, Arnott's Limited, at the company's annual general meeting on 29 October last year:

We can continue to build our business and our profitability without Campbell's Soup.

On the other hand, Campbell's Soup had a great deal of reason for wanting Arnott's: to pursue its growth strategy in Asia, to achieve its own performance targets, and I quote David Johnson, President, Campbell's Soup, speaking to a journalist from the *Australian* on 13 October 1992, as follows:

What I resolved was that the best brand of all was Arnott's...the manufacturing in Australia and the strategic location of a headquarters for Asia, being in Australia, was absolutely ants pants.

Food industry analyst, Bill Leach, writing in the *Australian* on 14 October 1992, said:

The US food industry is highly consolidated, which means takeover options are limited. It makes sense to look offshore. I guess they see Australia as a cheap entry into Asia and obviously the Asia Pacific region is seen as one of the fastest growing regions in the world.

In the words of CS First Boston Pacific, also quoted in this leaflet to shareholders:

Arnott's is a key part of Campbell's Asian strategy.

Certainly, it served Campbell's interests, but whether it served Australia's interests is doubtful. Certainly, the majority opinion of the public is not to that effect. Other institutions did not wobble at the knees and change over. The three largest institutional shareholders, National Mutual Life, NRMA and Mercantile Mutual decided it made more sense to keep their stakes in one of the country's two quality food stocks. However, their decision may partly have been made to avoid the same anger that has been directed at AMP for abandoning Arnott's and selling down its 8.6 per cent stake to 2.3 per cent. Rage was expressed by policy holders and certainly anger emerged from the Arnott's family itself. The *Advertiser* of 6 February pointed out:

The Arnott family said it felt betrayed by the AMP society for selling its stake in Amott's after promising it would not.

In the political arena we have words that we use to describe people who promise to do one thing and then do exactly the opposite, but I would not like to use those words in this place because it would be unparliamentary. A backlash against the AMP started to eventuate immediately after its decision was taken last Thursday, and I quote from the *Advertiser,* as follows:

Hundreds of callers have telephoned the Arnott family to express their dismay at AMP's action after it emphatically rejected Campbell's $9.50 a share bid as too cheap. Mrs Alice Oppen, descendant of Arnott's founder William Arnott and leader of the Shareholders Action Organisation, said yesterday she felt 'betrayed' by the AMP and would close her accounts there immediately. And Mrs Oppen encouraged other shareholders to do the same. 'I think AMP has irretrievably damaged its image in Australia,' she said, adding that Australian investors had been 'double crossed'. 'AMP has betrayed the Australian public who wanted to invest in a sound institution. They've done it before, and this is just another bad financial decision which has led them to need money so much. It is a sell—your-mother move-and my husband is going down to AMP to settle our accounts with them this morning. Our phone has been ringing non-stop since with calls from shareholders and sympathisers who said they would pull out of investments and policies with AMP.'

Mrs Oppen said the Shareholders Action Organisation would send information to Arnott's investors next week, urging them to hold on to their shares and to sell out of the AMP.

There has been some degree of public support for that decision taken by the family. The *Australian* on 6 February—the same day as the *Advertiser* article—reported that the AMP switchboard in Sydney had taken almost 900 telephone calls before 11 a.m., when a media curtain descended on the number of calls. The number of angry investors was obviously so great that they decided to censor the number involved.

There was some more tangible evidence from a Sydney radio news poll on 2GB, which posed the question 'Was the AMP Society wrong in its decision to sell the bulk of its Arnott's stake to Campbell's?' It received 6 285 respondents. An impressive 95 per cent agreed the AMP should not have decided to sell, with only 315 of those 6 285 supporting the decision. The marketing and promotions manager of 2GB, Ms Zina Dabscheck, said the response was overwhelming. She is reported as follows:

We usually get a couple of thousand of callers to our news polls. Today we were overrun [with three times that number]. Our presenters were having difficulties taking all the calls—people are really up in arms about it.

I have put this motion before the House so that members can have the same opportunity to express their outrage about the AMP's action.

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I move:

That this House, recognising that the River Murray is of vital importance to South Australia for water supply, environmental and recreational purposes, urges the Minister of Public Infrastructure to make strenuous and urgent representations to the Albury City Council and the Government of New South Wales with a view to the adoption of full, off-river disposal of existing and future sewage effluent at Albury.

When I left the Ministry last year I decided that one of the things I would try to do on the backbench would be to use the forums of the Parliament to draw to people's attention the ongoing problems and challenges of the Murray-Darling system, that having been one of the things in which I was involved as a Minister through most of the 1980s. I am pleased to see the amount of media attention that has been given to some of the problems in the system in recent times, and I do not suggest in any way that anything much that I said in here had much bearing on the renewed interest that has been taken up by the media in this matter.

I do welcome it because the Murray-Darling Basin, for many of the reasons I have outlined in previous questions and speeches in this House, is one of our major environmental challenges and we are fortunate in having already in place bureaucratic and political structures that will enable us to address effectively some of the problems as we already are doing. However, it is since the setting up of some of these structures that the inevitable consequences of many years not only of neglect but of wanton vandalism in parts of the basin have become apparent.

Nowhere is that perhaps brought home to us with greater drama than in the great Darling-Barwon algal bloom of a year or so ago. In a recent speech to the House I set out some of the problems of nutrient pollution in the Murray-Darling Basin. They were things that needed some attention because, for a long time, we have been aware of the problems of salinity in the basin and projects like the Woolpunda salinity interception scheme have been amongst the projects that have been launched and, indeed, in the case of Woolpunda, completed in order to address the continuing problems of salinity. Until recent times less has happened in the area of nutrient control to ensure that we do something about this. The algal blooms, the running green of the Darling, are merely the final symptoms of this underlying malaise.

The matter to which I want to turn the attention of the House this afternoon is not the only way of approaching this problem. Nutrient blooms occur as a result of both point source pollution and pollution from diffuse sources, and the contribution of the various forms of pollution varies somewhat according to whether we have a high or a low river regime. For example, in times of low river, point source pollution, particularly as a result of effluent outfall from towns along the river, looms large indeed in percentage terms. It provides about 50 per cent of the contribution of the nitrates and phosphates to the river system. In years of high river flow, such as we have recently seen, the diffuse sources become important indeed.

As to river management, the management of the waters in the system to try to get consistently higher flows as we have seen, irrespective of the amount of rainfall, and I know one cannot escape from that altogether, is an important topic, but it is not the subject of this motion. The subject of this motion is point source pollution, in particular point source pollution from effluent outfalls from the river towns and from a project which is being taken up by the Albury City Council and is in the planning stage right now. The reason for moving this motion is to attempt to get the consensus of this House, the unanimous support of this House, so that we, as the elected representatives of the people of South Australia, can make it clear not only to the local government authority at Albury but also to the Murray-Darling Basin Council what we believe should happen in relation to certain options currently being considered.

The Albury City Council intends to upgrade and expand its sewage treatment facilities in a staged project which is due to commence in 1998. Various options are under investigation, and generally these envisage abandoning the existing plant in West Albury and replacing it with a new plant 2.5 kilometres to the north-west.

The gradual transfer of treatment capacity from the existing site to the new site would take place between 1998 and 2019 and would cater for an increase from the present 40 000 population to 106 000 people by the year 2040. I must say that that is a population figure that scares the living daylights out of me: the only thing is that it is reasonably certain that I will not be around in 2040 to have to worry too much about it.

An honourable member: You will.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Well, I am working on it. The council has recently invited public comment on five options for effluent disposal from the new facility. Three of these five options propose continuing the existing practice at Albury of disposing of treated effluent to the River Murray, albeit at reduced levels of nutrients and salt. The council will soon pass judgment on the options before it, and I am concerned that the council may well adopt one of the three less expensive options which will allow effluent disposal to the River Murray.

Such an outcome would fly in the face of, first, the water quality policy of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council; secondly, considerable public concern from communities located and dependent on the River Murray downstream from Albury; and, thirdly, recent trends throughout the Murray-Darling Basin to minimise or eliminate the entry of nutrients into the river and streams.

It is important that we place on record that South Australia speaks here not only in words but also in action. Industrial waste water disposal to the river, including approximately 17 point sources of pollution in South Australia, has been phased out during the past decade. River disposal of treatment effluent ceased from the Mannum sewage treatment works in June 1991 and from the Murray Bridge sewage treatment works in December last year.

Again, at the urging of this State, the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council has a policy to maintain and,

where necessary, to improve the existing water quality in the River Murray for all beneficial uses—agricultural, environmental, urban, industrial and recreational. To give effect to that policy the ministerial council encourages the best practical methods of waste treatment and disposal.

Over most of the Murray Valley the climate and topography enable off-river disposal of waste water by irrigation or evaporation and these methods are actively encouraged. In the case of Albury sewage, both the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and the New South Wales Environmental Protection Agency have indicated a preference for off-river disposal. So, it is with some concern that I view the possibility that in just a few years a new and expanded sewage treatment plant could still be discharging effluent directly into the headwaters of the most important river in this country. Hence, my urging of support for this motion.

I should take the opportunity of referring to the environmental statement which was delivered by the Prime Minister a little before Christmas and which indicated that there would be considerable money from Commonwealth sources for the tackling of some of the problems of the Murray. It seems unlikely, however, that Commonwealth money, certainly from this bucket, would be available, partly because of the time situation. Obviously the Prime Minister would want that money spent well in advance of 1998. So, that money is likely to be aimed at the smaller towns along the river where often there is limited rate capacity to be undertaking the sort of capital expenditure that would be needed for these diversions of the effluent away from the river.

In addition, I believe that a good deal of the money that the Prime Minister has announced is to go into what is called the healthy catchments scheme, which will endeavour to address the problem of nutrients and salt from diffuse sources rather than from such point sources of pollution as effluent outfalls. While we certainly welcome the Prime Minister's initiative and hope that the money can be spent as soon as possible, nonetheless we have to concede that here we are talking about something that is further down the track. We have time to get the policy right so that when 1998 comes the Albury City Council and the work it will be doing will be ensuring that the effluent is disposed to land rather than to the river.

I conclude with observing that a wide range of treatments are necessary for addressing the various problems that the Murray system faces. We are fortunate that we have a ministerial council which now embraces the four river States, because clearly some of the problems of the river, like the problems of our railway system, have been related to the fragmented political control of these sorts of things in Australia before and since Federation. If the colonial and the State system produced three different railway gauges around the country, in the same way the fact that the Murray-Darling Basin lies athwart four of our States, as well as the Capital Territory, over many years there has been a fragmented approach to the solution of these problems.

That is largely gone but the problem of political will remains. There will always be that difference of emphasis between the various States, however much they agree to work together. The Murray-Darling Basin comprises most of the land surface of New South Wales, whereas—however important it is—it impinges on only a very small proportion of South Australia. On the other hand, South Australia is very dependent on the water flowing through that system.

So there is the continuing temptation in New South Wales in a way that we would never have to contemplate to open up further land to irrigation, to see that in fact more development is possible in that area. Victoria lies somewhere between the two States, it would seem to me, in relation to these sorts of problems. It is unlikely that Victoria, given the problems of salinisation in areas like Kerang, would be tempted to want to increase its irrigation projects. Of course, Queensland, because of the distance from the major river in the system and because of the intermittent nature of the flow in the various rivers which make up the tributaries of the system, has an entirely different set of problems altogether.

Some of these must be of long term. If we are to revegetate the headwaters of the rivers of the system, quite clearly that takes a long time to do. If we are to re-educate primary producers and others who operate in the area—as I know these people are only too willing to be re-educated—that also can take a generation or so. There can be no excuse for continuing, however, to put human waste into the river.

In passing I note that a recent report (I have not yet had a chance to look at it in great detail) suggests that we should no longer be putting sullage from houseboats into the river in the same way that we stopped putting sewage from houseboats in the river a long time ago. I support that proposition and I hope that that is something that could be phased in the near future. There is no excuse for continuing to put human waste directly into the river. The unanimous support of this motion by this House will be one small step along the way to achieving that desirable goal.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ASH WEDNESDAY BUSHFIRE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

That this House notes that on 16 February, 10 years have elapsed since the second of the Ash Wednesday bushfires and further notes that the disaster suffered by this State on that occasion was measured in severe loss of property and above all else, lives; this House commends the gallantry of all the firefighters, both regular and irregular, who risked their lives in the service of South Australia; moreover the House particularly notes the suffering of those injured that day and the grief of families in which life was lost.

This motion concerns events of some 10 years ago. The second Ash Wednesday bushfire of 16 February 1983 saw devastation in many areas of South Australia. The Hills area in particular was very badly damaged. Many of the assets of South Australia were destroyed. The fire that swept through the Hills area and the fire down in the South-East took a heavy toll of human life. It also took a

toll of South Australia's history. The fire that swept up into the Hills destroyed many of the great buildings that had been put on the Mount Lofty face in the past century. It destroyed many of the collections of books housed in places like St Michael's, the famous retreat up there, and it damaged Mount Lofty House, although not beyond repair; in fact, it was restored at some time and converted into a commercial establishment.

Many other principal buildings were destroyed in that region. It destroyed the obelisk at the top of Mount Lofty which had been there for many years and which had been the focus of tourist activity in and around the Mount Lofty Ranges. The fire swept through Greenhill, and I think the name of Yarrabee Road was well known by every person in South Australia because of the disaster of that day.

In moving this motion I wish to do three things. The first is to recognise that 10 years have now gone by since that bushfire and to bring some level of community awareness to the fact that it can indeed happen again either in the same area or in other areas of South Australia, given the conditions that were prevalent on that day. I hope to draw the attention of the House, of members and of the community in South Australia to the vigilance required in the bushfire season in which we are now. Another purpose is to give recognition to those people who fought the fire that day. In the motion I use the words 'regular and irregular'. What is meant by that is that we all know and recognise in here in many different ways the work of the CFS and the MFS. On that day they worked extremely well and there is no doubt that they saved many lives and much property. However, there is another group of people who need to be recognised as well. When there is a threat of bushfire in country areas and in the Hills many people flock to the CFS stations to help fight the fires. They do so sometimes with some training and sometimes with no training at all, but they do so in large numbers.

There were also many people that day who fought fires not only on their own properties but also on those of their neighbours. Many people on that occasion saw the necessity to go out there and help other people in the community and indeed, for many days and weeks after that, large numbers of people went out and volunteered to help with fences, stock recovery and a whole range of other duties for which they were not paid and for which, because of the terrible emotional response to the fire, they were not given full credit at the time for the exercise that they went into. In part, the second reason for my moving this motion is to recognise the services of all South Australians who participated in the anti-bushfire measures on that day and in the days that followed.

The third reason for moving this motion is that there was a considerable loss of life on that day and a loss of property. The committee of which I am the Presiding Member—the Economic and Finance Committee—brought down a report at the end of last year on the woods and forests in South Australia and, in part, one of the major problems that South Australia experienced on that day in February 10 years ago was the loss of a great deal of forestry in South Australia. When the committee looked at the implications of those considerable losses 10 years ago, it was pretty clear to us that the ramifications of that bushfire are still with us and, in terms of the families that suffered loss that day, there is no doubt that they too have feelings 10 years on which I think this resolution recognises.

Unfortunately, some people that day were trapped either in cars or in dwellings and perished, and I draw attention to one person in particular this afternoon. He had been the Chair of the Adelaide Teachers College, which at that time I believe was called the Adelaide College of Advanced Education. Dr Pfitzner, who was well known around education circles in South Australia, had been the Chair of that establishment for a great many years. He was also known as the man who wrote all the physics books that students, right up to the 1980s, were using in secondary curriculum courses around South Australia and I believe in other States. Dr Pfitzner suffered a heart attack that day while defending his own property in Piccadilly.

I think there were a number of lessons from that day, some of which were well learnt in South Australia. Unfortunately, I suspect that others will be revisited in the future. One of those lessons was the necessity for the MFS and the CFS to come to grips with their communication problems, which were so evident on that day. I fought the 1980 Ash Wednesday bushfire and the one thing that was very clear in that whole exercise was that the level of communication from one CFS unit to another was virtually non-existent. I fought the 1983 fire, with a much more personal note, which I will come to in a moment, and I do not know that the level of communication was a great deal better. As a result of working on the bushfire select committee in this House and on other occasions, I have since seen that those communication problems have been very much overcome and that the CFS and MFS are now acting in a much more coordinated way. I would suspect that the great lessons of those two Ash Wednesday fires have certainly been learnt by the CFS, the MFS and the Government.

During the second Ash Wednesday bushfire my residence at that time was directly threatened. The fire hit that hill at 3.21 p.m. For some two years afterwards one did not need anyone to point out from which direction the flames had come, because every tree, every weed and every plant was frozen in the direction from which the fire came. It approached my property at such speed that I had only one minute to vacate the premises. My next door neighbour had less time than that and did not get out at all. He managed to save his life by sheltering beneath his house, and for some weeks afterwards he experienced a number of emotional symptoms resulting from his escape from death.

A total of seven of the 10 houses on the hill where I lived in the Mount Lofty Ranges were burnt totally to the ground. Two were very badly damaged, and only my house miraculously escaped even minor damage. That experience is one of those occasions where people remember exactly where they were on that day because of the events that transpired.

There is also no doubt in my mind that anyone who was in the path of that oncoming fire needed to take shelter. When anyone says that bushfires can be fought in the full blast of a north wind in a temperature of about 44 degrees, I suggest they are speaking through the top of their head, because the reality is that nobody fights a fire or gets in the way of a fire such as that. The role of

the CFS and the MFS is to go in afterwards to ensure, where appropriate, that life and property can be saved.

I suspect that one of the lessons that has not been learnt from those bushfires in the early 1980s is the necessity for clearing up around many of the properties in the bushfire areas. The 10 years that have elapsed since the last fire have made it quite clear in my mind that people are now treating the risk of bushfire with much less caution than they should. In fact, one of the great things that has come out since 1983 is that we have become very slack in many areas with respect to anti-bushfire measures.

The other thing that needs to be highlighted in this debate is that the incentive of insurance companies to broach the subject with their various clients by reducing rates of insurance where anti-bushfire measures are invoked is something which unfortunately seems to have been stillborn. In many respects, in the early 1980s there were a number of proposals on the table for which anti-bushfire measures would be rewarded with lower insurance premiums. Sadly, much of that has not taken place. Many of the other anti-bushfire measures proposed by the Government have been accepted and incorporated into the building code. Unfortunately, for many of the existing properties the risk is still there, and it is my view that, through the insurance mechanism and levies, pressure can be put upon householders to include as many anti-bushfire measures as possible. The clearance of vegetation and, in particular, trees very near houses, the use of appropriate building codes, fire retardants and, in particular, insulation which of itself is not a fire risk are all measures that insurance companies should recognise.

I will conclude my remarks by saying that the fire in 1983 cost South Australia in excess of $100 million. As I understand it, the fire in 1980 had a price tag of approximately $20 million attached to it. However, more than that, the 1983 fire saw more than 20 lives lost in South Australia. Further, it saw a great deal of suffering and losses, not only of material things which were irreplaceable but also in many families, which led to suffering at levels that can only be imagined. Now, 10 years on, in many respects we are wiser. We can use this occasion in the House today to recognise the problems of 10 and 13 years ago and raise with the community the necessity for adequate anti-bushfire measures in all bushfire prone areas.

I would suggest that this year's bushfire season is a couple of months later than has been the case in previous years. The reason for that is the late rains, but I also warn the House that the 1980 bushfire occurred in March, not February, and the reason for that was that it rained until New Year's Day. In fact, as one who fought both bushfires, the 1980 fire was even warmer than the 1983 fire.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House condemns the policies pursued by the Federal and South Australian Governments which have contributed to the tragically high levels of unemployment in this State, denying South Australians, particularly young people, the right to work.

This motion is moved with a great deal of feeling. I know that every member in this House has been touched by the unemployment problem, whether it be their family, relatives or constituents. If any member has not been affected, they should not be in this House. What we are seeing is a tragedy, because we are denying the people who are our future the right to work. If this continues for much longer, this country will not be able to sustain its population. It will have a group of people who will be aggravated and upset, and who will take action because of the situation they are facing. People without hope become desperate, and that is what we are seeing today in many shapes and forms. It is highly regrettable and must be turned around.

In moving the motion, I point the finger at the State and Commonwealth Governments, because it is my belief that they have contributed to this situation in almost every field of endeavour. There is no doubt that everyone agrees that the three major ingredients for a strong economy are investment, productivity and marketing—an outward looking economy which takes on the rest of the world and competes with it. We do not have those ingredients in Australia and, in particular, South Australia. If we look at those elements, we find that everything that has been done in the past 10 years has reduced our capacity to achieve that desirable end which is to increase the wealth of this country and the prosperity of its citizens, and to be able to hold our head high in the international community because we can provide for our population and our young people in particular.

In South Australia, it is important to note that the deterioration has been quite dramatic. I note in the November LabourForce statistics for South Australia that the decline has been significant. In the year November 1991 to November 1992, the end of the period for which statistics are available, we find that unemployed persons in the 15 years to 19 years group have increased from 23.2 per cent to 31.4 per cent. In the 20 years to 24 years category, there has been a line ball situation. These figures refer to males. However, when we look at the figures for females, the increase has been from 21.9 per cent to 24.2 per cent in the 15 years to 19 years category, and from 11.9 per cent to 18.9 per cent in the 20 years to 24 years category.

These are our young people, and those rates do not express the full extent of unemployment because we know that, in those categories, there has been a massive withdrawal from the labour force in terms of people staying longer at secondary school or taking up tertiary courses. We see now that people are more inclined to go to an educational institution because jobs are not available, so the bland statistics do not tell the whole story, but they are a startling change in the situation over a very short time.

I remind this House that we will certainly crack the one million people unemployed if not in February certainly in March. Given the number of school leavers coming onto the market, if the next set of figures does not show one million unemployed, the following set

will—but a few days before the Federal election, reminding people of the key issues in this election, that is, the health and welfare of Australians and their future, not only within their own communities but within the international arena.

BRIGHTON KINDERGARTEN

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House instructs the Minister of Education, Employment and Training not to approve the recommendation by the Western Region Children's Services Office to close the Brighton kindergarten.

(Continued from 25 November. Page 1694.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I rise to speak against this motion, and I do so on the ground that I believe this matter has now been resolved with those at the Brighton Kindergarten and that the closure has been agreed to by the management committee. In his speech to the House in moving the motion, the member for Bright stated that schools and kindergartens are being closed by this Government. What he does not state is that the service is not taken away but is provided from another campus—and, in fact, a better service is provided more cost effectively. I have to say that, given some of the statements that the member for Bright has made in this House, I would have thought that he would applaud that: it is called responsible Government, for the honourable member's information.

