HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 March 1994

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

ACTS INTERPRETATION (COMMENCEMENT PROCLAMATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: 3 to 5, 8, 16, 17, 23, 24, 32, 39, 60, 62, 65 and 66; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

In reply to **Hon. M.D. RANN** (Ramsay) 23 February.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: In response to the part of the question which relates to school closures, I refer the honourable member to the reply given by my colleague, the Minister for Education and Children's Services, in response to a similar question raised by the Hon. C.J. Sumner in the Legislative Council on 23 February 1994.

In response to the part of the question dealing with TAFE closures, I can advise as follows:

There is a commitment to full consultation with DETAFE communities regarding issues relating to the closure of campuses and in all cases this has led to a successful resolution of any decision to close a campus.

During the last decade, 10 TAFE campuses have been closed with the support of local communities and in all cases with an improvement in delivery of service to the overall TAFE community.

It is intended that this successful consultative process continue in the future should it be necessary, and within that context appropriate notice will be given.

PUBLIC SECTOR SALARIES

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I wish to advise the House of the approach that the Government is taking in establishing remuneration for public sector executives. At the election, the Government received a strong mandate for change and it is traditional that a new Government should exercise its right to structure the public sector to ensure its policies and programs are implemented effectively.

Through a series of decisions, including new executive appointments and changes to the Economic Development Board and the Economic Development Authority, the Government has already clearly demonstrated its intention to ensure that the resources of the public sector are focused on rebuilding the State's economy. In meeting this goal, the entire public sector must become performance oriented, efficient and accountable for the provision of the highest standards of service to the public. As in the private sector, the performance of the public sector depends to a significant degree on the leadership and competence of its chief executives and senior executives.

However, the system inherited by this Government to employ and pay executives is not consistent with a need to focus on accountability and performance. Instead, the emphasis has been on job security and maintaining the *status quo*. There are few sanctions for poor performance and no incentives for exemplary performance. The former Government did not use performance agreements as an accountability mechanism for chief executives. For example, one CEO contract negotiated by the former Government for a five-year period required the contract to be paid out in full even if it was determined that the performance of the executive did not justify continuing employment.

The former Government was also unwilling to move executives out of the public sector even when it recognised that there was no longer a role for them to play. For example, just before the election, the former Government finalised arrangements to appoint Mr Bruce Guerin, former Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, to the position of Director, Institute of Public Policy and Management, at Flinders University. I estimate this appointment will cost taxpayers $1 million over the next five years. At the end of the contracted period of appointment, Mr Guerin would have the right to resume a permanent position in the public sector at a CEO salary under the conditions agreed by the former Government.

This is the price taxpayers must meet because the former Government was unwilling to confront difficult decisions about Mr Guerin's future in the public sector. Executive employment conditions negotiated by the former Government also lacked consistency. Chief executives generally have been appointed for a five-year term, but most of them have security of tenure in the Public Service. Indeed, there are some who have their Chief Executive Officer salaries permanently guaranteed due to the transitional provisions of the Government Management and Employment Act.

Therefore, most chief executives have enjoyed the same protection of permanent work tenure as other public servants. This is inconsistent with practices in the private sector and some other public sectors in Australia. Senior executives below CEO level are appointed by the Commissioner for Public Employment, a statutory position with responsibilities lying external to the operations of each department. This confuses the lines of reporting and makes it difficult to hold chief executives accountable for the actions of people for whose appointment they are not responsible.

In relation to payment, executive remuneration has been formulated only on the basis of salary rather than total cost to Government, including major items such as car, superannuation and fringe benefits tax. As a result, the cost of vehicles has grossly under-valued the benefit received by chief executives and senior executives.

Executives driving private plated Government cars have had a charge of $540 per annum levied for a four cylinder car, and $756 per annum for a six cylinder car. Obviously, these charges do not reflect the true cost to Government and to the taxpayer. Issues I have raised reflect some of the inconsistencies in the practices inherited by my Government, which we are determined to change. These changes will include the adoption of fixed term performance based contracts with a four week notice provision when service is to be terminated for unsatisfactory performance. We will not tolerate the continuation of practices developed by the former Government, which impose the price of significant separation payments for changing senior Public Service executives.

As a result of obligations inherited by my Government, I advise the House that separation payments negotiated with senior executives since the election have included Dr Peter

Crawford, former CEO, Department of Premier and Cabinet, $164 250; Mr Peter Emery, former Under Treasurer, $250 000; Ms Anne Dunn, former CEO, Department for Family and Community Services, $250 000; Mr Robin Marrett, former CEO, Economic Development Authority, $212 870; Mr Eric Willmot, former CEO, Department for the Arts and Cultural Development, $211 416.40; and Ms Kaye Schofield, former CEO, Department of Labour and Administrative Services, $90 646.55.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Very cheap, indeed, if one compares it with just one Mr Guerin, who is costing us $1 million, and we still re-inherit Mr Guerin in five years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has leave to make a ministerial statement.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: With respect to Mr Emery and Ms Dunn, it should be noted that, in part, the payments reflect the fact that they had permanent tenure of appointment in the public sector. I also advise the House that for a strictly limited period Mr Emery will be continuing, essentially on a part-time basis, his involvement in the corporatisation of the State Bank. I compare the payments I have just listed with a $1 million legacy left by the former Government as the price of its unwillingness to deal with Mr Guerin's future in the public sector.

The House should appreciate that before the election the former Government approved a number of separation packages itself. This included a payment of $187 574.40 to Mr Hedley Bachmann, former CEO of the Department of Marine and Harbors. While his resignation took effect after the election, his package was approved by the former Government, as were a number of others. As well as ensuring that in the future taxpayers will not be liable for large separation payments for public sector executives, the Government is introducing important improvements in accountability, including formal performance agreements and appraisal systems.

Executive performance will be subject to regular review on the basis of clear lines of accountability and explicit standards in performance targets. In developing new practices there is a need to ensure that high achieving executives can be attracted to South Australia's public sector and retained. Accordingly—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —the Government's approach to executive remuneration will be based on a more competitive and strategically defined market position, so that the transformation of the public sector we want to achieve is not jeopardised by any lack of strategic leadership and high calibre executive talent. Contemporary executive remuneration models used in other public sectors and industry calculate the basic components which make up the total package. They include not just salary but items such as superannuation and a motor vehicle, as well as fringe benefits tax. The benefits need to be determined and identified on the basis of the true cost to the Government. This Government will have a fair but transparent method by which a motor vehicle and other benefits are included in executive packages.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, if the honourable member wishes to ask a question on this matter, I will certainly welcome one from him at the close of this ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles has continued to interject. The Chair has been most tolerant, but that tolerance has run out.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government will also simplify the executive salary structure from the existing six levels. In adopting fewer levels, each remuneration band will be linked to competence and accountability. Part of a remuneration package will be at risk through the incorporation of performance based incentives, with a clear link between individual performance and the achievement of well defined objectives.

In establishing the top range in each remuneration band, the Government's position is that public sector executives should not be paid beyond the mid point of the market, except in very extraordinary circumstances. The proposed link with a selected market median will have regard to such factors as the loss of job security for senior executives and the need to attract and retain top calibre executives. The Government has applied these new practices in determining the remuneration of Mr Michael Schilling as the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order. He can ask a question later.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Schilling's appointment followed consideration of a number of possible candidates. Members will be aware that Mr Schilling has acted in this position since 12 December last year. During this period he has assisted the Government in achieving significant progress in the implementation of its programs. His appointment is partly in recognition of that contribution, made in a period of considerable challenge, along with his expertise in change management and the restructuring of large organisations. These attributes, coupled with his extensive knowledge of the South Australian Public Service, made him the obvious choice for this crucial position. As the Government announced when making public Mr Schilling's appointment, he will receive a base salary of $111 485 per annum, an allowance of $64 548 and the normal entitlements of this position to a car, superannuation contributions and leave provisions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the member for Ross Smith that I have already spoken to him. He can take this as a first warning. The Premier has leave and I will ensure that he is allowed to make his ministerial statement.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In part, this allowance reflects my requirement that Mr Schilling perform a number of additional duties, including overseeing the Government's deregulation program, the public sector reform agenda, the coordination of strategic planning, project coordination and to chair the Public Sector Management and Coordination Council.

In a first for the South Australian Public Service, I have instigated an agreement with Mr Schilling that up to $20 000 per annum will be paid if work performance targets agreed between Mr Schilling and me have been met at the end of each year. It is important to recognise that the remuneration agreed with Mr Schilling is well below the level of remuneration recommended by an independent remuneration consultant for this position. By comparison, the current head of the Victorian Department of Premier and Cabinet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —receives a package totalling around $270 000 plus performance pay of up to 20 per cent per annum which, over a five year contract period, can add up to another 100 per cent of the package.

An honourable member: What does he get if he doesn't do his job?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If he does not do his job, he is out. It is as clear as that. The information I have put before the House today is a clear signal of the Government's expectations of performance by executives in the public sector. This Government is about best practice. While we are prepared to negotiate employment and pay conditions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —to reflect best practice, we will be demanding, in return, the highest levels of performance, with the ability to deal with inadequate performance in ways which do not impose excessive costs on taxpayers. It is my intention to fully implement these changes as soon as practicable with amendments, where required, to the Government Management and Employment Act.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—Report, 1992-93.

Worker's Liens Act—Regulations—Forms.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Friendly Societies Act—General Laws—Friendly Societies Medical Association Inc.

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Murray-Darling Basin Agreement—Schedule D.

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

Australian Health Commission Act—

Flinders Medical Centre—By-laws—Traffic.

Naracoorte Health Service Inc.—By-laws—Conduct of premises.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Corporation By-laws—Port Lincoln—No. 27—Garbage Containers.

District Council By-laws—Penola—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Moveable Signs.

No. 3—Streets and Public Places.

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

Meat Hygiene Authority—Report, 1992-93.

WORKCOVER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: WorkCover has this week released its quarterly performance report for the period ended 31 December 1993. The recent review of financial performance by the WorkCover actuary, Tillinghast, for the first six months of the financial year indicates that an operating surplus of almost $18 million was achieved. This is the result of a significant contribution from investment income which exceeded budget forecasts by almost $35 million.

The funding position of the scheme, that is, the balance between estimated liabilities and total assets, is essentially unchanged at the end of the first six months. Whilst the mid-year actuarial review estimates a marginal increase in outstanding claims liabilities, this was offset by an increase in the value of assets. However, management is of the view that the actuarial study underestimates the scheme's actual liabilities at the end of the first six months of 1993-94 and believes that the true liabilities, if account was taken of a deterioration in the rate at which claims are closed, would be $25 million to $35 million above the reported level.

The underlying trends in a number of indicators give rise to concern about the performance of the corporation and the scheme for the remainder of 1993-94. I now refer to those concerns.

In the claims area, claims costs have exceeded budget by over $5 million for the first six months of the financial year. This is attributed to greater than forecast growth in claims numbers (and, interestingly, that was an issue that we forecast for the last three or four years); below expected rate at which claims are closed; and claims payments which may have been brought forward.

The principal indicators of claims management performance show little change: the percentage of claims determined within 14 calendar days of receipt is below target and has remained virtually unchanged for the last six quarters; there has been some marginal improvement in the proportion of long-term income compensated claims that have commenced rehabilitation within six months, but this remains well below expectations; and the rate at which claims are closed are below actuarial estimates for virtually all types of claim.

There are a number of strategies in place by WorkCover to address these performance concerns including: a long-term claims strategy designed to improve return to work rates for open claims incurred in the years 1987-88 and 1988-89; a short-term claim strategy designed to ensure effective intervention (such as work placement and rehabilitation) on recent claims; and the maximising of the use of section 42a (compensation for loss of earning capacity) to reduce claim costs.

In relation to the levies and investment area, the levy collection is stable and on budget, though the target of collecting 92 per cent of levy within 10 calendar days of the due date was not achieved. Investment returns in the first six months have been outstanding and performance targets having been significantly exceeded. However, such levels of return cannot be sustained in the long term.

In relation to the prevention of injury, claim numbers continue to grow at rates which exceed the rate of employment growth. This is a particularly concerning trend given that employment growth is itself expected to occur as our economy recovers with a consequent increase in claims numbers. The corporation's major prevention efforts in the first six months focused on the safety achiever bonus scheme for large employers. The Government commitment to increase funding of practical workplace prevention programs in high risk industries and in small business by $2 million will complement this scheme. The new workers program, directed to young and inexperienced workers, was launched in February 1994. The Engineering Employers Group safety scheme is also expected to commence this month.

The performance of private exempt employers and Government departments has improved, but relative deficiencies remain in their prevention activities. As a consequence, it is unlikely the June 1994 performance targets will be met.

The Government will place greater responsibility on Chief Executive Officers in the public sector to address deficiencies in work place safety in Government departments.

While the mid-year review shows that the WorkCover scheme remains fully funded, it is a concern that the increase in claim numbers and the deterioration in rates at which claims are closed, which have been evident for the last eight months, did not receive greater attention from the previous Labor Government as they represent significant concerns for the long-term viability of the scheme. Unless structural changes are made to the WorkCover system, these concerning trends indicate that the previous Government has left this State with a scheme capable of again experiencing a blow out in unfunded liabilities (as it did in the late 1980s and early 1990s), with consequent increases in claim numbers, cost of claims and levy rates. Unlike the previous Labor Government, this Government will act to make the necessary changes to the WorkCover scheme and has the clear mandate of the people of South Australia to do so.

WATER QUALITY

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Infrastructure): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: A national approach to water quality has been raised at the recent COAG conference in Hobart. In particular, the Premier raised the matter in private discussions also with the Prime Minister. Specifically, blue green algae was discussed as a problem seriously affecting our water supply fed by the River Murray and its tributaries. South Australia is now at the leading edge of research on this worldwide problem. The Australian Centre for Water Quality Research, which includes the State Water Laboratory of the E&WS Department, has just been awarded grants totalling $265 000 from the Urban Water Research Association of Australia for further blue green algae research.

This brings the total external funding for algal toxin research by the Bolivar centre to over $1 million and reflects the high level of investigative research for which the centre is renowned. The additional funds will allow researchers to develop better methods of analysing paralytic shell fish poison toxins found in certain types of blue green algae, like the *Anabaena* species currently in Lake Alexandrina. They will assist research staff to investigate the factors which lead to their production and to observe what happens to the poisons during water treatment. This funding success will expand the already substantial existing departmental programs carried out in this area and will contribute significantly to vital research already being carried out at the centre.

In addition to this, South Australia will also host an international workshop in Adelaide this month on toxic algae, where over 35 leaders in the field from 10 countries will gather to discuss the most recent developments in research and consider the benefits from international collaboration. This is a significant coup for South Australia, because it is the first time this research group has met in Australia. The program is being hosted jointly by the Australian Centre for Water Quality Research, the American Water Works Association and the Study Centre for Water Research in Belgium.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY BOMBING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: At approximately 0915 hours on 2 March 1994, South Australians were reminded of the ever present danger facing police and emergency services when a bomb exploded in the NCA offices on the 12th floor of the CPS Credit Union Building in Waymouth Street. As a result of the explosion, Detective Sergeant Geoff Bowen was killed and five staff were injured. My sincere condolences and those of all my parliamentary colleagues go to the wife and family of Detective Bowen.

To accept this tragedy as part of the job of a police officer is an enormous request. This terrible incident is a pointed reminder of the commitment and the dedication, as well as the extreme danger, that our police officers face from day to day. A package was collected from the Adelaide GPO by courier and delivered to the office of the National Crime Authority. The parcel was scanned and cleared. Detective Bowen was opening the parcel when the bomb exploded. He was killed instantly and lawyer Peter Wallis injured seriously. Mr Wallis is currently in hospital, having undergone surgery, and I understand will require further surgery. To him and his injured colleagues we wish a speedy recovery. Our thoughts also go to their families and loved ones.

The incident was declared a major crime almost immediately. This activated the task force policing plan, which enables the South Australian Police to respond in a structured and planned way to pool together resources under a clear incident management structure. Resources from all areas of the South Australian Police Force were activated and personnel with additional specialist skills seconded to the task force. The task force includes 16 full-time detectives and 30 technical services people working extended hours. The State Forensic Science Centre has been working virtually non-stop. All areas of the South Australian Police Force have been involved in various tasks. Counselling was initiated by the South Australian Police and other agencies, including the Australian Federal Police, with National Crime Authority approval.

Several lines of inquiry were commenced and are still ongoing. Assistance is being provided by the National Crime Authority, the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence and the Victorian State Forensic Science Laboratory. The task force has spent a lengthy time at the scene of the crime to collect and examine all material, to reconstruct the scene and determine the type of explosive used, composition of bomb housing and the amount of explosive. The forensic evidence gathering is time consuming but is absolutely vital to achieve a conviction. A number of premises have been searched and people interviewed. A $500 000 reward, provided jointly by the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments, has been posted for information leading to the identification of the person or persons responsible for this bombing.

Cabinet responded immediately by ensuring that an appropriate reward was available to assist the police in their inquiries. A 24-hour hotline has been established and people with any information have been encouraged to contact police on a special inquiry telephone number. The initial public response has been heavy and a steady stream of quality information is now being provided to the investigators.

It is also worth noting that Waymouth Street was reopened to traffic on the evening of the bombing and that the NCA offices have been handed back to staff today. I pay tribute to the swift action of all emergency services personnel involved. Their rapid response time resulted in the quick extinguishing of fire, prompt medical treatment and transfer of injured to hospital, cordoning off and evacuation of the incident scene and the activation of the Police Operations Centre. South Australians can be justly proud of the efforts of their emergency service personnel in these most trying of circumstances.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTIONS

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier give a guarantee that the introduction of compulsory inspections for motor vehicles will not require the payment of an inspection fee, as such a new tax would break the undertaking given by the Premier and confirmed by the Treasurer in this House on 17 February not to introduce any new taxes without the resignation of the Government? The Minister for Transport has announced possible proposals to investigate the introduction of compulsory checks each time a motor vehicle is sold in South Australia. Interstate, such a requirement attracts a fee. In New South Wales the current fee for inspections is $23.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, it was clearly stated before the election that the Liberal Party would look at this matter by referring it to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, which is a standing committee of the Parliament. I would have thought that this was the very sort of matter that would be considered by that committee. After all, the Labor Party has members on that committee, where they can make their point, and no doubt they will. The Government has made no policy decision to introduce—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government has made no policy decision to introduce compulsory testing of vehicles. All we have done is refer the issue to the standing committee of the Parliament for it to investigate and make a recommendation to Parliament.

GUERIN, MR BRUCE

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): What is the present status in the public sector of Mr Bruce Guerin, former Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: During my ministerial statement I raised the issue of Mr Guerin at Flinders University. Immediately on coming to government I determined that this was one matter that would be investigated, and I was concerned to see that the Government actually signed a contract during the period of the election campaign to confirm the position of Mr Guerin at Flinders University. As I said in my ministerial statement, in fact he has been made a director of an Institute of Public Policy and Management at Flinders University.

What concerns me is the whole basis on which the former Government did this. First, it had said that Mr Guerin could receive his full entitlement as the former head of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. In other words, for the next five years Mr Guerin continues to receive the full salary that the Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet would receive, plus any further increase in that salary that may be awarded at any time during the five year period. On top of that, he is entitled to a Government car with private number plates and also to superannuation; and, on top of that again, the Government paid a further $100 000 to get him established at Flinders University. On top of that yet again, he has the full entitlement to come back into the Public Service at his CEO level at the end of five years and to continue with permanency in the South Australian public sector.

I would have to describe that as the worst contract I have seen, written against the interests of the public of South Australia—the taxpayers—who are paying the bill. It is absolutely astounding that we should be paying an academic exactly the same salary as the CEO of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet with no ability whatsoever for the paying party, that is, the Government of South Australia or the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, even to scrutinise Mr Guerin's performance while he is in that position. For five years we pay the salary with no recall on Mr Guerin's performance, output or anything else involving that position, and I find that absolutely astounding and clearly against the interests of the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Members opposite should be ashamed of themselves for ever agreeing to a contract like that, particularly as Mr Guerin had stepped down as the CEO of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet when the then new Premier, Mr Arnold, took up the position, back in about September 1992.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have still been trying to find the results of the work carried out by Mr Guerin between September of—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has leave. There are far too many interjections from both my right and left and I will take action on either side of the House if they persist.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out to the House that Mr Guerin stepped down as CEO of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet in September 1992. The contract was signed for him to take up the position at Flinders University in November 1993. We are still trying to identify the work that he carried out in that period of approximately 15 months.

The Hon. S.J. Baker: He was on stress leave.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, he was not on stress leave; he had been on stress leave prior to that date. We are still trying to find out what work was carried out in that 15 month period. In particular, the then Premier, Mr Arnold, pointed out to this House in the Estimates Committees that Mr Guerin was writing a report on the overseas offices of the Government. We are still trying to find that report. The best we can find is that—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You were the head of the Premier's Department. You were responsible and you commissioned the report. Why did you not ask for a copy of the report? We cannot find it. We have asked for it within Government but we cannot find it, and it highlights the fact that the former Labor Government failed to take any hard decisions when it came to replacing CEOs; and we, the taxpayers, will have to pay dearly for this for at least the next five years, if not well beyond.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTIONS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. During the Minister's negotiations last year with the Motor Traders Association regarding the introduction of compulsory motor vehicle inspections, was it agreed that traders would conduct inspections for a fee if the system was introduced in this State, and did the Liberal Party receive a six-figure donation to its election campaign fund from the association?

Last year the member for Bragg told Parliament that he met the motor traders and discussed proposals for the introduction of compulsory motor vehicle testing. It was also revealed at that time by the former Deputy Premier, Don Hopgood, that during these discussions the Liberal Party had requested a donation of $100 000 for its election campaign, presumably in exchange for a change in policy direction. Dr Hopgood revealed that the deal involved the Liberal Party's promising to legislate to provide for the compulsory inspection of motor vehicles—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is now commenting. You were given leave to explain your question, not to comment. If you continue to comment, leave will be withdrawn.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am quoting from Dr Don Hopgood, who was a member of this House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is debating the issue. He will abide by the ruling of the Chair or leave will be withdrawn.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Dr Hopgood said that a Liberal Government would legislate to eliminate the traditional consumer protection responsibilities from the Consumer Affairs Office. We have seen *Fightback!* Now we are seeing '*Payback!*'

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Perhaps it would help the Deputy Leader of the Opposition if he read what Dr Hopgood said two days later.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: What Dr Hopgood said two days later in this Parliament, and it is in *Hansard*, was that he accepted the explanation by the member for Bragg and he was disappointed that he had asked the question because he understood that the question that he had asked two days earlier was incorrect.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Perhaps the Deputy Leader should go back into his own files and look at some of the things that he used to do. I recall that the previous Government used to supply to the union movement the names of all the people employed in the public sector who were not union members so that the union movement could take the matter up. It was a hit list, and that was one of the sorts of issues that the previous Government used to get into.

I have no concerns about my actions in this Parliament and I have put on the public record my position, which is that I was not involved—and if members wish to go back and look at *Hansard* they will find that I was not involved—in any discussions relating to donations and the issue that is going on now. I think that the Deputy Leader ought to have a discussion with the very honourable man that Dr Hopgood is, and, instead of being the sleazebag that this gentleman is, why does he not uphold the traditions of Dr Hopgood and every other Deputy Leader?

Mr QUIRKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think it would be reasonable to ask for a retraction of that remark.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One point of order at a time. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is capable of raising the matter himself if he takes offence to it. I suggest that the terms used by the Minister are not in the best interests of the Parliament and are not conducive to the reasonable conduct of proceedings. Therefore, I ask him to modify his comments.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I withdraw the term and replace it with 'this honourable member.'

EDUCATION REVIEW

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Has the Treasurer been advised of claims by politically active members of the South Australian Institute of Teachers that it is being denied access to the intensive review of education currently being conducted by the Audit Commission?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Yes, I saw a media release by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. There was some suggestion that the Institute of Teachers should play a major role in the auditing of the Education Department, and there was some suggestion from other unions that they should have an intimate involvement in the Audit Commission's review of this State and its finances. We do not do such things: we do not get unions involved, and we do not get people involved in this process. We get an outside body to assess the quality of the performance, finances and situation of the State as it is today.