Perhaps it would be appropriate for me to give some background on the western development plan study, which was initiated in response to consistent demand from parents with young children, who requested changes in the current provision of children's services in that area. In doing so, I think it is important to recognise that the needs of families have changed, and I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, would be well aware of that, as indeed I am. More women are returning to the work force, and many of those jobs are part-time or casual, making arrangements for care and education of young children increasingly difficult for many families. I have some first-hand information on that, where it is extremely difficult for those young women who need to go back to work in these days where it is difficult to manage. They need to know that the particular type of care that they require is available for them, and quite rightly so.

I have been informed that, throughout the formulation of the western development plan, considerable consultation and joint planning with parents and staff was given high priority, and that was not mentioned by the member for Bright in his speech. It is important to say that there was a good deal of consultation. Emerging consistently from all those discussions was one theme, that is, the need for greater flexibility and choice in early childhood service provision. We must be aware that this is an increasingly important area, which Governments of all persuasions must look at. We must provide the best possible, the most flexible, service to meet the needs of those people requiring that service.

The western development plan had some very clear aims, and I would like to document those and put them on the record. The first aim was to more effectively allocate existing resources in the western region to place the region in a position where it is better able to meet the emerging and future needs of parents. The second aim was to increase the number of full-time preschool services. The third was to establish a number of focal multifunction services, and that is part of that greater flexibility requirement mentioned in the consultations. The fourth aim was to take into account the demographic and social changes throughout that particular region which had resulted in an over supply of services in some areas and an under supply in others. Thus it was to achieve consistency and equity over all areas that this plan was developed. I believe that that has been done, and done in a very positive way.

The member for Bright was correct in saying that his electorate was designated as cluster five. During investigations and discussions, it was found that this area did have quite a large number of services available to it. Several pre-schools in close proximity are, unfortunately, under utilised: first, within two kilometres there were Dover, Somerton, Warradale and Ballara; secondly, within 3 kilometres, Seaview Downs and Seacliff; and, thirdly, Townsend House, which caters for approximately 10 preschool children.

As well as that, it was found that many children using the Brighton preschool lived in close proximity to other services and could access these services without too much disruption. The western development plan determined that there were approximately 95 vacancies within this geographic area with the closure of Brighton. The claim that the overriding objective of the western development plan is to sell off preschools to raise revenue is quite untrue and, I believe, a blatant misrepresentation of the facts by the member for Bright.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: The honourable member interjects, but he is well known for getting his facts wrong, so I would suggest that he desist from interjecting.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright will have the chance to respond.

Mrs HUTCHISON: It is a fact that the Brighton preschool is owned by the CSO, but Marino and Plympton kindergartens were owned by local government. The intention of the western development plan is to be cost neutral, and again I would think that the honourable member would applaud that. Any moneys recovered from the sale of preschool buildings will be used to develop and improve other preschool buildings in the western region, thus the funding for significant upgrading of Dover Kindergarten has been recommended from savings arising from the western development plan. All assets and equipment owned by kindergartens that have closed have been reallocated to other early childhood services so that money is still in the system providing those services. Brighton preschool was identified as the service within the geographic area which should be closed. As I said, much consultation went on at that time.

This decision was based on a number of factors, which I will document. First, the building was of poor quality, and that was ascertained after a special building report

had been done. Secondly, the original building was meant for short-term use only and, although being a corrugated iron army hut, it has been in service for 55 years but is not viable in the longer term, and we must look to the longer term. Thirdly, apart from the condition and structural materials of the building, the actual layout of the building is restrictive. The internal design does not allow for flexible use, which was one of the requirements identified in the consultations; in short, the building does not meet current building design criteria and, therefore, could not be considered in the establishment of any additional programs. Fourthly, the siting of the kindergarten is not ideal, being on a main road. The noise level in the play area is significant and restricts outdoor learning experiences. Those were the grounds on which the decision was made.

In the overall planning of the extension of local kindergartens, the Brighton preschool location meant that the preschool could not be considered for further development. Other local services are located in quiet streets adjacent to parks and reserves, and closure of the Brighton preschool will enable the CSO to extend another local kindergarten to a full day service, which again was one of the requirements. The Dover preschool will operate as a full day centre from the commencement of term 1, 1993. The advantage of the full day centre is that parents have greater flexibility in the sessions that they can use. Many families will probably opt for their children to attend full days rather than sessions.

The honourable member talked about the closure of the Marino Kindergarten. Here is an excellent example of community consultation and a wonderful spirit of community cooperation whereby the staff and parents of the Marino and Seacliff kindergartens worked together successfully to amalgamate and establish one service, which has a new name, that is, the Seacliff Community, reflecting a new direction. That was a positive aspect of what was done; everybody combined and came up with a decision, which was unanimously agreed to. Parents worked together to establish a new constitution—and they must be given credit for that—philosophy and policies, and the newly amalgamated centre is a truly cooperative venture of two formerly separate community groups. That can be done again if people are willing.

The amalgamated service will operate full day from the beginning of term 1, 1993. A funded occasional care program will be established at Dover Kindergarten by term 2, 1993, and that will provide the local community with an occasional care program that will give parents access to fee relief—a very important aspect. The establishment of this program at Dover would have affected the viability of the Brighton care program. Indeed, although the care program at Brighton was successful, it must be remembered that it was provided through the use of CSO facilities but was not accessible to parents on low incomes because of the set fee scale. The CSO will now be able to offer a more equitable occasional care service for local families.

A new Commonwealth funded long day centre at Warradale providing 45 places will open in February, thus expanding choices for parents in the area. In summary, the outcome of the WDP is that the half day service at Brighton will now operate at Dover Kindergarten as a full day centre, with an occasional care program. Choices for parents in this area have been expanded by the establishment of a more flexible service.

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): The address that we heard prior to the adjournment by the member for Stuart was nothing short of an insult to the people of my electorate and, in particular, to the committee of the Brighton Kindergarten. We heard an address by the member for Stuart, a member representing an electorate covering the northern extremities of this State, taking in cities such as Port Augusta and, based on her address to this Parliament, I doubt whether the honourable member has even contacted the people involved with that kindergarten or has been to the kindergarten about which she tried to convince this Parliament she was speaking with so much authority.

The honourable member simply had her facts wrong, wrong and wrong yet again. Indeed, far from being resolved, the issue of the closure of Brighton Kindergarten is still very much alive in the eyes of parents who had children at that preschool and in the eyes of the parents who use the child-care facilities at that preschool. It is with some irony that this debate has occurred tonight, because the closure of the facility also sees the end of child-care facilities that were provided by the community for the community without any support of the Children's Services Office.

I remind members of the statement I made in this House earlier—that I was completely disgusted to hear statements made by staff of the Children's Services Office to the effect that they were eager to close the Brighton preschool facility, eager because the type of child-care facility that was being offered by the Brighton preschool was, in their words, 'an elitist facility and not in keeping with the general thrust and direction of the policy of the Children's Services Office'. Both parents and I found that statement totally repugnant.

There is only one reason why that facility is being closed and the reason is simple: it is an attempt to grab revenue. Parents who have children going to that preschool have been disadvantaged. That preschool site is the one with the greater economic value and, so far as this Government was concerned, the decision was simple. Far from being happy about the decision, parents have been bludgeoned into unwilling submission and negotiation has been almost non-existent. The dictatorial attitude of departmental staff has caused distress to the parents involved with that kindergarten, and I hope that process is never again seen in this State.

Many other members would agree with me that there are times when rationalisation of Government facilities is necessary, but there is a way of undertaking such a role, and what we saw at Brighton certainly was not the way to go. The member for Stuart also mentioned the closure of the Marino Kindergarten through an amalgamation with the Seacliff facility and students moving onto that site. The parents of both groups worked well together in spite of the process undertaken by the Government.

I have previously quoted in this House letters I received from concerned parents and members of the committees of those preschool centres expressing their

disgust about the manner in which the whole exercise was conducted. I am sure that those parents will be further disgusted when they read the address given in this place today by the member for Stuart.

Mr Lewis: A real vote loser.

Mr MATTHEW: As my colleague the member for Murray-Mallee says, a real vote loser, not that that should be any motivation for any discussion in this House. If the Government thinks it has its eye on the ball, the speech by the member for Stuart is proof that it certainly has not got its eye on the ball. Therefore, I urge the House to support my motion and, in doing so, to show disgust for the speech given in this Parliament by the member for Stuart.

Motion negatived.

PUBLIC SECTOR SALARIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Holloway:

That this House notes the Government's decision to request the State Bank, SGIC and other statutory authorities to more fully disclose details of salary packages in excess of $100 000 in their annual reports and calls on the Federal Government to consider amending schedule 5 of the corporations law to ensure that a more complete disclosure of remuneration is included in the financial report of Australian companies.

(Continued from 25 November. Page 1695.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the motion. While I believe that the figure of $100 000 is a little low, I also believe that the disclosure of executive salaries in- our companies should be reported more clearly to the shareholders and the public. For too long now we have had the comparison between the Public Service and private enterprise as to the remuneration packages that should be offered to chief executives and certain levels of executive officer.

The $100 000 level could include a salary as low as $35 000, depending on the components of a salary package. As I understand it, taxation laws could be changed within the next few months. Even the Government Party has looked at that, and what we know as packages created for taxation advantages could be changed. Even so, I still believe, as doubtless does the mover of the motion, that $100 000, or the level of salary offered in many companies, bears little relationship to the workload and job specifications of certain industries.

There is no doubt that there are companies which are highly profitable and which operate in an area where they have a monopoly or a position so close to a monopoly that it does not matter. There are other smaller companies where executive officers have to work hard and use all their technical skills barely to make a profit, yet those officers do not receive the same sort of remuneration.

We are paying the price for what happened in the late 1970s and early 1980s in respect of the smart-alec entrepreneurs, and I have referred to them in previous debates as nothing more than upmarket con people who, in some cases, got away with it, but in most cases they failed. The economic situation of this country eventually turned around to some semblance of what should be sane economic conditions, and every one of those companies eventually went to the wall.

Of course, some of the entrepreneurs went to gaol. Many of them are still running around when they should be in gaol and no doubt in time they may be caught. They created a false market and a false situation through false valuations of properties. In future, I hope that all Governments will take heed of the situation that occurred. It was ludicrous for a company executive to buy a property for $1 million and then immediately return to the bankers and say that the property was for sale for $2 million, creating a false market. They were able to borrow $1.750 million immediately. That is what happened. The level of equity in many property transactions was far too low.

At the same time the Australian banking system panicked. With the deregulation of banking, the whole of the financial market showed just how irresponsible it could be when it thought the American banking institutions would come in, endeavour to buy a share of the market and lend the money without taking the appropriate security and/or precautions—and that is exactly what it did. In many cases the business that was available for someone to come in and buy a new market share was extremely risky. We in South. Australia of course paid that price through the State= Bank because the entrepreneurs got into the State, Bank and anybody who approached it with a fair and reasonable proposition, wanting to expand;got what they wanted on almost no deposit.

Then the economy got strapped and interest rates rose to the rate they did, and it was a recipe for disaster. So, the taxpayers and the future generations of this country and this State will pay the price. But it was the decisions of the executive officers which caused the problems. It is scandalous to think that some of these executives were given bonuses—very large and lucrative bonuses—and that it was written into their contracts and/or salary packages that, if they could write a business contract to lend money for X million dollars or to borrow money and then on-lend it, they received a percentage of the commission; in other words, they creamed the profit from the top.

So, we found that a lot of these people were extremely highly paid for a short period. That is why I agree with the mover of the motion that we need full disclosure. We need full disclosure of the whole of the remuneration package and of the details as to how it was created. The shareholders of Australian companies should have this spelt out. We have found in the past two years also that the remuneration of the directors of some of these companies is absolutely outrageous. I do not think the shareholders have had any idea of the salaries and, more importantly, the sort of packages some of the directors have been receiving. A lot of them were on non-contributory superannuation schemes. I do not think the shareholders or the people of Australia realised that those who led some of these companies and those who are still leading some of Australia's biggest companies were and still are receiving tremendous benefits that are not fully disclosed to the community. That in itself is a disgrace.

We talk about accountability. We hold the Government accountable. The State Bank and the State Government

have been put through probably the most ruthless examination, not only in this State but in the Victorian Parliament as well, yet when Westpac—reputedly the biggest and strongest bank in Australia—conducted its recent annual general meeting it went on for eight hours, and certain sections of the media, shareholders and board directors complained. But that was nothing compared to the examination to which the State Bank in South Australia has been subjected, and it is not finished yet.

So, a second meeting of shareholders of Westpac was held. I believe that in the future more power will go to the shareholders. I hope that they will continue to cross-examine their directors and demand greater accountability from them and their chief executive officers in relation to what has transpired within those companies.

If we get that type of accountability, if we get that type of disclosure, I think State and Federal Governments will find it much easier to select their chief executive officers and Governments will not be under pressure to pay huge six figure sums in salaries and/or packages to attract the right people to administer the various Government departments. That is the real problem: it starts right up there with the general managers of the biggest companies in Australia—BHP, Fosters Brewing Company, News Corporation and many other huge conglomerates—who receive packages that are out of all reason as far as the average citizen is concerned. It flows right down and hits the very levels of Government that we deal with on a daily basis in this Legislature.

That is the problem and that is why we must virtually demand that the Federal Government amend the disclosure laws so that we can see exactly what is happening in private enterprise as well as in the public area. We will look at the public area, but private enterprise must be prepared to meet the same terms and conditions as do public organisations. For that reason I support the motion.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I will speak very briefly to this motion. I congratulate the member for Hanson on the speech he has just made, because it was a very thoughtful contribution about what has been happening concerning Australian companies, involving not only boards of directors but managing directors. Sometimes managing directors are appointed to the boards and sometimes they are not. In recent years the managing directors have been kept off the boards because of the problems that Australian companies have encountered. The recent Westpac annual general meeting is a good example of how small shareholders are expressing their anger at what is happening so far as directors of companies are concerned.

I agree with the member for Hanson that not only the salaries but the packages should be disclosed. Company directors, in some instances, have been giving themselves very big packages that the shareholders have never noticed. For example, they give themselves a parcel of shares paid to lc and the dividends from those shares are put into the pot, which eventually pays for the shares. They are given a period of years in which to actually pay for the shares, and if the shares devalue to the extent where they are not worth picking up the directors are given the option of whether or not to buy them.

I find what has been happening in Australia in recent years involving particular companies to be nothing short of disgraceful. Some very prominent Adelaide personalities have been involved in this aspect—dare I mention Adsteam—where certain parcels of shares were paid to lc and were not picked up because the shares had devalued so much. But, had the shares gone the other way, the directors concerned would have picked up millions of dollars.

The new chairman and directors of Westpac are in a similar situation and stand to pick up over $15 million. This is one of the aspects that held up the recent annual general meeting of Westpac for so long: the shareholders were dismayed at the package being offered to the board of directors. Of course, we often hear much about the chairman of the board but we do not often hear a lot about the other board members, and the other board members are taking their little slice also.

Really, you have to ask yourself, 'Who actually pays in the long term for these huge packages?' It is the shareholders. This is money that ought to be going to the shareholders. It does not matter how you dress up the package, in the long term somebody pays, and it is the ordinary shareholder that is paying. In some of the failed companies we have in Australia, the boards of directors are still paying themselves huge amounts of money. The dividends in certain companies have been stopped for a long time—and here I mention Ariadne.

Not only have the dividends in Ariadne been stopped for years, but the shares are delisted: the shareholders cannot even trade in the small amounts to which the shares have been devalued. In the meantime, the directors of that company are paying themselves huge dividends. The way the company directors have been paying themselves these huge amounts of money is most unfair, and the small shareholders have not had a proper opportunity to make their voices heard. Anyone, for example, who takes out shares in the National Bank of Australia and lives in Adelaide never gets the opportunity to go to an annual general meeting, which is held in Sydney. It is all right to say that they can hand over their proxies to somebody else, but if they hand over their proxies to somebody else they must have the ability to organise, to have another group of people who know what is going on within the company, and the odds are against them all the way. The best and only way I can think of under the circumstances is to accept the proposition now before us and to make sure that the remuneration packages are fully disclosed.

In my brief time on the Economic and Finance Committee, which I shared with the member for Hanson, I was astounded by some of the wages that people in our statutory authorities are paying themselves. They bypass the normal arbitration system, and in Government the way to get hold of money in South Australia is to go not into the Public Service but into one of these statutory authorities. Members should look not only at the wages these people pay themselves but also at the packages.

The packages are enormous.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member will have the chance to enter the debate and I think he ought to,

because it is a very important debate. I will not answer the interjections but, if he wants to pose a few more questions, he should enter into the debate. I know that in some of our statutory authorities people are being paid merely to design the packages for the people in that organisation, and I daresay the member for Hanson knows the organisation that I am talking about. So, the only defence as far as the general public, we as shareholders of those organisations and the little shareholders in the companies are concerned is full disclosure. There ought to be full disclosure of both the salaries and, more importantly, the packages provided in those industries. I think in a bipartisan way everybody can support this proposition.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BRIGHTON AND MAWSON HIGH SCHOOLS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House rejects the proposal to amalgamate Brighton and Mawson High Schools, recognises the need to build on the success already achieved at both schools through academic excellence and Brighton's specialist music program and recognises the need to develop Mawson High as a specialist school with a focus on technology.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 1573.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I rise on behalf of the Government to oppose this motion moved by the member for Bright. In doing so I would like to say that as an ex-student of Brighton High School I would certainly not support any action that would harm the reputation of that school in any way, and I certainly have no intention of supporting any motion that is not in the best interests of Brighton High School. However, I think it should be pointed out that the amalgamation of Mawson and Brighton High Schools has taken place; it was announced late last year that the amalgamation would take place as of 1 January this year.

School amalgamations are always contentious, and I am sure all members of this House who have been involved in that procedure would be well aware of what I am referring to. However, generally speaking, once these amalgamations have been completed, I think there is an acceptance of them. One can understand why the parents and staff at particular schools would be concerned about the unknown and about what may happen as a result of these amalgamations; nevertheless, we have to be aware that in many parts of Adelaide there are demographic changes the school-age population is declining. If we are to manage our schools efficiently and get the best education system possible, we must have a certain size of school to make our education system effective.

The member for Bright, who moved this motion, is quite infamous in this House for moving motions concerning his electorate that are basically calling on the Government to contribute more money to his electorate. He is also a member of a Federal Party that at this very moment is campaigning for an election on the basis that it will cut $10 billion out of Government spending, and one aspect of that Government spending would be assistance to the States. So, I think the member for Bright and his Opposition colleagues should be a little more honest in their attitude to such matters. If they are really supporting their Federal colleagues and their philosophy of small government, they should have the decency to get up here and be consistent.

The member for Bright is also a member of the same Party as Mr Geoff Kennett in Victoria who, just days after the last election, cut the number of schools by 50 and reduced the number of teachers, not by a few hundred but by thousands. Of course, that was not announced prior to the election, and there was no consultation. The member for Bright's speech on this matter was rather opportunistic and hypocritical. He made a number of assertions I would like to address, the most outrageous of which was that there was no consultation. I think that if we compared the consultation over the merger of Brighton and Mawson High Schools we would see that it was considerably greater than the consultation that Mr Kennett had in Victoria when he closed his 50 schools—there was absolutely zero consultation about that.

I would like to announce the details of the decision. A press release was put out by the Director-General of Education on 16 December announcing this amalgamation. The specialist education services which are provided by both these schools, which include music at Brighton High School, will continue to be provided at the amalgamated school, so the high standard of the curriculum will be maintained. Also, the two existing principals of these schools will remain on their respective sites during 1993 and a new principal will be appointed from the beginning of term 3 this year.

A working party, which investigated this merger, issued a questionnaire to all parents of the respective schools early last year. That working party, which included staff and school council representatives from both schools, recommended that by the start of 1994 the Mawson site should be used as a junior secondary campus for years 8 and 9 and the Brighton site as a senior campus. The Government has decided that one of the initial tasks of the new principal when that person is appointed later this year and of the school council would be to review this recommendation in view of the limits two campuses would place on the curriculum and the ability to upgrade technical studies, home economics and classroom facilities.

Any decisions relating to the school's name, uniform, logo, motto and colours will be decided by the new principal and the school community. So, many of the allegations made by the member for Bright as to what would happen as a result of this amalgamation are simply not true, and many of those matters will be decided by the school community later this year. As I said earlier, that is a great contrast to the way Mr Kennett, his Liberal colleague in Victoria, handled things.

In his speech, the member for Bright provided a lot of information about the history of Brighton High School. I attended Brighton High School during the 1960s and in fact did my Leaving at that school in 1965, which was the year that saw the end of the Playford Government. I well recall that during Leaving chemistry we had a class of 52 students. Nearly the whole school was housed in green wooden pre-fab buildings which were intolerably

hot in summer. The fact is that, during the Playford era, our school system was an absolute disgrace. We had huge class sizes and whatever people might say about the condition of our schools today, believe me, they are infinitely better than they were then, but that is a piece of history that the member for Bright left out of his speech.

Also in his contribution, the honourable member made some rather outrageous claims that the Government had been involved in a campaign of rumour and innuendo concerning Mawson High School and, as a result, there had been a reduction in the student population there. That is quite untrue. What needs to be understood about this merger is that it has come about because of demographics. Members opposite cannot deny the fact that there has been a falling population in the catchment area for these two schools, and I refer to the Brighton and Glenelg council areas. In fact, according to ABS projections, it is expected that between 1991 and 1996 there will be a 7.2 per cent decline in the number of five to 12 year olds in the Glenelg and Brighton areas. That is an annual decrease of 1.4 per cent.

What is also important to understand is that at the moment many students attend these two schools from the southern suburbs, that is, those over the Hills face zone. However, years 11 and 12 will be opening soon at Hallett Cove, which means that many of those students will no longer need to travel to Mawson and Brighton High Schools. When one combines the demographic trends and the extension of the Hallett Cove school, there is simply not the student population in the area to support two schools at a level at which the curriculum and a quality level of education is viable.

Any member in this House who has a high school in their electorate would be well aware that once a school population drops to the level of Mawson—and its enrolment has fallen below 400 students—it is extremely difficult to maintain a curriculum that gives students a realistic choice. That is the reason why the two schools are to be merged. As I said, many of the claims of the member for Bright are simply not true. Things such as the loss of name, tradition of the school and uniform will not be the case. Indeed, I note that the working party recommended that the new school be called the Brighton Secondary School, but it will be up to the new principal and school council of the combined school to make such decisions later this year.