We can surmise how difficult the finances are, and I have made a number of statements about that over a period. Before the election we made it clear that the Audit Commission would report on the State's finances and, indeed, that it would carry out some specialised studies, which it is doing, into education, health and water resources. It is important that this exercise be undertaken, because, unless we know the state of our assets, unless we know the state of our finances and unless we know how we are performing according to national benchmarks, then as a State and Government we cannot hold our heads high, because the information has not been provided.

We know that we are facing an extraordinarily difficult situation, brought about by the mismanagement of the previous Government. We have to get a report which is not biased from the point of view of the participants and which does not involve the input of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. We should not have the Institute of Teachers involving itself in an audit, nor the Public Service Association or any other union. When the Auditor-General reports on a department, he does not call in all the affected players and say, 'Would you like to make a submission?' That is not the way it happens. The Audit Commission is progressing extremely well. There have been selected consultancies in the three areas that I have mentioned. The Audit Commission will be reporting during April, and the amount of information that is now coming to light is amazing.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTIONS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial

Affairs. During the discussions that the Minister had last year with the Motor Traders Association, which he has confirmed, can he explain the extent to which the inspection of motor vehicles being sold would upgrade the roadworthiness of vehicles in South Australia, given that a large percentage of vehicles change ownership infrequently and would not be subject to inspection even if they were defective, and was it agreed that traders would conduct inspections for a fee if the system was introduced in South Australia?

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Standing Orders require that Ministers must answer questions for which they are responsible to the House. I would put it to you, Sir, that no Minister in this place as a shadow Minister was responsible to this House for anything.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr Brindal: There is.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Unley that he will be named if he again defies the ruling of the Chair. The honourable member left this House last Thursday in what appeared to me to be a less than favourable disposition towards the Chair. He is warned for the first time and will be named if it becomes necessary. There is no point of order. The Chair will make a determination. If the honourable member feels aggrieved, it is up to him to take the appropriate action. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you for your protection, Sir. A spokesperson for the RAA described the move towards compulsory inspections as an unnecessary impost on motorists, and said that inspections had no real effect on road safety and penalised the majority of motorists for the sake of the minority. The spokesperson said that in New South Wales surveys showed that despite regular testing the rate of unroadworthiness of cars was about the same as in other States.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As the honourable member would be aware, there is a motion in the Legislative Council to discuss this issue, and I understand there is reference to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NORTHFIELD DEVELOPMENT

Mr TIERNAN (Torrens): In light of the recently released survey from the Real Estate Institute, and the increase in affordability in housing in South Australia, can the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations provide any details of the progress of the new Northfield development? The recent slow rate of progress of the Northfield development is adversely affecting the quality of life of a large number of families who live in Hillcrest and Gilles Plains, in the District of Torrens, and that includes the redevelopment of primary schools in those areas. Any acceleration of the Northfield development project will be welcome news to the residents of Hillcrest and Gilles Plains.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The Northfield development reflects the growing confidence which has been sweeping through South Australia since December. Prior to Christmas (the October/November period) all the statistics and indicators showed very clearly that by this time this year we would be in the grip of a major downturn in commencements in the private housing market.

As all observers will have noted, the trend has gone the other way and we have seen a complete about-face, a complete back flip on the statistics and, in fact, we are riding on a crest in respect of new developments in the private housing market. Northfield is reflecting that, and the honourable member would be aware that Northfield is a joint venture between the South Australian Government and the private sector. I can advise the honourable member that the number of take up allotments is now greater than that budgeted. We had budgeted for 139, but they have now increased to 152.

It has been such a success in recent weeks that the developers are planning to release Stage 5 ahead of time and, as that stage adjoins a central park and some reserves which contain ornamental lakes, we expect the uptake to be even greater. I can also report that building work is progressing on the combined builder display village, and the first private dwellings of nearly 60 houses have been completed. Also, to reflect the success of the development and the private sector, which is involved, the Enfield council recently awarded the project the Outstanding Business Achievement Award. The project is a success; it is ahead of schedule, and I would attribute much of that to the resurgence of confidence that has been running through South Australia since the election.

WOMEN'S ADVISORY SERVICE

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier reaffirm his commitment to maintain the Women's Advisory Service within the Premier's Department? As the House would be aware, today is International Women's Day. I have been informed that the Government is considering abolishing the position of Women's Adviser to the Premier and the Women's Advisory Service within the Premier's Department, contrary to a statement the Premier made on 24 October 1993 when he said:

> The Women's Advisory Service in the Premier's Department—we'll maintain that.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I stand by the commitment I made in October 1993. We will maintain that service. However, we are restructuring its administration and, in fact, decisions are already being made as to how that is best achieved. We have a Minister for the Status of Women, and it is appropriate that the Minister for the Status of Women be the person who is responsible for this whole area.

Without wanting to pre-empt decisions that I think will be made very shortly, I can say that we will be upgrading the status we give women in respect of the opportunity for women to more fairly express their views to the Government in a much broader forum than has been the case up until now. In other words, we are upgrading the role that the status of women has within the whole of Government and making sure that it is far more effective. It is fair to say that when I became Premier I looked at the whole area of the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the way that the Women's Adviser sat there and, in many ways, the lack of influence she had across the whole of Government.

The former Premier now shakes his head, but that is clearly the case. I indicate to the House that we are standing by our election promise because we want to make sure that we upgrade the status of women within South Australia.

MEDICARE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of the South Australian Government's response to the proposal to increase the Medicare levy?

The SPEAKER: I point out to the Minister that this is a matter for which we do not have direct responsibility in this State.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I accept that, Mr Speaker, but I point out that there is a Commonwealth-State agreement in relation to Medicare and, indeed, it was the Medicare Agreement that affected so many country hospitals around the State, including a number of electorates which swung from the Labor Party to the Liberal Party at the last election. So, whilst we do not have any specific taxation responsibility, we do have a major interest in this matter.

I thank the member for Newland for her question, which is particularly important as it deals with a Federal taxation increase. Nothing more and nothing less—increased taxation. Senator Richardson, the Federal Minister for Health, has indicated that he wants this money for new initiatives. I point out to Senator Richardson that his old initiatives are not working, either. As I have said before, the Medicare levy is nothing more or less than a Federal tax. It started at one per cent; it went up to 1.25 per cent; last year it crept up to 1.4 per cent; and now we hear inexorably another 40 per cent increase. It appears that it is by no means coincidental that this increased tax grab by the Federal Government comes at the same time as its decision that it cannot get the jobs levy up. It needs more money, and it will tackle this issue via the Medicare levy.

The system simply is not working at the moment; this much vaunted system is disadvantaging the very people for whom it was devised. In fact, the massive shift to the public hospital system, because of the lack of incentive to be privately insured, means the system is now so full that the foundations are cracking. The remedy is simple: the system needs to offer people an incentive to enter the private health system. So, let us look at the system that Senator Richardson—the much maligned Federal Minister for Health, according to the Prime Minister—is thinking of introducing to try to encourage people to enter the private health system. The first reaction to that was from Access Economics, which said that there would be an increase in private health insurer's premiums of 20 per cent. Australian Private Hospitals Association indicated a potential increase of 12 per cent.

In case members opposite believe that perhaps those groups have a biased position, let us look at what the architect of Medicare, Dr Deeble, said about Senator Richardson's proposal. He said that without any shadow of a doubt it would increase private health insurance premiums by 10 per cent. The reason people are getting out of private health insurance is that they cannot afford to be in it now. Quite frankly, Senator Richardson is on the wrong track. Unfortunately, unless something is done, the State will be left to bear the burden once again of increasing financial pressures as people get out of the private health system and desert it in droves because they cannot afford to be in it. This means that the public system, which was devised for people who are unable to afford private health insurance, will become overburdened, with longer waiting lists and so on.

People with private health insurance actually pay three times for their health care. First, they pay via their taxes, because everyone pays taxes, and the Medicare levy does not pay for the total health care bill. They pay a second time with the Medicare levy, which we hear the Federal Government wishes to increase by 40 per cent. They pay a third time when they pay very considerable private health insurance premiums. What will happen if and when Medicare premiums rise by 40 per cent? The very people who can least afford it will have to pay. Struggling families will be asked to pay this money. I ask members opposite: where is the social justice in that? There is absolutely none. It is nothing more and nothing less than an increase in tax. This increase in taxation is a classic socialist response to a major problem. It indicates that the Federal Minister for Health has been rolled.

COAG MEETING

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier now accept that his approach in the lead-up to the COAG meeting was wrong and that he was an abject failure in arguing his position at his first heads of Government meeting?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Prior to the Council of Australian Government meeting in Hobart, the Premier said in this House:

> It concerns me that the Commonwealth Government is pushing ahead with the Hillmer recommendations. . . I thought I had put down a pretty clear position that we were not accepting the Commonwealth's stance. . .

Despite the Premier's apparent tough public stance prior to COAG, he was ineffectual in arguing his case and within 24 hours totally reversed his position from opposing the Hillmer recommendations to supporting them. An article in the *Australian* of Monday 28 February, based on an interview with Professor Hillmer, states:

> Western Australia and South Australia dropped their publicly stated objections and agreed to a uniform State position at a private strategy meeting of the six Premiers in Hobart last Thursday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It appears that the Leader of the Opposition does not even understand what happened at the COAG meeting. It appears that the Leader of the Opposition does not even realise that the communique put down by the Federal Government, including the Prime Minister, was totally rejected by the State Governments and thrown out. Instead, the communique adopted by the State Governments reflected exactly the position that I put in this Parliament.

Let us look at some of the issues that were picked up in the final communique and which I outlined to this Parliament. I refer to the fact that Hillmer would produce very significant problems for State Governments throughout Australia, and particularly here in South Australia, with bodies like ETSA, the E&WS, the taxi industry and others. I refer also to the fact that the States should have the opportunity to carry out an audit to find out what the impact would be before agreeing to any Federal legislation. That is exactly the position that was adopted. The Deputy Premier was sitting there throughout this, including the private lunch that we had with the Prime Minister, where the Prime Minister backed down completely from the Federal communique.

It was on the absolute insistence of South Australia that it was included that the Commonwealth must consider the payment of compensation to the States for any loss of income that the States may suffer as a result of Hillmer—again, a position I put down in the ministerial statement in this House immediately prior to going to the COAG meeting. So, I am not quite sure what fantasy magazine the Leader of the Opposition has been reading, because quite clearly, for the first time, the State Governments got together and stuck to a

line. We had a meeting on the Thursday before COAG, we stuck to the line and we got our communique through, and it was the Federal Government that had to back down.

The interesting thing that a number of State Premiers said to me was, 'Gee, it is nice to have a Premier from South Australia who is prepared to stand up for his own State, and to stick to a position that has been put down by the other State Governments.' What they found in the past was that former South Australian Premiers simply grabbed at the coat tails of Keating and went along with everything he did, including in respect of issues such as native title. I suggest that, if the Leader of the Opposition has any doubt about that, he just pick up the telephone and ring a number of the State Premiers and ask for their views as to the stance taken by South Australia compared with earlier stances.

I am quite pleased to tell the Leader which Premiers in particular commented on this fact. It was the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales, the Chief Minister from the Northern Territory, the Premier of Tasmania and the Premier of Western Australia, who even went to the bother of telephoning me the next day to reinforce his point of view. At long last, and for the first time, the Federal Government has stood up and recognised that there is a rightful place for the States in the Federation of Australia—something which the Labor Government of South Australia was not prepared to stand up and insist upon.

Mr ROSSI: First, Mr Speaker, I want to raise a point of order in respect of these galahs on my right.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Lee wants to take a point of order, he must not comment or make reflections on any other member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is completely out of order. If the honourable member wants to raise a matter in relation to the conduct of another member, he must refer to that member by his or her district.

SABCO

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Can the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development explain to the House how South Australia has managed to woo a little bit of Victoria to South Australia? I read a small report on the weekend about the reopening of the well known company SABCO, the former South Australian Brush Company which, incidentally, is in my electorate. I understand that the parent company has been convinced to relocate to South Australia from Victoria.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This is another good news story for South Australia, hot on the heels of ACI ($90 million), Cathay Pacific and the Australian Aviation College, the Lobethal mill, and now SABCO, a South Australian company which unfortunately went into receivership in 1992 with debts of some $24 million. As a result of that, the jobs of SABCO workers in South Australia were under severe risk, to the extent that they agreed to take a cut in pay to try to keep the operation going in the interim. It looked like the company would not survive in the long term.

A company by the name of Tomlin, of which Mr Robert Happell is Managing Director, bought the company from the receivers last year. His company operated a facility in Victoria which employed some 65 people. At that stage, there was some risk of the operation's being transferred out of South Australia and consolidated in Victoria.

There were extensive negotiations, and I acknowledge the role of the Centre for Manufacturing in this regard together with its enterprise improvement program—coupled with this Government's policies on workers compensation, industrial relations and a number of other initiatives that are creating a pro-business climate in South Australia, something which the business community in this State has not had the benefit of for the last decade or more. We have been able to achieve financial restructuring of SABCO, which has over 50 per cent of the Australian market regarding a number of its products and which is a well known household name right throughout Australia.

Not only were we able to save SABCO and 85 jobs but also we have attracted from Victoria all the operations of the Tomlin company, including its metal work, contract moulding facilities and administration from Geelong and Port Melbourne. The whole lot has now relocated in South Australia, with the managing director relocating two weeks ago into this State. That means that, instead of our just protecting the 85 jobs, which was our initial objective, we have also achieved expansion to 160 jobs in South Australia. In addition to that, the Tomlin company is starting a three-shift operation at SABCO in South Australia. It did not bring the other 80 workers over from Victoria; they are 80 new jobs created in South Australia for South Australians. Whilst we might have lost the Grand Prix to Victoria because of lack of diligence on behalf of the former Government, we are attracting long-term jobs to South Australia from Victoria.

STATE DEBT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Treasurer have a targeted debt reduction by the end of this year and, if so, what is the figure? On 6 October 1993, the *Advertiser* reported that the then shadow Treasurer had said that the sale of land and buildings would be a key element of a Liberal strategy expected to cut between $700 million and $800 million from State debt in the first year of office. This statement was reinforced on 3 December with the announcement that land and building sales would contribute some $260 million towards this target of debt reduction. On 24 February, the Treasurer told this House:

> If I had said that we were going to write off $800 million worth of debt by 31 December 1994, obviously I would have been derelict in my duty.

We would like to know what the figure is for this year.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I think that the Opposition is hard of hearing. I made a number of comments when we last dealt with this same question. Not only are members opposite hard of hearing but obviously they have no better thoughts on their minds or any interesting questions to ask of the Government at this time, because they have seen how they have been dealt with.

Importantly, when we laid down a debt strategy we made it clear from the beginning that it was a debt strategy to the year 1997-98. There was no confusion amongst anybody about what the level of debt was to be in particular years because we have never outlined that. We are trying to grapple with the budget we have been left with, for goodness sake. And members opposite know just how flawed that budget was: they know all the dirty little things that were done with the finances to make a huge deficit into a surplus to make the budget look a little bit better for the election.

So the last thing I would have put down was any strategy to reduce debt in this first financial year, simply because we

did not know what the figures were: we were relying on the former Government, which had never been particularly helpful or, in fact, honest about the way it approached the situation. Therefore, we can have no confidence in the figures that were provided at the time.We have never put down a strategy for reducing debt in this financial year. We have said, 'Visit us again in 1997-98, and then talk to us about whether we have hit our targets.'

LAKE EYRE BASIN

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): During the Australian heritage ministerial conference in Canberra last week, did the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources raise any issue of concern to South Australia, in particular in relation to the Lake Eyre Basin?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Norwood for his question. I attended the biannual Ministers conference on heritage issues in Canberra. As a matter of fact, I was given the opportunity to chair a significant part of that meeting, but before taking the chair I took the opportunity to advise the conference of the South Australian Government's objection to world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre Basin and in particular its serious concern about not being consulted by the Commonwealth on the issue since coming into office. Our objection was noted in the minutes of the meeting and I gained considerable support in the concern that I expressed at that conference.

I had arranged a meeting to see the Hon. Ros Kelly in relation to the Lake Eyre Basin issue at 5.30 p.m. on Monday 28 February but, for reasons known to all of us, that was not possible. I was running about three hours late. However, I used that time to meet with the Executive Director of the Australian Heritage Commission, Sharon Sullivan, and I raised a number of other issues including the Old Queen's Theatre in Playhouse Lane, Adelaide. I advised Ms Sullivan of my support as Heritage Minister and also of the support of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw as Arts Minister for the restoration of the Old Queen's Theatre, and I sought information about possible sources of Commonwealth funding.

As members of this House would realise, the Old Queen's Theatre is the oldest theatre on mainland Australia and its restoration is a matter of national significance, deserving national, State and local support. It represents a magnificent opportunity to combine heritage and the arts with support coming from the three spheres of government and the community, and I am pleased to advise the member for Norwood that I will be further pursuing the issue through each sphere of government.

So my time was used constructively, and I am pleased that yet again I had the opportunity to make quite clear, particularly to the Commonwealth Government representatives who were at that meeting, the attitude and the policy we have in this State regarding the world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre Basin.

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Has the Minister for Emergency Services or any members of his office or of the Correctional Services Department had any discussions with representatives from the wine or grape growing industries concerning the future use and possible sale of the Cadell prison property and, if so, were any agreements reached that would pre-empt the inquiry by his department into the future use of this facility as a prison?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the honourable member for his question. First, it would be remiss of me not to congratulate the honourable member on his elevation to the front bench. I recall with fond memories the occasion on which the now member for Giles welcomed me when I became Opposition spokesman for correctional services and listed my predecessors, saying that I too would move on. I must say that the member for Giles looks very good from here in his new role, and I thank him for his time when I was Opposition spokesman—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I would suggest to the Minister that he now answer the question.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I was going to mention, with your agreement, Mr Speaker, the former member for Playford, Mr Gregory, who is no longer spokesman: there is a new spokesman.

No member of my office or staff has been in contact with any wine growing or grape growing company. However, one of my assistant directors from the Correctional Services Department has, I understand, been involved in some discussions with a grape growing company to determine whether there would be any interest from that company in working with the Correctional Services Department to supervise the planting and growing of vines on the Cadell property and also to utilise the grapes from that property to try to do something to boost the income of that farm.

That particular avenue of investigation is one of many that are being undertaken by my department at this time. The new Opposition spokesman should be aware that the Correctional Services Department is undertaking a number of areas of investigation to determine how we can best utilise our present prisons system and how we can best undertake a more effective prison industry service.

In this State at present we spend about $8 million per annum on prison industries with a net return of just $800 000. That makes our prison industries in South Australia some of the most inefficient, if not the most inefficient, in Australia. In many other States they are able to utilise income from prison industries to reduce the overall cost of imprisonment. My officers will continue to pursue those areas of investigation to determine how we can make our prison industries much more efficient.

ONKAPARINGA INSTITUTE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. How will the capital works project currently under way at the Noarlunga campus of the Onkaparinga Institute of Vocational Education help address the training and employment needs of young people living in the Noarlunga region? As the local member for the Noarlunga area, I am concerned about the high levels of unemployment and the lack of training opportunities, especially for young people.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Kaurna for her question and her ongoing interest as the local member. Work has started on the Noarlunga campus and, in particular, on upgrading the car park. Work will start shortly on the building expansion. The southern area, of which that campus is a part, has one of the lowest participation rates for TAFE in the State, being less than half the rate for the rest of the

metropolitan area. That area also has some of the highest youth unemployment levels not just in South Australia but in Australia.

It is important that the area be provided with adequate training facilities not only for young people but for people of other age groups as well. The new facility, which has been approved by Cabinet, will cost about $11.7 million and will be completed by June 1995. It will cater for the emerging growth in the viticulture, retailing, tourism and community services areas, as well as expansion in the existing areas of business studies, computing, hairdressing, hospitality and a range of other programs. It is an exciting new development. TAFE is in an expansionary phase in South Australia and, as Minister, I intend to drive it vigorously to ensure that our work force has the best training opportunities in Australia and that it is used to create employment opportunities both in that region and in other parts of the State.

PRISON CLOSURES

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Has the Minister for Emergency Services undertaken a study of the impact that the closure of prisons at Port Lincoln and Cadell will have on local economies, and will he say what consultation he has had with local communities and with the members for Custance and Flinders? On 1 March this year the Minister confirmed that his department was examining the future of key prison facilities, that this was likely to result in the closure of the small prisons at Cadell and Port Lincoln, and that these prisons had been ordered to justify their existence or face closure on economic grounds.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I repeat that at present in our department we are examining the prisons system to determine how it can best be utilised. The reason for that—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the honourable member listens, he will hear the reply to the question. At present South Australia has the most expensive prisons system per capita in Australia. This Government has inherited a prisons system that compares with prisons systems in other States as follows. Excluding capital, in South Australia we have a cost of $56 438 per capita to keep a person in prison for one year. The next worse State is Victoria, which has a cost of $43 389. It is quite a difference from $56 000 to $43 000. Queensland has a cost of $39 170; Western Australia, $42 919; Tasmania, $41 780; the Northern Territory, $43 139; and New South Wales, $23 375.

When I cited those costs previously while in Opposition, the previous Government claimed they were wrong: the previous Government through two successive Ministers claimed that those costs were wrong. Since coming to government, we have confirmed through the Department of Correctional Services that those costs are correct. South Australia has the most expensive prisons system in Australia. Whether the Opposition likes it or not, this Government has a mandate for change, and I think it is reasonable to expect that the taxpayer would want us to bring down the cost of imprisonment in this State and, in so doing, to make sure that we have effective prison industries and that we are providing effective education and rehabilitation programs. One cannot point to those factors in South Australia and even suggest that our costs could be higher because of education/rehabilitation being more effective, because it is not.

I am not about to pre-empt what my department's recommendations may be to me. It is undertaking an evaluation of every institution in South Australia to determine how our prisons system can best be utilised and how costs can be contained. When that process is completed and the recommendations have been put to the Government, I will report back to this Parliament further.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles.

SPEED CAMERAS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister for Emergency Services inform the House of the rationale behind the decision to erect speed camera signs for motorists to see after they have passed through radar units? How will this innovation prevent people from feeling that the radar units are not merely revenue raising devices?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Along with other Government reviews of previous Government inefficiencies, we have had a look at exactly how speed cameras have been used in South Australia. In Opposition I continually claimed, as did many of my colleagues, that speed cameras were not being used effectively for road safety purposes. On coming into government and discussing the ways in which cameras could be better utilised with the Police Commissioner, it seems that those cameras were not being used effectively to bring down the road toll.

As a consequence, at the request of the Commissioner and in consultation with me, the Police Department has been developing a more effective way of utilising speed cameras to ensure that they are not used for revenue raising purposes but as an effective and efficient road safety method. When that review is completed and decisions have been made by the Commissioner, I will bring back to this Parliament the details of how speed camera operation will occur in South Australia.

If the honourable member has seen a sign in any location in the metropolitan area of the nature that he describes, it is there because the sign is part of a trial and, when the trials are completed, the department will be in a better position to make a decision and henceforth a recommendation.

TAPESTRIES

Mrs HALL (Coles): Is the Premier aware of a serious suggestion that the Government intends to hang a woman later this year in the House of Assembly?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I must confess that there are plans to hang not one but three women in the House of Assembly later this year. As members would realise, there is a specific proposal to hang two magnificent tapestries in this Chamber. Those tapestries are now being woven in the main foyer of the National Australia Bank in King William Street. I was there last week and watched a number of the overseas writers who were visiting Adelaide as part of Writers Week weave part of the tapestries—a very small part—and I have woven a small share myself in the black area. The tapestry is magnificent even though it is yet unfinished. It is a tapestry of the portrait of women but the detail of the signatures on the tapestry needs to be seen to be believed.

I make a timely reminder to everyone in South Australia, and especially to members as they sit in this Chamber, that South Australia led the world, first, in giving women the right to vote and, secondly, in giving them the right to stand for election to the Parliament. It was a unique step. Suffragists such as Mary Lee, who will be one of those depicted in the tapestry, did so much for the cause of women, not just here

in South Australia and Australia but throughout the world. I am delighted that our Parliament is about to pay tribute to that. At least two of these rather sombre looking gentlemen will have to come down to make way for the women, but that will not be before time. I hope that these tapestries become a permanent feature of this Parliament and a permanent reminder to all South Australians that in so many areas they have helped to lead the world in establishing a democracy. I would hope, therefore, that even the Opposition is prepared to take one further small but very significant step to allow voluntary voting in South Australia so that, 100 years after women were given the right, this right may also be exercised here in South Australia.

SPORTS PARK

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What progress is being made on the golf course project at State Sports Park? Further, will the Minister give a guarantee to this House and the city of Enfield that this project will continue and the land will not be used for other purposes such as housing?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: Yes, the golf course is proceeding at State Sports Park. I have not received any information through my department to give me any concerns about the future of the project. I am very happy to obtain additional details for the honourable member, because I know of his interest in the project. State Sports Park has the capacity to accommodate many sports. With discussions taking place involving sporting groups that have asked to be considered out there, it is difficult to say exactly which sports will end up at State Sports Park, because some sports have difficulty in being located out on the northern extremity of metropolitan Adelaide when many of their participants live in the southern or western suburbs.

I think the golf course is an excellent idea. I am very supportive of the golf course in that area and see no reason why any other sport would encroach on it. Certainly, I have no plans for urban housing development in the area currently designated as the golf course.

MOUSE PLAGUE

Mr VENNING (Custance): My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. Is the Department of Primary Industries in a position to act quickly in the case of another mouse plague? South Australia had a serious mouse plague last year, and the previous Government lost five to six valuable weeks of control time while it made up its mind how best to control the problem. In all probability South Australia will face another serious mouse problem this year.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I acknowledge the honourable member's perception of the incompetence of the previous Administration in saying it lost several weeks before anything happened. It was a shambles last year: it cost many producers in South Australia a considerable amount of money, and many had to resow their crops two or three times because of the previous Administration's inaction and inability to make a decision. However, this time everything is under control. Strychnine will be used again if necessary, and it will be permissible to use it from the air. Mouse numbers are building up, especially in the Mallee and on the West Coast, and they are getting close to horticultural areas in the Riverland. We are all ready to go. Victoria has contacted South Australia to find out our methods and is working in with us, and this year primary producers in South Australia will have no fear of any inability on the part of this Administration to make the decisions.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr BASS (Florey): Two weeks ago my colleague the member for Torrens identified a problem in his electorate associated with the behaviour of the youth of today and attendance by police. Not long ago, the actions of some police at Football Park were also brought up in this House. Today I wish to use this grievance debate to speak on behalf of the young policemen and policewomen who are patrolling our streets today. Because of the nature of their occupation and its military-style system of control, they do not have the opportunity to answer criticisms or to explain their actions. I feel that I have some expertise in this area because, as a police officer for 33 years, for some time I was actually one of those front line police officers who deal with youth. I must say that, although my colleagues and I were front line police officers many years ago, it was in a different era and we not only were supported by the public but also had the respect of the youth of the day, and we were supported by a senior executive group.

At this time I must comment on the two Commissioners of Police in office early in my career: Brigadier John McKinna, who was without doubt a magnificent leader of men and women and who led by example; and he was replaced by another great leader of men and women, Commissioner Harold Salisbury, who was without a doubt a man who went out of his way to meet the troops, supported by his wonderful wife Joan, who never missed visiting the wife of a sick or injured police officer. This type of leadership and support gave all police officers the will to carry on with their duties. I make no criticism of the present Commissioner of Police, as he is Commissioner in a different time and he has a different style from that of Brigadier McKinna and Commissioner Salisbury.

However, times have changed. In my opinion, the Police Force has become top heavy with commissioned officers all desperately trying to climb the promotional ladder. Past Governments, mainly the Labor Government, put in place many social changes which in many cases have caused the family unit to break apart. We have a vocal minority now that goes out of its way to complain against whatever police officers are doing or when they are trying to carry out their duties. I might say that they are carrying out their duties with reduced power; subject to cross-examination of everything they do—not only once in the courts, but by the internal police investigation branches of ACB and IIB, the Police Complaints Authority, the NCA or by their own commissioned officers. From my own personal experience, I can tell the House that when one is investigated for simply doing his or her job it can be a harrowing experience and an experience that most police officers do not wish to go through a second time.

I said that there has been a reduction in powers. Police officers can go to groups of people who are drunk and

carrying on but they have no power of arrest. If police officers carry out what they legally are allowed to do, then very often they are criticised and never allowed to explain exactly what they were doing and the reason they did it. I say that it is time we got behind our young police officers and gave them support to do the job. It is a job that they can do if they simply have the backing of this Government, the Parliament, the public and their senior officers in the Police Force.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to speak on the Greek community's concerns about the recognition of the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia. At the weekend I was one of a number of members of Parliament who addressed a rally of well over 10 000 members of the Greek community, including Bishop Joseph and distinguished reverend fathers: Peter Soustas, Basil Taliangis, John Kiosogoulous, Charlie Moshakis, Nick Niarchos, Con Marinos, and other leading representatives of the Greek community.

The message I gave to that rally on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition and the State Opposition in South Australia was both simple and clear. This followed a meeting on Friday at which the Leader of the Opposition, myself and my parliamentary colleague Michael Atkinson met with representatives of all sections of the Greek community. At that meeting it was once again made clear that Greek Australians have many legitimate concerns about the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia and its recognition.

Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition has written to the Prime Minister calling on him to reconsider the recognition of that country and urging him to consult with Greek Australian community leaders as a matter of urgency. It is quite clear that the Greek community's views must be heard at the very highest level. We know that members of the Greek community in this State and across the nation are deeply troubled by the use of the Star of Vergina in the flag of the former Yugoslav public of Macedonia. The Star of Vergina is associated with the family of the great Greek leader Alexander the Great. It is clearly a Greek symbol and, as I said at the rally and as I said two years ago at a similar rally, there must be no rewriting of history; there must be no attempt to falsely recast the role of Alexander the Great in history.

The Federal Government has already indicated to the Government of the new republic its concern over the use of this symbol. The South Australian Labor Party has called on the Federal Government to go further. I believe that the Federal Government should formally recognise the Star of Vergina as purely a Greek symbol. The Leader of the Opposition has written to the Prime Minister on this matter. It should be unacceptable to all of us to see the Star of Vergina on the flag or Coat of Arms of any other country. How would other Australians feel if the Eureka Stockade flag appeared on another country's banner?

The appearance of the White Tower of Thessalonika on bank notes in the new republic is similarly offensive to the Greek community. How would we in Australia feel if the Sydney Harbour Bridge or Ayers Rock appeared on foreign bank notes? As I pointed out to the rally, Australians who are old enough should remember how they felt about offensive bank notes prepared by wartime Japan with Australian symbols on those bank notes in preparation for the occupation of Australia.

The issue of the territorial ambitions of the new republic is at the heart of many Greek concerns. That view is perfectly understandable given the violence and turmoil throughout much of the former Yugoslavia. It is even more significant when we hear Russia politicians like Zhirinovsky talking of the creation of a Greater Bulgaria that would include the new republic and perhaps part of northern Greece. Greeks in South Australia and across the nation also remember the invasion of Cyprus and when the international community sat on its hands. They fear that, if their territory were to be invaded, they may again receive little help from other nations.

The parliamentary Labor Party in South Australia understands all of these concerns. The Prime Minister needs to consult the Greek community urgently to make sure that he, too, understands these concerns. I welcome the efforts of Senator Nick Bolkus in attempting to organise a meeting between the Prime Minister and community leaders. It must be recognised that the Prime Minister put conditions on the recognition of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, including that the use of the word 'Macedonia' must be settled in a way that does not cause further tension with Greece; that Greek concerns about territorial ambitions be fully met; and that international concerns about the treatment of minorities be satisfied. All of these things must be done, and the Greek community of Australia must see that they are being done. The Labor Opposition of South Australia does not object to the people of the Skopje region having an independent State. No-one does, not even the Greek—

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

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): In the brief time available to me today I wish to raise a matter on which I have addressed the House before. I refer to the increasing concern to institutionalise matters relating to social justice almost as an industry. I have acknowledged in this place on many occasions the initiatives taken by the previous Government in addressing many important facets of issues relating to social justice in our society. I gave some indication to the House then of what I believe are growing concerns about the fact that, when a Government decides there is a priority and that priority is to receive budget consideration, the first thing that it does is to set up an army of bureaucrats to administer the money which is appropriated by the Parliament.

While it is laudable to put money into areas of social justice and to give money to those who are in need, it is less laudable to give millions of dollars supposedly for social justice, very few dollars of which filter through to the people actually in need and most of which goes to looking after an army of bureaucrats who are supposedly there to help the less fortunate.

I have related to this House before that some years ago I was in Ceduna where I picked up a paper put out by the Aborigines in the area. They had calculated that per head of population more than $1 million had been given for every Aboriginal man, woman and child in the Ceduna area, and the paper at the end cryptically commented, 'How many millionaire Aborigines do you know?' I think that is the crux of the problem.

We are told that ATSIC has grown into a bureaucracy and has a plethora of funds that it invests. If we go on to North Terrace, to parts of Elizabeth and into Victoria Square we do not see much evidence that the problems that a few of those people have are diminishing. Rather, we see that the problems are, if anything, not going away. ATSIC seems to have a

propensity for putting a bandage on the sore rather than dealing with the real issue. As I travel around Adelaide, unless it is my eyes, there appear to be more and more legal aid offices to help Aboriginal people when they are in trouble, but there does not seem to be much evidence of offices being available to address the needs of Aboriginal people before they get into trouble.

I should like to point to an excellent example of good practice which comes from the Aboriginal communities in Central Australia. I refer to the Imparja television licence which they successfully contested against commercial interests and which they have run for a number of years. Among the best use of public broadcasting that I have ever seen in this country are many of the advertisements on social justice matters put out by the Imparja television station. One would have to describe them as advertisements, but they are really community bulletins which deal with matters relating to children and their need to do homework and the fact that children who need to do homework are disturbed if they come from an environment in which there is arguing and drunkenness and, therefore, the inability to concentrate.

Those advertisements have been very good, but in Adelaide's much more complex society, and with all the resources that we have in Government, we seem to be more happy to employ bureaucrats to sit, meet and discuss the problem endlessly and report that somehow the problem is for ever escalating than actually to apply money to address and fix it. I suggest that the only money that is well spent in the area of social justice is that which is applied to the people who are in need to alleviate the need or to provide preventive measures.

I think that the Government has been long on talk and very short on action. There should not be a talkfest about what social justice means. There should be remedial action for the people in need and, more importantly, preventive measures should be put in place so that people do not continue to fall into the trap. This Parliament should apply money for social justice, not for bureaucrats to become fatter and sit at conferences toasting the disadvantaged people they seek to serve.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I wish to speak about the lack of grants to communities in the south-western areas of Adelaide. For some time the City of Marion has been attempting to develop an indoor aquatic centre on Oaklands Road at a cost of between $5 million and $6 million. At that location presently there exists one large olympic pool. However, that pool has problems associated with the seasons dictating its usage, because in a cool summer season there is very little usage of that pool. As a result, the school children in the area have limited facilities for learning how to swim.

There is also the ongoing problem—which receives high publicity—of the high number of people in this State who do not have expertise with regard to swimming and who do not learn to swim. We have the problem of deaths in pools and the requirement to fence pools to protect people, but for some unknown reason we do nothing to create facilities for children at schools so that they can participate in swimming lessons. When the seasons are good their swimming lessons are usually restricted to three days in a full year. As well, swimming pools in areas such as Marion are there for the community.

If there was an indoor aquatic centre in the City of Marion, it would offer training facilities for Australia's future athletes. If South Australians tried to think of the number of Olympic athletes we have developed in relation to swimming, most people would find it hard to come up with the names of five swimmers who have attained Olympic gold. However, with respect to States such as Queensland and New South Wales we can all think of Perkins, Holland and so on, who have achieved that high standard, and that is because indoor facilities are available in those States for school children and youngsters to improve and train all year round.

An indoor aquatic centre would offer the community facilities associated with recreation and general fitness. It would also provide family activities in this Year of the Family, which is most important. At present the people in the south-western suburbs have to travel into the city to use that type of facility. This development, which the City of Marion has been trying to establish, would offer employment opportunities in the south-western area. It would provide employment for between 120 and 150 people in the manufacturing phase of the facility; it would provide full-time employment for 15 people in the design of the facility; and it would provide jobs for up to 50 people in the construction phase of the indoor aquatic centre. In other words, a total of 215 people would obtain full-time employment associated with this facility. Following the construction phase, the facility would offer 10 full-time jobs.

The proposed facility has attracted a lot of knockers. The City of Marion has gone cap in hand to both State and Federal Governments. The State has referred it to the Federal Government. Unfortunately, the previous State Government spilt more money than the City of Marion requires. The Federal Government has not come back with a response and there has not even been a mark on the white board. This State needs development, for without development we have stagnation. Marion is looking for an indoor aquatic centre, and this would offer development to the south-western corner of Adelaide, and that means jobs, tourism and growth. Let us put the knockers behind us; let us make the hard decisions and let us develop this State.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I wish to note the answer given here this afternoon in Question Time to a question I asked of the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. The answer he gave to this House was unequivocal support for a golf course to be constructed on land at State Sports Park, Gepps Cross. I commend him for his answer and I look forward to the provision of this facility in my electorate in the near future.

The history of this project goes back over many years. One of the first commitments I made when I ran for Parliament in 1989 was that I would support a golf course on that parcel of land to ensure the open space nature of those lands as an important buffer in an area where, unfortunately, there is a great deal of urban infill, and already vast expansions of housing such that the entire character of the area will be changed.

Indeed, I note that the Regent Gardens project, through to the proposed Walkley Heights project, and utilising lands at Northfield—both agricultural land and surplus Hillcrest land (when those problems are resolved)—and surplus Yatala lands and others, will see something of the order of 7 000 to 7 200 allotments, a project which dwarfs anything else in the area and which is about half the size of the Seaford project. That project will be largely finished during the life of this Parliament.

So, it was pleasing today to hear the Minister give a guarantee not only to this House but also to the City of Enfield that the project which was started many years ago and which has been sharpened in the past couple of years is to proceed. I have had some discussions with the City of Enfield, and the final question to be resolved is that of water quality and the availability of water for this golf course at the site, because the commercial rates of water would be such that the golf course would not turn a quid and, as a consequence of that, underground water and the retention of stormwater on the site is absolutely essential for the commercial nature of this project.

The City of Enfield has advised me that it is now satisfied with the water analysis that has been made. It is now waiting on the Department of Recreation and Sport to continue with discussions that have taken place over the past years, so that the City of Enfield can finally put the project to its own members and proceed with it on the basis that the Department of Recreation and Sport will part with the land and that the City of Enfield will be the preferred developer.

One of the problems with this project last year was the interference of the Australian Democrats and some other people in the area and, in particular, one or two noted cohorts of the Democrats in the area who sought to undermine this project for some silly reasons, including a handful of trees which had been put in the wrong place. Indeed, the Department of Recreation and Sport did not cover itself with glory in the whole exercise.

It is pleasing to see that the Government, those now on the other side of this Chamber, as well as the former Government and now the Opposition, are fully behind this project. I welcome the Minister's answer to my question. It is quite obvious that the Australian Democrats were much more worried about a few trees than about the overall nature of that land. Some sort of development is absolutely essential to keep the basic open space character of that area. I simply say now that a number of discussions took place in my office last year between all interested parties, and those issues relating to the forest were resolved to the satisfaction of all parties concerned with the exception of the Australian Democrats, who turned up only to the first meeting—they did not come back after that—and showed no more interest in the project.

Mr BECKER (Peake): I received the February issue of a magazine called *In Black and White*, which is put out by St John Ambulance (South Australia) Incorporated. I was delighted to read an article entitled 'A new initiative', which advises readers that hundreds of Japanese who attend the Adelaide Grand Prix were surprised to learn that there were several St John Ambulance volunteers at the course who spoke their language.

St John has led the way in providing volunteers to the Grand Prix for some years—and certainly last year—who between them speak 13 languages including German, Vietnamese, Italian, French, Chinese and Japanese. These volunteers wear a special badge for easy identification. An added bonus was that the St John volunteers became unofficial ambassadors for the Grand Prix and for South Australia, with visitors from many lands seeking their advice on a wide range of topics. The work that St John does at major sporting events such as the Grand Prix has not been made known publicly at all. Of course, it is a real challenge for the Victorians to match our efforts.

I was also amazed to read the statistics surrounding the operations and the efforts of our St John Ambulance staff at the Grand Prix. In 1992, members of the Operations Branch gave 452 member days and about 6 000 hours and treated 901 patients over the four-day period. In 1993, members gave 587 member days—quite a substantial increase—and 7 689 hours, and treated 634 patients. I believe that the very kind weather had something to do with that: it was not very hot, so there were not many heat-related problems.

However, it takes a fair number of staff and volunteers to organise the service and to attend to the needs of the public. It is something that we all take for granted. These people are there and, whilst they are in a uniform that can be easily recognised, no-one seems to take much notice unless they need attention. I believe it is very important that we record in Parliament our appreciation of the service of the St John Ambulance volunteers. The fact that they attend the Grand Prix means that they are recognised as ambassadors for the Grand Prix and for South Australia at a time when about 3 000 overseas visitors and about 27 000 or 28 000 visitors from interstate—mainly from New South Wales and Victoria—attend the race. Let us put it on record: if it were not for the attendance at the Grand Prix of the Victorians the numbers would be down dramatically. It is these volunteers who help to make the attendance at these events just a little more comfortable. Of course, they are there to help and assist at any time.

I was surprised to read the summary of treatments as reported for the 1993 Grand Prix. On the Thursday there were 43 treatments compared to 96 in 1992; on the Friday there were 119 treatments compared to 171 in 1992; on the Saturday there were 230 treatments compared to 273; and on the Sunday, which of course has the biggest attendance rate, there were 243 treatments compared to 361 in 1992. The statistics show a total of 634 treatments for 1993 and 901 in 1992. There are several staff who deserve commendation as well as the volunteers for organising and coordinating the whole operation. The public has come to expect St John to attend and to provide peace of mind and assistance. The added bonus on this occasion was that so many of the volunteers could speak 13 different languages. That must help in any function such as this. We can be very proud of the efforts of these people.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills:

Supply,
Correctional Services (Prisoners' Goods) Amendment,
Electoral (Abolition of Compulsory Voting) Amendment,
Pay-roll Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment and
Petroleum (Submerged Lands)(Miscellaneous) Amendment

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 10 March.

Motion carried.

WORKCOVER CORPORATION BILL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the reconstitution of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation and its continuation under the

name 'WorkCover Corporation of South Australia'; to provide for its functions and powers; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Approximately seven years ago the former State Labor Government introduced a new system of workers compensation and occupational safety, health and welfare into South Australia. That legislative package was a major change from previous laws on this topic and involved the repeal of the 1971 Workers Compensation Act and the 1972 Industrial Safety Health and Welfare Act.

The new laws introduced some seven years ago, as explained by the then Minister, now member for Giles, were to have some high ideals. A number of these ideals, in particular the streamlining of the workers compensation system and the emphasis upon rehabilitation of injured workers, were quite sound social goals. However, as any objective observer over the past seven years would know, the lofty ideals of the former Government have met a rocky path. If members of this Parliament listen to what industry and employees are saying in the community, the 1986 legislation has fallen far short of achieving those high ideals painted by the former Government in 1986 and 1987.

This is not to say that the existing WorkCover system has failed outright or that the pre-existing system was preferable. What it does say is that a system such as this, which combines industrial, social and economic principles, must be refined and restructured on an ongoing basis to ensure that all of its basic objectives are met on a fair basis. This is where the word 'failure' is an appropriate expression—not failure of the WorkCover scheme in itself, but failure by the previous Labor Government to accept over the last seven years any criticism of the 1986 legislation and a manifest failure by that Government to make the structural reforms necessary during the last seven years in order to put the WorkCover and occupational health and safety schemes on a more equitable and more affordable basis.

Therefore, to the extent that the previous Labor Government made some reforms in 1986, it now stands equally condemned by its head in the sand attitude in which it failed to acknowledge its mistakes over the next seven years.

One just has to simply look back to the former Government's attitude a couple of years ago when the Parliament had to take the Labor Government kicking and screaming to a select committee of inquiry in order to expose some of the deficiencies and inequities in the legislation—and that at a time when claims, unfunded liabilities and levies were out of control. Even worse, it was only through the combined efforts of every member of this Parliament, excluding the members of the ALP, that any changes at all were made to the scheme, changes which were belatedly foist upon the previous Government by this Parliament.

Contrasted to this short-sighted and irresponsible attitude of the former Government, the Liberal Party now in government in this State has the willpower and the vision to make the necessary structural reforms to South Australia's WorkCover and occupational health, safety and welfare laws. Moreover the Liberal Party not only has the willpower and vision: it has the mandate of the people of this State. I repeat: not only do we have the willpower and vision but we also have the mandate of the people of this State. On 11 December 1993 the people of South Australia rejected the inaction and incompetence of the previous Labor Administration. On 11 December 1993 the people of South Australia endorsed, amongst other reforms, the Liberal Party's worker safety policy, a policy which had been released publicly and debated during the State election campaign. That policy clearly promised to the community that the necessary structural changes to these laws will be made to ensure a fairer and affordable system. The people of South Australia, including many thousands of employers and employees alike, endorsed these policies just 12 weeks ago. Today the State Liberal Government fulfils its policy undertaking to the people of South Australia by introducing these much needed reforms into this House.

It is necessary at this juncture to point out to the Parliament the justifications for structural reform to the WorkCover and occupational health, safety and welfare laws. The justifications are these: first, the current system fails to give proper priority to the joint responsibility of workplace safety, that is, the responsibility of both the workers and the employers; the current system fractures the WorkCover Board along philosophical policy lines thereby inhibiting efficient decision making and administration; thirdly, the current system fails to integrate or relate the administration of the WorkCover system with the administration of the occupational health, safety and welfare system, despite there being clear areas of overlap where duplication can be eliminated or reduced; fourthly, the current system contains some manifest inequities for both employers and employees; and, fifthly, the current system is nationally and internationally uncompetitive. I think it is worthwhile repeating that: the current system is nationally and internationally uncompetitive.

Sixthly, the current system is open to, and in some cases allows, quite unreasonable claims and rorts to be compensated; seventhly, the current system fails to give proper status to the proper role of policy making, which should, after tripartite consultation, be the responsibility of those who are politically accountable, that is, the Minister and the Government; and, eighthly, the current system with its promotion of inefficiencies and abuses is unaffordable, thereby putting at risk the long-term capacity of the scheme to deliver full and fair benefits to those workers who are genuinely injured at work and nationally competitive levy rates that industry can afford.

It is to the continued shame of the previous Government that it closed its eyes to these deficiencies and failings of the current scheme. As it did with so many other areas in which it mismanaged this State, it failed absolutely the test of accountability. On how many occasions did we hear the former Government tell this Parliament, tell employers, tell employees, tell the unions, tell the medical profession, tell rehabilitation providers, tell self-insurers or tell the legal profession that, if they had a problem with WorkCover or occupational, health safety and welfare laws, it was not the Government's problem: they should go and speak to someone else, either a member of the WorkCover Board or a WorkCover manager.

This approach was the ultimate expression of political irresponsibility. Quite clearly, the former Government knew or should have known that the WorkCover board and management were obliged to operate within the parameters of the imperfect system that the Government itself had established. This failure of accountability for policy must be put to an end. The WorkCover board and its management and the managers of occupational health, safety and welfare laws must be permitted to get on with the job of managing the scheme whilst the Government of the day must be account-

able for policy. Our structural reforms embrace these objectives.