The member for Bright also challenged me to stand up in this place and dissociate myself from Education Department staff who he alleged said that Brighton High School is not the sort of school they want to see in this community. I would certainly dissociate myself from such comments, but I challenge the member for Bright to produce any of those statements, because I do not believe that any member of the Education Department would make such a claim. Certainly no member of this Government would claim such a thing.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: If the member for Bright claims they did, let him produce the evidence. Certainly, I would denounce that. As my time has almost expired, I conclude by saying that the amalgamation of Brighton High and Mawson High is under way. I believe it will be a success. The decision that the Government has made—

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): At the time of moving this motion, a decision had not been announced regarding the future of Brighton and Mawson High Schools. Since that time, an announcement has been made by the Government to the effect that, as I suspected, Brighton and Mawson High Schools are to be amalgamated, commencing from the beginning of the 1994 school year. What is not yet known is whether that school will be on one site or two sites, and it still leaves a strong possibility, as I further suspected, that the merger is likely to occur on the Brighton High School site with the ultimate sale of the Mawson High School site.

I listened with interest to the contribution by the member for Mitchell. He said that the reason for the decision concerning the schools was one of demographics, and that is correct. I am the first to acknowledge that numbers have dropped at Mawson High School, and they have dropped to some 380 students. The reason for that is quite simple. Regrettably, it is a pattern that we have seen before. If a Government wishes to make a hard decision but does not wish to announce it, there is nothing like a couple of rumours circulating in the community to bring about the demise of a school. Indeed, the numbers at the school dropped not because there was any significant change in the demographic make-up of the area from one year to another but rather because there was an air of uncertainty in the community for about four years. For some four years there has been a cloud over the heads of students and parents at Mawson High School. For that reason, parents started to move their children elsewhere.

To lose the nature of education provided by the present Mawson High School is something akin to losing the nature of education previously provided by Goodwood High. To amalgamate two schools as diverse as Mawson and Brighton into a school like Brighton with over 1 100 students serves no purpose. Brighton High School already is a full school, and it provides quite a different type of education. The two schools have separate identities with quite different curricula. The parents and students are most unhappy about this decision which has been forced upon them. I have been very close to the decisions that have been occurring and the concerns expressed by parents. In my role as a parliamentary representative, I sit on the Mawson High School Council. My colleague, the member for Hayward, equally has been close to the concerns expressed by parents because he sits on the Brighton High School Council. We have discussed this issue at length and have both been receiving similar feedback from parents. The distress and concern they feel has increased as a result of this decision that has now been forced upon them.

It is important that this motion is passed if for no other reason than an expression by this Parliament of the view that those two schools should continue separately. Mawson High School provides technical education, and that style of education has a real and much needed place in our society today. As we talk about extending and developing industry, including skilling our population, we cannot overlook the fact that we need to skill people in our State in areas of trade, electronics and computing,

and that is one very large and significant area that can be accommodated through a technical high school. The amalgamation of these two schools in my view is an absolute tragedy, an unnecessary burden placed on Brighton High School, and an unnecessary removal of the nature of Mawson High School, and for that reason I commend the motion to the House.

Motion negatived.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MOTOR VEHICLES AND WRONGS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That this House reaffirms its decision of 22 March 1978 when it carried the following motion moved by the then member for Morphett, now the Minister of Primary Industries, 'That this House commends the State Government for continually refusing to permit extensions of the Adelaide Airport beyond its present boundaries and for its insistence that the present flying time curfew be retained and obeyed':

Which Mr Holloway has moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'House' and inserting in lieu thereof the words:

(a) Notes the State Government's approach of favouring initiatives that lead to improved air access to Adelaide and enhance the State's economic development prospects, provided that public sensitivities to operations at Adelaide Airport are properly taken into account;

(b) calls upon the appropriate authorities to ensure the noise reduction measures accompanying the dispensation for Qantas to operate within the curfew at Adelaide Airport are closely monitored and extension of this dispensation beyond 1993 occur only if unreasonable noise pollution problems have not occurred; and

(c) calls upon the Adelaide Airport Consultative Committee to consider and make recommendations to the Federal Airports Corporation and the Federal Government enforcing the airport's noise—abatement procedures and encouraging the maximum use of low-noise certified aircraft.'

(Continued from 19 November. Page 1590.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I cannot support the amendment. Whilst I understand the sentiments of the member for Mitchell, the local residents would never forgive me or any other elected representative if they allowed the Federal Government, the Federal Airports Corporation and the Glenelg and West Torrens councils to agree to breaking the curfew that we established in the early 1970s under a Liberal Government. I was able to extract from the—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: No, that was Janine Haines. Janine Haines was going to lie down on the tarmac, and we were all encouraging her by promising to supply her with pillows and anything else that she needed.

Mr Ferguson: You promised that you would stand on the tarmac in front of the planes.

Mr BECKER: Not me mate; I'm too chicken for that. Janine Haines was going to do that and, with her mouth and everything else, it wouldn't surprise me. The whole purpose was to accommodate Qantas so that it could fly into Adelaide at 5.5 a.m. and then go on to Sydney in the early hours of the morning. This is where Adelaide is unfortunate. Whilst we are in the centre of the continent, we are ideally situated to have an international airport which could operate 24 hours a day, but not in the current location at West Beach. Back in the days when Don Dunstan was Premier, we should have agreed to establish a truly 24-hour international airport at Monarto—a central area for all of Australia. Adelaide could have been used as a central landing area for international flights, with travellers flying off to various destinations around Australia on intra-state routes.

One huge international airport really would be sufficient for Australia, and it certainly would be viable, particularly when you look at the transit airports in places such as Singapore. That airport has a huge turnover. Just about every country in the world is represented at the Singapore international terminal. It has gone through three stages of development; it is many years ahead of its original plan, and it is an extremely profitable airport. It returns a profit of about $750 million a year. Of course, it is the success of the tourism industry for the city of Singapore. However, it is hard work to attract international flights to Australia and to Adelaide. In fact, it is hard work to attract international tourists to any city in Australia, let alone Adelaide, and we must do all we can to accommodate them. I am quite mindful of that because tourism does create a large number of jobs; it is labour intensive.

I believe that flights from London could leave later, or could have a longer break in Singapore or whatever en route. Personally, I cannot understand why direct flights from London to Australia have to go via Singapore: they ought to go via Harare, for arguments sake, or Africa. It would be quicker, and Harare as a destination has a lot to recommend it. So, there are alternatives. The State and Federal Governments ought to get together and put up alternatives to airline carriers with regard to using the facilities of Adelaide Airport. Nothing is impossible. There are ways and means of promoting a city to attract flights within the normal curfew hours, that is, 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. When daylight saving ends next month, Qantas jets that now arrive at 6.5 a.m. will land at 5.5 a.m. So, in theory these planes have been coming in at the equivalent of 5.5 a.m. There have been many complaints from local residents not only about jet aircraft movement but other aircraft movement as well. The Federal Airports Corporation has let the residents down.

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

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (23)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins, G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, D.M. Ferguson, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway (teller), D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (20)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, H. Becker (teller), P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.K.G. Oswald, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MOTOR VEHICLES WRONGS) BILL

The SPEAKER: A short time ago I read a message from the Legislative Council transmitting the Statutes Amendment (Motor Vehicles and Wrongs) Bill. I was informed at that time that the Bill was a private member's Bill and, accordingly, I sought a date for the second reading from the member for Davenport. However, I am now informed that it is a Government Bill and, to make the record correct, I request a date from the Minister.

The Hon. R. J. GREGORY: Tomorrow, Sir.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Ferguson:

That this House—

(a) supports the motor car industry in South Australia;

(b) views with concern the statement made by the Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors that Mitsubishi would walk away from a $10 million engine plant in South Australia if a Coalition Government imposed its zero tariff policy;

(c) agrees that a zero tariff policy will destroy incentive to invest in the industry;

(d) calls upon all members to support a call to the Coalition leaders to drop this anti-development policy and to support the retention of jobs in the industry; and

(e) calls upon the Leader of the Opposition to jointly sign a letter of protest with the Premier.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1139.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Paragraph (a) of the motion moved by the honourable member seeks the support of this House for the motor car industry in South Australia. There can be no doubt about that. Every South Australian supports the motor car industry in South Australia. The industry developed in this State as a result of initiatives taken by the Liberal Government during the Playford era. During those years of development much employment was created and, to a great degree, the industry was the basis of much development in the western and northern suburbs, being the core of the development of Elizabeth and surrounding suburbs.

Of course, the motion is supported from this side in the strongest terms. At the time, the Playford Government made sure that the cost structure of South Australia was low enough for that industry to compete not only within Australia but also outside Australia. The industry had export markets to South Africa but, because of world pressures, our trade with South Africa was cut off, and in that way we cut off part of our nose to spite our face.

In other parts of the world there was just as much political conniving and destruction of people's lives, for example in Russia, but people with affiliations similar to those of members opposite believed that that sort of society was a great society. We now find that Russia and South Africa have changed paths. One was on the extreme right and the other on the extreme left, both involving racism to some degree in the way they operated. There is no doubt that the first paragraph of the motion is supported unanimously, because the industry is important.

However, we had an ALP Government coming to power now only in this State but also in the Commonwealth, and it brought about a cost structure and a system that destroyed the economy of Australia and our opportunities to export outside the State within Australia or to export outside Australia itself. It was those philosophies and actions that destroyed our markets over the past 10 years. I refer to the so-called 'Great Gladiator', who carries some sort of sword with which to cut other people to pieces—his tongue. Mr Keating was the man who destroyed Australia as Treasurer and who is destroying it as Prime Minister. Members opposite claim that we should go along with him, yet Mr Keating, his colleagues and the people of Australia know that he is the man who did the damage, and he is still doing it. Mr Keating says that 12 per cent unemployment is going to be with us and that we have to learn to live with it. There is no real change at hand to create employment.

Those people who supported his election through the Party system stop him and have him cornered because, if he does not go where they want, he cannot survive. He is trapped between those members who push him through the system as an elected member and the people of Australia who are tired of the rhetoric, the promises and his saying that there is no recession.

Mr Keating claimed it was the recession that we had to have. He then claimed that we were coming out of it and then he claimed that we had 12 per cent unemployment but he does not know whether that figure will decline. 'Trust me, I will help South Australia when we get into power; trust me, sell the bank and I will help you, but there are no guarantees whatsoever,' are the words of the man who has brought the economy to the point where the motor industry and other industries cannot compete.

The member for Henley Beach who moved the motion knows that that is the truth. Based on his own business and investment knowledge he knows what it is to experience an economy destroyed through foolishness—and the economy has been destroyed. It was destroyed by foolishness. Some people claim that the world is in recession and that we should be affected to some degree, but they are fools. Australia is a country with almost every mineral resource one wishes to produce. Australia can grow any crop grown in the world and we have virtually every natural resource. We have the ocean and our continental shelf has hardly been touched, yet it is two-thirds of the size of our land mass.

In other words, two-thirds of our country has been hardly investigated or prospected in terms of its wealth and minerals. True, we have found oil, but we have allowed others to fish it out. Australia should never have

fallen into the hole as deeply as it has. To some extent it should have followed the slump in the economies of other countries, but it should not have been one of the leading countries going into the slump.

The Federal Coalition wishes to bring about a complete change through Fightback—a change that will give the people the opportunity and encouragement to save and to gain from effort, although now they are taxed by people who have destroyed the country. On what basis do they say that they had a right to destroy the economy of the country and then tell somebody else who wants to encourage development and saving that they are wrong?

I ask the member for Henley Beach—I know he cannot answer now unless he wishes to interject—whether he really believes the Prime Minister when he says, 'Trust me' after 10 years of failure. No person in business or private life would trust a person who has twisted, turned, dodged and evaded the truth on a regular basis. We would not do it.

The member for Henley Beach says he agrees that a zero tariff policy will destroy incentive to invest in the industry. The Coalition has not said that it wants zero tariffs: it has said it wants minimal tariffs, and that is an issue that the ABC and other areas of the media, and the ALP, have promoted all along. They have referred to zero tariffs, but the policy is for minimal tariffs. The ALP has a policy of 5 per cent tariffs. There is very little difference between minimal tariffs and 5 per cent.

The member for Elizabeth knows that only too well: he knows it to be the truth. Another part of the motion calls upon all members to support a call to the Coalition leaders to drop this anti-development policy and to support the retention of jobs in the industry. A Party that has been the instigator, the planner and the creator of the largest body of unemployed, in percentage terms, in our country since the Depression years talks about policies that destroy jobs. What a joke, what a laugh, what hypocrisy and what double standards when it says that the Coalition policies will destroy jobs!

It does not say much for any Party which has been in power for 10 years, which has stood and watched while 12 per cent of Australia's population, and in some cases up to 35 per cent of young people in a particular area, are unemployed but which says that that is all right and asks our forgiveness for that, even though another Party says that it can turn around the situation with a complete package, in particular with an industrial reform package. When a farmer grows lucerne, mows it, rakes it, bales it and carts it to the port, and when it costs more from the time it leaves the truck at the port to get into the hold of the ship than to get to the port, do we have a problem? Of course we have a problem. We should be ashamed when we cannot give a guaranteed date of departure for goods from our ports.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It was not my intention to enter the debate until the member for Davenport started waffling on with a diatribe about concern for the motor car industry. I have a long and vivid memory about the motor car industry, particularly in relation to my initiation, if you like, into the Parliament in October 1979. I remember vividly asking many questions of the then Minister of Industrial Affairs (I think it was the Hon. Dean Brown) about the future of General Motors—Holden's at Woodville, and what did I get out of him—sweet Fanny Adams. That is all I got out of him—not a scintilla of concern about the motor car industry, particularly the Woodville plant. He had never gone down to see the troops. The only time we ever heard him express concern about the western suburbs of Adelaide and the north-eastern suburbs was come election time, when they suddenly go down there and start talking about concern for the high unemployment, concern for the elderly or whatever. I remember—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Get back in your rabbit hole. I have been here long enough to remember: never once did we see them in the western suburbs, whether during the lead-up to an election or during their three or four year term—and it was three year parliamentary terms in those days. Not once did we see the Liberals down there at the Woodville plant. Not even at election time would they go to the Woodville plant.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will have his opportunity in this debate.

Mr HAMILTON: Sir, I refer to the cynicism of the member for Davenport. I know he was not sincere about his contribution: he was filling in time. The numerous questions I asked and the correspondence I directed to the then Minister of Labour gained me nothing. Even the then Mayor of Woodville, to his credit, and the council tried to do everything possible to assist those workers in the area, particularly at that industrial site. To their credit they were involved in helping to set up the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing in that area.

The only time I ever saw the Conservatives down my way was come election time. We had the member for Coles suddenly appearing on the scene, I think to give support to the now member for Bragg—and there is no question about the fact that they came down there. I think the member for Henley Beach will recall quite vividly that on the eve of the 1982 election they came down to the West Lakes area and put out some disgusting leaflets—

Mr Ferguson: I remember what you said to them.

Mr HAMILTON: I think it is fair to say that the member for Albert Park has a certain volatility about him when he is stirred up. The then Premier I think wore out a pair of shoes racing backwards when I set upon him. I was thankful to my colleagues that they dragged me away at that time. My feeling manifested itself on that occasion because of my concern for the workers in that area and for the electors that I represent. Try as I might, I got very little support from the then Government.

I can even remember one occasion—to show the flippancy of the now Leader of the Opposition—when a lengthy question was asked about a proposed high school on Delfin Island, and the response was, 'If the member for Albert Park can contain himself, they will probably end up planting some pine trees there and growing a forest.' That was his concern about the western suburbs of Adelaide. Repeatedly, we noted the flippancy.

The member for Davenport, to be charitable to him, did not believe what he was talking about. We all know that we live in a world economy. I could reflect back many years ago, long before I came into this job; I talked to trade unionists about the world car concept and how it would impact upon this country. We could compare the volume of cars in this country *vis-a-vis th*e volume in Japan, and we only have to look at the Mazda plant in Hiroshima to see the large turnover of motor vehicles and the technology. And I am talking about 1977 when I was there. We had obsolete equipment. Workers were being asked, in plants like General Motors-Holden's at Woodville and Elizabeth, to work with obsolete and outdated equipment, but those workers were being blamed because their productivity levels were not as high as management wanted.

We all know that the quality of motor vehicles that were brought into this country helped lift them up; they had to do that, otherwise they would not have survived. We were using equipment here that was pre the Second World War, as you, Sir, quite probably would acknowledge. There is no doubt that the motion that has been moved by my colleague the member for Henley Beach is quite correct given the outdated equipment that workers had to work with at that time.

The Coalition cries crocodile tears in relation to this issue. We know what its intentions are in terms of zero tariffs. Members opposite can bleat all they like, but we know what their intentions are. Indeed, the motor car industry and the representatives of those workers in the trade union movement and the ACTU are well aware of the intentions of the conservative Governments in this country. I support the motion.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Obviously, I oppose the motion. Having listened to the member for Albert Park over the past 10 years, I must say that during my earlier time in this Parliament I conjectured on the fire with which he delivered his speeches. He has lost that fire, and I believe it is the subject matter, which he has handled very ineptly, that has been responsible for making him more than reflective in the statements he has made tonight. He does not have that old fire and brimstone that he used to have, and obviously he knows that he is on very shaky ground when supporting this motion moved by his colleague the member for Henley Beach.

Let us be quite sure about what will actually happen. First, it is my belief that the Australian electorate will endorse the Hewson Liberal Government at the election on 13 March. There will be changes and they will be the changes that this country needs. This motion is incorrect in almost all details. It does say, and I support paragraph (a), that this House supports the motor car industry in Australia. That is where the motion is all right, but after that it goes sadly astray.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Mitcham has already spoken in this debate. I refer you to *Hansard* of 28 October 1992, page 1138. On another point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier has taken a point of order and until we have cleared up that point the Chair will accept no other point of order. I have checked the record. The honourable member is correct: the member for Mitcham may not speak again. The member for Bragg will resume his seat. The member for Napier has a further point of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: How does *Hansard* record this transgression by the member for Mitcham when he has already spoken?

The SPEAKER: I would think that it would probably treat it as does the Chair—as a trivial offence. I assume the contribution was made in error; I certainly do not believe the Deputy Leader would have consciously participated in the debate twice. The record will show that he has contributed twice and it would not surprise me if the contribution were only a repetition. The honourable member for Bragg.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will cease disrupting the proceedings of the House.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to make some comments on this motion and, whilst I myself have not spent any direct time in the industry, having had a father who was works engineer at General Motors-Holden's and having spent a lot of my childhood at both the Woodville factory and in the development of the Elizabeth factory when he was works engineer, I do know a little about the motor car industry. There is no doubt that it is one of the most fundamental industries for us in South Australia. It is absolutely critical that the motor car industry continue to be viable in this State, because not only is it the foundation of the manufacturing industry but it is also fundamental to the very important components industry which employs many people in our State.

I find this motion quite interesting because, as the member for Mitcham pointed out, it contains several fundamental errors, the first being that the Opposition should have a zero tariff policy. That is not correct. As part of the Fightback package, our Federal colleagues have continuously said that we would have a minimum level of tariff protection, and that has been set at 5 per cent, but the nonsense of this whole argument about low tariffs is easily offset by the advantages to the community and the motor car industry in particular by the best of the Fightback package. I understand that General Motors-Holden's pays about $9 million a year in payroll tax. That amount will be removed automatically as part of the Fightback package.

General Motors makes a very significant contribution in the form of payroll tax. I am not aware of the payroll tax paid by Mitsubishi, but I suspect that it would be similar to that paid by GMH, because it employs about the same number of people. So, we are talking about a contribution through the Fightback package back to the industry in terms of reduced costs of about $18 million to $20 million a year. The amount of petroleum used by that industry, not only in the factory but also in the movement of vehicles around this country, will also create a very significant reduction in costs through the Fightback package.

There are other areas of cost reduction in this Fightback package which will be very important to the motor car industry. In the past six months I have spent a considerable amount of time talking to Mitsubishi and also to General Motors, and one of the issues which is not mentioned in this motion but which is a very

important part of the Fightback package is the changes and reforms in the industrial relations system. There is no doubt that we have an opportunity for the motor industry to look again at its existing award conditions; entering into more flexible enterprise bargaining positions will enable it to change the work practices and become a far more productive and more interesting place for individuals to work in.

It is interesting that the member for Albert Park brought up occupational health and safety, and I would agree with him that there has been a very significant improvement in the machinery used and in working conditions for employees in both the Mitsubishi and the General-Motors factories. It is my understanding from talking to both managers that both those plants would now be considered to be at about 90 per cent of world standards. It is also interesting to note, and the member for Albert Park did not pick this up, that the personnel productivity within both those factories has improved dramatically as the relationships between employer and employee have improved and as industrial relations issues have changed. So, as we enter into a new era in which there will be more flexibility and more opportunity for industrial reforms to take place, we will see some very important changes in this industry.

The concerns of the Managing Director of Mitsubishi, concerning which it is suggested that he would walk away, are just not true. What the Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors has said is that, if there is not a clear position for his company by early 1995, Mitsubishi Motors is not likely to expand here in South Australia.

What he wants, and what has changed in the Fightback package which has given him more certainty, is that in the year 1996 there will be a total review of the development of industrial relations and the whole economy as it relates to the motor car industry, and a special research project will be undertaken to make sure that the position of the motor car industry in 1996 is evaluated. That is a condition of the new Fightback package. There will be an evaluation process of where the economy stands, halfway through this reduction of tariff levels, as we move towards the year 2000.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on Government business.

BARLEY MARKETING BILL

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the marketing of barley and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: 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.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill, together with complementary legislation in Victoria, will continue the joint scheme for the marketing of barley produced here and in that State.

However, the measure represents more than an automatic renewal of the legislation and in fact, is a result of the first comprehensive review of the barley marketing scheme since its enactment in 1947. This review was undertaken in 1988/89 by a group drawn from both Governments, the Australian Barley Board and grower organisations in the two States.

The working group subsequently reported to the South Australian and Victorian Ministers and its recommendations form the basis of this Bill. There was, of course, later and lengthy consultation with grower organisations and the users of barley in order to refine the recommendations.

While many of the provisions contained in the Bill have been carried over from the current Act, the proposed measure adds refinements that will place the Australian Barley Board in a better position to respond to a grain marketing environment facing a period of change.

In that vein, the financial position within the grain industries, deregulation of the domestic wheat market and the expanded powers of the Australian Wheat Board have focussed attention on State authorities marketing their geographical portions of a grain crop or crops.

Although there is evidence of industry support for national co-ordination of the marketing function for most grains, consensus as to a desirable structure is yet to emerge. Since South Australia and Victoria believe that such consensus may take some years to evolve, they have agreed to maintain an improved form of the joint barley marketing arrangements for a further five years.

The Bill requires the two States to formally consult before continuing these arrangements beyond that term. The role of the Australian Barley Board in future, Australia-wide marketing will be a significant issue at these consultations.

In turning to particular features of the Bill, it is appropriate to reiterate that the measure is based on the recommendations of the working group previously described. However, in establishing the Australian Barley Board, the Bill strikes a compromise between the views of that group and those of certain sectors of industry.

Accordingly, the Australian Barley Board will consist of two Ministerial nominees, two elected grower members from South Australia and four members nominated on merit, by a Selection Committee. At least one of the selected members must be a Victorian barley grower. Similarly, one of the two members with a knowledge of the barley industry must be a Victorian resident. The selection process already used by the Commonwealth and others in appointments to statutory marketing authorities encourages high quality candidates to offer themselves for appointment. This is not to suggest that elected members have proved or will prove unsatisfactory, but the positive aspects of selection should be appreciated.

The Selection Committee itself will comprise five members, four of whom will be nominated equally by the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated and its Victorian counterpart. Honourable Members will know that election versus selection of grower members has been debated actively in South Australia. While the Bill provides for the election of officials, certain factions maintain that the issue must ultimately be resolved by taking a poll of growers. The Bill provides for the conduct of such a poll if barley producers indicate that is their collective desire.

The Bill provides for the Australian Barley Board, through a compulsory delivery requirement, to retain its control over the export of barley and oats from South Australia and barley from Victoria. For the domestic market, the Bill establishes a framework whereby barley processors will be able to more readily source grain direct from producers.

Besides providing an element of domestic competition to the Board, this feature will allow growers and processors to enter into mutually advantageous arrangements for the production and sale of special purpose barley. The intent of the Bill is that while the Board may not actively discourage such direct sales, it will retain an element of control over them.

In this regard, deeds of agreement setting commercial and other conditions for the licensing of such sales had already been developed by the Australian Barley Board and major malting companies. However, difficulties later arose in Victoria where two influential maltsters wanted the Bill to provide for automatic licensing before signing the agreements. The Board and grower organisations resisted this demand and stalemate followed. The revised maltster licensing provisions of Part 5 of the Bill simply and directly resolve the impasse.

The Bill also allows the Board to market, at its commercial discretion, a wide range of grain crops grown in South Australia and Victoria. Marketing of those crops (other than barley and oats) will be on a voluntary basis on the part of both the Board and the grower. Cash trading will be a further option available to the Board.

In a wider monetary context, the Barley Board is entirely self-funding and no Government funds have been, or will be, required for its operations. The Bill provides that the Board's borrowing activities will be governed by South Australian financial legislation under which the Board has operated for some years.

The Bill will also enable the Board to establish grain pools on a range of criteria and to set up financial reserves to facilitate the pooling and marketing operations of the Board. Honourable Members will note that under its proposed powers, the Board may carry out or fund research and development that assists in the production or marketing of grain . The reserves could also be put to that use.

On that note, a further initiative in the Bill is the establishment of a Consultative Committee. The major function of this committee is to provide grassroots advice to the Board concerning its general policies but particularly in regard to the Board's use of financial reserves and possible joint venture arrangements with a commercial partner or partners. The joint fixing by the Ministers of a maximum reserve fund would be based on recommendations by the Consultative Committee.

Having alluded to research, the South Australian Bill transfers from the current Act provision for the deduction of 'voluntary' research levies as they are commonly termed. It will be recalled that the *Wheat Marketing Act 1989,* has already been amended to accommodate changes in the Commonwealth arena and to deposit wheat levies in the *South Australian Grain Industry Trust Fund.* This Bill also provides for such procedures with barley levies.

The accountability of the Australian Barley Board to government and the barley growing community will be strengthened. In addition to providing both Parliaments and each grower organisation with an annual report detailing its operations and financial position, the Board will also be required to provide both Ministers with a rolling operational plan based on a five year time horizon.

The Government believes this legislation will put into place, for the next five years, marketing arrangements that will make a significant contribution to the efficiency of the South Australian and Victorian barley industry.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Part 1 of the Bill (comprising clauses 1 to 7) contains the preliminary provisions.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 defines words and expressions used in the Bill.

Clause 4 provides that for the purposes of this Act, the Minister and the Victorian Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette,* declare the grain to which this Act applies.

Clause 5 provides that Parts 4 and 5 apply to barley and oats harvested in the season commencing on 1 July 1993 and each of the next four seasons but do not apply to barley grown in a later season. Proposed subclause (2) provides that the Minister must consult with the Victorian Minister before the end of the season commencing on 1 July 1996 about the arrangements for the marketing of barley grown in South Australia or Victoria.

Clause 6 provides that it is declared that it is the intention of the Parliament that this Act and the Victorian Act implement a joint South Australian and Victorian Scheme for marketing barley grown in South Australia and Victoria. Proposed subclause (2) provides that it is also declared that it is the intention of the Parliament that this Act not be amended in any manner that may affect the operation of the joint Scheme except on the joint recommendation of the Minister and the Victorian Minister.

Clause 7 provides that the Minister may, in writing, delegate to any person any of the Minister's powers under this Act, other than any power which is to be exercised jointly with the Victorian Minister or this power of delegation.

Part 2 of the Bill (comprising clauses 8 to 26) provides for the establishment of the Australian Barley Board and its powers and functions.

Clause 8 provides that the Australian Barley Board is established as a body corporate with perpetual succession with all of the consequences at law that go with being a body corporate.

Clause 9 provides that the Board does not represent, and is not part of, the Crown.

Clause 10 provides that the common seal of the Board must be kept in such custody as the Board directs and may be used only as authorised by resolution of the Board.

Clause 11 provides that the Board consists of eight members appointed jointly by the Minister and the Victorian Minister, of whom one will be a person nominated by the South Australian Minister, one will be a person nominated by the Victorian Minister, two will be growers in South Australia (who will be elected), one will be a barley grower in Victoria nominated by the Selection Committee, two will be persons with knowledge of the barley industry (one of whom is resident in Victoria) nominated by the Selection Committee and one will be a person nominated by the Selection Committee with particular expertise. A person who is a member of the Selection Committee is not eligible for appointment as a member of the Board.

Clause 12 provides that the Selection Committee is to consist of five persons appointed jointly by the Minister and the Victorian Minister of whom two will be persons appointed from a panel nominated by the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporation, two will be persons appointed from a panel nominated by the Victorian Farmers Federation and one (the Chairperson) will be jointly nominated by the chief executive officer of the South Australian Department of Agriculture and the chief executive officer of the Victorian Department of Food and Agriculture. The members of the Selection Committee are appointed for such period and on such terms and conditions, including payment of allowances, as the Minister and Victorian Minister determine. The clause further provides that a decision

may not be made at a meeting of the Committee unless all members are present or, in the case of a meeting conducted by telephone, unless all members participate by telephone.

Clause 13 provides that the Minister and the Victorian Minister may determine selection criteria to be applied by the Selection Committee in selecting persons for nomination.

Clause 14 provides that the Minister and the Victorian Minister will appoint one of the members appointed by either of the Ministers to be the Chairperson of the Board for such period as the Ministers determine.

Clause 15 provides that the members of the Board may elect another member to be the Deputy Chairperson of the Board.

Clause 16 provides that a member of the Board, unless an officer or employee of the public service, is entitled to be paid by the Board the remuneration and allowances (if any) fixed by the Minister and the Victorian Minister.

Clause 17 provides that a member's term of office must not exceed three years and a member is eligible for re-appointment.

Clause 18 provides the terms by which the office of a member of the Board becomes vacant including the removal from office by the Minister and the Victorian Minister under proposed subsection (3).

Clause 19 provides that if the office of a member of the Board becomes vacant for some reason other than the expiry of the term of office of the member, a person nominated for appointment to the office in accordance with clause 11 will be appointed to fill the vacancy and to hold office, subject to this Act, for the remainder of the term. However, if the vacancy occurs within six months of the expiry of the term of office of the member, the office may be left vacant for the remainder of the term.

Clause 20 provides that a member who has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in a matter being considered or about to be considered by the Board must, as soon as possible after the relevant facts have come to the member's knowledge, disclose the nature of the interest at a meeting of the Board. Such a disclosure must be recorded in the minutes of the meeting and, unless the Board decides otherwise, the member must not be present during any consideration of the matter by the Board, or take part in any decision of the Board with respect to the matter. It further provides that this clause does not apply to a pecuniary interest that a member has because of his or her qualification to be a member if that is an interest in common with other persons holding a corresponding qualification.

Clause 21 provides that the Board is subject to the general direction and control of the Minister and the Victorian Minister and any specific written directions given by the Minister and the Victorian Minister or by either Minister (with the written consent of the other Minister). A Minister must not give a written direction unless satisfied that, because of exceptional circumstances, the direction is necessary to ensure that the performance of the functions, or the exercise of the powers, of the Board, does not conflict with major government policies and the Board must include in each annual report directions given under this clause during the year to which the report relates.

Clause 22 provides for the manner in which the proceedings of the Board will be carried out.

Clause 23 provides that an act or decision of the Board is not invalid by reason only of a defect or irregularity in, or in connection with, the appointment of a member or of a vacancy in membership, including a vacancy arising out of the failure to appoint an original member.

Clause 24 provides that the Board may employ staff (including a chief executive) on such terms and conditions as it thinks fit and may make arrangements for using the services of any officers and employees of the public service or any public authority.

Clause 25 provides that a member of the Board is not personally liable for anything done or omitted to be done in good faith in the exercise of a power or discharge of a duty under this Act or in the reasonable belief that the act or omission was in the exercise of a power or the discharge of a duty under this Act and that any liability resulting from an act or omission that, but for proposed subsection (1), would attach to a member of the Board attaches instead to the Board.

Clause 26 provides that the Governor may, if of the opinion that circumstances have arisen rendering it advisable to do so, by notice in the *Gazette,* remove all the members of the Board from office, but they or any of them are eligible (if otherwise qualified) for re-appointment.

Part 3 of the Bill (comprising clauses 27 to 32) deals with the objectives, functions and powers of the Board.

Clause 27 provides that the objectives of the Board are to supply marketing services to South Australian and Victorian barley growers and producers of other grains and to maximise the net returns to South Australian and Victorian barley growers who deliver to a pool of the Board by securing, developing and maintaining markets for grain and by minimising costs as far as practicable.

Clause 28 provides that the functions of the Board are—

- to control the marketing of barley and oats grown in this State and of barley grown in Victoria
- to market and promote grain in domestic and overseas markets
- to co-operate, consult and enter into agreements with authorised receivers relating to the handling and storage of grain and carriers relating to the transport of grain
- to determine standards for the classes and categories of grain delivered to the Board
- to determine standards for the condition and quality of grain delivered by authorised receivers to purchasers
- to import barley and grain; and
- to provide advice, as requested, to the Minister and the Victorian Minister about the marketing of grain.

Clause 29 provides that the Board may do all things necessary for the performance of its functions and, in particular, has the following powers—

- to acquire barley, oats and other grain
- to dispose of barley, oats and other grain
- to appoint agents, or to act as an agent, whether in or outside Australia
- to give guarantees or indemnities
- to arrange the marketing of barley, oats and other grain
- to promote, carry out or fund research and development that will assist in the production or marketing of barley, oats and other grain; and
- all other powers conferred on it by or under this Act or the Victorian Act.

Clause 30 provides that the Board may, in writing, delegate to any member of the Board, or to any employee, any of its powers under this Act, other than this power of delegation.

Clause 31 provides that for the purposes of this Act, the Board may, by notice in writing, served on the person to whom it is addressed, require the person to give to the Board, in writing, within the time specified in the notice, such information relating to barley and oats, barley and oat products or substances containing barley or oats as is specified in the notice. A person must not, without reasonable excuse refuse or fail to comply

with a requirement under this section or give to the Board any information that is false or misleading in any particular. The penalty for contravention of this clause is a division 7 fine ($2 000).

Clause 32 provides that before the first anniversary of the commencement of this proposed section, the Board must submit to the Minister and the Victorian Minister a plan of its intended operations during the remaining seasons to which this Act applies and thereafter, with each annual report it submits to the Minister and the Victorian Minister, the Board must also submit a plan of operations for the remaining seasons to which this Act applies.

Part 4 of the Bill (comprising clauses 33 to 41) deal with marketing.

Clause 33 provides that subject to this Act, a person must not sell or deliver barley or oats to a person other than the Board. Subclause (2) provides that it is an offence if a person transports barley or oats which have been sold or delivered in contravention of proposed subsection (1) or bought in contravention of proposed subsection (4). Proposed subsections (1) and (2) do not apply to—

- barley or oats retained by the grower for use on the farm where it is grown
- barley or oats purchased from the Board
- barley of a season sold or delivered to the holder of a licence or a permit for that season issued under proposed section 42 or 43
- barley or oats which do not meet the standards determined by the Board
- oats sold to a person who purchases the oats for the purpose of converting the oats into chopped, crushed, or milled oats or any other manufactured product and reselling the oats in that form; or
- oats sold to a person who purchases the oats for use and not for resale.

Proposed subsection (4) provides that a person must not buy barley from the grower other than under a licence or permit issued by the Board under Part 5 or oats from the grower except with the written approval of the Board. The penalties for an offence against this section are different where the offender is a natural person or a body corporate and if it is a first or subsequent offence.

Clause 34 provides that, unless it is otherwise agreed, on delivery of barley and oats to the Board, the property in the barley and oats immediately passes to the Board and the owner of the barley and oats is to be taken to have sold it to the Board at the price to be paid under this Act.

Clause 35 provides that the Board may by instrument appoint a person to be an authorised receiver for the purposes of this Act. Where a grower intends to deliver barley, oats or other grain to the Board, a delivery of the barley, oats or other grain (as the case may be) to an authorised receiver is, for the purposes of this Act, to be taken to be a delivery to the Board and an authorised receiver holds, on behalf of the Board, all barley, oats and other grain the property of the Board which is at any time in the receiver's possession. This clause further provides that an authorised receiver must not part with the possession of any barley, oats or other grain the property of the Board except in accordance with instructions from the Board or from a person authorised by the Board to give such instructions.

Clause 36 provides that any person who, after the 'declared day' in relation to a season, consigns or delivers to an authorised receiver any barley or oats harvested before that day, must make and forward to the authorised receiver a declaration stating the season during which that barley or oats were harvested. The penalty for contravening this provision is a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 37 provides that the Board must market or otherwise dispose of, to the best advantage, all barley and oats delivered to it under this Act, having regard to the reasonable requirements of maltsters in this State.

Clause 38 provides that for the purpose of marketing the barley and oats of which the Board has taken delivery, the Board may establish pools in relation to barley and oats of a season. The Board may at any time transfer any barley or oats remaining in a particular pool to another pool, and/or declare a pool closed.

Clause 39 provides that if the Board sells barley or oats from a pool, the net proceeds of sale must be distributed among the growers who contributed barley or oats to the relevant pool in proportion to the quantity contributed by each grower.

Clause 40 provides that notwithstanding the other provisions of this Act, where barley of a season is sold to the Board by any person under this Act, a payment of the prescribed amount will, with the consent of the person, be made for barley research purposes out of the money payable to the person by the Board in respect of the barley.

Clause 41 provides that a person does not have a claim against the Board in respect of any right, title or interest in barley or oats delivered to the Board.

Part 5 of the Bill (comprising clauses 42 and 43) deals with stockfeed permits and maltsters licences.

Clause 42 provides that a person who applies to the Board for a permit for a specified season authorising that person to purchase barley harvested in that season from growers for stockfeed purposes in Australia must be issued with the permit within 21 days of the Board receiving the application and the fee set by the Board.

Clause 43 provides that a person who is engaged in or who proposes to engage in the business of malting or other processing of barley for human consumption who is also a party to a deed of arrangement entered into with the Board may apply to the Board for a licence for a specified season to purchase barley harvested in that season from a grower for malting or other processing in Australia for human consumption purposes. Such a licence must be issued within 21 days of the Board receiving the application and the fee set by the Board.

Part 6 of the Bill (comprising clauses 44 to 47) is entitled 'Financial'.

Clause 44 provides that the Board is a semi-government authority within the meaning of the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987* that must before 31 December of each year, apply to the Treasurer for consent to its proposed financial program for the following financial year and forward a copy of the consent and any conditions attached to it, to the Minister and the Victorian Minister.

Clause 45 provides that the Board may establish a reserve fund to provide for the costs of administering the marketing scheme and defraying any other costs of the Board. This clause further provides that the Board may pay into the reserve fund an amount not exceeding five per cent of the net proceeds derived from the sale of barley, oats or other grain and that the balance of the reserve fund must not exceed the amount set by the Minister and the Victorian Minister.

Clause 46 provides that any of the functions of the Board may be exercised by the Board, by an affiliate of the Board or by the Board or an affiliate (or both) in a partnership, joint venture or other association with other persons or bodies. This clause

further provides that for the purpose of exercising its functions, the Board may join in the formation of a corporation to be incorporated and may purchase, hold, dispose of or deal with shares in, or subscribe to the issue of shares by, a corporation, provided the Board acts in accordance with such guidelines (if any) as are determined by the Minister and the Victorian Minister.

Proposed subsection (4) provides that an affiliate of the Board must not, except with the approval of the Minister and the Victorian Minister, engage in any activities which the Board may not engage in.

Clause 47 provides that if the Board is a member of, or forms or participates in the formation of, a limited company within the meaning of the *Corporations Law* and the Board has a controlling interest in the company, the Board must include in its annual report a copy of the accounts of the company in respect of the financial year ended during the period to which the Board's annual report relates and within 14 days after lodging any report, statement or return in respect of the company with the Australian Securities Commission under the *Corporations Law,* submit a copy of the report, statement or return with the Treasurer.

Proposed subsection (4) provides that if the Board is a member of, or forms or participates in the formation of, a limited company to which proposed subsection (1) applies, the accounts of the limited company must be audited annually by the Auditor-General or, with the agreement of the Auditor-General, by the Victorian Auditor-General.

Part 7 of the Bill (comprising clauses 48 to 52) deals with accounts and reports.

Clause 48 provides that the Board must keep proper accounts and records of all money received and paid by or on account of the Board.

Clause 49 provides that the Board must, in respect of each financial year, prepare an annual report to be laid before each House of the Parliament before the expiration of the seventh sitting day of that House after the report is received by the Minister.

Clause 50 provides that the Board must cause its accounts to be audited at least once each year by a registered company auditor appointed by the Minister and the Victorian Minister on the recommendation of the Board.

Clause 51 provides that, subject to section 38(4), the accounts of the Board relating to different pools of the Board must be kept separately.

Clause 52 provides that the Board must give a copy of each annual report to the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated and to the Victorian Farmers Federation when the report is submitted to the Minister and the Victorian Minister.

Part 8 of the Bill (comprising clauses 53 to 59) deals with the dissolution of the Board.

Clause 53 provides that the Board may be dissolved in accordance with this Part on a poll taken under proposed section 54, at the request of the Board under proposed section 55 or on the recommendation of the Minister under proposed section 56(1) and of the Victorian Minister under the corresponding provision of the Victorian Act.

Clause 54 provides that the Minister must direct that a poll be taken of growers on the question that the Board be dissolved if the Minister is satisfied, on representations made during a permitted period by growers by petition to the Minister, that at least half those growers desire that the Board be dissolved or if the Minister has received notice that representations have been made to the Victorian Minister under a provision of the Victorian Act corresponding to this section. If a poll is to be held in both states, then it must be held on the same day.

Clause 55 provides that the Board may, by instrument under its seal, request the Minister to take action to dissolve the Board. The Minister may refuse to consider such a request unless the request is confirmed by the Board, by a similar instrument, within such period as the Minister determines.

Clause 56 provides that if the Minister is satisfied of certain matters and he or she recommends this action to the Governor, the Governor may, by notice in the *Gazette,* direct the Board to wind-up its affairs, after which the Board must proceed to wind-up its affairs and a liquidator may be appointed.

Clause 57 provides that as soon as practicable after a notice under this Act is published in the *Gazette* directing that a poll be taken, and before the day fixed for the taking of the poll, the Minister must cause a report relating to the proposal to which the poll relates to be published in such manner as the Minister considers appropriate.

Clause 58 provides that the regulations may, subject to this Act, make provision for or with respect to the conduct of polls.

Clause 59 provides that the Board must pay the costs and expenses of a poll under this Act.

Part 9 of the Bill (comprising clauses 60 to 68) provides for the Barley Marketing Consultative Committee.

Clause 60 establishes the Barley Marketing Consultative Committee.

Clause 61 provides that the function of the Committee is to provide advice to the Board about its general policies, particularly with respect to the use of financial reserves and the establishment of joint venture companies.

Clause 62 provides that the Committee consists of a Chairperson (who must not be a grower) appointed by the Minister and the Victorian Minister jointly and four other members so appointed.

Clause 63 provides that the Chairperson of the Committee must preside at a meeting of the Committee.

Clause 64 provides that three members of the Committee one of whom must be the Chairperson constitute a quorum of the Committee and that the Committee must meet at least once every six months. Subject to this Act, the Committee may regulate its own proceedings.

Clause 65 provides that a member of the Committee, unless an officer or employee of the public service, is entitled to be paid from the funds of the Board the remuneration and allowances (if any) fixed by the Minister and the Victorian Minister.

Clause 66 provides that a member's term of office must not exceed three years and a member is eligible for re-appointment.

Clause 67 provides for the circumstances in which the office of a member of the Committee becomes vacant.

Clause 68 provides that if the office of a member becomes vacant otherwise than by reason of the expiry of the term of office of the member, a person nominated for appointment to the office in accordance with proposed section 62 must be appointed to fill the vacancy and to hold office, subject to this Act, for the remainder of the term. However, if the vacancy occurs within six months of the expiry of the term of office of the member, the office may be left vacant for the remainder of the term.

Part 10 of the Bill (comprising clauses 69 to 74) of the Bill deals with general provisions.

Clause 69 provides that the Board may appoint persons as authorised officers for the purposes of this Act.

Clause 70 provides that an authorised officer or any member of the police force may, for the purposes of exercising any

power conferred on the officer by this Act or determining whether this Act is being or has been complied with, at any reasonable time and with any necessary assistants—

- enter and search any land, premises, vehicle or place
- where reasonably necessary, break into or open any part of, or anything in or on, the land, premises, vehicle or place or, in the case of a vehicle, give directions with respect to the stopping or moving of the vehicle (on the consent of the occupier or on the authority of a warrant issued by a justice)
- search for, inspect and make copies of any documents
- require the occupier of premises entered and searched to produce any documents and to answer questions.

Clause 71 provides that it is an offence for a person to—

- delay or obstruct an authorised officer or member of the police force in the exercise of powers under this Act
- without reasonable excuse, refuse or fail to comply with any requirement made under proposed section 70; or
- give false or misleading information in response to a requirement made under proposed section 70, the penalty for which is a division 7 fine ($2 000).

Clause 72 contains the evidentiary procedures for proceedings for an offence against this Act.

Clause 73 provides for service of notices or other documents required or authorised by this Act.