Contrary to the repeated claims by the previous Government that the WorkCover scheme was affordable and had no funding problems, the facts are that over the life of the scheme the average levy rate rose from 3 per cent in 1987-88 to 3.24 per cent in 1992-93, peaking at 3.79 per cent in 1990-91. Even during 1993, with claims artificially low due to recessionary unemployment, the average levy rate was 2.86 per cent, more than 1 per cent higher than comparable national schemes. This represents an added cost to South Australian industry of $90 million every year—an absolutely appalling position.

After seven years, South Australia has a workers compensation scheme which has the highest levy rate in Australia. This state of affairs will cease. The biggest single challenge for this Government in this area is to reduce the average levy rate to a figure equal to or less than the average levy rate of other schemes in Australia whilst maintaining benefit levels which are both affordable and equitable to employers and employees alike. The uncompetitiveness of our workers compensation system cannot be lightly dismissed. Indeed, this was a theme of the former Minister's second reading speech when he introduced the scheme into the Parliament on 12 February 1986. He said at that time, and it makes very interesting reading:

> It is patently clear that a further round of premium hikes lies just around the corner unless decisive action is taken to reform the system. There are, of course, other pressing reasons, both social and economic, for undertaking these much needed reforms. . . If we do not take similar action in this State our competitive [situation] will be severely eroded. This Bill addresses the critical problems that South Australian industry now faces.

That was the current member for Giles in 1986. Seven years after the introduction of the scheme we are saying exactly the same thing, and exactly the same problem exists. In the meantime, we have had a disorganised and absolutely mixed-up and messed-up compensation scheme.

Applying that standard, the very standard which the former Government set for its scheme, the scheme has failed South Australian industry. Even the most basic economics or industry policy would recognise that South Australia will fail to achieve employment growth and will fail to become nationally, let alone internationally, competitive whilst costs to industry such as WorkCover costs remain nationally uncompetitive. This fact cannot be ignored. This is not a matter of hollow political rhetoric: it is purely and simply a real problem which must be addressed now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith was warned earlier today. I have been lenient with him for the past 10 minutes; I ask him please not to interject.

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I note clearly the interest of the Opposition: two members have now come in to listen to this important legislation. For this reason, this State Government will put every possible resource into ensuring that the average worker levy rate in this State is reduced. In approximately 18 months we aim to have a figure of 1.8 per cent—a figure which would make our scheme nationally competitive and which would allow the current $90 million of additional levies to be channelled by industry into constructive employment growth. I repeat that: $90 million in surplus is being paid in levies today because we are not nationally or internationally competitive. Even more concerning is the fact that in recent years the previous Government chose to mask the unaffordability of the scheme by relying upon the natural decline in costs and claims as a result of the loss of employment in an economic recession created by the policies of both State and Federal Labor Governments.

For the record, it is important to point out that, for the quarter ended in December 1993, the WorkCover quarterly performance report, the quarter managed by the previous Labor Government, expresses major concerns at the continued growth of claim numbers and points to little overall improvement in the number of long-term claims. That report says that the corporation management believes the mid-year actuarial report possibly underestimates the scheme's outstanding liabilities and that the annual review will more clearly review the impact of recent experience. It is patently obvious that the previous Labor Government sought to achieve a full funding status of the scheme by relying upon reduced claims caused by recessionary unemployment.

Equally obvious is the fact that, unless structural reforms are made as a matter of urgency and priority, increased employment arising out of economic recovery will blow out WorkCover's claim numbers and unfunded liability to an unacceptable level. Again, that is not hollow rhetoric. In recent days, WorkCover has advised the Government that the savings to the scheme arising out of these amendments will do no more than simply hold the average levy rate at its current uncompetitive level of 2.86 per cent. I think that needs to be repeated and understood: these changes to the scheme will do no more than simply hold the average levy rate at its current uncompetitive level of 2.86 per cent. What that means is that this Parliament—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: This is absolutely comparing like with like, because what this is doing is signalling the exact position of our scheme now, not any mystery scheme in the future. Last week, the board received a report that said that unless changes were made we would have to stay at the existing uncompetitive average levy rate. We have been hoodwinked for the past two years by the previous Labor Government when it said that everything was about to turn around. It was not turning around at all. All that was happening was that the claim numbers were going down and that was the only thing that was turning the scheme around.

We were being hoodwinked by the previous Government. Without these amendments the WorkCover Board would have no option but to recommend to the Government an increase in average levy to 3.15 per cent or an extra $25 million from South Australian industry each year. The previous Labor Government told us that the scheme was fully funded, that it had the scheme under total control in terms of claims costs, yet 12 weeks later when we ask the question, 'What is the position of the scheme?' we are told that right now, unless these changes are made, the WorkCover Board will have to recommend to me an increase in average levy from 2.86 to 3.15 per cent.

What a sham perpetrated by the previous Government, and the member for Ross Smith, with his mate the previous Minister, knows full well that every South Australian has been hoodwinked by the stories that were being put around by the previous Government about how efficient and well managed the WorkCover scheme was. It will cost South Australian industry an extra $25 million next year just to balance the books unless we make these changes. The

changes we are now putting before Parliament are doing no more than holding the line. We are not going ahead as we hoped we would be doing: we are merely holding the line because the previous Labor Government hoodwinked industry and the community. The situation is a disgrace.

However, as I said at the time, every dog has its day, and the previous Labor Government has been caught again. It was caught with the State Bank and it has now been caught with regard to WorkCover. As I said previously in this place, I always suspected that things were not as they seemed, and now we see in a formal report—not my figures—to the WorkCover Board that an extra $25 million is needed to fund the scheme, otherwise it will be necessary to make changes. Clearly, that state of affairs cannot be allowed to exist. It would be gross irresponsibility for this Parliament to fail to recognise the urgent need for these reforms or to heed the clear mandate provided by the people of South Australia on 11 December 1993.

There are no credible alternatives to the reform package the Government is now proposing. Importantly, the reforms are primarily structural, and unless the structures are correct WorkCover will be unable to operate efficiently. Unless the structures are correct, duplication of administration between workers compensation and occupational health, safety and welfare will continue. Unless the structures are correct, policies will be introduced or ignored without political accountability. Unless the structures are correct, employers and employees—the most important participants in the scheme—will continue to feel remote from the workings of the system. Therefore, the structures must be changed.

In addition to making the necessary structural changes, it is the Government's intention to put safety in the workplace back on the top of the agenda as the primary social objective in this area. It is the State Government's intention to ensure that both employers and employees adopt as a matter of the highest priority a shared vision for the prevention of work related injuries and diseases and the development of healthy and safe workplaces through a balance of education, motivation, regulation and enforcement.

This social priority underpins the Government's desire for greater consistency in administration and policy between the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act and the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act. The Government will be true to its pre-election promise that an additional $2 million of funds per year will be targeted for education and prevention programs designed to establish safer workplaces, particularly in small business and higher claim industries.

The Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Advisory Committee, with its responsibility to report directly to the Minister, will further sharpen this focus on safety in the workplace. At all times safety in the workplace will become the overriding objective and will be understood by employers and workers as a joint responsibility within their respective areas of control. In both the private and the public sectors the Government will ensure that the chief executive officers of South Australian businesses or Government departments will be responsible both under the Act and in practice for safety and prevention programs in their workplaces.

Following from these structural changes, this package of legislation makes a number of necessary and urgent changes to provisions of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act, particularly in the area of journey accidents, stress claims and alcohol or drug induced injuries. These changes are designed to provide a more equitable system between employers and employees and to exclude, so far as is possible, abuses and rorts in the areas of journey accidents and stress claims. Unless these changes are made, employers will unfairly continue to fund a significant percentage of road accidents in this State.

Unless these changes are made, the system will remain open to abuse and exploitation, thereby prejudicing its capacity to deliver fair benefits to workers genuinely injured at work. Unless these changes are made—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith will come to order. The honourable member has not been in this House very long, but I suspect he has been in it long enough to realise that he has been warned twice today by two different occupants of the Chair. One warning is usually sufficient, and I assure the honourable member that if he wishes to remain in the House to listen to the rest of the debate he will do so in silence. The Minister.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Unless these changes are made, the system will remain open to abuse and exploitation, thereby prejudicing its capacity to deliver fair benefits to workers genuinely injured in the workplace. Unless these changes are made, the scheme will quickly become unaffordable, unfunded liabilities will blow out as they did in the late 1980s, levy rates will increase, and South Australia will be the loser. Unless these changes are made, employers will have the unfair burden of funding injuries beyond their control and outside the workplace, while workers will have no incentive to adopt some responsibility for safety and self-insurance outside the workplace.

In recent days a number of members of this Parliament have made public comments concerning these journey accident amendments. I emphasise to all members that the State Liberal Government has a clear and unequivocal mandate to introduce this reform. Our worker safety policy, issued before the State election, specifically undertook to restrict claims for journey accidents to exclude the routine journey to and from work but still to include any work related journey. Any frustration of this policy change will in effect stand in defiance of the mandate for change given by the people of South Australia to this Government on 11 December 1993.

These changes to the structure and administration of workers rehabilitation and compensation, to occupational health, safety and welfare, and to journey accidents, stress claims and related matters will not be a panacea for all the ills of the existing scheme. There must and will be more changes in the August session of this parliamentary year: changes that will arise from an assessment of the scheme by the new board and by the WorkCover Advisory Committee. They include matters such as: rehabilitation practices; the two year review of claims; the return to work provisions; the level of benefits; the role of the medical and legal professions; and the review process of dispute resolution.

These changes are, however, the first necessary steps. Without these first steps the weaknesses of the Act caused by the stubbornness of the previous Labor Government will continue to burden the scheme, with disastrous consequences for South Australian employers and employees. This package of legislative reforms that the State Liberal Government is now introducing comprises three Bills: the WorkCover Corporation Bill 1994, the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Administration) Amendment Bill 1994 and

the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare (Administration) Amendment Bill 1994.

I will now deal with the relevant policy matters in the WorkCover Corporation Bill. This Bill proposes the establishment of a new Act, the WorkCover Corporation Act 1994, to provide a new board for the WorkCover Corporation and to vary the corporation's functions and powers as a result of the abolition of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission and the merger of some of its activities into the restructured corporation. It is proposed that the current board of 14 persons be replaced by a board of seven.

This new board will be a management board, operating along commercial lines and not fractured by divisive policy or legislative debates which inhibit sound management. One of the seven will be nominated by the Minister after taking into account recommendations of associations representing the interests of employers and one will similarly be nominated after taking into account recommendations of associations representing employees. The other members will be recommended by the Minister for appointment by the Governor on the basis of relevant expertise to manage the corporation on a commercial basis.

It is crucial that the WorkCover Board be a corporate board operating on commercial lines, without philosophical divisions over policy. This is particularly so when it is recognised that WorkCover manages assets of $779 million, has an income of $280 million per year, has administrative costs of $44 million per year and makes payment of claims of $261 million per year. Indeed, the need for a commercially oriented board was acknowledged by the former Labor Government in 1986 when the then Minister stated in his second reading speech that:

> The creation of the sole authority to operate along corporate lines on a non-profit basis is central to the reforms and to the achievement of real costs savings.

Once again, however, the former Government's actions did not match its objectives. In order to achieve a balanced, commercially oriented board, members of the board will need to be drawn from persons with expertise in fields such as workers compensation and rehabilitation, insurance administration and investment, management and finance, human resource management, occupational health and safety, and employee representation.

The Bill also outlines the conditions of membership of the board, the members' duties and responsibilities and how the board should conduct its proceedings. These provisions are consistent with those relating to the establishment of other statutory boards and are in line with the philosophy and direction of the Public Corporations Act. It is proposed to vary the functions and powers of the corporation to provide that the corporation be empowered to administer the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986, in addition to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 and any other legislation prescribed by regulation.

Non policy making functions previously assigned to the Occupational Health and Safety Commission have generally been incorporated in the revised functions of the corporation in this Bill. The proposed powers of the corporation will be sufficiently broad to allow it to perform its management functions within the framework of legislative policy. For example, the corporation would have the power to enter into any form of contract or appoint agents or engage contractors to assist or carry out any of its functions. This would allow the corporation to use the services of private insurers companies and to manage claims if that approach is considered appropriate and desirable by the Government and the board of the corporation.

A further significant variation to the role of the corporation proposed in the Bill is in the area of policy advice to the Government. The restructured corporation would not have the power to determine high level policy matters concerning workers rehabilitation and compensation or occupational health, safety and welfare. These policy making powers, including consideration and preparation of new legislation, codes of practice and regulations, are to be vested in the Minister upon the advice of two statutory advisory committees, namely:

- The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Advisory Committee to be established by amendments to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act contained in a separate Bill; and
- The Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Advisory Committee to be established by amendments to the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, also contained in a separate Bill.

The board clearly will remain responsible for specified matters relating to the administration of the two Acts and the operation of the corporation—a multi-million dollar business. Amendments to the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act contained in a separate Bill propose the abolition of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. As a consequence, and in line with the inclusion of the responsibility for the administration of various functions under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act to the proposed restructured corporation, it will be necessary to transfer certain staff of the existing Occupational Health and Safety Commission to the corporation (and possibly in some cases to the Department of Industrial Affairs). This Bill provides for that transfer of staff and for staff to be transferred to the Department of Industrial Affairs or another administrative unit in the Public Service if that is appropriate. Any such transfer would be without loss of accrued rights in respect of employment.

In summary, this Bill will facilitate the restructuring of the administration of occupational health, safety and welfare laws and workers compensation in this State. It will establish a structure geared to greater management efficiency and less duplication. It will integrate many of the services provided to, and the requirements placed upon, employers and employees. Further integration will occur progressively to ensure that occupational health and safety and compensation and rehabilitation of workers is managed in a coordinated, efficient, equitable and affordable way. I commend the Bill to the House and seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the explanation of the clauses without my reading it.

Mr Clarke: Objection!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have an objection. There is no alternative but for the Bill to be read in its entirety.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Ross Smith for giving me a further reading lesson. I can assure him that in the future he will get a couple. The explanation of the clauses is as follows:

Clause 1: Short title. This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement. The measure will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation. This clause sets out the definitions required for the purposes of the Act.

Clause 4: Continuation of Corporation. The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation is to continue as the WorkCover Corporation of South Australia.

Clause 5: Constitution of board of management. The Corporation will now be managed by a board of seven members appointed by the Governor.

Clause 6: Conditions of membership. The conditions of membership of the board will be determined by the Governor. A term of office will not exceed three years (and a member will be eligible for reappointment at the expiration of a term).

Clause 7: Allowances and expenses. As is the case with the current board, a member will be entitled to fees, allowances and expenses determined by the Governor. Payments will be made from the Compensation Fund.

Clause 8: Disclosure of interest. This clause will require a member who has an interest in a matter before the board to declare the interest and withdraw from the room. The Minister will be able to require a person who has, in the Minister's opinion, an interest which is not consistent with the proper performance of duties to discharge the interest, or to resign from the board.

Clause 9: Members' duties of honesty, care and diligence. This clause sets out various duties and standards that must be performed and observed by a member of the board.

Clause 10: Validity of acts and immunity of members. An act or proceeding of the board is not invalid because of a vacancy in its membership or a defect in an appointment. A member of the board will not incur any personal liability in the performance or exercise of functions, duties or powers; liability will instead attach to the Crown.

Clause 11: Proceedings. This clause sets out various matters relevant to the proceedings of the board. Five members will constitute a quorum of the board.

Clause 12: Functions. This clause sets out the functions of the corporation. These functions will now include the administration of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986, the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986, and any other legislation prescribed by the regulations. The corporation will be responsible to promote or support the formulation of policies and strategies that promote occupational health, safety and welfare or the rehabilitation of injured workers. The corporation will also be responsible for the efficient and economic operation of the workers compensation scheme under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986.

Clause 13: Powers. This clause sets out the powers of the corporation, which include the power to appoint agents or engage consultants (subject to ministerial consent in circumstances specified by the Minister).

Clause 14: Corporation to have regard to various differences in the work force. The corporation will be required to take into account various differences in the work force. The corporation will be required to ensure that information provided in the workplace is in a form and language appropriate for those expected to use it.

Clause 15: Committees. The corporation will be able to establish committees.

Clause 16: Delegations. This clause sets out the corporation's powers of delegation.

Clause 17: Accounts. The corporation will continue to be required to keep accounts and to satisfy various accounting standards and practices.

Clause 18: Audit. The corporation will continue to have at least two auditors.

Clause 19: Annual reports. The corporation will continue to produce an annual report. The regulations will be able to specify various matters which must be included in an annual report (including, for example, information about occupational health, safety or welfare).

Clause 20: Chief Executive Officer. The corporation will continue to have a Chief Executive Officer. The CEO will be appointed by the board after the board has consulted with the Minister.

Clause 21: Other staff of the corporation. The corporation will be able to appoint its own staff, who are not Public Service employees. The corporation will also be able to use, with the approval of the responsible Minister and on mutually arranged terms and conditions, employees of the Department of Industrial Affairs or other Crown employees. The Minister will also be able to transfer departmental officers to the corporation after consultation with the corporation and any relevant industrial organisation.

Clause 22: Superannuation. The corporation will continue to be a public authority under the Superannuation Act 1974.

Clause 23: Use of facilities. The corporation will be able to use the resources or facilities available in both the public and private sectors.

Clause 24: Government Finance Authority Act not to apply to corporation. The corporation is not a semi-Government authority under the Government Financing Authority Act 1982.

Clause 25: Protection of special name. The name 'WorkCover' will continue to be afforded statutory protection.

Clause 26: Exemption from stamp duty. The corporation's exemption from stamp duty on account of any insurance business carried on by the corporation will continue.

Clause 27: Regulations. The Governor will be able to make regulations for the purposes of the Act.

Schedule. This schedule sets out the various transitional provisions associated with the measure. The schedule will expressly provide that the members of the board of the corporation holding office on the commencement of the relevant clause will cease to hold office. The Governor will be able to transfer the staff of the South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission to a Government department, or to the corporation. The regulations will be able to deal with other matters of a saving or transitional nature.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (ADMINISTRATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is the second in the package of three Bills relating to structural reform of South Australian workers compensation and occupational health, safety and welfare laws. In my second reading explanation to the overriding legislation—the WorkCover Corporation Bill—I outlined the Government's policy objectives and the justification for these measures.

This second bill proposes amendments to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act to:

- introduce statutory objects which balance the interests of employers and employees in applying the WorkCover legislation.

(This is a very important issue, because for the first time we will have a 'fairness' clause which recognises that both employers and employees have to be dealt with fairly.)

- provide for the restructuring of the board of the corporation.
- establish the workers rehabilitation and compensation advisory committee.
- abolish compensation under the WorkCover scheme for most injuries arising during journeys to and from work.
- abolish compensation under the WorkCover scheme for most injuries arising during authorised breaks but outside of the workplace and outside of the employer's control.
- abolish compensation for certain injuries caused by alcohol or drug consumption by employees.
- vary the provisions relating to compensation for stress related disabilities.
- clarify the provisions relating to the power of WorkCover to commute weekly payments to a lump sum.
- clarify the appeal powers of the workers compensation appeal tribunal.

These amendments are aimed at streamlining the operation of the corporation and removing compensation for certain injuries which are clearly outside the control of the employer and do not occur at work. These amendments introduce greater equity in balancing the interests of employers and employees. These amendments reduce the capacity for abuse and exploitation of the WorkCover system.

These amendments are also expected to improve the financial viability of the WorkCover scheme as a first step towards improving the competitive position of South Australia regarding the costs of workers compensation insurance.

I remind the House that, as I said in the previous second reading explanation, unless these amendments are made the WorkCover board will have to increase the WorkCover levy from 2.86 per cent to 3.15 per cent, because we were hoodwinked about the increase in claims and the potential cost to the scheme.

Objects of Act

The current Act does not contain specific statutory objects. The Government believes that outlining statutory objects in industrial legislation is of value to a proper understanding of the purpose and policy objectives of the Act. It should also be of value to the courts when interpreting and applying provisions of the Act. The objects proposed for the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act reflect the necessary and appropriate balance between the interests of employers, the interests of employees and the public interest in legislation of this type which has important industrial, social and economic significance. The proposed amendments specifically require judicial and quasi-judicial bodies (such as the Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal and review officers) to interpret the Act in light of its objects and without bias towards the interests of employers or workers. Whilst this legislation is remedial, it is remedial to both the interests of employers and employees, and should be interpreted and applied as such.

Board and Advisory Committee

The structural changes in relation to the corporation's powers and functions and the establishment of the advisory committee are outlined in the report on the WorkCover Corporation Bill. The proposed amendments in this Bill are simply to remove the existing parts of the Act relating to the board and its powers and functions.

The advisory committee to be established under this Bill will be responsible for the provision of advice to the Minister on:

- the formulation and implementation of policies relating to workers rehabilitation and compensation.
- proposals to amend the Act or regulations.
- any other matters relating to workers rehabilitation or compensation.

It is intended that this advisory committee will enhance the tripartite consultative process, but have sufficient flexibility in membership (and through its sub-committees) to properly perform its functions. In order to sharpen the focus of accountability for policy matters, the Minister, with advice from the advisory committee, will deal with matters of policy in relation to the legislation. The WorkCover Corporation and its board will be responsible for managing and administering the scheme in accordance with those policies.

Coverage

There are three areas of coverage under the current scheme which this Bill proposes to remove, namely—

- injuries occurring during journeys to and from work
- injuries occurring during authorised breaks outside the workplace or unconnected to work
- injuries caused by alcohol and drug consumption

Journey Claims

It is proposed that injuries arising as a result of a journey to or from work (such as a journey between the worker's place of residence and workplace) not be compensable. It is further proposed that injuries arising from journeys between two workplaces with different employers—and one should note 'different employers'—also not be compensable. Most of these journeys will, however, be compensable under the compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance system. However, journey injuries will continue to be covered if the journey is undertaken as part of the worker's employment or at the express direction or request of the employer.

This approach to journey claims has already been taken in some other Australian jurisdictions. I noted earlier that the member for Ross Smith said that this is an automatic, expected exercise in the labour market. Perhaps he ought to talk to some of his Labor mates in the other States and, in particular, the Commonwealth to see what in fact is happening or is about to happen. It is consistent with the recommendations in the recent draft report of the Industry Commission inquiry into workers compensation arrangements in Australia. It is both necessary and equitable.

Workers compensation legislation should compensate workers for injuries at work—not outside of the workplace. South Australian employers should not fund road accidents or injuries outside of their control—that is the combined responsibility of the community at large and the individual worker. Further, the extent to which the current journey provisions are abused and stretched beyond their intended application is a matter of grave concern to the Government—a concern which can only be remedied by parliamentary action.

In recent weeks I have already provided this Parliament with examples of these abuses. Journey accidents represent about 4.5 per cent of claims and approximately 7 per cent of annual costs after recoveries, and that is after recoveries. The rate of claims is increasing. When translated to dollar figures there are significant costs to the scheme: some $22 million per year before recoveries and $15 million per year after

recoveries. The removal of these claims will enhance the financial status of the scheme, will enable a clearer focus on maintaining fair benefits for employees genuinely injured at work and will reduce the current premium pressure on employer levy rates. As mentioned, this measure will have a net cost saving to the scheme of approximately $15 million per year.

Authorised Breaks

This Bill also proposes the removal of compensation cover for injuries occurring during authorised breaks away from the workplace, or at the workplace before or after work where the worker is involved in an activity unrelated to his/her employment.

Again, this approach is consistent with the views expressed by the Industry Commission that employers should be held accountable for injuries that are within their control or influence, but should not be accountable for injuries outside of their control. These claims represent approximately .5 per cent of claims, or approximately $1 million dollars per annum, of which only $100 000 is recovered. This measure will therefore have a net cost saving to the scheme of approximately $900 000 per year.

Drug and Alcohol Related Claims

It is proposed that compensation be removed in relation to injuries which are wholly or predominantly attributable to the influence of alcohol or drugs voluntarily consumed by the worker (other than a drug lawfully obtained by the worker and consumed in accordance with the directions of a legally qualified medical practitioner, dentist or pharmacist).

This provision is an extension of the existing serious and wilful misconduct provision contained in the Act and is justified by reference to the Government's priority on safety in the workplace. The amendment recognises that employees as well as employers have responsibility for workplace safety. It is also warranted by the current community standards in relation to drink driving and the unlawful use of drugs. It is also consistent with the principle that employers should only be accountable for injuries which are within their control.

The proposal is necessary and reasonable. A worker's injury will fall outside the ambit of the Act only if a clear causal link is established between the injury and the voluntarily consumption of drugs or alcohol. Similar provisions are contained in workers compensation legislation in some other Australian jurisdictions. The 1971 South Australian Act, repealed by the previous Labor Government in 1987, also contained a provision which embraced this concept.

Commutation of Weekly Payments

The Act currently provides that a worker (or dependant spouse in the case of a deceased worker) may ask the corporation to commute his/her entitlements from weekly payments to a lump sum. Interpretation of the current provisions by the courts in some recent cases has resulted in the corporation's having very limited discretion to refuse an application for a commutation in cases where it does not consider it appropriate (such as where the future liabilities are uncertain). In some cases the courts have also determined that the worker is entitled to receive a lump sum partial commutation and continue to receive (reduced) weekly payments, thus undermining the main purpose of the commutation, that being the finalisation of the liability to make weekly payments. All of those who have been here since 1986 know that that was never the intention of the Act, whether it be a Liberal Opposition—now a Liberal Government—or a previous Labor Government, now the Opposition.

These interpretations by the court are totally at odds with the original design of the scheme which intended to remove a 'lump sum' mentality and provide weekly income support. The court's interpretation threatens to undermine the viability of the scheme.

The proposed amendments to section 42 are intended to address these issues by giving absolute discretion to the corporation to make or not make a commutation payment and to ensure that such payment discharges the corporation's liability to make weekly payments. Consequential changes to section 35(6) and (6a) refer to the effect of a commutation on the worker's entitlement to weekly payments in respect of future separate injuries.

The proposed changes to section 44 are intended to bring the provisions relating to the commutation of a spouse's entitlement to weekly payments in line with those applying to workers under section 42. These measures will have a potential cost saving to the scheme of approximately $5 million to $10 million per year relative to present costs.

Stress Related Claims

It is proposed that the provisions relating to stress claims be amended to require a clearer causal link between employment and the disability. The changes would require that stress arising out of employment be 'wholly or predominantly' the cause of the disability. It will include, in this statutory definition, both an illness of the mind and a physical manifestation of that illness. For it to be compensable the changes would also exclude compensation if the stress is wholly or predominantly attributable to a reasonable act, decision or requirement in connection with the worker's employment or made under the Act affecting the worker. This amendment will create greater equity in the determination of stress claims and will help eliminate, so far as is practicable, claims which constitute an abuse or exploitation of existing benefits. This measure will have an approximate cost saving to the scheme of $6 million per year.

Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal

The Bill proposes minor amendments to clarify the powers of the Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal in circumstances where it is necessary for the tribunal to set aside and remit a decision of a review officer.

Summary

In summary, these changes complement the necessary structural changes to workers compensation and occupational health, safety and welfare laws. They introduce greater equity, overcome current anomalies and ambiguity, and restrict or remove compensation where the cause of the disability is genuinely out of the control of the employer.

However, employers will continue to be held accountable for those injuries which are within their control or influence, and decisive action will be taken to ensure that employers take whatever steps are considered appropriate to prevent or minimise the extent of injury and disease in the workplace and to provide fair benefits for those genuinely injured at work.

These changes represent potential savings to the WorkCover scheme of approximately $27 million to $32 million per year, a saving which will prevent any further increases to levy rates over this year—a very important issue.

Unfortunately, we did not believe that this was the situation because we had been told by the previous Government that it was not the case. Unless this occurs, we will have to increase the levy from 2.86 per cent to 3.15 per cent. That is a tragedy for South Australia. It is a total deceit by the previous Government, but it now means that this legislation

is a matter of urgency, not a matter of structural change and trying to improve the scheme. Purely and simply, surgery is required to amend the falsehoods and the direction it was taking, about which the previous Government did not tell this place. I commend the Bill to the House and seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr CLARKE: I object, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to resume with the explanation of the clauses.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Clause 1: Short title. This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement. The measure will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Substitution of s. 2. It is proposed to enact an objects provision for the Act. The provision will set out the basic principles that underpin the workers rehabilitation and compensation scheme established by the Act and the objectives of the legislation. Subsection (2) is a direction to any person who exercises judicial or quasi-judicial powers under the Act to interpret the Act in light of these objects and to avoid a bias towards the interests of employers or the interests of workers.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation. This clause makes various consequential amendments relating to defined terms under the Act. Recognition is also to be given to the role of the new advisory committee in providing advice on regulations.

Clause 5: Substitution of part II. This clause provides for the repeal of part II of the Act (as the corporation is now to continue in existence under a separate Act as the WorkCover Corporation). In addition, however, the clause provides for a new Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Advisory Committee. The committee will assist the Minister by providing advice on policies affecting the administration of the Act. The committee will also advise the Minister on various relevant legislative proposals and report to the Minister on other matters relating to workers rehabilitation or compensation. The committee will be able to conduct public meetings and inquiries. A member of the committee will be appointed for a term of office not exceeding two years (and will be eligible for reappointment from time to time).

Clause 6: Substitution of s. 30. The contents of this clause principally address three issues. First, section 30 of the Act is to be rewritten as part of a review of the compensability of various disabilities that occur during attendances at various places, or while undertaking a journey. Limitations are to apply in relation to attendances at workplaces before or after work. Various absences will now not be covered by the scheme. A disability will not be compensable if it arises out of, or in the course of, an involvement in an activity unrelated to the worker's employment and specific mention is made in relation to social or sporting events. A disability that occurs during a journey will only be compensable if it occurs between two places at which the worker is required to carry out duties of employment. A journey between two places of employment with different employers will not be covered.

Secondly, new section 30A relates to stress-related claims. It is proposed that a disability caused by stress will only be compensable if the stress is wholly or predominantly stress arising out of employment. The Act presently provides that a disability that consists of an illness or disorder of the mind caused by stress is only compensable if stress arising out of employment is a substantial cause of the disability. Furthermore, the matters that cannot give rise to a stress claim have been revised to include any reasonable act, decision, requirement or instruction made or given in the course of, or in connection with, the worker's employment, and any reasonable act, decision or requirement under the Act. The effect of this will be that the matters currently within the ambit of section 30(2a) of the Act will be subsumed into a general provision relating to stress-related claims, and that a liability for a stress-related claim will not arise if it can be shown that the stress is not attributable, to a significant extent, to a reasonable act, decision, requirement or instruction of the employer or to a reasonable act, decision or requirement of the corporation or an exempt employer.

Thirdly, new section 30B relates to misconduct. Subsection (1) is in similar terms to existing section 30(7) of the Act. Subsection (2) addresses the effect of certain actions on a claim for compensation. It will now be a bar to a claim to prove that the disability is wholly or predominantly attributable to serious and wilful misconduct on the part of the worker (compare existing section 56(1)), or to the influence of alcohol or a drug (other than a drug lawfully consumed in accordance with the directions of a recognised expert).

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 31—Evidentiary provision. The key feature of this amendment is found in new section 31(1). It is proposed that the Act specifically provide that a disability is not compensable unless it is established on the balance of probabilities that it arises from employment. The Act is presently silent on where the burden lies when a claim is made under the Act. The exception is, and will continue to be, in relation to disabilities that come within the operation of the second schedule (where the effect is such that disabilities are presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to have arisen from employment). The advisory committee (in addition to the corporation) will be able to make recommendations to extend the operation of the second schedule by regulation.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 35—Weekly payments. This amendment is consequential on proposals to amend the operation of section 42 of the Act and is intended to ensure that proper account is given under section 35 to a commutation under section 42 where a worker suffers two or more disabilities (as a worker cannot receive in any case payments in excess of the worker's notional weekly earnings). The key is to ensure that the worker is notionally taken to still be receiving the weekly payments that the worker would have been receiving if there had been no commutation. This concept is equally relevant to cases that involve an assessment under division 4A and so existing subsection (6a) is to be replaced with a comparable amendment (new subsection (6b)).

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 42—Commutation of liability to make weekly payments. These amendments are principally concerned to improve and clarify the operation of section 42 of the Act. It will be made clear that a liability to make weekly payments may, on the application of the worker, be commuted to a liability to make a capital payment. The corporation will have an absolute discretion as to whether or not it allows the commutation. (The amendment will therefore make it clear that once the worker has made the application, it is the Corporation's decision as to whether the commutation occurs.) If the commutation occurs, it will discharge all liability to make the weekly payments to which the commutation relates. It will not be possible to claim that a residual liability remains. The maximum amount for lump

sums payable under this scheme will remain (fixed to the prescribed sum).

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 44—Compensation payable on death. This makes various amendments to section 44 of the Act that are similar to the amendments to be made to section 42 in relation to commutations. Commutations will be limited to the prescribed sum.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 46—Incidence of liability. The new provisions relating to "journey injuries" and absences from work mean that there is less reason to continue with the concept of "unrepresentative disabilities" (as presently defined in section 3 of the Act). The concept is therefore being removed. A consequential amendment must therefore be made to section 46.

Clause 12: Repeal of s. 56. Section 56 of the Act is to be repealed (and replaced by new section 30B).

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 64—The Compensation Fund. This clause will allow the corporation to use the Compensation Fund for various matters allowed by regulation. The amendment is necessary in view of proposals for the corporation to assume the administration of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986 (and, potentially, other Acts as well).

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 67—Adjustment of levy in relation to individual employers. This is a consequential amendment on account of proposals to limit the compensability of a disability that occurs during a journey, or during certain absences from work.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 73—Separate accounts. This is also a consequential amendment.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 97—Appeals to tribunal. This clause makes a technical amendment to section 97 of the Act to ensure that the tribunal has the power to set aside a decision under appeal (as a prelude to remitting the matter to a review officer for further hearing).

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 112—Confidentiality to be maintained. These amendments revise the provision that relates to the confidentiality of information in order to provide greater consistency with proposals under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986.

Clause 18: Repeal of s. 121.

Clause 19: Repeal of s. 123.

Clause 20: Amendment of fourth schedule. These amendments are all consequential on the proposed new WorkCover Corporation Act.

Clause 21: Application of amendments. The amendments will not have retrospective effect, except in relation to the reforms relating to commutations.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE (ADMINISTRATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is the third Bill in the package of three Bills relating to structural reform of South Australian workers compensation and occupational health, safety and welfare laws. In my second reading speech to the overriding legislation, the WorkCover Corporation Bill, I outlined the Government's policy objectives and the justification for these measures.

This Bill proposes structural and consequential changes to the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act. It enables workplace safety to be put back as the overall policy priority in this area. The Bill proposes to abolish the Occupational Health and Safety Commission and to establish the Occupational Health Safety and Welfare Advisory Committee in line with the State Government's policy. This will sharpen the focus of accountability for changes in policy and enhance the tripartite consultative process to policy making. It also proposes necessary consequential changes to give effect to the transfer of certain functions of the existing Occupational Health and Safety Commission to the WorkCover Corporation.

Other amendments in this Bill deal with:

- a provision that employers can be required to establish health and safety committees where they have not already done so;
- more effective confidentiality provisions;
- consequential changes to requirements for exemption from the provisions of the Act;
- enabling powers for the transferral or removal of workplace registration fees.

Structural changes

In accordance with the Government's policy to integrate services to employers in relation to occupational health, safety and workers compensation, this Bill proposes the abolition of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission in its current form. The responsibility to administer these portions of the Occupational Health Safety and Welfare Act previously administered by the commission would be taken up by the reconstituted WorkCover Corporation to be established under the new WorkCover Corporation Bill.

The Occupational Health Safety and Welfare Advisory Committee is to be established to advise the Minister in relation to:

- the formulation and implementation of policies relating to occupational health, safety and welfare;
- proposals to amend the Act or regulations;
- the establishment and review of codes of practice;
- any other policy matters relating to occupational health, safety and welfare.

It is intended that this advisory committee will be tripartite. It will be an important consultative forum and overcome the current fractured policy and activities of the WorkCover Board. The Minister, with advice from the advisory committee, will determine matters of new policy in relation to the legislation, and the WorkCover Corporation will be responsible for the administration of parts of the Act.

Consequential amendments to various sections of the Act will be necessary to substitute the WorkCover 'Corporation' for the 'Commission' in relation to the various aspects of the Act.

Other substantive changes to the Act are as follows:

Health and Safety Committees

It is proposed that section 31 be amended to allow for regulations to be made to require an employer to establish a health and safety committee. This power could be used to require certain categories of employers to establish a health and safety committee if their safety performance or consultation record indicates that a committee is necessary.

This Government is committed to ensuring that employers take their responsibilities in regard to the health and safety of their employees seriously. This proposed amendment will

allow appropriate action to be taken in this area. It will complement the Government's commitment to ensure that chief executive officers in the private and public sectors take both legal and practical responsibility for workplace safety.

Confidentiality provisions

It is proposed that the Act be amended to ensure consistency with the confidentiality provisions under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act and to allow disclosure of information to the corporation as is necessary.

It is further proposed that any person (including a health and safety representative, committee member or consultant) when making a disclosure under the provisions of section 55(1) must, as far as is reasonably practicable, take steps to prevent or minimise any adverse commercial or industrial impact on the relevant employer.

Exemptions from the Act

The current Act provides for the Occupational Health and Safety Commission to grant exemptions from the provisions of the Act. With the abolition of that commission it is necessary to make a consequential amendment to the Act. It is proposed that the Minister have the power to grant an exemption under the Act but that, prior to the granting of an exemption, the Minister must consult the advisory committee and, where reasonably practicable, consult with associations that represent employers and workers.

Workplace registration fee

Changes are also proposed in relation to the workplace registration fee to enable the fee to be removed by proclamation should that become necessary or if it is seen as desirable to incorporate or absorb the fee into the WorkCover levy.

In summary, whilst the changes proposed in this Bill are mainly structural and consequential in nature, they are an important step towards improving the efficiency of occupational health, safety and welfare services to employers and employees. These structural changes also provide the necessary flexibility to interrelate the activities of the restructured WorkCover Corporation with the Department for Industrial Affairs, where necessary and appropriate.

I commend the Bill to the House and seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the detailed explanation of the clauses without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The measure will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation, other than the amendments relating to the Employers Registration scheme, which will come into operation on 1 July 1994.

Clause 3: Amendment of long title

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the long title of the Act.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause makes various consequential amendments relating to defined terms under the Act.

Clause 5: Substitution of Part II

This clause provides for the repeal of Part II of the Act so as to dissolve the S.A. Occupational Health and Safety Commission, and to create a new *Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Advisory Committee*. The committee will consist of at least five members appointed by the Minister after consultation with relevant organisations. The committee will assist the Minister in the formulation of policies, and will advise him or her on the implementation of policies, relevant to the administration of the Act. The committee will also advise the Minister on various relevant legislative proposals and recommend and review codes of practice under the Act. The committee will provide other advice relating to occupational health, safety and welfare. The committee will be able to conduct public meetings and inquiries. The committee will be expected to make proposed regulations, codes of practice or standards available for public comment, together with an industry impact statement. A member of the committee will be appointed for a term of office not exceeding two years (and will be eligible for reappointment from time to time).

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 21—Duties of workers

The function of the commission to publish or approve policies that apply at a workplace for the purposes of section 21 of the Act is to be taken over by the Minister.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 27—Health and safety representatives may represent groups

The Minister will now approve guidelines for the purpose of constituting work groups under the health and safety representatives scheme.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 28—Election of health and safety representatives

The corporation will be able to assist in the election of health and safety representatives (instead of the commission).

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 31—Health and safety committees

An employer will be required to establish a health and safety committee if required to do so by or under the regulations.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 32—Functions of health and safety representatives

The Minister will now be empowered to approve consultants for the purposes of section 32 of the Act.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 34—Responsibilities of employers

The corporation will take over the role of the commission in relation to approving of courses of training relating to occupational health, safety or welfare and to establishing guidelines.

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 38—Powers of entry and inspection

The Minister will authorise the people who can exercise the powers of an inspector under the Act.

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 51—Immunity of inspectors and officers

This is a consequential amendment.

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 53—Delegation by Minister

This will vest the Director's powers of delegation under the Act in the Minister.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 54—Power to require information

The power to require certain information presently vested in the commission will be transferred to the Minister.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 55—Confidentiality

This clause revises section 55(1) of the Act so that the rules relating to the confidentiality of information have a greater degree of consistency with the rules under the *Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986*. A person who makes a disclosure will be required, in so far as is reasonably practicable, to take steps to prevent or minimise any adverse commercial or industrial impact on the relevant employer.

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 60a—Expiation of offences

The form of an expiation notice will now be determined by the Minister. The expiation period is to be extended to 60 days to ensure consistency with the *Expiation of Offences Act 1987*.

Clause 18: Amendment of s. 63—Code of Practice

Codes of practice will now be made on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 63a—Use of codes of practice in proceedings

This amendment clarifies the intent of section 63a of the Act.

Clause 20: Repeal of s. 65

This clause is consequential on the dissolution of the commission (as annual reporting will now be dealt with under the *WorkCover Corporation Act 1994*).

Clause 21: Amendment of s. 66—Modification of regulations

The Minister will be entitled to receive a copy of any notice of exemption under section 66 of the Act.

Clause 22: Amendment of s. 67—Exemption from Act

The Minister will now be empowered to grant exemptions from the Act, after consultation with the Advisory Committee and, so far as is reasonably practicable, after consultation with relevant registered associations.

Clause 23: Amendment of s. 67a—Registration of employers

Greater flexibility is proposed in relation to the application of section 67a of the Act, especially as to the amount that will be payable to the department in each year. The Governor will be able, by proclamation, to fix a day on which the section expires.

Clause 24: Amendment of s. 68—Consultation on regulations

This clause relates to consultation by the Minister on proposed regulations. The Minister will be expected to consult with the Advisory Committee in so far as is reasonable or appropriate in the circumstances of the case.

Clause 25: Amendment of s. 69—Regulations
This clause makes various consequential amendments to section 69 of the Act.
Clause 26: Amendment of first schedule
This clause makes a consequential amendment.
Clause 27: Amendment of second schedule
This clause deletes redundant material.
Clause 28: Transitional provisions
The Governor will be able, by regulation, to make saving or transitional provisions on account of the enactment of this measure.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from 24 February. Page 284.)

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I wish to address my remarks tonight to the Macedonian issue. I listened with amusement when I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition say today that he felt that the Republic of Yugoslavia Macedonia should not be entitled to use the Star of Vergina, which of course has always been historically associated with Macedonia, as in the Macedonia of Alexander the Great.

As members well know, the Deputy Leader's Federal Labor Government gave recognition to the name and the use of the name, the Republic of Yugoslavia Macedonia. Macedonia is represented by the Star of Vergina and so it seems to me that it is fatuous for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to say that he was opposing the use of the Star of Vergina, because one follows the other. The hypocrisy of the Federal Labor Government is patently obvious from the following statement that Prime Minister Keating made on 3 March 1992:

The Government would not proceed to recognition of the Republic of Yugoslavia Macedonia until three basic outstanding questions were resolved.

1. The use of the word 'Macedonia' being settled in a way that does not cause further tension with Greece.
2. Greece's concern about possible territorial claims or aspirations being fully met.
3. The international community's concern about protection of minorities being fully satisfied.

The Greek Prime Minister, Mr Papandreou, said on 18 January 1994:

The Greek people would not accept the inclusion of the name 'Macedonia' in the Republic of Yugoslavia Macedonia.

Again, in the Greek Parliament on 24 January 1994 he said that Greece was still concerned and their concerns were not met. What does the Prime Minister of Australia do after giving an undertaking to the Greek community? He subsequently recognises the Republic of Yugoslavia Macedonia, and that is total hypocrisy and a total betrayal of the Greek community. One might well ask why he did that. One can reach one of three conclusions: first, that the Prime Minister was ignorant of the historical link between Macedonia and Greece; secondly, that he did not care; or, thirdly, probably he was influenced by Gareth Evans.

We all know that he is an internationalist, a man who is interested only in the Asia Pacific region. He has ambitions to be Secretary-General of the United Nations and to get a Nobel prize, so he betrays the Greek people. He does not even bother to consult with the Greek community, and he advises his Prime Minister to recognise a country and the use of a name that is totally alien to the Greek community and to which it is totally opposed. We well know that there are about 750 000 Greeks in this country. The justification for the lack of a claim to the use of the name 'Macedonia' is clear from history.

There is no doubt that Yugoslavia has no right at all to use the name 'Macedonia'. The Greek gods resided on Mount Olympus, which is obviously physically in Greek Macedonia. The Macedonians spoke the Greek tongue, the Aeolian tongue (a dialect of Greek), and that was according to the historian Hellanius. Homer in the *Iliad* refers to the Greek tribes living in Macedonia. That was in the ninth century BC. In the fifth century BC Herodotus also talks of the Greeks in Macedonia. If one then turns to religious sources, the prophet Daniel, in chapter 8 verses 1 to 22, predicts the coming of a king—and this is 200 years before the coming of Alexander—who will defeat the Persians and Medes, and he talks about a Greek king. So, even in the book of Revelations it was accepted that Macedonia was Greek and would be led by a Greek king.

Historically, it is clear why the Republic of Yugoslavia would want to use the word 'Macedonia'. In 1944 the Yugoslav Communist Party under Tito established a Macedonian Government and a House of Representatives. It then renamed the southern Slav dialect the Macedonian language. Until then, of course, it was known as a Slav dialect. In 1968 it established a Macedonian Church not recognised by either the Orthodox Greek Church or any of the orthodox churches, nor recognised by the Vatican. Obviously, the reason they did that was ultimately to make territorial claims.

If one looks at what is happening at the present time, it is clear that that is their probable intention. The tower of Salonika, which is currently on their currency, is situated physically—

Members interjecting:

Mr CUMMINS: The Leader of the Opposition is sitting over there. I might say that it was noted that on Saturday he did not even bother to attend the rally that 6 000 to 8 000 Greek people attended: a man who purports to be concerned about the Greek people did not even bother to turn up at the parade. We have his Deputy Leader talking about the Star of Vergina, saying that it should not be used, and his Federal Labor Government turns around and allows the use of 'Macedonia'. Following from that, obviously, one would expect that they would be able to use the star, which they are doing.

That is the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy to the Greek people of this State. They know that they are in trouble: they are running for cover by talking about the Star of Vergina. What a joke that is, I might add. In addition, it is clear from the papers circulating from the Macedonian people in Melbourne that the Republic of Yugoslav Macedonia is making claims against land in Greek Macedonia, for example, in Salonika and Halkidiki. It is very clear what the intentions historically of the Tito Communist Party were, and it is clear also from the present history that those intentions are still there.

Of course, the word 'Macedonia' itself was never associated with the historical region; there was never a State in the Balkans called 'Macedonia'. Macedonia only meant 'the land of tall people', so why has the Federal Labor Government allowed a description of people to be used as descriptive of a State and allowed a former communist regime trying to make claims against Macedonia to use the name the Government recognised? Of course, the recognition

was supposed to be temporary, and the problem of the use of the name was supposed to be solved by September of last year, and it has not been. So, there is temporary recognition. There is no reason why now the Federal Labor Government should not withdraw its recognition immediately, because the issue has not been resolved. Because it will not do that, it is another example of the Federal Labor Government's attitude towards the Greek community in this country and its concerns in this country.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to raise one matter today, but I must make some comments at the outset on the issue raised by the member for Norwood a few moments ago. I conveyed my apologies to the organisers of Saturday's rally, because I had a pre-existing commitment in the South-East of the State which took me out of town on Saturday, and my message was conveyed to the organisers. I met with the organisers and heads of Greek community organisations on Friday, particularly Mr Peter Soustas of the Pan-Macedonian Federation, and they are in no doubt whatsoever as to where the State Labor Party stands on this matter. I might say that the State Labor Party has stood on this matter very strongly and consistently. I spoke about this matter long before anyone on the other side of this House chose to do so. I remind members that on 15 February I stood in this House and gave a speech on this matter, and I wondered where the other speeches were. I fully expected—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will tell you about my Federal colleagues in a minute. I fully expected that other members of this place would stand up afterwards and say, 'Hear, hear! We endorse the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition.' I wondered where the members for Colton and Norwood were when I raised this issue in the House. Where were the member for Unley and other members who espoused their views, supposedly supporting Greek Australians on this matter?