Clause 74 provides for the making of regulations under this Act.

Part 11 of the Bill (comprising clauses 75 and 76) contains the transitional and repeal provisions.

Clause 75 repeals the *Barley Marketing Act 1947*.

Clause 76 contains the transitional provisions.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FISHERIES) BILL

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fisheries Act 1982, the Fisheries (Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Rationalisation) Act 1987 and the Fisheries (Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery Rationalisation) Act 1987. Read a first time.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: 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.

Explanation of Bill

1. Marine mammals

Following an incident in which four dolphins were killed for rock lobster bait on Kangaroo Island in April 1990, and numerous representations for stronger penalties, the government sought to reconsider the levels of penalties that could apply to such offences under the *Fisheries Act 1982*. The two persons directly involved in the offence were convicted and each received a penalty of $1000, which in turn initiated considerable public concern at the killing of dolphins and attracted more public comments at the perceived inadequacy of the fines imposed.

The dissemination of that concern through the print and electronic media has in itself sent a clear message to the fishing industry that the killing of dolphins is not acceptable to the people of South Australia. That level of public concern would, to a degree, have a deterrent value in its own right.

However, it is believed that the public concern that has been expressed (including international) in response to the incident indicates a desire for increased penalties for the offences against protected fish, especially marine mammals.

Therefore, it is proposed that the Fisheries Act be amended to prescribe a division 3 fine (a fine not exceeding $30 000), or a division 5 term of imprisonment (a term not exceeding two years) as a penalty for the harming or killing of a marine mammal. It should be noted that a Bill to amend the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972* to amongst, other things, prescribe such penalties for the harming or killing of a marine mammal has been introduced into Parliament.

2. Rock lobster offences

Penalties that can be applied to a licence holder following a conviction for a breach of the Fisheries Act include a fine not exceeding $2 000 for a first offence, seizure and forfeiture of equipment used in the offence, demerits on a licence which could result in suspension or cancellation of the licence, and a mandatory penalty of five times the wholesale value of the fish or $30 000, whichever is the lesser. Collectively, the penalties are substantial, but some rock lobster licence holders are continuing to operate unlawfully, particularly by using more pots than are endorsed on their licences.

During discussions with representatives of the rock lobster industry, concern was expressed by industry that some licence holders continued to use more rock lobster pots than they were entitled to. Not only is such action contrary to the regulations, it is also contrary to the agreed management arrangements which have been put in place to provide for a sustainable commercial fishery. Introducing excess effort into the fishery can lead to over-exploitation of the rock lobster resource and ultimate collapse of the fishery.

It is clear that the existing penalties are not sufficiently high to act as a deterrent to those contemplating breaches of the Act. Persons engaging in over-potting often do so over an extensive period and earn more than the penalty expected under current legislation. This has prompted industry to recommend an additional mandatory penalty for an offence involving the use of more pots than a licence holder's entitlement. Specifically, the court would be required to permanently revoke the number of rock lobster pots used in the offence from the licence holder's allocation.

The government supports the proposal, given the seriousness of illegal fishing and the impact it has on the rock lobster resource. It is considered that such a mandatory penalty would act as a deterrent and help reduce the incidence of licence holders using excess pots.

3. Marine scalefish fishery review

The marine scalefish fishery has been under review for over two years during which two green (discussion) papers have been released (January 1990 and July 1991) and in which substantial consultation has taken place.

On 10 August 1992, the government endorsed a wide ranging package of long term management measures for the fishery. This will entail changes to the *Fisheries Act 1982* to—

- increase penalties under the Act to make it a separate offence for licence holders and fish processors to fail to comply with catch and disposal record documentation;

- make it an offence for fish processors to be in possession of blue groper for sale.

4. Previous convictions

Section 56(3) of the *Fisheries Act 1982* provides that where a court convicts the holder of a fishery licence for a prescribed offence, the court must—

- suspend the licence for not less than three months if the licence holder has one previous conviction; or
- cancel the licence if the licence holder has two previous convictions.

On 24 July 1992, the Supreme Court of South Australia delivered a judgment in relation to an appeal by the (former) Department of Fisheries against the result of a prosecution against a commercial abalone fisher. The appeal was based on the fact that the presiding magistrate failed to suspend the licence in accordance with section 56(3) of the Fisheries Act.

In the judgment, reference was made to the application of section 56(3):

> " ... the wording in the subsection 'previous conviction' and 'previous convictions' must be construed as referring to a conviction or convictions recorded before the commission of the offence resulting in the conviction first referred to in the subsection. As that was not the case here, the complainant's appeal must be dismissed."

As a result of the judgment, it is proposed that the Fisheries Act be amended to make it quite clear that a suspension or a cancellation of a licence would result from a second or third conviction for a prescribed offence within a three year period, irrespective of when the offences were actually committed or when the convictions were recorded.

Such an amendment would restore the intent of the provision, it would reflect the seriousness of fisheries offences, and it would also serve as a deterrent to those contemplating breaches of the Act.

5. Abalone fishery

In October 1991, the House of Assembly Select Committee enquiry into the abalone industry recommended that a number of changes be made to management arrangements relating to the fishery in South Australia. These recommendations were endorsed by the government in June 1992.

The Select Committee recommended, amongst other things, that the issue of abalone licences not be restricted to natural persons as is the present situation and that provision be made for abalone licences to be issued to partnerships and companies. However, the Committee had concerns that corporate licences without owner operator provisions may make it easier for foreign interests to obtain licences and to gain control of processing and pricing arrangements. In this regard, the Committee recommended that foreign ownership of any one abalone licence be limited to a maximum of 15%.

It is recognised that the structure and ownership of companies can be complex matters and the Department of Primary Industries (Fisheries) has no expertise in this field. Without additional resources to monitor ownership on a routine basis, the system would rely on the Act amendment acting as a deterrent to people exceeding 15% foreign ownership and the Department would follow up only specific cases brought to its attention.

To be an effective deterrent, the legislation would need to confer on Director of Fisheries the power to not renew a licence where foreign ownership was found to exceed 15%. This is supported by advice from the Crown Solicitor, who noted that there would be some difficulty in determining any arrangements behind the company which holds the licence. The Crown Solicitor also suggested that Commonwealth controls on foreign investment could be sufficient to protect Australia's interest.

The Committee also recommended that there be an increase in fines and the introduction of jail terms for taking, dealing in, and/or processing illegally taken abalone.

It is proposed that specific penalties for taking abalone without a licence (poaching) be as follows:

- division 1 fine (a fine not exceeding $60 000); and/or
- division 5 imprisonment (a term of imprisonment not exceeding two years).

An issue not addressed by the Select Committee is the matter of licence suspension following a prosecution. The Fisheries Act provides for a licence to be suspended or cancelled for various offences. However, suspending a licence for three months (as provided for after two offences) would not necessarily act as a penalty because of the quota arrangements which apply in the fishery — *i.e.* a licence holder could still take the annual abalone quota (within a licence year) after serving a term of licence suspension. It is proposed that this anomaly be rectified by amending the fisheries legislation to provide for a licence holder's quota allocation for that year or subsequent year to be reduced following a conviction for a fisheries offence.

The Abalone Industry Association has indicated that it supports the cancellation of quota in lieu of licence suspension in such instances.

6. Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery

In October 1991, the House of Assembly Select Committee enquiry into the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery recommended that a number of changes be made to management arrangements relating to the fishery in South Australia. These recommendations were endorsed by the government in November 1991.

The Select Committee recommended that a Management Committee be established to determine policy and its execution in the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery. This committee is to consist of—

- a representative of the licence holders. The representative to be determined by a compulsory ballot where more than one nominee is proposed conducted under the auspices of the State Electoral Office annually; and
- a public officer nominated annually by the Minister of Fisheries (now Minister of Primary Industries); and
- an independent chair selected by the Minister and appointed for two years.

The Crown Solicitor has advised that for a Management Committee to be anything more than an advisory committee, it must be given statutory recognition.

Amongst other things, the Select Committee recommended that the Management Committee be empowered to suspend fishing licences for up to 28 days following breaches of fishing strategy. For a fishing strategy to be enforceable, a breach of the strategy would have to constitute an offence against the Act. To give the Management Committee the power to suspend a licence would involve it in making a finding of guilt which would pre-empt the judgment of a court. In this regard the Parliamentary Counsel has expressed concern at allowing a non-judicial body to suspend a licence.

The government has given careful consideration to this matter and decided that giving such powers to the Management Committee would be contrary to the existing provisions of the Fisheries Act which already has scope for licences to be suspended or cancelled. Accordingly, the government has decided not to implement this element of the Select Committee recommendations.

The Select Committee also recommended a number of options relating to payment of licence fees and surcharges. One of the recommendations was that licence holders be encouraged to make larger payments to pay off their individual debt.

If individual licence holders are to be encouraged to make larger payments on their individual debt, the *Fisheries (Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Rationalization) Act 1987* would need to be amended. This matter was clarified in a judicial review (judgment delivered May 1991) which determined that the Rationalization Act provides for surcharges to be levied providing they are levied evenly on all licence holders. Under the current provisions, the Act does not provide for a variety of surcharges to be levied at the same time.

It is proposed that the Rationalization Act be amended to provide, notwithstanding that all licence holders will incur the same base debt when the fishery reopens, for different surcharges to apply to different licences to enable this to occur if required.

This Bill also provides for an amendment to section 4 of the *Fisheries Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Rationalization) Act 1987,* which stipulates preconditions that must be met before a licence in respect of the fishery can be transferred.

Specifically, the existing provisions require the transferor to pay accrued and prospective liabilities imposed by way of surcharge on the licence before the Director of Fisheries can authorise the transfer of the licence. The accrued and prospective liabilities relate to money borrowed from the South Australian Government Financing Authority by the Minister of Primary Industries in order to buy back (remove) six licences and boats from the combined Gulf St. Vincent/Investigator Strait Prawn Fishery. Repayment of borrowed money is to be made via a surcharge on the remaining ten licensees.

It is proposed to remove the surcharge repayment constraint on the transferor and allow the transferee (incoming licence holder) to assume liability for the prospective licence surcharge amounts until the debt is extinguished. The proposed variation provides a means for current licence holders who cannot service their licence surcharge payments to leave the fishery and the government to recoup the debt from future licence holders.

At present, if a licensee were to surrender the licence or the licence was cancelled by the Minister for non-payment of the surcharge liability, there is no provision for recovery of the liability other than for the current licensing year. It is proposed that a provision be included in the Act that in the event of non-payment of any amount of the liability, the outstanding amount be recoverable as a debt to the Crown. This will provide the government with a means of recovering a debt due attributable to a licence holder and help any remaining licence holders by not expecting them to pay for a debt incurred by a defaulter.

7. Integrated management

At the 1991 annual general meeting of SAFIC, the (then) Minister of Fisheries announced the convening of an industry/department working group to discuss self or co-management of the State's fisheries. The term *integrated management* has subsequently been adopted, as it better describes the intent of the proposed arrangements.

The proposal has also been discussed with representatives from the recreational fishing sector, as recreational fishers are major users of fisheries resources, particularly the scalefish resource. In this regard, the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council (SARFAC) would also be involved in the integrated management process.

The working group's discussions have resulted in agreement on the following matters:

- integrated management requires industry accepting genuine responsibility;
- responsibility be exercised by delegating specific fishery management responsibility to streamlined management committees (as opposed to management liaison committees which tended to have large membership);
- responsibility be reflected in the legislation to ensure the management committees operate in accordance with the objectives of the Fisheries Act.

It is proposed that the Fisheries Act be amended so that the role of the fishing industry in managing the State's fisheries resources is recognised in the legislation, and at the same time imposing responsibilities on industry management representatives to operate in a manner consistent with the objectives of the Act.

Furthermore, the opportunity has been taken to amend the *Fisheries (Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery Rationalization) Act 1987.* The amendment reflects the fact that the former Department of Fisheries has been abolished and its functions taken over by the Department of Primary Industries and the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI). Under the Rationalization Act the former Department of Fisheries was the government fisheries representative on the Rationalization Authority, and there is a need for such representation to continue. In this regard, the amendment proposes that the government fisheries representative be a Public Service employee rather than an employee of a particular government department. The amendment has been drafted in this manner so that the Act will not need further amendment in the event of any future changes to government administrative arrangements.

In providing the above explanation of the proposed amendments to the *Fisheries Act 1982* and to the *Fisheries (Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Rationalization) Act 1987,* I would inform the House that the South Australian Fishing Industry Council (SAFIC), representing the interests of commercial fishers, and the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council (SARFAC), representing the interests of amateur fishers, have been consulted and generally support the proposed amendments.

In addition, other interests groups have been consulted and their responses indicate agreement in principle to the proposals.

In preparing the bill, the Parliamentary Counsel has taken the opportunity to substitute the references to the Commonwealth *Fisheries Act 1952,* which has been superseded by the *Fisheries Management Act 1991,* with references to the equivalent provisions of the latter Act. The references in the South Australian Act relate to Commonwealth/State fishing management arrangements.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement of the measure on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation
This clause is the standard interpretation provision included in Statutes Amendment measures.

PART 2
AMENDMENT OF FISHERIES ACT 1982

Clause 4: Amendment of long title
This clause amends the long title to reflect the Act's protection of marine mammals in their own right and not as fish of a class declared to be protected for the purposes of section 42.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 5—Interpretation
This clause introduces into the Act definitions of "abalone", "Australian fishing zone", "fishery management committee" and "marine mammal", substitutes the definition of "Commonwealth Act" and strikes out the definition of "Commonwealth proclaimed waters".

This clause amends the provisions relating to the application of the Act to replace obsolete references to "Commonwealth proclaimed waters" with references to the Australian fishing zone and makes other changes to reflect changes to the application of the Commonwealth fisheries legislation within the Australian fishing zone.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 6—Interpretation
Clause 7: Amendment of s. 7—Powers and functions of Minister
These clauses delete references to provisions of the repealed *Fisheries Act 1952* of the Commonwealth ("the repealed Commonwealth Act") and substitute references to the equivalent provisions of the *Fisheries Management Act 1991* of the Commonwealth ("the new Commonwealth Act").

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 10—Delegation
This clause substitutes subsection (5) to bring it into line with the equivalent provision of the new Commonwealth Act.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 11—Procedure of Joint Authorities
This clause substitutes subsection (1) so that it refers to the provisions of the new Commonwealth Act.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 12—Report of Joint Authority
This clause replaces the reference to a provision of the repealed Commonwealth Act with a reference to the equivalent provision of the new Commonwealth Act.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 13 Arrangement for management of certain fisheries
This clause replaces references to provisions of the repealed Commonwealth Act with references to the equivalent provisions of the new Commonwealth Act.

Clause 12: Substitution of s.14 Application of this Act to fisheries in accordance with arrangements
This clause substitutes a new section so that references to "Commonwealth proclaimed waters" are no longer included.

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 15—Functions of Joint Authority
This clause inserts a new provision to require a Joint Authority, when exercising functions under section 15, to have the objectives stated in section 20.

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 20—Objectives
This clause provides for fishery management committees to have, in the administration of the Act, the same objectives as the Minister and the Director of Fisheries have.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 23—Delegation
This clause empowers the Minister and the Director to delegate their powers under the Act to fishery management committees.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 34—Persons and boats engaged or used in fisheries to be licensed
This clause increases the maximum penalty for taking abalone for the purpose of trade or business, or engaging in a fishing activity for the purpose of taking abalone, without a fishery licence from a division 5 fine ($8,000) to a division 1 fine ($60,000) or division 5 imprisonment (2 years).

Clauses 17: Amendment of s. 37—Conditions of licences
This clause increases the maximum penalty for taking abalone in contravention of a condition of a fishery licence from a division 7 ($2,000), division 6 ($4,000) or division 5 ($8,000) fine, depending on whether the offence is a first, second or subsequent offence, to a division 1 fine ($60,000) or division 5 imprisonment (2 years) whether the offence is a first or subsequent offence.

This clauses also increases the maximum penalty in the case of any other offence of contravening or failing to comply with a condition of a fishery licence from a division 7 fine ($2,000) to a division 6 fine ($4,000) in the case of a first offence, and from a division 6 ($4,000) fine for a second offence and a division 5 ($8,000) fine for a subsequent offence to a division 5 fine ($8,000) whether the offence is a second or subsequent offence.

Clause 18: Insertion of s. 41a
This clause inserts section 41a.

Section 41a: Offence of killing, injuring, etc. a marine mammal

Subsection (1) prohibits a person from—

- killing, injuring or molesting, or causing or permitting the killing, injuring or molestation of, a marine mammal; or
- taking, selling or purchasing or having in his or her possession or control a marine mammal or the body or part of the body of a marine mammal.

The maximum penalty is a division 3 fine ($30,000) or division 5 imprisonment (2 years).

Subsection (2) provides that in proceedings for an offence against subsection (1), it is a defence if the defendant proves—

- that the alleged offence was not committed intentionally and did not result from any failure on the part of the defendant to take reasonable care to avoid the commission of the offence; or
- that the act alleged to constitute the offence was authorised by or under some other Act or law.

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 44—Offences with respect to sale, purchase or possession offish
This clause increases the maximum penalty for selling or purchasing abalone taken in waters to which the Act applies but not pursuant to a fishery licence and for selling or purchasing abalone, or having possession or control of abalone for the

purposes of sale from a division 5 fine ($8,000) to a division 1 fine ($60,000) or division 5 imprisonment (2 years).

Clause 20: Amendment of s. 46—Regulations relating to fisheries and fishing

This clause amends the regulation-making powers relating to fisheries and fishing to authorise the making of regulations—

- that prohibit or limit foreign ownership of fishery licences;
- that establish fishery management committees;
- that empower or require a court convicting the holder of a fishery licence of an offence of contravening or failing to comply with a licence condition to order that the conditions of the licence be varied by the Director in a manner specified in the regulations;
- that authorise the Chief Executive Officer of SARDI, rather than the Director of Fisheries, to determine what information must be included in returns; and
- that require returns to be lodged with the Chief Executive Officer of SARDI rather than with the Director.

Clause 21: Amendment of s. 55—Regulations relating to fish processing

This clause amends the regulation-making powers relating to fish processing to enable the making of regulations—

- that authorise the Chief Executive Officer of SARDI, rather than the Director of Fisheries, to determine what information must be included in returns;
- that require returns to be lodged with the Chief Executive Officer of SARDI rather than to the Director; and
- that prohibit or restrict the sale, purchase, possession or control by fish processors of fish of a prescribed class, including fish taken in waters to which the Act does not apply.

Clause 22: Amendment of s. 56—Suspension or cancellation of authorities by courts

This clause inserts a provision that requires a court convicting the holder of a fishery licence of a prescribed offence to take into account previous convictions for prescribed offences whether the prescribed offences were committed before or after the commission of the offence under consideration for the purpose of determining whether the court is required by section 56 to suspend or cancel the offender's fishery licence.

The clause also amends the definition of "prescribed offence" to include an offence against section 41 a inserted by this measure.

Clause 23: Amendment of s. 58—Review of decisions relating to authorities

This clause provides for there to be a right to a review of a decision by the Minister to order the cancellation of a fishery licence held in breach of a regulation prohibiting or restricting foreign ownership of such a licence.

The clause also removes subsection (4) which is obsolete because of the repeal of the *Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926* and changes all references to "a District Court" to the Administrative Appeals Court which is a Division of the District Court established by the *District Court Act 1991*.

PART 3
AMENDMENT OF FISHERIES (GULF ST. VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY RATIONALIZATION)ACT 1987

Clause 24: Amendment of preamble

This clause amends clause 5 of the preamble to the principal Act by striking out the word "equally".

Clause 25: Repeal of s. 4

This clause repeals section 4 of the principal Act which deals with the transfer of licences. Section 4 prohibited transfers of licences until 1 April 1990 and since that time a transfer of a licence has required the approval of the Director. The Director is required to consent to a transfer if the criteria prescribed by the regulations are satisfied and an amount is paid to him representing the aggregate of the licensee's accrued and prospective liabilities by way of surcharge under the Act, less any component of that prospective liability referrable to future interest and charges in respect of borrowing. The section also provides that where the registration of a boat is endorsed on a licence to be transferred, that registration may also be transferred.

The effect of repealing section 4 is that a licence in respect of the fishery will be transferable in accordance with the scheme of management for the fishery prescribed under the *Fisheries Act 1982*. The criteria prescribed by the *Fisheries (Gulf St. Vincent Prawn Fishery Rationalization) Regulations 1990* are identical to, and thus duplicate, those prescribed by *the Scheme of Management (Prawn Fisheries) Regulations 1991* under the Fisheries Act. The new section 8 substituted by clause 25 of this measure will provide that the licensee's liability under the Fisheries (Gulf St. Vincent Prawn Fishery Rationalization) Act 1987 will, on transfer of the licence, pass to the transferee (the new licensee). Section 38 (4) of the Fisheries Act already provides that where a licence is transferable, the registration of a boat effected by endorsement of the licence may be transferred.

Clause 26: Substitution of s. 8—Charges on licences

This clause repeals section 8 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision.

Proposed subsection (1) requires the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette,* to quantify the net liabilities of the Fund under the Act as at the day fixed by the Minister in the notice ("the appointed day").

Proposed subsection (2) provides that, as from the appointed day, each licence is charged with a debt calculated by dividing the amount determined under subsection (1) by the number of licences in force on the appointed day.

Proposed subsection (3) provides that the debt will bear interest at a rate fixed by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette* and the liability to interest is a charge on the licence.

Proposed subsection (4) requires a licensee to pay the debt, together with interest, in quarterly instalments (which may be varied from time to time) fixed by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette* and payable on a date fixed by the Minister in the notice and thereafter at intervals of three months, or if there is an agreement between the Minister and the licensee as to payment, in accordance with the agreement.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that where a licence is transferred, the liability of the licensee passes to the transferee.

Proposed subsection (6) provides that any amount payable by a licensee under the Act may be recovered as a debt due to the Crown.

Proposed subsection (7) provides that if a licensee is in arrears for more than 60 days in the payment of an instalment, the Minister may, by notice in writing to the licensee, cancel the licence.

Proposed subsection (8) provides that where a licence is surrendered on or after the appointed day or is cancelled under subsection (7), no compensation is payable for loss of the licence and the total amount of the debt charged against the licence becomes due and payable by the person holding the licence at the time of the surrender or cancellation.

Proposed subsection (9) defines "appointed day" and net liabilities of the Fund under this Act" for the purposes of the section.

PART 4
AMENDMENT OF FISHERIES (SOUTHERN ZONE ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY RATIONALIZATION)ACT 1987

Clause 27.• Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation
This clause amends the definition of "Southern Zone" to update the reference to regulations to the current scheme of management.

Clause 28: Amendment of s. 4—Te Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery Rationalization Authority
This clause provides for a Public Service employee appointed by the Minister to be a member of the Rationalization Authority rather than an employee of the Department of Fisheries which no longer exists.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES (WRECKED OR WRITTEN-OFF VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Motor Vehicles Act to require insurers of motor vehicles, members of the motor trade, auctioneers and private owners, to advise the Registrar of Motor Vehicles when a vehicle is wrecked or written off. The amendment will prohibit ownership transfers of a wrecked or written off motor vehicle without an inspection to verify the identity of the vehicle.

This proposal is aimed at reducing the incidence of stolen vehicles being registered with false identification obtained from wrecked and written off vehicles.

Where the Registrar has recorded a vehicle as wrecked or written off the vehicle will be subject to an inspection if any subsequent application for transfer or re-registration is submitted. The inspection will primarily be aimed at identifying stolen vehicles which have been given a new identity by using the compliance plate or vehicle identification number from a wrecked or written off vehicle. A secondary aim will be to ensure that any wrecked or written off vehicle which has been repaired and is to be re-registered, is roadworthy.

Notification of some wrecked and written off vehicles and the recording of these vehicles on the Registrar of Motor Vehicles commenced in January 1991. The information is currently provided to Motor Registration by some insurance companies on the basis of a voluntary agreement. Not all insurance companies are a party to this agreement and some insurers who are party to the agreement have not complied with the agreement. There is currently no requirement or agreement for notification of wrecked and written off vehicles by members of the motor trade, auctioneers or private owners.

Vehicles that are currently recorded as wrecked or written off are required to be inspected for two purposes. Firstly an engine number check is undertaken by a police officer and secondly a roadworthiness check is undertaken by a Department of Road Transport inspector.

To minimise inconvenience and cost it is proposed to introduce new procedures that will reduce the need for two inspections. Under this proposal an initial engine number inspection will be undertaken with a subsequent roadworthy inspection being requested only if deemed necessary by the inspector.

A training program for police officers involved in vehicle inspections has been introduced as a means of improving the detection rate of stolen vehicles.

The amendment to the Act contained in this Bill has the potential to reduce vehicle theft and may lead to vehicle safety benefits.

Clause 1: Short title— This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement—This clause provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 22—Registrar may require applicant to supply information—Section 22 currently empowers the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to require an applicant for registration of a motor vehicle or for a permit to provide evidence by statutory declaration or otherwise as to any facts that affect the fee for the registration or permit or payment for insurance in respect of the vehicle. The clause amends the section so that the power to require evidence extends to any matter in relation to which information is required to be disclosed in applications for vehicle registrations or permits.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 24—Duty to grant registration—Section 24 currently allows the Registrar to refuse to register a vehicle pending investigations as to the correctness of particulars disclosed in the application or examination of the vehicle as to its roadworthiness. The amendment is designed to make it clear that vehicle examinations may also be conducted to verify information disclosed in the application or information disclosed as a result of a requirement of the Registrar under section 22 (as proposed to be amended by clause 3).

Clause 5: Insertion of heading before s. 44—This clause inserts a new heading (Duty to Notify Alterations or Additions to Vehicles) before section 44 to make it clear that section 44

does not operate only in connection with the amount of registration fees.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 44—Duty to notify alterations or additions to vehicles

This clause adds a definition of 'alteration' allowing regulations to be made including in the matters of which the Registrar must be notified the wrecking of the vehicle or the disassembling of the vehicle or part of the vehicle for salvage. A consequential amendment is made to subsection (3) to make it clear that notification of alterations or additions to vehicles may not necessarily result in an additional amount becoming payable in respect of vehicle registration.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 54—Cancellation of registration and refund—The clause amends section 54 so that an application to the Registrar by the registered owner of a vehicle for cancellation of the vehicle's registration must be made in a manner and form determined by the Minister (as in the case with other applications relating to vehicle registration).

Clause 8: Insertion of new s. 55a—Cancellation of registration where information provided by applicant was incorrect—Proposed new section 55a empowers the Registrar to cancel a vehicle registration if satisfied that information disclosed in the application for registration or an application for transfer of the registration, or in response to a requirement of the Registrar, was incorrect. This new provision would enable cancellation in respect of stolen vehicles otherwise than under section 54 which requires application by the registered owner. Provision is made for a refund of the registration fee in appropriate cases as, for example, where a person registered as the owner of a stolen vehicle was unaware that the vehicle had been stolen and that he or she was not the true owner of the vehicle.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 58—Transfer of registration—Section 58 currently requires the Registrar to transfer a vehicle registration on due application and payment of the transfer fee and stamp duty (if any). The clause amends this section so that the Registrar may—

(a) require evidence supported by statutory declaration as to any matter in relation to which information is required to be disclosed in the application;

(b) refuse to transfer the registration pending investigations (including examination of the vehicle) to verify information in the application or evidence provided by the applicant in response to a requirement of the Registrar;

and

(c) refuse to transfer the registration if satisfied that any such information or evidence is incorrect.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 139—Inspection of motor vehicles—This clause makes an amendment that is consequential on the amendments allowing investigations and vehicle examinations for the purpose of verifying evidence provided by an applicant in response to a requirement of the Registrar.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 145—Regulations—This clause adds a new regulation-making power allowing registrations to be made requiring persons of a specified class to notify the Registrar of specified matters relating to any motor vehicle (whether registered or unregistered) that is—

(a) written off as a total loss or constructive total loss for insurance purposes;

(b) wrecked or wholly or partly disassembled for salvage;

or

(c) sold or acquired for wrecking or such disassembling or when in a condition such that it cannot be driven on a road lawfully or at all and requires extensive repairs.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 February. Page 1856.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Yesterday whilst speaking to this Bill I drew the attention of the House largely to the dereliction of duty by the present Government over some 20 years that it was in office really in its failure to develop adequately the economics of the State. I now propose to take a different tack for the remaining time allotted to me and put in a very strong plea for the newly formed Economic Development Board of South Australia to pay attention to another aspect of South Australia's economic development which has been sadly neglected, and that is the area of decentralisation.

I would draw to the attention of the new board the fact that rural South Australia is a very important cog in the South Australian economic machine. The South-East of South Australia in particular, part of which includes the electorate of Mount Gambier that I have the honour to represent, contributes very substantially to both the home and export revenue of this State. I would remind all members of the House and also the members of the board that South Australia does not begin and end within the confines of Adelaide, and many people in rural South Australia have come to believe that that is the impression held by metropolitan residents.

In particular, I would commend to the board the Mount Gambier electorate as a district that has long been ripe for development. It recently won the title of Australia's tidiest town, and the City of Mount Gambier is in fact a great attraction in its own right. However, it has so much more to offer to industrialists, small businesses and potential future settlers there. As a rural city, its facilities are second to none in Australia. It has a very desirable lifestyle. It is readily accessible to both the Victorian and South Australian State capitals, Melbourne and Adelaide. It has one of Australia's most efficient transport industries, centred around the Scott K and S industry, but with other smaller transport industries also based in the city. I believe we would unquestionably have the largest concentration of heavy transport vehicles per head of population of any city in the southern hemisphere, possibly the world over. There is therefore speed and ease of access for products and supplies for anyone wishing to establish in the South-East.

The South-East has another commodity more precious than gold in this driest State in the driest continent, and that is a more than adequate supply of clean, pure water. We also have land available for subdivision, broad acre sites ready and waiting. We have a local gas supply, recently opened up from the Katnook field, and we are also happily situated with electricity coming from metropolitan Adelaide on the State grid and with an

interstate grid coming through just north of Mount Gambier providing further security of supply.

We still have a rail freight service, although the rail passenger service has been discontinued and has been replaced by a very efficient bus service to and from Adelaide provided by Bonds buses. Also we have air and road freight and passenger services which are extremely good. We have cultural, educational, recreational and sporting facilities of a great variety and to a high standard. I doubt whether there would be any other rural city in Australia able to compete with Mount Gambier on that basis. We have an intelligent—and this I regard as the most important aspect of Mount Gambier's attractiveness—well educated and adaptive work force, very reasonable in attitude towards employers and with a very good record of service and loyalty.

I would remind the Economic Development Board, in closing my remarks, that the whole State remains to be developed and we must, if possible, arrest and even more desirably reverse the population flow which has taken place over the decades from rural South Australia to the Adelaide metropolitan region. I am sure members would agree with me that, in the long run, it is cheaper and also provides a much more desirable lifestyle for all of us if the metropolitan area does not become crowded by people moving in from the country and if we continue to develop the rural centres as they should be developed.

I have always regarded the South-East of South Australia as the jewel in South Australia's crown. I came here almost 40 years ago, arrived in Mount Gambier and have never seen any reason not to remain there. It is a very desirable place and I strongly commend it to the South Australian community, the Economic Development Board, and all manufacturers, industrialists, business people and anyone else looking for a very pleasant place in which to settle and establish business.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I did not intend to enter this debate until the Deputy Leader, in making his contribution to this Bill last night, attacked the Premier. I thought it was a very unwarranted attack on the Premier, but I will come to that later. I support the Bill. There is no doubt that the constant knocking by the Opposition has not helped South Australia one iota. The Opposition ignores the Arthur D. Little report which, in many respects, was responsible for this Bill. All members of this Parliament should embrace this Bill, given that it endeavours to assist regional development by implementing regional development strategies and to assist a whole range of other industries in South Australia.

Frankly, I was disappointed with the Deputy Leader's attack on the Premier, which caused me to exchange words with him and which, I must say, was unparliamentary and—albeit belatedly—I withdraw it. However, I am a person who believes that, if I am wrong up, I will own up. Equally, the Deputy Leader should consider his statements and his attack upon the Premier. In fact, he said:

> These amendments are still a mystery to the House, and I have not seen any file. So, whether the Premier was indulging in rhetoric to justify his overseas trip, which cost taxpayers $30 000 or $40 000 or whether he did actually pick up one or two ideas whilst he was overseas we are yet to find out.

Most uncharitable! If the member for Mitcham had done his homework, he would have found out the aims of that overseas delegation. The Premier's press release of 9 January 1993 indicates that the Premier, as part of his overseas trip, was to seek compensation for the Maralinga clean up and settlement. Every member in this Parliament and every South Australian would believe that it is the responsibility of the British Government to clean up the disgusting mess it left behind as a consequence of the tests that were carried out at Maralinga and nearby. In part, the press release states:

> The trip, which also includes a business visit to Spain, has been rescheduled after being postponed when Mr Arnold became Premier in September 1992. In London, the Premier will be pushing for a settlement by the British Government on the issue of rehabilitation of former British nuclear test sites in South Australia. He will also raise the issue of the British Government's delay for compensation for the traditional owners of the Maralinga lands. Other aspects of the Premier's U.K. trip include discussions in Scotland with the Scottish Enterprise. This organisation is similar to the proposed South Australian Economic Development Board.

If the Deputy Leader had done his homework, he could have asked questions in his contribution or in the Committee stage. But, no, he had to try to make some cheap political point about the cost of the Premier's overseas trip. It is fair to say that, in my time in this place since 1979, I have found that if you start dishing out that muck it is likely to come back your own way. It does not do anything to promote business in South Australia. It does not do anything for those who read *Hansard* to see a puerile contribution such as that made by the Deputy Leader when we are talking about lifting the economy and business confidence in this State. Further, the press release states:

> Mr Arnold will also meet with Mr Allan Pedder, Chairman and Chief Executive of the Tioxide group. The company is expected to make a decision in the near future as to whether the more than $300 million plant to manufacture the paint pigment titaniumdioxide will be given the go ahead.

If my memory is correct, I understand that that plant may be set up in Port Pirie. I took it upon myself to go to Western Australia last year and look at what is happening in a plant outside Gin Gin, and I will talk about that at another time. I understand the importance of such a plant. It would cost $300 million to set up a plant in South Australia, not to mention the benefits that would accrue, particularly to regional development, for a place such as Port Pirie. I am sure everyone read the recent announcement in the press of the probable loss of 500 jobs at the Broken Hill mine. Of course, that will impact upon not only Broken Hill but Port Pirie. So, the Premier's overseas trip was certainly warranted in my view and in that of any clear thinking person.

In addition, had the Deputy Leader not been so lazy and just wanted to make, as he did, a cheap political point, he could have obtained a copy of the Premier's press release of 11 January and seen as follows:

> The South Australian Premier, Lynn Arnold, today met with the Greek Prime Minister in Athens. It's believed to be the first meeting between an Australian Premier and a Greek Prime Minister and is one of the highlights of Mr Arnold's trade and cultural mission to Greece. Premier Arnold left for Greece last Saturday with a 10 mission business delegation for the week

long visit. The trip followed the postponement of a trade mission scheduled in September 1992.

Again, the Deputy Leader gives no credit in his contribution in this House—none whatsoever. He did not mention the importance of what this Government is trying to do. I understand that the role of the Opposition is to scrutinise, to put up alternatives and to criticise. One should be fair in their contribution, and I do not believe that the contribution made by the Deputy Leader was fair.

The Premier led a 10 person delegation on a week long visit, and anyone who has been on those trips—not that I have—would know that it involves talking, meeting business people and being on the go all the time. I do not see it as any junket or tripping around the world just for the sake of doing that. The Premier has more going for him than that sort of thing. The press release also goes onto stress the importance of this visit, as follows:

He outlined the strong links between Greece and South Australia and that the trade between the two must be increased.

One is well aware of the importance of the ethnic communities in South Australia, and particularly the strong ties that have been built up between the South Australian and Greek communities. Again, by making puerile comments and attacking the Premier yesterday, the Deputy Leader did no credit to this Parliament.

The Premier's press release goes on to say that the Premier would also meet with senior members of the Greek business community in Athens and Thessalonika through their respective chambers of commerce. Again, we are talking about setting up a board to promote South Australia and economic development in this State and for many other purposes, yet at the first opportunity in this Parliament we have the Deputy Leader of the Opposition making puerile comments attacking the Premier because he went overseas.

Without any valid basis to his comments he attacked this important overseas visit and tried to debase it. It is painful for the people of South Australia to have a Deputy Leader who wants to be Deputy Premier of South Australia but who acts in this way. If this is the type of contribution he makes, all I can say is that if the Opposition is successful at the next election—and the Opposition has a 50:50 chance, as we all know—God help South Australians, given this sort of contribution and the way he tries to assist his Leader.

It does no credit to any member of Parliament when contributions like that are made. Certainly, one hopes that the people from the Greek community and the Greek consulate do not get hold of the Deputy Leader's contribution, because I suggest it would be an insult to the senior officials of the Greek Government who were visited by the South Australian Premier in Greece.

The Premier was to meet the Minister for Macedonia and Thrace, the Environment Minister, the Transport and Communications Minister and the Agricultural Minister—all people important to South Australia and the South Australian economy. Members opposite talk about the agricultural industry in South Australia. We all realise that that industry is of critical importance to this State. Farmers out in the rural community are hurting. We all know that they are hurting, as you illustrated today, Sir, in your contribution on another matter.

We all know that farmers have been adversely affected during the past 12 months through unseasonal conditions that have impacted on them. Quite properly, farmers are trying to promote their products overseas, yet the Deputy Leader's contribution gives no credit to the Bill, which seeks to promote South Australia internationally and focus on competitive, market driven and suitable economic development in this State. The Deputy Leader's contribution yesterday has done nothing towards that at all—not a thing. He made a purely political contribution. It did nothing to enhance or promote internationally what we are trying to do in South Australia. There is little credit in the Deputy Leader's having raised the matter he spoke of in the context of this important Economic Development Bill.

I would expect the Opposition, if it can, to tear a Government Bill to pieces: that is the role of the Opposition, and we all understand that. The Deputy Leader should have been constructive, but his contribution and the manner in which he started yesterday indicated that the Deputy Leader was lazy and had not researched the matter. If he had, his contribution would not have focused on the matter he raised at all. He should have focused on promoting South Australia and its products internationally, and he should have pointed out where we could increase the opportunities for development and investment in South Australia.

The Deputy Leader could have expressed concern about unemployment in South Australia. He could have suggested ways that the Government could reduce the level of unemployment in this State, a matter of concern to all members of Parliament. I would like to say much more on that, but I would also like to address a number of other matters.

I refer to the KPMG Peat Marwick report. I know it is painful for Opposition members to listen to these points because they do not like to hear the facts, as we saw in Question Time today. I refer to the Minister of Public Infrastructure's interesting response with respect to electricity prices. If I get time, perhaps I will be able to read that information into *Hansard.* The Peat Marwick report states:

When viewed on a segmented basis, South Australian electricity prices compare more than favourably, particularly amongst larger users.

Earlier today a question was asked about the price of natural gas, and in that respect the report states:

...the effective price of natural gas in the Adelaide industrial market to represent the least expensive in Australia across virtually all consumption levels.

I would have thought that the Deputy Leader could have addressed those issues. He did not do that yesterday in his contribution which, as I said, I believe was poorly researched. The Deputy Leader put little effort into it. I believe his speech was just rhetoric. The Opposition refers to payroll tax, and the KPMG Peat Marwick report states:

The New South Wales tax review found that payroll tax is a relatively low add-on cost factor. On this basis, the review concluded that the abolition of payroll tax would represent a relatively low employment generator. Payroll tax in South Australia is among the lowest in Australia.

The report goes on:

The facts differ markedly from the perceptions held in the business community where the cost of payroll tax is regularly singled out for criticism. Part of the reason for this discrepancy may be that lower average levels of profitability in South Australia which makes non-profit based taxes absolutely more onerous.

As I indicated, I would have thought that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could have addressed those problems. In relation to costs, earlier today the Minister of Public Infrastructure pointed out that the former Minister of Water Resources last year announced that water charges in 1993 would be pegged at the same levels as in the current financial year and that this would result in a real reduction in water charges.

However, with an additional 15 per cent goods and services tax on an average residential bill of $260 in the 1991-92 financial year, the cost would increase to $299. The Minister then went on to talk about the average residential sewerage bill, yet no Opposition member raised the question of the impact of such a tax on gas and electricity supplies in South Australia under the proposed

15 per cent goods and services tax. None of that was mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I believe his contribution was one of the worst I have heard from a Deputy Leader in all the time that I have been in this Parliament. The Deputy Leader used a cheap political point to try to single out the Premier, yet he could not substantiate any costs. The Deputy Leader mentioned $30 000 or $40 000, yet he had no facts. I understand the figure is about $10 000, but the reality is that the Deputy Leader was talking tongue in cheek and did not support the Economic Development Bill. He said he did, but I do not believe him. His speech was full of carping criticism and rhetoric—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I very much regret the gestation period of this legislation, because it seems to have been almost as long as it takes a human being to come into existence. The Government has been pregnant and promising for so long that I wonder who it was or what it was that conceived the organism to which the legislation will act as a midwife. I urge the Government that, if there is not labour soon, we should induce it. If that is not the case, if the Parliament cannot administer something to the Government to get it to deliver, I fear the whole concept will be stillborn.

Notwithstanding that, I am concerned about its genetic composition. I am a bit apprehensive about at least one of its parents—the Government—and the way in which it has conducted its relationship with the other parent—the community. I worry as to who was doing what to whom in the process. Having drawn that analogy, I wish to address the concerns I have about the board's composition where it is apparently deficient.

Naturally, I support the legislation: I have done so ever since I have been a member of this Parliament, but I worry, as I did about the State Bank legislation, about what it can do and not do. Admittedly, it is capable of being made more accountable and controlled than was the case with the new State Bank. However, our difficulty is that it is only the Minister and, if this Government stays in office much longer, I will worry about the consequences of doing that, because Minister after Minister in this Labor Government, and the Premier we have had and the one we have got, do not seem to know much about nurturing enterprises. Indeed, they have pretty well killed off everything they have put a hand on and, if they put a hand any further towards the survival and purpose of such enterprises, they will die more quickly.

One only has to look at the clothing factory and examples of that order. It does not pay taxes and it does not pay dividends: it does not make profits. Worse than that, the darn thing runs at a loss, and other taxpayers who compete with it have to pay the taxes to pick up that deficit.

As if that were not sufficient illustration, one only has to look at the Grand Prix Board and the way it is running the Entertainment Centre: not only is there no necessity to supply a dividend on the capital of the $50 million that is invested but there is a grant of $500 000—and they still cannot make it pay. It runs in deficit, yet the Powerhouse runs profitably. I wonder what this Government has to be told and how long it needs to discover for itself in its experiments and excursions into enterprises that it cannot administer and control enterprises effectively. Governments cannot do that, because they invariably employ people who are not tenured in their positions according to the results they get. Their job goes on and their superannuation goes on. Again, one only has to look at the Grand Prix Board to see the point I am making. The rip-off continues.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, send this piece of *Hansard* to everybody in every quango in this State: I will be pleased to have them read it. It is a great pity that they do not have to make their living from the enterprises they operate.

Mr Atkinson: Are you attacking the Public Service—

Mr LEWIS: I am attacking those people who do not have the wit, wisdom or ability to make the profits that pay their salaries but who require, through political patronage, their jobs to be financed from the public purse—and that is wicked. The member for Playford, who is the chairman of a standing committee of this Parliament, well knows the point I am making and agrees with it, as does every other member of that committee. It is absolutely wicked the way State taxpayers are being ripped off by those kinds of enterprises. I hope that what this board will do is to address some of that stupidity in the way in which resources are allocated for the development of essential infrastructure in South Australia in the future.

Notwithstanding all that, the composition of the board is commendable in the sense that it contains a person who has expertise in economic development, international business, management and industrial relations, and at least one of those persons has to have the right plumbing—it provides that we have to have a woman and a man. It makes you wonder, does it not? Already there is a legislative requirement that by the year 2000 half of these people be women and half be men, regardless of merit, competence or any other factor—whether they wear beards or anything else. Some of the deficiencies that I then see in the statements of

imperatives are, regrettably, that no-one is required to have expertise and insight into the development of enterprises based on the rural sciences and no-one—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: —is required to have expertise on the development of enterprises relevant to the development of mining and value adding of what is obtained from mining, whatever that may be.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Murray-Mallee to take his seat. If the honourable member for Spence wishes to enter the debate, I would be delighted to put his name down as a contributor; indeed, he can be the next contributor. In the meantime, I would ask him to cease interjecting and leave what he wants to say until then.

Mr LEWIS: I do hope he is as generous with his time to me as I have been to him when he his speaking, if he has the courage to do so, trusting that in the process he will remain relevant to the terms of the Bill. I share the concerns that have been expressed by the people in rural enterprises. Mr Tim Scholz, the current President of the South Australian Farmers Federation, and other experts in the mining industries have expressed the same view about the absence of any requirement for any member of the board to have expertise in those areas. The primary industries are where we generate wealth, where the greatest multiplier exists, and that is what the Economic Development Board ought to be aiming to do—to get the greatest possible benefit from the multipliers in any enterprise it establishes. It should minimise the amount of capital necessary to create each job and expand the rate at which such jobs will be generated further down the track in the South Australian community.