Mr Quirke: Looking at a map.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, they must have been looking at a map. It is all very well now that they see large crowds in the street for them to say, 'We want to be in on that too.' I stood up on this matter the moment I heard rumours that a policy change was in the wind at the Federal level. The others were silent; and the member for Norwood has scurried from the Chamber with his tail between his legs, because he knows they are the facts. I have been on the public record criticising my Federal colleagues. I have been interviewed in the media criticising my Federal colleagues. I have said so in this place; and in other fora of my own Party I have criticised my Federal colleagues. I have not been hiding my criticism away from the public view on this matter. So, my Party and I have a very good track record on this matter.

Therefore, as I make those comments, I wonder where the member for Norwood is in relation to the Hon. Andrew Peacock. If he is to be consistent on this matter, saying we are not at variance with our Federal colleagues on this matter when in fact we are, where is he with the Hon. Andrew Peacock, who on 15 February this year acknowledged that Australia's decision to recognise the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia as an independent State was consistent with that State's membership of the United Nations? That is what the Hon. Andrew Peacock said about the matter. I am critical of the Hon. Andrew Peacock on that matter. Where are the members for Norwood, Unley and Colton in terms of commenting on the Hon. Andrew Peacock's views on that matter?

What we see happening in this country at the moment is a willingness on the part of some to turn this into a politically partisan issue, when it is a much more serious, significant issue than that. We have seen the scurrilous activities of Jeff Kennett in Victoria who has chosen to debase this and reduce it to an issue of Party political lines. I did not choose to do this when I spoke in this House on 15 February; I have not chosen to do this when I have spoken at Greek Australian functions. Indeed, when I was Premier of this State, the Hon. Julian Stefani, who was overseas at the time, offered to convey a message from me to an international conference on the question of Macedonia. When he asked whether I would be prepared to have him convey the message I said 'Yes', because I knew that we both spoke with one voice on that issue. I did not try to play political games; I did not try to divide this issue off on one side or the other. Neither did he, for which I give him credit.

An honourable member: Not then.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Not then; I do not know what his current views are on the political Party games on the issue, but I notice that other members on the other side seem very free and easy in wanting to turn this into a Party political battle. Actually, I wanted to speak on some other matters today, and one particular matter concerns an organisation known as Compassionate Friends of Adelaide.

The reason I raise this today is that associates of this organisation came to see me in my electorate office in the last half of last year. They were keen to attract Government funding for that organisation. It had had small amounts of funds up to that time, but not anywhere near enough to help that organisation fulfil its requirements. I indicated at the time that I was very sympathetic to its position and that we should be giving further financial support. I was in a difficulty when I last met with them because that was during the caretaker period prior to the election. As members will know, the caretaker provisions prevented me from making any new decision on this matter. I could enact a previous decision, but I could not make a new decision, pending the outcome of the election on 11 December. What I did say on that occasion was that I supported the work of that organisation and that, were we to be re-elected to Government, I would commit my Party in Government to giving Compassionate Friends $10 000 to help them with the valuable work that they do.

I raise this matter now in the hope that the new Government will realise the significant work of this organisation and will take up the commitment that I made on behalf of my Party—which I do understand does not bind the present Government. Nevertheless, I hope that it will see the wisdom and virtue of supporting this organisation. I certainly draw this matter to the attention of the Minister for Family and Community Services.

On the face of it, it might seem an easy problem to resolve, that the money could just be given. However, some changes to the guidelines would need to happen to have that funding made easily available to Compassionate Friends. Compassionate Friends of South Australia has been paid small amounts of money up to this point of time. In 1990 it was paid $500 and in 1991 it was paid a further $500 from the State Minister's own lines. In November 1993 it was paid $1 000 from the Minister's own office budget lines. Further funding was not available to the organisation. I shall read from the letter of the then Minister (Hon. Martyn Evans) who, in writing to Compassionate Friends of Adelaide, said

that he had received its submission for funding, had received support from a number of other groups, particularly Families Against Senseless Tragedies, and had approved a special one-off grant of $1 000 to Compassionate Friends of Adelaide. The key point in the letter that he wrote on that occasion was this:

> Although your agency's activities fall outside the criteria of Family and Community Services funding programs, I am aware of the valuable work undertaken by your volunteers in the provision of assistance to bereaved families.

It was that issue that I felt needed to be addressed as well as the simple matter of the actual money—whatever amount that would be. My commitment to the organisation was that, were we to be re-elected to Government, not only would we make available $10 000 but we would ensure that the guidelines, which to that point in time had precluded it from receiving funding, would be amended to enable organisations like it to be eligible for funding.

As I say, this in no way binds the present Government, but I raise it as a matter which does deserve full consideration. I hope the Government will give consideration to it. I regret the fact that we were not in a position to give it assistance earlier. I want to acknowledge quite freely the considerable work that the then member for Walsh (Hon. John Trainer) and a number of other members on this side of the House did in supporting the work of this organisation. Unfortunately, we have not addressed that in our funding guidelines. I do regret that and hope that the matter can be fixed up in the near future.

There were also some other matters raised with me by Families Against Senseless Tragedies, which indicated its support for Compassionate Friends. It raised some issues with respect to further considerations of the Wrongs Act. These matters were being considered prior to the last election. I hope that these matters are still being considered by the present Government and that matters that have been drawn to the attention of the Attorney-General's office will continue to receive some consideration. There is the matter of Crown appeals, suspended sentences and such issues that the Attorney-General was considering prior to the election. I hope that the new Attorney-General likewise will do the same.

It raised a number of issues with respect to the Justice and Consumer Affairs Committee report on support services for victims of road accidents. Families Against Senseless Tragedies was a member of a working party on that matter, but I understand that a number of recommendations by the working party have not yet been fully addressed. I was being asked for a check list on that matter to provide information on what had been done about those recommendations and what still remained outstanding. Again, I draw that to the attention of the Government, hoping that it will look favourably at the recommendations of that working party.

I do not wish to take my full time today, but I did want to raise those two issues. I come back again to the matter that I raised at the outset in response to the member for Norwood and draw attention to some important points that need to be made. Returning to the member for Norwood's apparent study of the matter, I interjected upon him because he—

Mr Quirke: Petulant address.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Petulant address, yes. He pretended to portray that he knew what he was talking about, but he let himself down when he referred to Salonika. If he had a proper understanding of the area, he would know that it is Thessalonika. It is called Salonika by many others, but Greeks believe that Thessalonika is the correct name. I understand that Thessalonika takes its name from the wife of Phillip of Macedon. I think Thessalia might be the name, but I stand to be corrected on that. It has been pointed out to me by Greeks in Thessaloniki that Salonika is not the correct name for the place. So this person, who attempted to say how much he knew about the history, failed to get the name right. He used the name that is commonly used by non-Greeks, but it is not the correct name used by Greeks. I have no doubt that Salonika is the name used by people in the Skopje region.

I return to a more serious matter. I have written a detailed letter to the Prime Minister on this matter drawing attention to his comments of March 1992 indicating the undertakings that he gave to the Greek Australian community about recognising the concerns of Greek Australians and Greeks internationally to the name issue and indicating that those matters should be resolved. In my letter I point out that, as I read Gareth Evans' statement, he still acknowledges that those issues have to be resolved. I most certainly endorse the sentiment that the issues have to be resolved and that full recognition should be contingent upon fulfilling the guidelines laid down by the Prime Minister in 1992.

I should like to correct a misapprehension that some people seem to have. I make this as a non-partisan statement, because I believe that there are people on both sides of politics who have this misapprehension. I refer to the understanding of what is behind the Greek Government's decision to co-sponsor the admission of FYROM to the United Nations. The misapprehension is that some people interpret that to mean that the Greek Government unreservedly supports the admission of FYROM to that body. That is not the case. In fact, it made the point known internationally that when it co-sponsored the application of FYROM to the United Nations it was recognising, as I do, the legitimate right of the people of that region to be independent and to have free status, but also recognising that there were unresolved issues. The point was clearly made at the time of that co-sponsorship motion that the name issue was unresolved and Greece did not accept then, when it acted as co-sponsor, or now, as the matter is still being debated, the right of that region to use the name Macedonia or to use the Star of Vergina on its flag. It is a misapprehension by some to presume that Greece has somehow tacitly supported these things when it has not.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I simply make the point that the Hon. Andrew Peacock made comments supporting Gareth Evans, and I just wonder where the member for Norwood was in criticising the Hon. Andrew Peacock. I raise that simple point with the member for Unley, and I hope that he recognises that I have acknowledged those members opposite when they have expressed views similar to my own on this matter. That is more than we hear from members opposite, who choose to make political Party politics of this matter and refuse even to acknowledge when somebody across the floor from themselves might happen to have a similar view on certain issues. That, I think, is very cheap politics. That kind of thing is inflaming the row we have in this country at the moment and which is leading to the fringe of violence that I abhor and I hope that all members in this House would abhor. The violent activities that are taking place in this area at the moment cannot be condoned, and all people who have roles of leadership have an obligation to ensure that we keep the debate on this matter in the realm of the intelligent and out of the realm of the violent.

I do not wish to speak further on this today, but I call on members opposite to at least play their role in this very important matter and give due seriousness to the issues involved and with an appropriate recognition of the views that have been expressed on this matter and, where criticism has to be given, that they are fair in their criticism as well, including of their colleagues in other arenas.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): In my Address in Reply speech I commented on the maiden speeches of 11 new members. Before doing so I listened carefully to their speeches and later read and annotated the *Hansard* account of each of them. I did this because I believe members are likely to reveal more about themselves in their maiden speeches than they will do in subsequent speeches and my concentrating on these contributions was a way of getting to know the members better.

Most Liberal members have taken my textual criticisms in a sporting spirit and some are pleased that someone did listen to their remarks. I am sure new members enter Parliament expecting adversarial exchanges in the Chamber. However, the member for Lee is an exception. He seems to think that the immunity of the maiden speech to interjections extends to subsequent criticism. In my remarks about the member for Lee I mentioned that he had stood unsuccessfully for public office many times: for the Senate as the head of the Majority Wishes Party; for the position of General Secretary of the Public Service Association; for the Findon ward of Woodville council; for the West Croydon ward of Woodville council; and for the Albert Park ward of Woodville council.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: I said he had been unsuccessful in each of these elections, but I congratulated him on winning the poll in Lee and added that I was always pleased to see former members of the Spence ALP sub-branch succeed.The member for Lee said that this list was a misstatement, and he is right in two respects: first, the list of his unsuccessful candidatures is much longer; and, secondly, he has not stood for Findon ward. I apologise to the member for Lee for that mistake but it in no way detracts from the point I was making. I shall now put the record straight by detailing the member for Lee's previous candidatures. In December 1984 he headed the Australian Majority Wishes Party ticket for the Senate. He polled 765 votes of 786,785 cast, or 0.09 per cent of the total.

Mr Brindal: That is more than Claire McCarthy, isn't it?

Mr ATKINSON: No. That result could hardly be described as the majority's wish! In his home booth of Woodville South, at which 2 000 people voted, the member for Lee received two votes. I hope, in reciting that figure to the House, I am not violating the secrecy of the ballot. In December 1985 he stood as the independent Majority Wishes candidate for the State district of Henley Beach: he polled 264 votes, being 1.4 per cent of the total. In 1984 he stood for the position of General Secretary of the Public Service Association. There were two other candidates. Mr Rossi polled 194 votes in a turnout of 6 717 voters, being 2.9 per cent of the formal vote.

On 7 July 1979, he stood for Albert Park ward of Woodville council; on 1 October 1983, he stood for Beverley ward of Woodville council; on 2 May 1987, he stood for West Croydon ward of Woodville council; on 29 July 1991 he stood for Seaton ward of Woodville council; on 26 October 1991, he stood for Albert Park ward of Woodville council for the second time; and on 11 May 1992, he stood for West Croydon ward of Woodville council for the second time. All six of these local government campaigns ended in defeat for the member for Lee. I mentioned only three of these defeats in my Address in Reply speech, but the attack by the member for Lee on my remarks has now required of me that I should mention them all.

It should be noted that the member for Lee lives in Findon ward, yet this is one of the few wards in the Woodville council that he has not contested. Like the member for Colton in his Address in Reply speech, I confused the suburbs of Findon and Seaton; I confess my mistake. One has to admire the member for Lee for his persistence in politics; it has now been rewarded by a seat in this House. However, his victory does not erase his political record or his record in public life, and it is neither offensive nor improper for me to recite it.

The member for Lee further objected to my mentioning that he had stood against his wife, Annette, in the Albert Park ward by-election. He said that my remark was incorrect and offensive and that he wanted a retraction and an apology from me.

Mr Speaker, in the 1991 Albert Park ward by-election, being a by-election for a single vacancy, the votes were cast as follows: John Casey, 216; Carlo Meschino, 167; Chris Taylor, 140; Annette Rossi, 80; Joe Capella, 56; Joe Rossi, 16; Rocco Marafiote, nine; informal, 11. When Mr Rossi was eliminated and his preferences were distributed six of his preferences went to the only candidate who was an ALP member, five to Mrs Rossi and one to another Labor orientated candidate. It does the member for Lee no credit to deny in the House that he stood against his wife in this election.

I stand by my remarks—they were not incorrect, as the member for Lee claims. Desirable as apologies and the begging of forgiveness are in a civilised society, I shall not be apologising as the member for Lee demands because I have done nothing wrong in this matter.

The member for Lee then said he was offended by my saying he had been a member of the Spence ALP, and he called on me to explain my remarks. Party records show that the member for Lee joined the Spence West ALP sub-branch during the 1985-86 financial year. His name and address appear in this sub-branch minute book, moving and seconding motions within the Spence ALP. He renewed his financial membership by paying the required fee for the 1986-87 financial year. His membership was then cancelled by the ALP head office when it was noticed that he had twice stood against endorsed Labor candidates for another political Party. That he was expelled from the ALP does not render the honourable member's ALP membership void from the beginning, as he seems to think.

Mr ROSSI: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I object to the word 'expelled'.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order, because it is not contrary to Standing Orders. The honourable member has the opportunity to make a personal explanation, if he desires, before the adjournment debate tonight.

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Lee also argued that I misled the House by claiming that I won all polling booths situated in Spence. The member for Lee says quite correctly that in the Woodville South booth my Liberal opponent polled 845 primary votes to my 779. What he does not mention is that after the distribution of preferences I won the booth. It is universally accepted by members of the House and by political Parties that booths are won and lost on the two Party preferred vote, not on the primary vote.

It is true that the Liberal candidate polled 216 votes to my 173 in the Woodville Road booth, but this booth is not situated in Spence. It is a Price booth in the Price electorate. If I may extend the argument a little beyond its usefulness, the member for Lee might as well say that the Liberal candidate out-polled me in Spence declaration votes cast at Kingscote, Kangaroo Island. My assertion that I carried all booths situated in Spence is correct.

I should like to thank the Liberal candidate for Spence, Mr Danny McGuire, for the honourable way in which he fought the campaign. Danny and I have quaffed beer together; he has been to my home; he has given me lifts from time to time; and, during the campaign, we spoke regularly to prevent misunderstandings and prevent any excesses by our campaign workers. Mr Danny McGuire is a gentleman.

I stand by my Address in Reply speech. I do not accept the member for Lee's implication that I lied in my Address in Reply speech. I do not believe it is appropriate for me to retract and apologise for any of my speech other than the mistake of saying 'Findon ward' when I should have said 'Seaton ward'. I am pleased that you, Mr Speaker, have not responded to the request by the member for Lee for a ruling that would stop me speaking about these matters in the House.

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

Mr ATKINSON: I do not think it parliamentary for the member for Lee to refer to me in the House as a 'gutter player', as he did. Alas, I was not in the House to object to that epithet at the time. I invite members opposite to peruse the documents that underpin this speech. I should add that the rule under which the member for Lee was expelled from the ALP was rule 59(a)(ii), which states:

> Any person not being a member of the Party who as a candidate opposes or has opposed an endorsed Labor candidate shall not be eligible for membership of the Party.

Indeed, his membership fee was courteously returned to him and its return is noted in the minute book of the Spence West sub-branch, which I have with me.

Mr BECKER (Peake): I thank the member for Spence for his contribution this evening. He spent the whole time berating the member for Lee. However, what he has done is reflect on the former member for Albert Park, Kevin Hamilton. No-one worked harder for his electorate than Kevin Hamilton and probably no-one would have been more disappointed than he at being defeated.

However, that cannot take away the credit that the member for Lee deserves, because he, too, worked hard: he has worked for his people and for his electorate. He may have been involved in the Labor Party or other political Parties, but at least he has learnt the lesson of life. The member for Spence has yet to learn that lesson, that is, that we are here to represent the people. That is what we are here for: we are not worried about his self interest or anyone else's interests. We are here to represent the people, and it is high time that the remaining few members of the Opposition learnt that unless they start to represent the people their numbers will fall and fall and they will be lucky even to be able to have enough members to enable them to form a basketball team. Holden's will not get any business out of them because they will all fit in the back seat of a Tarago!

I am disappointed about the legacy that has been left to us by the Labor Party. Over the wonderful years of the 1980s development and progress took place everywhere else in Australia. However, we in South Australia witnessed the very poor fiscal management of the Labor Government. That cost us dearly. At a time when we want jobs and when we should be doing something we cannot do anything because we have lost $3.1 billion plus other hundreds of millions of dollars, and here we are struggling to try to lift South Australia out of the doldrums. I pay tribute to Jim McCusker of Kensington Park, who wrote to the Prime Minister.

Mr Atkinson: A good Labor man.

Mr BECKER: Let us give credit where credit is due. In his letter to the Prime Minister, Mr McCusker states:

> Dear Sir,
>
> May I present you with 35 written appeals calling for the early completion of the Darwin rail link in Australia's, South Australia's and the Northern Territory's vital interests and as promised in the 1910 Commonwealth of Australia Northern Territory Acceptance Act, as copy attached.
>
> Copies of nine letters to me in favour of the Darwin rail link early completion from concerned politicians are also attached, namely, the Hon. Barbara Wiese, MLC, Minister of Transport Development; the Hon. Sandra Kanck, MLC, Australian Democrats; the Hon. Neville Wran, ex-Premier of New South Wales; the Hon. John Bannon, ex-Premier of South Australia [ex-Lord Mayor].

He didn't write that; that is my comment. The letter continues:

> The Hon. Lynn Arnold, ex-Premier of South Australia; the Hon. Heini Becker, MP, Liberal member for Hanson (at that stage); the Hon. John Dawkins, MP, Treasurer, Parliament House, Canberra.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: What company! The list goes on:

> The Hon. Marshall Perron, Chief Minister, Northern Territory, Darwin; and Senator Chris Schacht, Labor Senator for South Australia.

It is very nice to be included in that group of people. We are interested in the future of South Australia and the Northern Territory. The letter continues:

> Also copies of 24 letters and articles from concerned citizens, mostly as published in the Adelaide *Advertiser* calling for this Darwin rail link to raise South Australia and Northern Territory and Australia up from recession to prosperity.
>
> Although I attend the local Norwood ALP sub-branch, I was invited as guest speaker to the Lobethal Liberal sub-branch AGM of the Hon. John Olsen M.P. to outline the Darwin rail link prospects in which all were very interested. Certainly, all in South Australia and Northern Territory are very strongly in favour of the early completion of the Darwin rail link with which the present obstructive strike at Australian ports could have been relieved and the many containers stranded at the southern port terminals could have been entrained through in three days to the Darwin terminal within the Asia Pacific region, to which 40 per cent of the containers are addressed for distribution. The remaining containers could be forwarded on.
>
> But no, for lack of the rail the containers had to languish in the hot sun indefinitely while perishable contents (meat, cheese etc.) deteriorated and we lost customers who could not accept the delay in deliveries caused by the strike action of the southern ports people who have been opposing the Darwin rail link. This delay is dumping Australia down into recession from which the Darwin rail link will lift Australia up to prosperity.
>
> So please, please let us press on with this Darwin rail link in everybody's interest and ADVANCE AUSTRALIA.

It is signed Jim McCusker, Chartered Civil Engineer. His application to the Prime Minister is supported by a letter from Marshall Perron, dated 19 February 1993. It is important that we record in *Hansard*, in the interests of this rail link, Marshall Perron's views. He writes to Jim McCusker and states:

> Thank you for your letters of 8 February and 12 February 1993 in relation to completion of the north-south transcontinental railway between Adelaide and Darwin. Your expressions of support are

welcomed by me and my Government. Indeed, I am pleased and heartened by the level of support the project has received in South Australia, as demonstrated by the press clippings you enclosed with your letters.

I remain convinced the project is in the nation's interest, and most importantly in South Australia's interest, with a 1990 study by the firm Coopers and Lybrand for the South Australian Government stating that up to half of the project construction expenditures could be undertaken by South Australian constructors. With the current cost of construction estimated at $850 million for the permanent way, this represents a significant boost for economic activity in your State during construction, quite apart from the considerable ongoing benefits the railway would bring to the South Australian economy in the operational phase, by way of warehousing goods for sale and distribution in northern Australia, and making Adelaide the transport hub for distribution of international trade through Darwin to the rest of Australia.

Of equal importance is that the Commonwealth should fulfil its legislative commitments to your State, as the attached extracts from Commonwealth legislation demonstrate. Once again, my thanks for your support. Yours sincerely, Marshall Perron.

He enclosed the Northern Territory Act Acceptance Act 1910-1973. Mr Speaker, you are fully aware of the benefits that would flow to your electorate, because it takes in 85 per cent of the northern portion of South Australia. So much so that in the *Economist* magazine last year, Rod Nettle, an economist, wrote an article, 'Why we must build the rail link to Darwin.' I will quote some of the extracts from his article which has been well researched and well prepared. He states:

. . . railways are not about leisurely, luxury travel these days, they are the work horses of the world and still the quickest and most economic means of moving large quantities of goods from one point to another. Since 1911, we have been trying to get a line built from Alice Springs to Darwin to place the final link in a chain of railways which transport goods around Australia and to our export ports. After 82 years of almost non-stop campaigning, High Court cases and Federal Governments, we still have not completed that rail network.

That is a tragedy with respect to all Governments and all political Parties of all political persuasions: nobody has got in there, pushed hard enough and put up the money. What we will get is the great bureaucratic maze again—let's have a committee; let's have a feasibility study; let's do this; let's do that. It is past that stage. The time is for action when we get down to start building this railway line.

It is expected that more than 2 000 jobs will be created during the construction stage, but I believe we could create a lot more than that and give people the opportunity to work for the first time in two or three years. Unemployment has reached 21 per cent in my electorate: that is a disgrace. We are doing all we can to find out where the jobs are and what job opportunities there are to help these people get back into the work force, to give them some respect, to give them some dignity, to give them some hope and to give them some opportunity, and many opportunities would be created by the building of this railway line. Some of the statistics are amazing. The Alice Springs railway would cost about $900 million. It would cover an area of 1 410 kilometres, and the article states that that 'will be a shot in the arm for Australia'. The article further states:

Its building would require the manufacture of 155 000 tonnes of steel rails, 9.2 million spring steel rail fasteners, 2.3 million steel and concrete sleepers, 15 kilometres of concrete culvert pipe and the supply of 2 million cubic metres of ballast. It would involve earthworks totalling 14 million cubic metres, the upgrading of 160 existing bridges and culverts, the construction of 80 new bridges and the construction of buildings and workshops costing $40 million.