I note that no comment is made about the desirability of having someone on the board who has expertise in the development of tourism. There is a most outstanding opportunity for South Australia in that domain. We most certainly could do with a bigger slice of international tourism, and we are told by the people in Canberra that we will get a dramatically increasing number of people coming to Australia between now and turn of the century. If that is the case, I do hope that the board focuses attention upon getting our fair share of those tourists. At present, of course, we are a bunch of wimps.

The members of the House of Representatives and the Senate who are members of the Labor Party seem to have no capacity whatever to influence the current Government in Canberra to give us a better slice of the action in the promotion dollar for international tourism. We do not get a fair go there, and they say nothing about it. The Government is not embarrassed, either by them or anybody else, and it is regrettable. Regional tourism presidents around this State constantly draw attention to the necessity for us to get a fairer share of the numbers that are coming here and a greater proportion of the dollars that are being spent.

We pay our taxes just like everybody else, and we have the chance to offer people from overseas as much excitement and insight into unique environments and pleasant surroundings as anywhere else in Australia, if not more so. There are things here as novel as anywhere else on earth, and it is only a matter of our using our wit to devise the means of promoting an awareness of that potential product for us to get the jobs and the benefits that come from it, and the board ought to pay attention to that point.

I wish also to mention the two very important rural enterprises that can be developed more rapidly if the board addresses its attention to those areas. One is the area of aquaculture, whether it is fresh water or salt water production of fish and associated species, including vegetation. We have natural wild blooms of *Dunaliella* occurring now in salt lakes around this State, and that is an extremely valuable, sought after source of beta carotene. The world pays well for that, but we do nothing about developing extraction plant and equipment for it, and it could be worth a lot of money to us if we were to do so.

In addition to that, we have an ideal coastline and a major waterway as well as a substantial irrigation industry in this State, all of which provide us with excellent sites and opportunities for the establishment of aquaculture, not only in salt water but also in fresh water. In salt water we have low lying areas which are already salinated anyway, which are close to the sea and in which we could establish huge areas of ponds that would support thousands of families from the value we could derive in terms of the fish flesh they produce, whether they are crustaceans—and our crustaceans are sought after overseas—or our inshore marine vertebrates.

I am talking about such fish as King George whiting, which gives a skinless, boneless white-fleshed fillet with stable protein and glycogen. It has an outstanding quality of flesh which is absolutely second to none on earth when it is thawed from freezing. It is an excellent product and has to be worth at least $15 a kilogram wholesale in bulk out of this State, and we do nothing about farming it, yet it is an obvious species to be farmed. The techniques of farming such species are well documented around the world. All we have to do is to have the wit to put it together and to get the kind of thing going that we had with the AMP, where we developed large tracts of land for agricultural production in this State (and elsewhere in Australia, for that matter) just after the Second World War, continuing during the 1950s and early 1960s, and to allow the people who work on those projects to obtain the titles to the farms that can result, in the same way as they did then—by balloting for them.

In addition to that, we have an abundance of native plants and animals which are not yet farmed but which we know are well adapted to our soils and to our climate. They evolved here naturally—they fit—yet we do nothing about developing them as commercial enterprises. For instance, while we sit on our hands, we see the North Americans taking millions upon millions of dollars out of an industry based on our emus. We ought to get on with that. All members hardly need to be reminded that our native animals have very low cholesterol, if any, in their flesh. They are then very sound species to be farmed as alternatives to those species that can be shown otherwise to cause health problems if they are consumed in any great quantities by people anywhere, whether in Australia or elsewhere.

We have all these natural advantages and all we need is to put it together in the way in which the board

could—by getting financiers and a scheme through which that finance can then be put together, with the efforts of young people, many of whom are unemployed and lack career opportunities otherwise, to develop those kinds of enterprises and acquire the skills necessary in the process of doing so, through TAFE. That would be instead of having a lot of pretend courses and the life enrichment courses that cost the taxpayer a lot of money, use up resources, occupy classrooms, chew up electricity and make no contribution back to the State's coffers in terms of economic expansion. It does not occur; it does not happen. It is tragic—what a waste—yet there is self actualisation for too many already well cared for and well catered for members of the community.

So, I have attempted to address those areas which are obvious and to which I believe the board ought to pay its attention. I now wish to point out that in our rural towns and cities we have an excellent opportunity in South Australia, especially in the electorate I represent, to develop small manufacturing aimed at niche markets, whether in Australia or overseas, such as precision pools and things like that. It will cost less to make them in towns such as Lameroo or Karoonda than to make them in the western suburbs. The rental cost of the land is lower and communications are identical, with fax machines, mobile phones and the like such as we have today.

There is no difference in the administrative costs, but there is considerable difference in the rent cost of land and buildings, and there is a willing work force there that will otherwise leave those towns in the very near future and migrate into the city, creating a welfare problem here. It would require the expansion of our sewerage, water, electricity and telephone services as well as kerbing, streets and schools, thus congesting the city. Those same people could be left where they are and others could be encouraged to go and live with them and work in the enterprises that could be established in those towns where they would be more efficiently established in economic terms as well. It is a better social environment, anyway, in so many ways.

Mr Venning: Quality of life.

Mr LEWIS: It is about quality of life, as the member for Custance says. Having made that point, I wish to draw attention to the mess that 20 years of Labor has imposed on this State. It has started a trend in the sort of things that I have just mentioned of depopulating rural South Australia and increasing dependence on welfare in the cities. There has also been the destruction of jobs because there is inflexibility in the rate at which change can occur in our businesses. This board must address that problem and ensure that Governments of the day understand the necessity for such changes to occur.

People accuse me of being conservative. I do not mind if that is in terms of social values and such things. However, when it comes to industrial legislation and economic development I am not conservative; I am radical. It is the twits who sit opposite who are conservative. They cannot conceive of the necessity for change, even though it is taking place in the rest of the world. They bleat about the way the automobile industry is deteriorating and collapsing. We are in the rust belt. That is because of their dogged pigheadedness of insisting that the earth was flat when it came to conditions of work. It just cost too much to do things here.

We have the example of fellows like Ted Gnatenko. More recently we have had the policies and bigotry encouraged by the present Prime Minister in the way in which he has campaigned as Treasurer and now as Prime Minister. They give those people the mistaken belief that the world owes them a living and the rest of South Australia, and indeed Australia, should pay a premium on their products so that they can keep their jobs while we lose jobs in the export industries, about which I have been speaking, which need to be developed and which the Arthur D. Little report recognised as needing to be developed. That is the stupidity of the kind of argument that we have been hearing from members opposite and it distresses me.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I do not think that anyone could oppose this Bill, and the objectives that it is setting out should be embraced and applauded. However, there are a few issues on which I should like to offer a few words of caution and of which I hope the Government is mindful when it embarks on the establishment of this board. Certainly South Australia is looking for and desperately needs some economic development. Nobody could argue against that. We have areas which are seemingly devoid of interest. We seem to be losing businesses interstate and we seem to be unable to attract new businesses. If this board under this legislation will endeavour to attract industries to the area and attract the further development of some of our existing industries, that will be a positive path for South Australia. What is the future direction of this State under this board? What guidelines is Parliament giving to the board and what are we asking it to achieve?

I want to follow the issue raised by the member for Murray-Mallee. We have an infrastructure spread across this State which is being under-utilised. I refer to most of the areas outside the metropolitan area. We have in those areas schools and hospitals. We have the sporting infrastructure and the community infrastructure which has been wound down and under-utilised because of a change of economic circumstances in those broader areas. That infrastructure is here in South Australia. It requires no further new cost, other than existing maintenance, to be able to make effective use of it. There is no reason in the world, as the member for Murray-Mallee said, why some of the boutique-type industries and the smaller industries could not be located in the regional areas and be able to capitalise and make good use of the facilities that are there. A more idealistic lifestyle those people could not wish for and certainly could not get in the metropolitan area. That is the sort of direction in which we should be looking.

I hope that this board will look seriously at that aspect, because the old cliché that South Australia ends at Gepps Cross is not just a cliché; it is a reality in the minds of many people. That reality or the views of those people must be changed. If we are to set up a board which might have some bureaucratic control and has the blinkered approach that South Australia ends at Gepps Cross, this whole Bill is wasted. If, on the other hand, it

will look at South Australia in its full and broad context, it is a different matter, and it is a matter that can be embraced and supported by every member of this House.

I look at my own electorate and see that big gulf of water. Regrettably time and again I find people saying, 'It is too far away. It is not within an hour's drive of Adelaide.' Yet, the economic development potential of that area is enormous. Despite the adversity, many great developments have taken place there. The member for Murray-Mallee mentioned agriculture. There is an oyster industry of enormous proportions developing there. Unfortunately, the heat wave in the last few days caused a setback for some of them, but potentially it is there. Some people were in considerable difficulties on the land, but one chap I know is employing six people on an oyster lease on a property up there. It was not there four years ago. We have a venison industry. Members might be interested to know that the Eyre Peninsula produces one-seventh of Australia's velvet. Needless to say, all the issues in relation to tuna farming have now come to light. It is the only place in the world where southern blue fin tuna is actually farmed. That has the potential to bring enormous amounts of money into this State, and we certainly hope that it does that.

Maybe this board could pick up some of those anomalies that exist within various Government departments in some of those areas where one department is working against another because it might be environmentally sensitive or for some other reason. I raise the issue in relation to tuna farms. We have people saying that they do not want tuna farms in Boston Bay. A tuna farm comprises approximately one-quarter of a hectare. Even if there were 100 of them, that would mean 25 hectares out of a bay with a total area of many hundreds of thousands of hectares. We must get our priorities right and into some sort of balance. Within five years those tuna farms will be requiring in the vicinity of between 25 000 and 30 000 tonnes of pilchards or equivalent food to feed them. Then we consider the industries that flow on and relate to it.

I would hope that this Economic Development Board would take those sorts of things into its grasp and look at them and try to develop further from them. Most of the industries which have been undertaken on Eyre Peninsula, and I refer specifically to the fishing industries, and which have proven to be quite good, and I specify abalone, prawns, tuna farming, sashimi tuna (which was in long lining and purse-seining), have all developed because of a diversity in another industry. The new industries brought to the area, such as the expansion of oyster farming, deer, elk and buffalo farming, and even emu farming (despite the fact we do not have the legislation yet to slaughter birds, but at least half a dozen people are rearing emu chicks in anticipation), have all come about because of the good times in one industry and people diversifying and therefore creating a new industry, or the reverse where it has been adverse conditions and they have had to diversify. The potential is there, but we must get Government red tape and bureaucratic nonsense off their backs to allow them to develop in such a way.

One of the issues that concerns me a little is that a board of this kind might be able to sing its praises that it was able to attract an industry that could employ 500, 1 000 or 2 000 people in South Australia, and that is great, but we would only have to encourage our small business community to take on one extra employee and there would not be enough people in South Australia to fill those positions. So, instead of focusing on one new, big flash Harry type of business—and I am not discouraging that idea, and we should encourage every industry possible that we can—we should not forget the greatest potential for expansion that we have is in the encouragement of our small business community to be able to employ just that one extra person. That is the direction in which we need to go.

Of course, some of the issues that need to be taken into account will not come under the guidelines of the Economic Development Board. That board will not be able to change payroll tax or the wholesale sales tax. Some of those sorts of things still have to be addressed by the Government. The Government cannot hide behind an Economic Development Board and say that it is charged with the responsibility. It must release some of those shackles that confront small business now.

South Australia is in a mess: there is no question about that, and one could argue for a long time just how big a mess we are in. It was brought home to me the other day when I read an article in the *Bulletin* magazine, I think, where it stated that in the past 10 years South Australia has lost $1 million per day. That has been our debt every day for the past 10 years. It is a bit hard for the average person to comprehend just how big that figure of $3.15 billion really is.

All members of this House would know that we have just been through the biggest natural disaster that South Australia has ever had with excessive rain and damage to countless hundreds of thousands of tonnes of grain: 96 per cent of the grain on Eyre Peninsula has been downgraded because of the excessive rain, and the grain has sprouted in the head. It has been downgraded about $55 a tonne, and that does not take into account the loss of production of the grain that was knocked out of the head or the loss of weight of grain that occurs when it gets wet and then dries out again. We are probably considering in the vicinity of a $65 per tonne direct loss to the farmers as a result of that. That is part of the loss.

The other loss has occurred in the Riverland, and it involves the fruit growing and grape growing areas and the losses that have occurred to local government as a result of lost bridges, washed out roads and every other sector associated with that wet area. Through the Minister of Primary Industries' working party it has been estimated that the loss (and that estimate was made by all the Government departments concerned, as well as the National Farmers Federation of South Australia and the bankers involved) was $294 million—a very big loss indeed.

How does that loss, resulting from the biggest natural disaster that has ever occurred in the State, relate to the biggest man-made disaster that has ever occurred in this State—and we are talking about 9 per cent? The biggest natural disaster that has ever occurred in South Australia is about 9 per cent of the man-made disaster of the State Bank issue and the associated losses. It is difficult to get those sorts of figures into the correct perspective. There are many many farmers who saw with some optimism two months ago a possible option of escaping their

economic woes at that time, but then to see the whole lot swept away from them with continuous rain is something that has not only been devastating to them emotionally and psychologically but has caused financial havoc as well.

Just 9 per cent of the State Bank debt would pay for the total natural disaster that has occurred each year. If the $3.15 billion was invested, the Government could contribute almost $300 million in a give-away measure, whether it be to primary industry or to the economic development of the State. That massive input could be the financial basis from which this particular board could operate, but we do not have it. We could talk about it, cry over it, if we wanted to do that, but it would not solve the problem. The residents of South Australia and their descendants are saddled with this debt for a long time to come.

What is our direction? Will this board have the ability to change our direction; to encourage new business; to revitalise our existing businesses; to encourage value adding of our existing commodities? Adversity does bring a number of things. I was talking to some people involved in the grain industry today, and we were trying to count the losses that have occurred in the grain industry. It might be possible to recover some of those losses, because much of the grain that has been damaged through shooting or germination of the grain, which creates the short grain, was high protein grain. It may be possible for the high protein nature of our grain to put us in a favourable market in the feed grain industry: we can only hope that that might be the case. Unfortunately, Canada has had an all-time loss because their crops were frosted; they are literally putting millions of tonnes of frosted wheat onto the world feed wheat market, and that makes it even more difficult for us to overcome this situation.

There is a brighter outcome in relation to the barley industry. The projections for the barley industry do look good. I strongly suspect that there will probably be an increase in barley acreages sown for the coming year. I am not sure that this Economic Development Board will necessarily come into that. However, the interest in value adding, the making and shipping of malt and other associated products in relation to the barley industry perhaps give it an even greater opportunity for value adding than does the wheat industry. Nevertheless, the potential is there for that to occur.

I get back to the brief reference that I made about the aquaculture industry. I firmly believe that there are aspects within the milling industry of grain that should be looking at the production of food for farmed fish and, in this case, tuna. As I mentioned, the tuna industry will be looking for 25 000 to 30 000 tonnes of pilchards. Why cannot a large proportion of that be a grain based food that could either be a baked biscuit or a compressed pellet that would be suitable for the aquaculture industry?

One could argue whether tuna farming is aquaculture or mariculture; we are possibly arguing over the terminology there. One would say that mariculture is fish farming within the sea environment and aquaculture fish farming on a land based environment, but that is purely semantics. My real comment on this is that, for us to attract economic development to this State, we must create an employment environment that is conducive to the employers in order that they be attracted to create job opportunities and, therefore, if they can create job opportunities, they will create the work employment and so there is a snowball effect. But we cannot have a situation where there are so many Government charges and restrictions on employment opportunities because, whilst those restrictions are there, no-one will be persuaded to create a new job. We know with the add on costs that many of our employment jobs can get into 50, 75 or 100 percent of the cost of the wage in add on costs. In the mining industry I understand about 250 percent of the actual salary paid to an employee is the add on costs, with workers compensation, which is obviously very high in the mining industry, and other such issues.

In that instance, unless an employee was on $50 000 a year, which is often the case in the mining industry, unless that employee can earn $2 500 per week, he is not making a dollar for his employer. Unless he can do that, it is not on. Time does not permit me to go much further than that, other than to say that I support the Bill in its basic thrust. I trust that those persons charged with the responsibility of the management of the board will take into account that South Australia extends from Western Australia to New South Wales and does not end at the perimeter of the city of Adelaide. If it does that, then it will serve this State well.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I will not go to great length but I feel very strongly about this Bill and I do support it. This is probably the most important Bill that has been before this House in my two and a half years of being a member, and it is great to see that the Government has at last got something right. But I wonder why it has taken so long for this to come before the Parliament. I have the copies of the original speech the Premier made to the Arthur D. Little report and again on 28 November when he introduced this Bill and here, eight and a half months later, we have the Bill before us.

The Premier did say that he would act ‘with haste’: I hope that the Premier will act a lot quicker than the eight and a half months it has taken to get this Bill here. I do not know why there has been a delay. There was a lot of talk and a lot of excuses. Even the amendments to this Bill we did not get until four clock this afternoon, and I am still somewhat amazed that it has taken that long for such an obvious, positive and fully supported Bill to get before the Parliament. The amendments should have been organised a long time ago. Now that the Premier is back from overseas (and I understand that he had a good trip; I hope it was worthwhile), I hope that the trip will be reflected in this Bill and in how effective the board is able to be when it is finally in place.

We have heard much about the Arthur D. Little report, and it is quite damning of our Government and State. That report said that it was urgent that this board be set up. I just wonder why it has taken so long. The development we have had in this State and in this

country has been so poor, and the report spoke very damningly about that. South Australia arguably faces the greatest challenge of all the States, because we are in dire straits.

The high cost of operating business in South Australia is obvious and, in my experience in the rural industry, rural producers are in survival mode only. They are not making any profits: they are just hanging in there surviving. They are down to the minimum work force, operating at a minimum level, making no profits and just existing. I know it is too late for many of them. I hope it is not too late to bail-out those we have left. We have the highest FID levels, BAD tax, electricity and water charges in Australia.

What also concerns me is the amount of banking that is moving out of this State to Queensland. That started as a trickle: it is now a flood. I hope Government members know this, because it is so easy and so obvious for people to go to the Queensland banks and avoid these ridiculous bank charges. I know several people who have taken that option. I also note that the Government was going to give back to the industry the $40 million, but I was upset that it took away $77 million in the first instance in the last budget.

Private enterprise has collapsed, and we all know that. We must get the Government back to its core activities, the activities that the Government used to be all about. They are not things that private enterprise can do and, indeed, always did. Government should not be in banking—and what a prophecy that is—in insurance, in printing or all those things that compete with private enterprise. It has been, and it has been found wanting time and time again.

The 20 years of Labor has failed because it has had the wrong policies. It is incredible to realise that our debt goes up $6 million a day. I had hoped that someone would interject and tell me that that was not the case. It is worse than a bad dream or a nightmare to say that we lose $6 million a day. This money has to be paid back. How long will it take to pay back one day's indebtedness? How long will it take to pay back the $6 million? Development is urgently required: it was required five years ago, and we eventually got a board.

This collapse of Government would be probably the worse of any Government in Australia's history. I have heard it said that it is probably the tenth worst in the world. It really is a shocking situation. I do not think that we have the ability at the moment to get out of our problems. That is a disgrace when you realise the resources that we have in this State. I hope that this board, more than anything else, will highlight the problems that we have had. Given all our resources we have—particularly our minerals—I hope we can overcome some of these problems. I went to the ABARE conference last week in Canberra, and the mineral wealth of Australia arose time and time again, but it has been blocked up with politics.

We have much wealth in this State, and we forbid a prospector even to fly over much of it, let alone walk over and detect it. This is an absolutely ridiculous situation. Mark my words and those of ABARE, minerals will be one of the key planks to get this country out of the demise we are in. At present the world is hungry for minerals, particularly Asia, and China in particular. These countries want our minerals. All we have to do is have the will to get them out of the ground, but we seem to be hog tied in all those areas. We just get lost in politics, rhetoric and noisy minority groups. It is high time we saw where we needed to go.

South Australia's unemployment is the highest of any mainland State. That has been said before and we say it *ad nauseam,* but it is a fact. It is a shocking and damning statistics, particularly in respect of our young people. Other countries are coming in and picking up our resources and beating us to the mark. It is not too late but, if we are not quick about it, it certainly will be.

I notice that the Northern Territory has launched into the Asian market, particularly Indonesia. We need to act now and get the board up and running. Contingent on that is the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, and I hope the board is able to enlighten the Federal Government and others in relation to the importance of this railway line, strategically and otherwise, not only to South Australia and the Northern Territory but to the rest of Australia, because Asia is the future to Australia's economy.

Asia will be the trading block with which Australia will be dealing in the next 20 years. We will not be in Europe or America—we will be in Asia, and this rail link is absolutely vital. It is obvious that we have to go that way. However, we do not have the will and we are blocked up. Certainly, the forgotten equation in South Australia is the small business sector. It is the largest sector and its prosperity affects our whole situation, particularly unemployment.

As I said, most enterprises are now in the survival mode and not the profit mode. They are just hanging in there and hoping that something will happen: hoping that the Government will change its ways or that the Government itself will change. The Opposition supports the establishment of this Economic Development Board. The Opposition is upset that we did not see these amendments until late today, but I understand that we are supporting them all.

This is an important Bill. Payroll tax is also a big issue that I hope the Government will turn around. South Australia is paying the price of bad Labor policies being in place for over 20 years, and I hope the board is able to enlighten the Government and convince it about the way it ought to go, because the policies that the board will recommend to the Government have been heard by the Government from this side of politics for 20 years.

The Government simply claimed that they were politically motivated ideas. I often read past debates, right back to when my father was a member here. Premier Dunstan started South Australia down its slide and my father and his colleagues spoke strongly and with conviction about the mistakes that were being made. All they got was ridicule from the other side. We have gone a long way since the early 1970s, but it has been all downhill.

For how long can South Australia continue to slide? How bad can it get? Still we hear the ridicule, particularly tonight, from members opposite. 'What about the workers?' is a cry we hear, but I class myself as a worker. I say, 'What about work and jobs for all our people, for all our unemployed?' These comments of ridicule come from people living in a fool's paradise.

One cannot support just one sector of the community *ad nauseam* and at great cost to every other sector, but that is just what has happened.

We have had an unbalanced view for so long, but now we need everyone in the community to get a fair go. To hear the speeches of members opposite makes me cross. Individually, I am sure members opposite know that they are like true schizophrenics, and that is what they must be. When they come into this House they do not realise that they are the same as people we see out in the street, but Government members come in here and change their colours and moods. We hear vehement speeches from members of the other side about how mistreated workers have been over all these years.

I would love to have another half dozen workers. I am down to two workers, and it grieves me to realise that in many operations farmers are holding only a skeleton staff—usually only the owner and the father or the owner and a worker. There is tremendous capacity out there and, as my colleagues the members for Murray-Mallee and Flinders said, we have to use the infrastructure that we have right across this State, but it is just not operating at the moment.

It is a very sad day. If we cannot reverse what is happening, the system will change. It will, only because it will be destroyed along with the rest of South Australia. This lack of direction makes the cost of development very high. We must go out into the community and see what is happening. One has only to drive down Port Road—and you would do that often, Sir—to see the facades, the industries that are not there or have just closed. We have all seen it. The member for Albert Park says that members on this side do not get out. I have been out in the electorate, and I have even been in his electorate. I have been to Shearers, and I have been to Horwood Bagshaw of Mannum, but that is another point. I am very upset at the moment. I have before me statistics relative to harvester and header sales last year in Australia. In fact, 450 harvesters were sold in Australia last year. Only one manufacturer remains in Australia—Horwoods of Mannum. Last year Horwoods sold only two harvesters and 16 power take-off headers. It is a sad day. That is a disgrace.

I do not own a Horwood Bagshaw. All the rest of the harvesters were imported, and 80 per cent of them came from America. Are we going to let Horwood Bagshaw sink altogether? Given the figures, it cannot afford to spend money on research and development. Would members opposite lend that company money to help it increase its sales? Of course they would not. The Government must decide that it wants to retain this industry and then support the research and development for it to retool and make a machine that the market wants. I intend to go down to Horwood Bagshaw in the very near future, and I invite other members to come with me to have a look and see whether we can help.

Mr Hamilton: Who is buying them?

Mr VENNING: The farmers are buying them, but they represent the small edge of the market. They are the class four style when most of the headers sold these days are class five. The class five has a 10 inch wider drum than the class four. Technology has left Horwood Bagshaw behind. It has not been able to retool because, as members would know, the cost of retooling is just beyond the reach of a manufacturer at Mannum. I hope that people understand that. I have spoken about the problems being faced by Horwood Bagshaw, but there are other companies that have been lost to this State. Andersons has gone, Arnotts has been sold to the US, Safcol has gone, and I am also very concerned about BHAS Pasminco, the largest employer in my electorate. I am very concerned that in the next few days we will hear some news about that company, given what has happened in Broken Hill. That must rub off down the line to Pasminco in Port Pirie. I only hope that that company is able to hold on and shortly return to its former greatness.

As my colleague said, regional development is a very high priority in this debate in the regions out there beyond Cavan, outside the metropolitan area. The Government must lead the way. I recently visited the New South Wales Department of Agriculture in Orange. If you want to see a Government leading the way, there is a grand example. It moved the whole Department of Agriculture outside of Sydney and put the whole thing, lock, stock and barrel, in Orange. I wonder whether members know whose money financed that—and this really got under my skin. In fact, $23.5 million of South Australian money built it. The South Australian Government Superannuation Fund Investment Trust supplied the money to put that enterprise there. It is working beautifully. Since the department opened there

12 months ago related industries and businesses have also moved to Orange. The New South Wales Government took a punt, and it is working. Let us hope that the South Australian Government is brave enough to follow that example.

I wish the board all the best. I know the credentials of two people who will serve on the board, particularly Don Williams. He was with Australian National when I knew him and now he is with the Submarine Corporation. I also mention Mr Brian Croser from Petaluma Wines. I acknowledge the calibre of these gentlemen and the other board members. However, I wonder about the value of our old political mate Chris Hurford. There is always a sting in the tail. I cannot understand why the Government stooped to this.

The board had an excellent line of appointments and then the Government included its old political mate Chris Hurford_ I despair. I wish him well. I wish the board well in its deliberations. I know it will come up with very keen ideas. I only hope that the Government has the wherewithal to and act on its findings. This Government is paralysed by its own members. The only way to change direction in this State is to change the Government, irrespective of what this new board advises. I wish it well. We are starving for development. I support the Bill.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I thank members for their participation in this debate on this very important piece of legislation. I will make some specific comments on a number of individual matters that have been raised by members in a few moments. The first matter I want to deal with relates to the comments that were made about the delay in debating this Bill. The member for Custance referred to an eight month delay. I acknowledge that there has been a delay in debating this Bill, but I would put the delay at something of the order

of four weeks. I indicated last year that I hoped this Bill would be debated in October. In the event, the Bill was not tabled in this House until November and it lay on the table over the break. I do not quite know where the member for Custance has been but we were not sitting in December and January, so I hardly think they count as a legitimate time to debate the Bill. If the member had wanted to come in here on his own and stand in the Chamber and talk about the Bill it might have been edifying for him but not for anybody else.

The reality is that, in terms of the sitting schedule, we are behind the timing I would have liked, but not severely behind on that timing. Indeed, there was merit in having the Bill lay on the table over the Christmas break to allow members of the community to make their own responses to this matter and perhaps suggest other amendments we might have had to this Bill. We have not had a lot of response to it because I think, broadly speaking, the kind of support we are hearing from the Opposition has also been reflected in many others. I might say right at the outset that I appreciate the indications of support from the Opposition to the Bill.

One of the things that disappoints me about the debate is that I had looked forward—and I certainly heard some of these views from my colleagues on this side of the House but I did not really hear a great deal from the other side—to something of a debate about the very purpose of economic development boards: what kind of function they might play, what kind of constraints or opportunities there should be for a board in the economic development of a State, and some canvassing of the different models in different parts of the world.

It is one thing to say there should be an Economic Development Board and an economic development authority but it is quite another thing to agree on what they should do, how they should be constituted, what their functions should be, what their spending powers should be and what their relationship with elected Government should be. I had rather looked forward to an invigorating debate on those issues because there is an invigorating debate to be had. For example, should an economic development board be entirely made up of private sector members with no representation from Government? Indeed, there are some models of that order in some parts of the world. We have chosen not to follow that model for a quite distinct reason.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Now the member for Hayward is saying that we are going to get this invigorating, intellectual debate in the Committee stage, and I look forward to it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Custance and the member for Hayward are both out of their seats and are both out of order by interjecting.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: On the other hand, there is some suggestion that economic development boards should overwhelmingly be made up of Government members with only a few representatives from the private sector. We have not chosen that approach, either. We quite consciously have gone for joint ownership of economic development in this State. We see a partnership being reflected in the membership of the board. Of course, there are other questions—whether or not the Economic Development Board should have powers of its own independent of what elected Government may say or do and whether it should be dependent upon elected Government or subject to even more control than that. That is again a very important set of issues that I would have liked to have seen addressed in the debate.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I see; that will be raised in Committee. The Government has chosen quite clearly a view of this matter that it should be an active relationship between elected Government and the Economic Development Board. The Bill contains reference to 'under the direction and control', but the more important aspect is that in consultation with the Minister and with the Government there shall be the development of certain programs. As I have said, I would have been interested to hear the views of members opposite about those proposals.

Then there is the matter of what is the relationship of the Economic Development Board not only to expenditure directly on economic development by the board itself of moneys given to it by the Government but its impact upon other areas of Government spending. That is another legitimate area of debate. Should such a board have advisory capacity, should it have directive capacity, should it have advisory capacity to a particular Minister who has directive capacity to other Ministers? Again, a series of issues could have been canvassed in that area. The Government has chosen a particular view on this matter. I think the right decisions have been made with respect to the circumstances of South Australia, but I would have liked to see some discussion of those sorts of issues.

Then there is the matter of the formulation of development plans. There is always major debate about whether or not it is possible to have proper development plans formulated for any economy. There have been some major international failures in this regard, five year plans of various sorts in various parts of the world, but this Bill provides for the formulation of strategies that can be worked on. The Government's interpretation of this is that it would be a rolling strategy development concept, that it would be dynamic, that there would be on-going work done by the board in consultation with the Government built upon the kind of analyses that come out of the Arthur D. Little report and other types of analysis that the board itself may undertake. Again, that is another area in which it would have been interesting to hear different perspectives from members opposite.

I turn now to a number of other issues. Points have been made, some of which I must correct immediately. The member for Custance, who is still in the Chamber, made the comment that the State debt is increasing at the rate of $6 million a day. He is wrong; that is not correct—the debt figure of this State is nowhere near that figure. I do not quite know where the member for Custance got that extreme figure from. Obviously, he is not listening now. One hears a figure around the rumour mill and clutches onto it and hopes that by repetition it becomes fact. However, it is certainly not only not fact, but clearly wrong. The member for Custance also raised an interesting example of Horwood Bagshaw. I am not quite sure of the point he wanted to make in terms of

what the Economic Development Board should do about Horwood Bagshaw, but I think the record of this Government—

Mr Ferguson: Good, old Bruce.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is right, Bruce McDonald. He is a very special person in the business community of South Australia and in the political community of various parts of Australia. However, I will not canvass any further Bruce McDonald's special contribution to South Australia, which I think has been forgotten by most because—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, he got on very well with the member for Kavel, as the member for Ross Smith mentions.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Bruce McDonald is hardly serious, but the issue is serious. I agree that Horwood Bagshaw is a serious issue, and this Government recognises it to be so, because it made a significant amount of support available to that company. I think it would have been becoming of the honourable member at least to have given credit for that, but that does not seem to be the sort of thing that comes out of these debates, that credit is given where credit is due. At the end of the day no-one could say that any problems that Horwood Bagshaw has had have been as a result of things imposed upon it by the State Government, because that is quite clearly not correct. The Government has gone to significant trouble to help that company over the years.

The member for Custance raised the matter of minerals. He said that the world, particularly China, is crying out for minerals. It may be that that is the case, but I must say that the London Metals Exchange prices do not seem to indicate that the world is crying out for minerals at the moment. Indeed, all the advice I have from some of the major mineral producers is that mineral prices are deflated. It is a very simple lesson of economics that if prices are deflated that is because demand is not there; in other words, the world is not crying out quite as much as the member for Custance would seem to think.

In any event, this Government has recognised that, while in the present circumstances the world is not crying out for minerals (China or anywhere else included), it is certainly true that in the longer term there would have to be enormous potential in that area, and we have put significant funds in our economic development package to that very end. I remind the honourable member (and again, credit could have been given where credit was due) that, of the $40 million that was announced by my predecessor, the member for Ross Smith, $11 million is particularly in the area of pre-feasibility work for mineral exploration. That is a program that has been very well received by the mining industry. If there are minerals out there to be found, this Government is doing what it can to help the mining industry find them and then to see the development of those activities.

The member also made some reference to the package fleetingly, but then went on to say that Governments have created the taxation revenues over the past year in excess of the amount of the package. Again, no credit was given where credit was due; for example, there was a total silence on the fact that this year's budget has built into it a payroll tax give-back of some $25 million. That is the amount given in the 1991-92 budget as a recurring element, and in the 1992-93 budget it is also a recurring element. So, the accumulated effect of that is $25 million in this budget. I remind members again that this is the only State Government in this country actually to have made a reduction in the rate of payroll tax, and that seems to have been overlooked entirely by the Opposition.

In addition to that, it was in this year's budget that we indicated that the real cost of electricity to industry would go down. The moment charges do not go up by the rate of inflation, in effect that is a give-back of resources to industry. That has not been credited by the Opposition. Likewise with respect to marine and harbours, there has been a real reduction in the cost of charges. So, I think the credentials are quite clear that, within very difficult financial circumstances (and no-one on either side would deny that these are very difficult financial circumstances for the State), this Government has still done what we could do to direct resources towards economic development type activities.

Just turning to some other matters that were particularly raised by members, again coming to the issue of payroll tax, I know that today the Leader of the Opposition has signed some package with John Hewson.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Jeff Kennett was not there: I see that they dutifully got him off somewhere else so he would not spoil the picture. We should remember that at the national tax summit in 1984-85 the member for Ross Smith as Premier stood up in front of the rest of the country and put some very clear views on payroll tax and how if we had the chance we would not have a payroll tax. However, the reality is that only 8 per cent of Australian companies pay payroll tax. I made that point yesterday in Question Time, and I was interested in some of the response of members in the debate on this matter, who then went on to suggest all sorts of reasons why the company tax reduction that Paul Keating has announced is not apparently significant. I will acknowledge the fact that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No, the stock exchange was very taken with the news. One only has to look at what happened to the index yesterday.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LINN ARNOLD: We are having a mobile stock exchange index reading here, but the reality is that some businesses are not incorporated companies and, therefore, the company tax issue is not directly relevant to them. I acknowledge that, but for the vast majority it is a relevant issue. One other member attempted to say they are not making profits anyway, so it will not be relevant.

It may well be, and it is, sadly, the case at the moment that a great many companies are not making profits. We certainly hope that they will be able to turn around. But the very purpose of being in business is to make money. The idea of going into business in the private sector is not out of some kind of altruism: the idea is actually to make money at the end of the day. So, the very goal is

to make money and, therefore, the moment one makes money in our society—and it is quite reasonable—one helps, through that money, to pay for the services of our community through the tax system. Therefore, company tax is a relevant issue. If company tax is no longer going to be 39c in the dollar but 33c in the dollar, that has to be a major benefit for all companies that are incorporated companies, unlike the payroll tax issue, which is relevant to only 8 per cent of companies.

The member for Kavel raised a number of interesting points. He said that we need to develop our external trade links, saying that we have missed out. He did not actually give credit where credit is due for the fact that South Australia is now a trade surplus State in terms of its export—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Custance may well say, 'What?', but the facts are there. Over the 1980s this State has grown from a relative balance between imports and exports of traded goods and services to now being a net exporter of traded goods and services. These are facts, not just contentions. We are quite a significant net exporter. Indeed, if the nation at large had that kind of balance, we would not have had the balance of payments problems that we have experienced. However, the point is acknowledged. I think what the member for Kavel was trying to say—not that he was disputing the achievements of the 1980s, which are significant, and I think he would have acknowledged that quite readily had he been aware of the figures—is that there is more to be done, and that is that we have to have growth in international trade from this State of 7 per cent a year over the 1990s. I accept that: it is a major challenge. We really have to look at the way we can do that.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is right. You have too, and you have certainly also acknowledged that a lot of other overseas offices work effectively indeed. The member for Kavel mentioned Indonesia, and I was interested to hear his comments. I think he would be interested to know that, during my visit to Indonesia last year, I did have some meetings with, amongst other people, the Remote Sensing Centre, which had had some contacts with Adelaide University. Those contacts had dropped away and we have been able to re-establish them, and hopefully that may lead to some renewed interest in some of the issues raised by the member for Kavel. In addition to that, SAGRIC International has an active presence in Indonesia in a number of areas, and I was interested to see that.

One particular area was Austrain, which is a tripartite venture with New South Wales and a very exciting one. I think that offers enormous opportunities. Nevertheless, it is quite true that Indonesia is a market that by and large Australia has ignored. The Northern Territory is the one exception to that, but the rest of Australia has by and large ignored Indonesia. We do have some pluses that give us a foundation for building on. The point is that international trade will have to be a critical part of our future.

A number of other matters were raised, such as the small business sector. Clearly, there is important work that needs to be done with the small business sector. The member for Kavel will note that in the ministerial restructuring small business has come back into the business and regional development area to further develop those linkages. In addition to that, we have been doing what we can in a number of regards. I have given the undertaking that within this year the Business Licensing Centre will be established. In relation to the WorkCover issue, we have had reductions in the WorkCover rates in this State, and I believe that that is a clear benefit for business in South Australia.

The member for Bragg referred to a number of issues, one being the general winding down of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. He said that the department is going 'absolutely nowhere'. That is a very bad reflection on the dedicated work of a team of people in that department, and I do not think they will appreciate hearing comments such as that. It is true that some people have been transferred from the department, but that has been part of a strategic plan. The Economic Development Authority, as that the department is now known, is responsible for oversighting work in a number of other areas.

There has been a transfer of personnel to the Centre for Manufacturing. I do not want to go into extolling the great virtues of the Centre for Manufacturing, but they are there to be acknowledged, and I know that many members opposite do acknowledge them. Some of the staff have gone there. If the member for Bragg wants to refer to that as a winding down of the department, it is a strange analysis, because these people are going out into an effective service delivery agency. Some people have gone to the Department of Mines and Energy. Again, that is to focus more keenly that department in the minerals development area in an economic development kind of focus. Others have gone to the Department of Primary Industries. The member for Bragg has made a wrong analysis, and I am happy for him to be briefed by officers of the Economic Development Authority to put him right on this matter.

Comments were made on the employment figures by a number of members, including the Deputy Leader. The figures used by the Prime Minister were quoted. I refer members to the figures that I have quoted. I do not dispute the figures that the Prime Minister quoted, but I want to refer to the figures that I quoted with regard to what has happened to employment change from 1979 to 1992 and from 1982 to 1992. They are very edifying figures indeed. I do not have them immediately off the top of my head, but I have arranged with my office to ensure that they are with us tomorrow in the Committee stage so that we do not overlook those edifying figures.

I remind members yet again that, after a ceaseless decline in manufacturing employment—not in manufacturing output but in manufacturing employment—that started in the mid 1960s in Australia generally, not just in South Australia, and went on into the mid 1980s, we arrested that and saw manufacturing employment grow until 1990. In South Australia we saw it grow at three times the national average rate for manufacturing employment. Then we had the severe recession and that hurt employment in this State. It has hurt employment in manufacturing industry, but we are still ahead in terms of manufacturing employment in comparison with some

years ago. Those are the figures for which I think due credit could have been given by members opposite.

We had some difference of opinion from members opposite. It was clear that they had not had their Party room debate on the kind of general line that they wanted to follow. They all agreed that they supported the Bill, but the member for Coles was saying that, under the Playford Administration, all the functions listed for the Economic Development Board and Authority were fulfilled either by the Premier or the Cabinet.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is not so.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It may or may not have been so. I am not all that sure about that. Whatever the case, the member for Coles seemed to be suggesting that all these functions should be kept by Cabinet, yet she finished her second reading speech by supporting the Bill. There is a slight irony in that.

The member for Victoria took an entirely different tack. The member for Coles said that all this was done by the Premier and Cabinet, as if that is the right thing to do. I have to say that the reality was that it may or may not have been so in Playford's time, but the world was different in those days from what it is now. However, the member for Victoria says that the board is subject to control and direction by the Minister and that therein lies the problem. He goes on an entirely different tack and says that this should not be happening, and he tries to develop that argument somewhat facilely later. However, he ignores the fact that at the end of the day money is being made available to this board by the elected Government, which is raising that money from South Australians and which therefore has a responsibility to them about how that money is spent.

It is not unreasonable to think that there should be some direction and control by the Minister of a board's spending what would be not insignificant amounts of money. The member for Victoria cannot have it both ways. He has to accept that there has to be accountability, and that accountability must be matched by some two-way relationship, including direction and control.

The member for Hayward commented that, because the Labor Government has been in power for most of a generation in South Australia, how dare it bring in a report like the A.D. Little report which makes some strong comments as to where the economy of South Australia should go. The reality is that world circumstances change. If a community is not prepared to refocus and respond to the challenges, if instead it wants to keep its head in the sand, it deserves to be criticised.

This Government has the guts to recognise that circumstances do change and we are prepared to hear about those changes and recognise what kinds of changes need to be put in place. We are not unique in that. The Government of Singapore, which has had an enormous involvement in its own economic development, in the second half of the 1980s recognised that the world had changed, and they commissioned a major report, which indeed was very strident about where Singapore stood in the second half of the 1980s. It made many recommendations for changes. It said that the activities that Government had been doing to that point needed to change dramatically. That was not an indictment of the Government of Singapore; rather it should be credited with the fact that they recognised the changed circumstances and were prepared to have a report prepared on that and were prepared to listen to those recommendations and put them in place, which they have done and very successfully so. That is the kind of corollary we would see here in South Australia.

I also note that the member for Hayward seems to have forgotten about the electors of Hayward. I was rather perplexed that the poor electors of Hayward really no longer have a member. In his contribution, he said, 'I can truly say that the electors of Unley are as perplexed as I am about this Bill.' I tell you what they are perplexed about—it is the member for Hayward. He then goes on to talk about Unley. It is a fairly poor effort that an elected member of this place, paid for by the community through taxation revenue to represent a certain area, has determined, 'I don't care about all of you; I'm off.'

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I would not ask that question too often. The member for Hayward nearly got into trying to defend Jeff Kennett but then decided it was not worth the trouble and backed away. Well, I commend him for that. He then raised the example of Korea and what Korea is doing to industrial development. I might say it is interesting to note that Korea has many interesting lessons in economic development, but it also has some lessons that are not so positive. Indeed, industrial relations in Korea are not the golden area that many might suggest. It is interesting to note that the Korean automotive industry has been quite interested in many developments in the Australian automotive industry, because industrial relations here have in the longer term been better than industrial relations in the Korean automotive industry, and they are quite interested to see the kinds of things that a proper relationship between unions and business can achieve, as we have in this country.

We had a rather unedifying debate from the member for Hanson on foreign investment. It is certainly a concern when productive activity is lost to this country by foreign investment disinvesting, but the reality is that, in a population of 17 million people, with the resources that we have in this country and the capital needs to exploit those resources, in a timely way—in other words, now rather than later on when they may no longer be valuable resources because economic circumstances and relativities may have changed, and with the lack of personal saving rates that exist in this country—foreign investment is necessary.

I do not think there is much to be said by attacking foreign investment. I hope that the Economic Development Board is out there trying to attract foreign investment into this State, and I rather hope the sorts of comments made by the member for Hanson are not taken too seriously by potential foreign investors who might want to read it. The reality is that a number of these companies still see themselves very much as South Australian enterprises. I might say that SAFCOL, which is a multinational company, does see itself as a South Australian focused enterprise trading multilaterally in the world, but it still sees its focus here in South Australia, as Bob Bastian will well and truly attest, and I suggest

that the member for Hanson take up that matter with him.

The member for Hanson also raised an interesting example concerning Peterborough, and I congratulate him for what he seems to have done to help with whatever may have taken place up there. He talks about X hectares and various other things. It is all a bit anonymous, but apparently something exciting has happened up there, and the member for Hanson has played some role in it, and I commend him for that. All honourable members should play a positive role in these regards and I will give credit where credit is due.

There are other matters I could canvass but I think at this particular stage the hour is late and apparently the member for Hayward promises that we are going to have an intellectually invigorating debate in the Committee stage tomorrow on all these issues, so it is perhaps timely that we go home and get to bed to rest up for this enormous debate. Once again I thank honourable members for their contributions. I particularly thank honourable members for their indication that they support this Bill. It will be a big plus that when the board is established we can say nationally and internationally that this has been supported by the Parliament in the broadest sense of the word, so that that body will have the maximum credibility.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 11 February at 10.30 a.m.