And that is just the beginning. It would be a colossal boost for the Iron Triangle cities of Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie. It would create employment for at least 250 people on a permanent basis after its completion. It would provide the opportunity for us to export to 720 million people. South Australian produce would feed the people who desperately need our products, some of which are the best you can get anywhere in the world. I commend this project to the House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Mr Speaker, I wish to address the House tonight on a matter which impinges upon your electorate, upon my own electorate and upon all people in South Australia, a matter which concerns the Pitjantjatjara people of the western desert and the Wiltja program. In addressing this issue, I point out to the House that, when the tri-State report was done on Aborigines in central Australia, the Pitjantjatjara people were recorded as being among the lowest, if not the lowest, Aboriginal achievers in mainstream education. The last Government, with a very good initiative, provided a program called the Wiltja program, which seeks to bring Aboriginal students from the tribal lands to Adelaide and to put them in mainstream high school schooling at Woodville High and a number of other high schools.

For years that scheme struggled. I believe that in October 1990 only six students were enrolled in the program, but currently 42 students are living in three hostels and the program itself is limited only by the availability of hostel accommodation and suitable people to assist. That is the good side of the story, but the bad side of it involves a history of bureaucratic bungling and woe that has to be seen to be believed. The bad side of it is related to a story I began this afternoon about bureaucrats who know better and who, rather than provide assistance to people genuinely seeking to improve themselves, put barriers in the way and create basically a bureaucratic mess.

Let me draw the attention of this House to the problems of these Aboriginal students who seek medical attention. In context, one of the hostels is in the Kings Park area, but medical attention cannot be sought from local medical centres for these teenage children who often suffer from the general disabilities that teenagers get, overlaid with the various viruses and so on that are known to pervade Aboriginal communities more than perhaps they pervade our own. When they seek medical attention, they are not allowed to go to the local medical centre: they have, instead, to attend the Aboriginal Medical Service. Instead of being dealt with locally and almost instantaneously, there is a strong recommendation that they go to the Aboriginal Medical Service, where they have to wait for between one and four hours.

Mr Atkinson: You mean they must wait?

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, they must wait for between one and four hours. The sole reason given for this is that the ordinary mainstream clinics or GPs in Adelaide would not understand the problems related to Aboriginal health and would not be capable of dealing with these people. That is an artificial hurdle that is put in the way of these students and their home carers. Their home carers could take them to a local medical centre where they could be attended to straight away. It would cost no more or no less than other medical attention—in fact, perhaps less—but they are denied this access because of the bureaucracy. That bureaucracy is called the Aboriginal Medical Service, and I suggest that it is more intent on looking after itself than its clients.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I suggest that instead of interjecting all the time the member for Spence might like to listen to this,

because I am endeavouring to make a reasonable contribution on behalf of people who are disadvantaged.

Mr Atkinson: I'm all ears.

Mr BRINDAL: I know that I should not respond, Sir, but, if he is all ears, he should keep his tongue a little more still. As if that were not bad enough, CAFHS decided in its wisdom to send a nurse to assist with these Aboriginal students. The person in charge of the program assumed that was a good move, that if a nurse came regularly once a week to check these children she would be able to prescribe Disprin, cough syrup and the normal medications for minor ailments. However, that is not so. The CAFHS nurse arrived, but rather than diagnosing and treating minor health problems she announced that she was precluded from doing any of that and that what she had to do was the conventional screening of height, weight, hearing and that type of thing. She was precluded from doing any nursing or prescribing of medication.

So, we have the health service and the nurse, but it does not stop there. Now we get into the irksome bits. Thank goodness, the irksome bits are not attributable to State public servants so much as to Commonwealth departments. There is a tutor program, which seeks to assist these children after school hours to supplement their learning during school hours. However, in its infinite wisdom, the Commonwealth does not try to assist the State to provide a reasonable program to assist the development of these students; instead, it imposes its own structure which it then makes the hostels fit. It imposes a structure that is not appropriate to the needs of the students, one that is unnecessarily bureaucratic and wastes resources. Wiltja likes to use the Commonwealth's homework centre approach with four or five students to one tutor and a coordinating supervisor. This allows flexibility so that if a tutor is away the children can be divided among other tutors. The idea of the supervisor is to see that the children are always with a tutor and that the whole thing is properly managed.

However, DEET says, 'No, that does not fit our scheme of things.' The children must fit into a particular mould, which it calls the small group tutorial scheme. The small group tutorial scheme is less cost effective: it limits students to five hours support per week, and it cannot support homework—only extension work. So the children have to go home; they must do this extension work, such as cutting and pasting and all these wonderful things that are supposed to extend them, but they cannot even be assisted with their homework. They cannot have relief tutors. This means that if one tutor is away the two or three students who are with that tutor must sit in their room because they are not allowed to go with another tutor. So, if their tutor is away—and it easily happens that 15 or 16 tutors are involved per night—someone is always missing out, because they cannot go with anyone else. They cannot have a coordinator. So, the whole thing is chaotic. If one tutor is away, three kids are rushing here and four there and no-one is coordinating them, although they can come down to groups of one or two.

So, instead of having a minimum of tutors with small groups all working together, you can have an extraordinarily large number of tutors with children getting lost and everything going wrong. This scheme was designed for homes in which there was one family and into which perhaps one or two other students came. If no tutor turns up, the children do not get to join any other group or do anything. It does not fit a boarding institution such as Wiltja. However, this year at Croydon, Taperoo and Cowandilla schools, and at other schools throughout South Australia, they have the very type of scheme that this boarding institution wants, but the Commonwealth says, 'You can't have that because you're not a school: you're a boarding institution. You don't fit the rules.' Again, it is that the school must fit the rules rather than the scheme being designed to fit the needs of the students. It is ridiculous bureaucracy at its worst.

In relation to Abstudy, DEET has a *pro forma* and, before it will pay this State the money due because of boarding and school fees and the like, it sends out a questionnaire to the parents. Members should bear in mind what I said: we are dealing with possibly the least English literate group in the State, and DEET's questionnaire contains 82 questions—all of which have to be filled out and all of which have to be submitted to DEET and checked before this State can get one penny. I do not know what members opposite think, but I had enough faith in the last Government to believe that it was not in the business of ripping off the Commonwealth. If this Government said to the Commonwealth, 'We have 42 Aboriginal students and, what's more, you can come and see them,' they might have really existed.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I wish to speak concerning the needs of the Kilburn football and cricket club and to tie it in with some of the problems that I see arising as a result of the fallout from the Ross Kelly affair, the Kellygate affair, the sports rorts affair, or however one may want to describe it. Whatever may be said about the Kellygate affair—and I know a great number of members opposite wanted to lampoon Mrs Kelly, in particular her great white board—what is beyond dispute is that the Commonwealth Department of Sports and Recreation made available to a whole range of sporting groups within this country a range of sporting facilities for which no-one has questioned the need. The Kilburn football and cricket club in my own electorate services a very deprived neighbourhood. It has a very high level of unemployment. Many of the persons living within that area rely solely upon Commonwealth Government benefits, namely, unemployment or single supporting parents benefits and the like.

Also, it is extremely poorly served in terms of facilities that are available to the community generally. There are no cinemas in the local area, and that sporting club, with a great number of volunteer supporters giving a lot of their own time, has been able to field a good number of sporting groups on the football and cricket fields. They are in urgent need of a vast upgrade of facilities currently available. The Kilburn oval area services netball, basketball and tennis. The netball and tennis communities are not getting sufficient volunteers to be able to run those clubs. What the Kilburn football and cricket club would like to do is build an all embracing community centre whereby it would be able to bring under its umbrella the tennis and netball club and also service the basketball need of the area which is a fast growing sport and which is much pursued and favoured by young people in this State, whatever their socio-economic background.

The club could run it as a community club. It needs about $1 million to achieve that. It is a substantial sum of money but, with cooperation between Commonwealth, State and local governments and with the local community itself, it is not an insurmountable amount of money. Unfortunately, what I fear is that, because of the debate that has raged over the past few months with respect to Ms Kelly and her portfolio, all Governments, whatever their political persuasion, will be loath, for fear of accusations of favouring one electorate over

another, to spend the necessary funds to upgrade these facilities.

It is interesting to note that Kilburn is in the Federal electorate of Adelaide which, as members know, is a marginal seat currently and temporarily held by the Liberal Party. I also note that Mrs Worth, the Federal Liberal member for Adelaide, has also visited the Kilburn Football Club and mouthed some pious and well meaning words agreeing about the need to upgrade the sporting facilities at the club. I am sure she is sincere in what she wishes for that electorate and I would be only too happy to join with her in a bipartisan approach to the Commonwealth Government to seek those sorts of funds with respect to assisting the club.

Unfortunately, in all the inquiries that I have made to date at local, State and Commonwealth Government level, the answer is, 'No, you will have to wait until after the budget has been handed down as to whether there are any allocations to be made for such worthy organisations as the Kilburn Football and Cricket Club.' I do not know what Federal money will be made available or what money is available from the State Government, which no doubt will renege on a number of undertakings and promises that it gave to the electorate last year, as it has already done to date, but I doubt that any funds will be forthcoming from the State Government.

Because of the controversy concerning which a Minister lost her job as a result of the so-called 'sports rorts' affair, deserving organisations such as the Kilburn Football and Cricket Club will miss out on much needed facilities.

Mr Brindal: You'll get them the money if you're good enough.

Mr CLARKE: I thank the member for Unley for his vote of confidence in me as the member for the area, and I will report back to him quickly on any progress made. Because of the high levels of unemployment and social security beneficiaries in the area, the need is great. Unfortunately, we have a high crime rate in the area. True, Kilburn is not alone in those problems, which are experienced by a number of communities, but such problems are exacerbated by the lack of facilities for young people. We have a high number of migrant groups who have moved into the area and they need assistance as well.

Nearly 89 per cent of children at Kilburn Primary School have a school card: the need is there. The Commonwealth Government did an outstanding job providing through Mrs Kelly's department a whole range of much needed facilities, and that is indisputable.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Whatever else, in terms of accounting or documentation abilities, they are all valid arguments that can be raised by any member of the Parliament, including the Opposition. I am not disputing their right to do so but, in pursuit of a ministerial scalp, they have effectively created such a stink that in future any Government, of whatever political colour, will be too frightened to do the jobs that should be done in providing proper resources for deprived areas. We will all be the poorer for that because of the social problems that will result from it. As I say, Mrs Worth was only too happy to visit the Kilburn Football Club, make an inspection and mouth all the right sorts of platitude but, when it came to her action in Canberra, she was baying for Mrs Kelly's blood along with the rest of the Liberal Party and was happy indeed to try to kick the living daylights out of the scheme, notwithstanding the fact that that scheme would have done a great deal in assisting organisations such as the Kilburn Football Club.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I wish the member for Ross Smith all the best in his endeavours, because I know the Kilburn Football Club very well. I am patron of the Greek Football Club in A1 amateur league and we compete against each other, and I realise the benefit it would be to the people of Kilburn, so I really hope that the honourable member succeeds. I have also been successful in amalgamating the Greek Football Club with the Henley Old Scholars Football Club, and it will be the Henley Greek Club competing in A1 next year.

I want to mention something that Mrs Kelly avoided in my electorate. I am very fortunate to have three surf lifesaving clubs in my area: West Beach, Grange and Henley. All three clubs, especially the Henley club, have a very long and proud history of surf lifesaving in this State. I was approached by Mr Tom Jennings, a former long-serving police officer who now organises the Henley Surf Lifesaving Club, who wanted to show me the facilities that club offered the young people of Colton and Henley and Grange. I was astounded when I went to look at the club because I was shown that, although it was a mixed club of both girls and boys, the women had no change facilities at all.

To alleviate this situation, the girls were given the men's change room and toilet, and the men changed in the sauna and gym as well as in the toilet used as part of the licensed facility. I was so aghast to see the conditions that existed that I then asked the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing to come down and look at what Henley Surf Lifesaving Club was putting up with, and he could not believe that a club of such long standing had such poor facilities. We can all be critical of Ros Kelly, and let us look at the bare facts. She gave the Semaphore Surf Lifesaving Club $45 000 to renovate a kitchen, yet she could not give the Henley Surf Lifesaving Club $39 000 or $40 000, with which it was then going to put an equal amount to build a change facility for the girls of the Henley Surf Lifesaving Club.

The dilemma of the member for Ross Smith is that the money that should have gone to the Kilburn Football Club went to the North Melbourne Football Club in the AFL. I do not know whether it was because Simon Crean happened to be the No. 1 ticket holder, but it was amazing that a rich AFL league club could get half a million dollars when the money would have been better spent in a district such as Kilburn, to serve a far more deserving community. The Henley Surf Lifesaving Club has never had any support from the local council. In fact, the council sent it an account recently for $1 000 for insurance, when it already has its own premises insured.

The club is now being asked to pay council rates, even though the club itself is built on Crown land, on the sand, on which the council should not have the right to charge rates at all. What is even more unbelievable is that the old change rooms and toilets have been demolished, leaving no facilities for the general public to change in. I hope that the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, somewhere in the allocation of funds within the next financial year, can find a paltry $39 000 for this project.

Having been involved with street kids over a long period, I have yet to see anyone who is committed and dedicated to sport, who has that commitment to go to training and wants to perform, really ever get into trouble with the law. I support the honourable member in respect of Kilburn, because I know

that those young people who will go to training three nights a week and play on Saturdays have a far better chance, having disciplined themselves in team sport, of becoming more worthwhile citizens in the community.

The sooner governments realise that the cheapest way of policing the community is by getting the youth of this State committed to sport and feeling a sense of mateship in playing a team sport, the quicker we will be able to put money more sensibly into the development of our youth, rather than waste it on policing because we do not provide the facilities that the member for Ross Smith spoke about.

I turn now to the continuing problems on the Esplanade at West Beach. I have looked at the letters on this subject written on behalf of the residents by the former member for Hanson to the Ministers and the police. Many people are now contemplating moving away from the Esplanade at West Beach, Military Road and the streets which run off it. That is because on hot evenings, especially on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays, anything up to 200 louts are there, some with their car radios blaring with others doing wheelies and burning rubber, with smoke going all over the place. Decent people who have come down there in the summer with their families and who expect to have a little noise until midnight but then to be able to put their children to bed and have a peaceful night and get up next morning to enjoy West Beach cannot do that.

I have spoken to the Brighton council. Brighton and Somerton have avoided some of the problems by declaring the areas dry, closing down the public toilets and car parks by 9 o'clock and putting humps in the road. They are very drastic measures and I do not know whether they work properly or whether they are the right things to do. I sincerely believe that the problem must be addressed by next summer, and I will certainly involve the Minister responsible. I think a joint working party is needed, made up of a couple of local residents, the local member of Parliament, a couple of council members who represent the ward and a member of the Police Force. I honestly believe that if we are to bring some sort of sanity back to the area we need to address those problems that are affecting us.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I wish to bring to the attention of the House tonight a dilemma that faces the land owners in the Sandy Creek Concordia area, about five miles east of Gawler. Let me give a little history first about how this has arisen. On 15 February 1986, Dr Hopgood, a Minister in the previous Government, announced five potential urban development sites to accommodate a metropolitan Adelaide population of 1.2 million people by the year 2010. Those areas were Sandy Creek, Roseworthy, Mount Barker, Aldinga and Willunga. Under section 50 of the Planning Act, the land that was outlined in those five areas was frozen. Owners could not develop or subdivide that land. In effect, their land was frozen in a stalemate, and its value went down at that time as a result.

Landowners in those areas accepted this, because they recognised the fact that they could be involved in an urban development and expected that a decision would be made in a relatively short period of time to allow them either to make plans for development at a later date or to get back to the farming enterprises they were engaged in before the freezing of that section. Section 50 provided that the Government was the decision maker and provided no right of appeal against that freezing of the land.

In 1986 Dr Hopgood said that four or five years down the track the Government would exempt some of the frozen areas from development restrictions, enabling them to revert to normal planning controls. That was in 1986, Mr Speaker, and I can tell you now that, while the land freeze is off, there are still restrictions on that land which prohibit farmers and landowners from developing that land or increasing their viability on that land.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr BUCKBY: It is eight years later and, as I said, some restrictions still apply. The Minister again in 1986 indicated that exemptions would apply to land divisions for general farming, but of course those did not ever come about. In May of 1990 a portion of the Sandy Creek area was included in the Barossa Valley Review. It was seen as a buffer zone, but after many letters of protest from local landowners, of which there are approximately 120 in the area, and no replies from the Government in answering those letters, the area was then removed from the Barossa Valley Review. At that stage, farmers or landowners perhaps thought that all was going to be well; however, not all was well because in January 1992 the area was included in the Mount Lofty Ranges Review.

So, more indecision and more dissatisfaction from farmers ended up with an SDP being developed and, finally, on 29 July 1993, some seven and a half years after the land was originally frozen—land which was only supposed to be frozen for a maximum of four to five years—the freeze was removed. However, still not all was well because there were restrictions which remained on that freeze. Notice was given that the land would not be needed for any urban development for at least 10 years into the future and that still remains. The SDP outlined:

> . . . the above mentioned areas within the District Councils of Barossa and Light and replacing these with policies which retain the open, rural character of the region through the promotion of broad acre agricultural activities.

The problem that landowners are locked into in the conducting of broad acre farming only is that of viability. If landowners of the region can only partake in the growing of crops or sheep or cattle on a broad acre basis they are obviously restricted in the different ideas or the different things that they can take on. Share farming has been expanded in the region and it has taken over a number of small properties. The problem is that with the restrictions remaining and the freeze in a 'semi-state' so to speak, farmers do not know whether in 10 years time they will be called on again for their land to be frozen and taken up by the Planning Department; or whether they should make investments in additional machinery, upgrade their fences, sheds and their property in general. It has become somewhat of a catch 22 for these people.

As I said, the lifting of the freeze has not solved their problems because, in the lifting of the freeze, restrictions still apply. They are as follows: no chicken or other poultry, hatcheries and batteries maybe erected on properties; no other large buildings which might be used for intensive keeping of animals or intensive agriculture can be constructed on properties and no horticulture in an artificial environment can be created on those properties. As I mentioned, there are some 120 land owners in this area. Their land value has subsequently decreased because of the fact that they are limited in what they can do with that land for agricultural purposes.

If those farmers or people on smaller holdings seek to increase their viability by increasing the intensiveness of their

farming operations, they are not allowed to do so either by these restrictions. It has become a real dilemma for these farmers. One particular farmer, who has done a lot of share farming in the area, has purchased land in the Murray-Mallee. Those land owners who are smaller landowners are now trying to find somebody else to do their work. If nobody else does, they will be left with an area of land which is no longer viable.

Farmers would like to know one way or the other whether they are considered to have agricultural broadacre or agricultural land. They feel that should that land be required for urban development in future all the restrictions should be lifted and they should be advised that their land will definitely be required. This is supported by a letter to the *Bunyip*, the local newspaper, by Mr Robert Finn from the District Council of Light. A portion of his letter reads:

> The District Council of Light is still concerned that the State Government has failed to review the boundary of the *de facto* long-term development area. It has the capacity to house substantially more population than was originally earmarked and it has placed very onerous controls on farmers at a time when they may need diversity to retain their real incomes.

I shall be bringing this problem to the notice of the Minister and the Government in the hope of resolving it successfully for farmers and landowners in the area who may seek to increase their viability and undertake some of those horticultural pursuits which this Government has outlined it is looking at in order to increase the export potential of this State.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I have some sympathy with the problems outlined by the member for Light, because I want to talk about land use, development and so on. However, the problems in Napier are with urban development and how the land use will be organised there. I particularly want to talk about the announced sale of South Australian Urban Land Trust land. SAULT has small pockets of land around the metropolitan area of Adelaide. It has been responsible for the controlled development of land around the urban fringes, and I believe it has some land in inner Adelaide as well. SAULT has been responsible for releasing that land in a controlled way and at reasonable cost so that urban development has been carried out at a pace which is affordable and sustainable for the overall development of the city.

A significant part of SAULT's land holdings are in the outer northern area around Napier. The proposal to sell off the remainder of SAULT land to fund election promises by the Liberal Government may cause problems for people in the northern fringes. This wholesale release of land will create a series of pressures on development in the north which will be difficult to control. Part of the promise was that it would not be sold unless it conformed to urban planning guidelines. However, the urban planning guidelines allow for extended urban development along the northern fringes on the basis that development in the south has run into environmental problems and needs to be restricted. Therefore, we have a situation where there is urban infill in the middle of the city and further development allowed along the north.

I think that we need to review this continually and take it fairly carefully. That is why I am alarmed at this wholesale release of land to developers in the north. The Munno Para council is already pushing through a four-lane highway along a quiet residential area to allow further housing development in the north-west. Not unnaturally, this is causing residents a great deal of worry. Whereas they had a quiet suburban street, they now have a highway with the potential for a lot of traffic through to the Main North Road.

Members in the south would be very familiar with this. In fact, the member for Mawson referred to a similar problem in the south. The problem with the *ad hoc* releasing of land, or *ad hoc* development, is that it impacts on those people who live around that development, and the provision of a road network illustrates that problem. The other problem with development is the urban infrastructure. Already in these outer urban areas there are problems with schools, a lack of community housing or meeting places, a lack of shops and a lack of transport.

With the Liberal Government's proposal to change the transport system we will probably run into further problems with transport, because in the outer areas we already have problems with frequency of transport and the cost. The State Government cross-subsidises the cost for outer urban areas. The competitive tendering system which is proposed will not assist in meeting costs for outer urban areas. The inevitable result of the competitive tendering system is that fares will rise in the outer urban areas and the frequency of services will not be maintained but will be reduced.

So, what we have is a series of new urban developments, without schools, without meeting places, without shops and with reduced transport to get to these centres. This has a dramatic effect upon the community, upon people's sense of community and on the basic facilities involved. A corollary of this is that people who move to these outer urban areas, the mortgage holders, usually have tight funds and are not able to afford, say, a second car, and they are not able to afford to move around easily, so they are trapped in these urban developments without suitable facilities to sustain their life there in a meaningful way. This is particularly so for women who are often there with young children, unable to move around easily, unable to form groups or get together: they are isolated in their suburban developments.

We need to give a great deal of thought to whether we encourage these dormitory suburbs. There are rows upon rows of housing. It might be quite good housing, there might be reserves and there might be open spaces all around—and in the area where the sale of SAULT land is proposed they will be surrounded by the Hills—but the fact of the matter is that there is very little industry or small business around these areas. The people who live in these suburban boxes have to travel to work, they have to travel to the shops and they have to travel to their schools and, as a result, there are problems with transport and roads. Perhaps later on, when the children have grown up, we will get problems with employment and unemployment.

There has been a lot of criticism about the development of the Elizabeth area in particular, that there is heavy industry alongside living areas. During the recession much of that heavy industry has had to embark on employment shedding, and this has caused massive unemployment in the Elizabeth area with its attendant problems. At least people who live in the Elizabeth-Munno Para area still have some diversity. We still have some mix of shopping and business, whether it be large manufacturing or small manufacturing: we do not have row upon row of suburbs where people are unemployed. There is a sense of community and a sense of belonging to a discrete entity.

In the south vandalism and graffiti are big problems, and unemployed youth, who are very bored and have nothing to do, have to travel long distances to get to any sort of entertainment or a social venue, and as a result these problems

aggregate upon themselves. Admittedly, there is not the push for industrial land or small business land. It is a very difficult problem, but we need to think carefully before we release big parcels of land for urban development.

According to some reports, the housing market is starting to pick up. No doubt, if SAULT land is made available developers will acquire it and then sell the land. We need to look again at what sort of controls we put on these developments. This is a case where we need local councils and the State Government to work together and intervene in the sort of development we achieve and to step back and think carefully about not only where we place our urban development but also where we place our industrial development and where we encourage small business to establish. If we encourage people to live in the outer suburbs we also need to encourage business to establish in those outer suburbs.

An honourable member: We agree with you.

Ms HURLEY: Thank you very much. This sort of planned development on an overall basis is really the way we need to move because we do not want to create a future ghetto—even though it may be a very attractive ghetto—in the northern suburbs. We do not want to perpetuate unemployment; we do not want to perpetuate the problems we see in Elizabeth where large manufacturing industries have shed people and are not providing employment. We need to tie in planning with the other sections.

I do not think that in the past departments have combined in a coordinated way. If we are to solve our urban problem we must do a little more planning and thinking about how we control our own environment and the way in which people live and their needs for a sense of community and a sense of belonging therein. It is not simply enough to build nice houses and leave reserve space.

Mr BASS (Florey): During this grievance debate I wish to speak about a subject of which I have had first-hand knowledge for some 20 years. I feel that I can speak with some authority on the subject of marijuana. I add that I can speak about it only because of my involvement with those who have been active in smoking the drug and from my personal observations. I have never smoked marijuana nor had the desire to do so.

What concerns me, and should concern the people of South Australia and the members of this House, is the damage being done to our youth of today. We have, in today's society, an ongoing battle between tobacco companies and those who are concerned for the health of our society, yet people are forever lobbying that marijuana should be legalised. I quote from the *Advertiser*, dated 25 February, the headline of which reads, 'Deadly Drugs Hit City Streets', and which states:

> The drugs are marketed as 'similar to speed' (a stimulant) but little is known about the chemical compositions of Wah and Techno. So far only one analysis of Wah has been conducted. The Drug and Alcohol Services Council found it contained a 'frightening' mixture of local anaesthetic and the stimulant caffeine.

One might say that anybody who took those tablets would be rather silly. Let me explain to this House a little about marijuana, indian hemp, pot, or a joint—all names of the plant *cannabis sativa*. The plant itself is not dangerous. What is dangerous is the oil that the plant contains—an oil called tetrahydrocannabinol. When a person smokes cannabis this oil is drawn into the person's lungs and, hence, into the bloodstream. People draw into their bloodstream some 61 cannabinoids, some of which have been identified and the effects known, but many others are not known and have not been identified. We know that cannabinoids break down into 421 chemicals. When you smoke pot you draw into your lungs tetrahydrocannabinol. That drug breaks down into 421 chemicals, the effects of many of which are unknown.

In human studies conducted by the American National Institute of Drug Abuse it was found that the chief psychoactive cannabinoid was delta-9-THC. Studies on animals—with which I do not agree—show that 5 per cent of the tetrahydrocannabinol is assumed to create the 'high' when humans smoke it. Research shows that this 5 per cent causes some problems. However, what concerns me and, indeed, the researchers is what damage the other 95 per cent of the THC is doing.

Research has shown that some of the non-psychoactive cannabinoids have caused harm to other bodily organs such as the heart, the liver and the brain. Research also shows that marijuana smoking is harmful to the entire pulmonary tree, ranging from the sinus cavity to the deepest recess of the lungs.

I refer to an article entitled 'Marijuana: More of the grim story' which states:

> Dr Rudolph Leuchtenberger and his wife, Cecile, of the Swiss Institute for Experimental Cancer Research at Lausanne, studied more than 5 000 animal and human lung-cell cultures exposed to puffs of smoke from a marijuana cigarette and from a tobacco cigarette. Their conclusion: fresh smoke from marijuana cigarettes is harmful to lung cells in that it contributes to the development of pre-malignant and malignant lesions. The smoke from the tobacco cigarette had much less effect.

Notwithstanding the scientific research, I have personally witnessed the decline in health of many bikies in South Australia during my time in the South Australian Police Department Bikie Squad back in the 1970s. In one instance, a bikie who was well known to me was an active user of many drugs and openly admitted to smoking three or four joints a day. This bikie left South Australia to live in Queensland and some two years later, when he returned to South Australia, our friendship was renewed. During a conversation one night over a drink, Al—I will call him—informed me that he no longer smoked dope. Why? Because it was affecting his memory as well as his health. It seemed that while in Queensland he was studying to complete his trade and found that his memory was no longer what it used to be and, notwithstanding his age, he found it difficult to concentrate. He stopped smoking dope and within six months his memory improved and his concentration returned. More to his surprise, a nagging cough and chest pains that he had been suffering also disappeared within two months of his stopping smoking the dreaded weed. I saw that scenario repeated many times during my time in the Bikie Squad and the Drug Squad. That only confirms what scientific research has shown.

I refer to a recent report from Wellington, New Zealand, which is entitled 'Use of cannabis "can damage brain"' and which states:

> Cannabis use can cause significant and irreversible brain damage. . . studies have shown. . . Damage could continue to occur up to five years after last using the drug, and in some cases the damage was irreversible. [The researcher]. . . said no evidence had been found previously that cannabis caused gross impairment to cognitive ability. While that still might be true, her study found cannabis did have 'significant' and sometimes apparently irreversible effects on the brain function.

Nevertheless, we still have supporters who continually want to legalise what may well be a bigger infliction on the people of this world than cigarettes and alcohol.

The hue and cry over cigarette advertising amazes me when one considers that it was not very many years ago that cigarettes were introduced to the world and now, apart from the millions who die from diseases associated with cigarette smoking, millions of dollars are spent to try to stop one of worst killers in modern history. Alcohol is no different. When first introduced to the world, it was a great social event, yet years later it kills and injures hundreds and thousands of innocent people and causes many illnesses that have ruined not only individual lives but the lives of the drinker's family.

Some 421 unidentified chemicals can be introduced into one's body to simply obtain a high caused by a minute part of some of the 421 chemicals. To those who support the legalisation of marijuana, I say this: if the people who introduced cigarettes and alcohol to the world knew the sickness and injury they have brought to the modern world, I am sure they would have thrown it all away as they were returning to their homes. As a member of this House, I will not be party to inflicting another catastrophe on this world, a catastrophe which may well destroy the life of my children or their children's children. I submit that not only is marijuana a drug which should be banned but laws should be made that carry the highest penalties for cultivation, possession or use of any part of the drug.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): This afternoon the Premier made a statement to the House which, I must say, contained some very interesting information, particularly in terms of the articles we have been reading concerning the salaries being offered to attract key players into the new Brown Government's regime. The interesting thing was that, when we went through the statement, we found that the sums paid for the separation packages of a number of people disposed of by the Government added up to a large seven figure amount. What we also saw (although it was not spelt out in this report but is something which has been made known in the media) was the enormous increase in salary for at least two of the Government officials that we know of. The salary increase for the head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is about $40 000 to $50 000, and a substantial increase is to be given to the new Under Treasurer.

I find this all very interesting. In fact, the statement dealt at length with the arrangements made with Mr Guerin. That is a legitimate target. The statement heralded that a substantial pay rise has been approved for a couple of chief public servants in key positions filled by the new Brown Government. It will be very interesting to see where this stops. There is no doubt that the salaries paid to every Chief Executive Officer—all those who have kept their jobs as well as those yet to be appointed—will be about 20 per cent or more in excess of what was paid by the last Government.

Mr Brindal: Pure speculation.

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Unley talks about speculation. We listened last year to his carping and whingeing over executive salaries. What is he saying about Mr Schilling? He is saying nothing. A couple of other points should be brought out. When the new Government was elected in December, it went on a binge with the Adelaide *Advertiser* of re-releasing a series of press releases. That continued right through into January. One release by the Treasurer was very interesting. I believe that he said on 29 December, 'The entirety of the Economic and Finance Committee's recommendations with respect to executive salaries will be implemented. The days of the fast buck for the Public Service are all over.'

We found out what that means: it means that you say one thing and you do something else altogether. You say that you are going to accept the recommendations, that there is to be moderation and that there are to be no more big salaries. You would probably even want to listen to the former member for Hayward when he used to make statements in this House to the effect that the highest paid individuals in the Public Service ought to be the Premier and the Ministers.

Mr Brindal: That is quite right, too.

Mr QUIRKE: I see that he still holds that position. Unfortunately, the Government that he represents has not taken that view. It goes out into the community and makes the right statements in the *Advertiser*, it comes in here and it talks about Mr Guerin, but the much more worrying trend is the message that is going out to public servants across the whole Public Service, and that is that, if you are one of the ones anointed by the new Government, you can expect a 20 per cent plus pay rise, because that is what is being paid. And we saw a paper justification today when we found out what rate of pay that person would receive in Victoria.

Indeed, it is very interesting to see which way this is going. It is also interesting to see the other appointments being made much further down the line and in the ministerial offices and the salaries. It would be very interesting to speculate on how far this is to go in the next six to 12 months. There is no doubt that paying ministerial officers $75 000—

Mr Brindal: Who told you that rubbish?

Mr QUIRKE: It is interesting that the member for Unley says that it is rubbish. I understand that a number of people closely associated with him are paying these sorts of rates for ministerial officers. This is a significant increase on what had been the norm in South Australia before the Brown Government.

Various other things have happened in the past 90 or so days since the State election, one of which provoked a great deal of public indignation and, certainly, indignation by members on this side of the House: in the last sitting week we found that a statement had been made in the other place that, all of a sudden, there would be a reference to the ERD committee in respect of the compulsory checking of motor vehicles. I remember that last year in this Chamber Dr Hopgood raised certain allegations about the MTA and, indeed, Liberal fundraising and compulsory car testing. I took no part in those debates. I listened with interest as the whole thing unfolded.

I took the view then that, where there was smoke, there was probably some fire and that at sometime during this parliamentary session there would be an attempt to bring in vehicle testing to provide extra work for the members of the MTA. I did not think that it would be brought in so brazenly within the first two sitting weeks. I did not think that there would be a murmur from any of the members opposite or their Ministers to move in that direction for some considerable time. I took the view that there would be some decency, particularly since the Minister concerned had been involved in other escapades which can be referred to only as being rather heartless and vicious, and I am talking about the dismissal of Mr Brown and the STA.

No doubt a number of other things will come out, one by one, in the next weeks of parliamentary sitting. I will listen with interest to the debate on the shop trading hours inquiry, because the smart money out there says that it will recom-

mend a deregulation of shopping in South Australia. The world was told something different last year but, if you read the fine print, you find that we will have an inquiry. I would like to put on the record tonight that I believe that inquiry will recommend a total deregulation of shopping hours in South Australia—that, in fact, there will be a complete abrogation of the promises made before the last State election. I hope I am wrong, but when that inquiry brings down its report it will be interesting

. *Mr Brindal interjecting:*

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Unley says that I will be wrong. He will probably have the most to lose because there are a lot of shopkeepers in his electorate.

I would like to make similar predictions regarding other issues, but we have not had any decisions yet. We would like to know where we are going with the Hindmarsh Island bridge and a number of things like that. We find that we are having one inquiry after another with one decision after another not being made. But, certainly, the message is there now for public servants in the upper echelons of the Public Service in South Australia that a pay rise is on the way.

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

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Tonight I wish to pay a special tribute to a great South Australian, the late Jack Oatey. I wish to pass on my and my family's condolences to Mary, Robert and Peter and the surviving family for their loss. My family and I were at Football Park last Thursday with about 1 500 others to take part in the memorial service. Tonight, I wish to put on record Jack Oatey's record of service to the South Australian football fraternity, because I believe that I am the only member of this place who served as a player under the late Jack Oatey. I was involved with the Sturt Football Club from 1975 to 1981, and I was fortunate enough to be on the senior training list under Jack for four of those years. I am also aware that the Deputy Clerk (David Bridges) was close to the late Jack Oatey in his capacity as a team manager of some of the junior teams of the Sturt Football Club, and I know of his interest in this topic.

To many of the players of the Sturt Football Club Jack Oatey was more than just a coach: he was a father figure. Virtually every player will testify to the great interest that Jack took in his players not only in their football skill but in their success off the field whether it be in their employment, their family life or their education. Jack's philosophy on life was that success on the field was only one part of your make-up as a person and that you should try to do your best to succeed in your other endeavours. He led by example with his interests off the field. For instance, I applied for a job with a builder by the name of Alan Sheppard. As I walked in the door for my interview Jack walked out. Apart from my parents, I had not told anyone that I was going for the interview. To this day I do not know how Jack found out I was going for that interview, and I still do not know whether he influenced my winning the job. If he did, I am grateful because that job helped to establish me in that field. That was the sort of interest that Jack took in his players.

He would know whether you were successful in your university examinations. I know that I was questioned once on why I had not achieved as high a mark in a particular subject as Jack thought I should have. So, Jack took an interest in all his players at all levels. When one considers the number of people involved in the Sturt Football Club, that was a tremendous thing that he did for his players; and he did it naturally. It was not part of the job, but something that Jack did as an individual. For that I think all players who have been involved in the club are eternally grateful. He treated all players and people involved in the Sturt Football Club and all the clubs in which he was involved as individuals. He motivated and communicated with them to get the best out of them. He was very quick to judge an individual's ability as a footballer. It is my experience that Jack could sum up a person's football ability on the first or second night of training.

I cite the example of Robbert Klomp who ended up playing many games for Sturt, South Australia and Carlton. Robbert went down with the Heathfield High School, which I attended, and he was on the track for an hour. Within two years Jack had him playing in a grand final for the league team. He recognised Robbert's ability instantly, and he did that over the years with countless players. Jack's father-like approach and his attitude to discipline led to great loyalty being given to him by the players and he was also very loyal to them. His philosophy on football was quite simple: if we were the more skilful team and if we had the ball the other team simply could not score. His whole approach to football was about skills.

He revolutionised the game by using handball as an attacking rather than a defensive weapon. He introduced the reverse punt, what some may know as the banana ball. He also introduced the check side ruck, which Rick Davies used so successfully for a number of years. Those innovations into the game revolutionised the game of football and gave us the modern game that we have today. This skills-based concept of football gave Jack his outstanding record as a player and a coach. No-one is quite sure how many games Jack played as a player. We know, though, that it was at least 219 senior games. He was an outstanding rover for Norwood, South Melbourne and South Australia, and came runner up in the Magarey Medal. He also coached over 775 games over some 37 seasons, and this included 10 premierships in 17 grand finals, with five premierships in a row in Sturt's golden era from 1966 on.

It was certainly a family affair at the Sturt Football Club. The Oatey family has now provided four generations of league footballers to this State. Jack's father Ted played for Port and West Torrens; Jack himself, of course, played; his sons, Robert and Peter played for Norwood, and Robert also played for Sturt; and now grandson David plays for Sturt. I must pay tribute to Mary and her family for the tremendous way they supported Jack in his achievement. It is my view and the general attitude at Sturt that Jack's great achievement is also the Oatey family achievement, because without their support Jack could not possibly have achieved all the great things that he has. So, I pay tribute to Mary and the outstanding way in which she has supported Jack over all the years.

Jack Oatey had a great sense of humour. He was a great story teller. He certainly had a temper, and those who had the pleasure to sit in the coach's box with Jack during a league game would certainly know what I refer to there. He was a very intense and very private person. Even though I was at Sturt for five or six years, I know little of Jack Oatey's private life, other than that he and Mary were tremendous dancers. But that is the nature of the man; he was such a private man.

Jack was involved in far greater things than just the development of a tremendous club at Sturt. He was also involved in the development of Football Park, in giving advice to other football coaches all over Australia and in

developing coaching manuals and courses for the SANFL. He has been honoured now by a medal being awarded for the best player at the grand final each year and, of course, he was involved in football until his death. My brothers and I are very grateful that we were able to share football with Jack Oatey. It is a privilege that we certainly treasure. I offer my condolences again to the family. He was a great Australian. He will be missed but certainly not forgotten.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I did not have an opportunity during my Address in Reply speech to extend a very sincere thank you to the electors of Goyder for having returned me at the last State election, and I wish to do so now. I have very much appreciated the support they have shown to me over many years. One never wants to be carried away by one's own personal commitments or one's own personal efforts in an electorate, because I know the Party stands for so much in this day and age, and I therefore want to acknowledge the excellent work of the Liberal Party and the face that the Liberal Party put forward at the last election. Obviously, as a candidate for the Liberal Party, I was one of the 37 members in the House of Assembly to benefit.

I also want to thank very sincerely and to acknowledge my campaign team and my campaign manager, Jeff Cook, who is from Minlaton and who has become well known in South Australia and interstate through many of the poems that he has written. Members may be aware that Jeff Cook had not written poetry until a few short years ago when his best friend passed away at a very young age as a result of cancer, and Jeff wrote his first poem to be read at the funeral of that friend, and from then on he has continued to write poetry and he has now written, and had published and printed three books that he seems to have a great knack of selling wherever he goes. He said that, on one trip to Tasmania, in an aircraft he asked the pilot whether he could read a few poems and it was agreed to.

He had made up a poem about the flight, and he sold many books on that flight, because the pilot and passengers were so impressed. In fact, he went up and down the aisles selling his book before the flight arrived in Tasmania. He has had similar experiences on other flights and bus trips. Jeff was a great person to have as campaign manager. I always felt very confident that if I had to be elsewhere helping other members, things would be in good hands with Jeff. Sincere thanks to Jeff Cook.

I also acknowledge the work of Mary Davey, from Yorketown. I have known Mary for many years and, in fact, she did all the book work. She is secretary of my SEC. Barbara Chapman from Balaclava made sure the flag flew if I was not present in Balaclava and surrounds. John Koenders from Maitland is a gentleman who has become a great friend of mine and I really appreciate his advice and guidance. Jill Clough from Kadina is a relative newcomer to the area but she has made herself part and parcel of the community in a short time. John Pointen is President of the Goyder SEC and has had a strong steering influence over several years.

Mr Atkinson: Who was at Wallaroo?

Mr MEIER: It was interesting to analyse the election and see what the Labor Party put forward. I have said for some years in this House that the Labor Party had forgotten country areas. Indeed, members may recall that I asked the Labor Party to extend enterprise zones to other areas of South Australia. I noticed in the last election campaign that they promised to extend an enterprise zone to the South-East. The House will realise that the Liberal Party has set up enterprise zones throughout South Australia. That is what I advocated and I am pleased that my Party has seen fit to do this and, in fact, we will see a real boost for country areas.

I was saddened and dismayed during the election campaign when the Australian Labor Party put out a pamphlet 'A vital message for country voters'. I was saddened, first, because on the front page it had the ALP logo still using the Australian flag, which the Federal ALP has made clear it does not want a bar of and wants that flag replaced. Many members of the State Labor Party also want it replaced, yet they were happy to fly with it at this election. But that was not what saddened me the most.

The country electorates were identified in the legend numbered 1 to 11 as South Australian country seats. Mr Deputy Speaker, you represent the seat of Gordon, the eleventh seat listed and you would know that the Labor Party either inadvertently or deliberately missed listing three country seats in that pamphlet. It missed out the significant and large area encompassed by the electorate of Eyre, which was not identified. It missed out the country electorate of Giles and it missed out the country electorate of Frome. In fact, there are not 11 but 14 country electorates.

Those three electorates were not identified in the pamphlet. The former member for Stuart, Mrs Colleen Hutchison, contested the seat of Eyre and it is not surprising that, as the ALP was not prepared to acknowledge the seat in the country pamphlet that went to all areas, she did not get in. The Labor Party candidate in the seat of Frome, Allan Aughey, likewise, did not get in, especially as the ALP did not acknowledge him in the country seat allocation, and the one surprise was the former Treasurer, the Hon. Frank Blevins, now the member for Giles. That vote was close, and I must admit that many of my constituents said there was one thing that saddened them in the election campaign and that was that the Liberal Party did not win the seat of Giles. That saddened me, too. With 37 members now, perhaps we could not expect to have 38 or 39 members: that will have to wait until the next election.

And, my word, we will be fighting in that respect! The member for Spence interjected a little earlier about the result in Wallaroo, and I am pleased he brought that matter up, because I am very pleased to say that, for the first time in recent history (in fact, I suppose for the first time in history full stop—although I have not done my homework back for 100 years but I will take the opportunity to do that), the Liberal Party managed to win Wallaroo. I must admit that it has been an aim of mine ever since I have represented that area, although I was not expecting to do it this time.

I thought that at this election I would get close and, hopefully, at the next election it would happen, but it was achieved four years earlier than I anticipated. I want to thank the Wallaroo people very sincerely for the confidence shown in the Liberal Party and in me as the new member. It was very heartening that, for the first time, I had the pleasure of being able to win every booth. It is another challenge for me to ensure that it remains that way, and it can only reflect on me if things go in the reverse but, since the Liberal Party intends to win an increasing number of seats at the next election, I hope that I may be able to continue to win all booths and, hopefully, to increase the majority.

Many people asked during the campaign, 'Do you think you'll win?'—not me personally, but the Liberal Party—and I said, 'I am confident but after the Federal election I take nothing for granted. One thing, though: if we don't win this time we'll never win in our present democratic system.' I said that because of the total untruths printed time and again and

stated by the Labor Party. There were so many untruths that I thought, it's been said so often that I suspect the people will believe it. But, thanks to all South Australians, they did not believe it.

They saw through the untruths and realised that Labor could not be trusted any more. They realised that so many of the statements made—which time will not permit me to go through, although I was hoping to go through 1 to 10—were total fabrications, and we will show over the next four years that the Liberal Party will take this State from strength to strength with all the power that it can wield, with the result that South Australians and Australia will benefit, and once again we will become a great State.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Recognising that this grievance debate relates to the Supply Bill, I would like first to use the opportunity this evening to refer to some of the public servants in my electorate. This is the one opportunity I did not have time to take during my maiden speech, but I would like to place on public record the very valuable close cooperation and communication I have had with a very large cross-section of public servants in my electorate since the election. This cross-section of public servants has come from a wide area, whether it be from teachers, policemen or E&WS Department workers, and many of them have stopped me casually in the street in the various towns in the electorate and not only offered warm congratulations to me and the Government but also offered to work very closely and cooperatively.

Over and above that, there has been a very kind offer from a number of senior departmental public servants to make available their cooperation personally to me in my office. I found that not only supportive but also encouraging and, while members in this House—some perhaps from the other side—and some members of the public may treat this a little sarcastically and say that they would expect that group of public servants or a section of them to come and make that type of offer, I found it to be very genuine, and I have taken it in that spirit. I am sure we will continue to work in close cooperation, as I have indicated.

I would like to use this opportunity tonight to raise an issue that is of serious concern to my electorate and also to the State at large. I refer to the common effluent disposal ponds located on the flood plain on the basin of the river valley, recognising that this is designed as the evaporation system for septic tank disposal and recognising the very important issue at the moment of their effect on the blue-green algae outbreaks farther down the river. I would ask the House to note that only three evaporation ponds—one at Renmark, one at Waikerie and one at Berri—still remain on the river system. Some members of the House may appreciate that in 1991 the effluent disposal system was transferred from Mannum and alleviated and that a little over 12 months ago a similar alleviation was fixed from the total Murray Bridge effluent disposal system.

I raise the issue this evening for three main reasons: first, as I have just indicated, because of its current obvious effect on the blue-green algae outbreak in the lower Murray system; secondly, because I would like to explain and expound upon the need for funding to have these effluent evaporation ponds moved; and thirdly because their non-removal at the moment is a direct hindrance to further urban expansion in the Riverland towns that are affected.

As has come to the public attention in the past 10 days, the current blue-green algae outbreak in the lower Murray system at the moment is undoubtedly a vivid example of the impact of nutrient deposition and disposal into the Murray River system; it is in fact a direct cause of that outbreak. I must congratulate the Premier on the Government's initiative in announcing last week that a major study will be undertaken to assess the alleviation of that problem with respect to the water supply to the lower Murray lakes area and particularly the areas of Clayton and Strathalbyn.

The announcement indicated that a budget of $10 million to $15 million total expenditure may be needed to alleviate the blue-green algae problem in terms of rectifying the domestic water supply requirement in that area, and it highlighted why this problem needs to be alleviated at the moment. No-one can deny that the nutrient infiltration being precipitated from these effluent disposal systems—without doubt because of its nutrient status—is inflicting an environment downriver that is facilitating this blue-green algae outbreak.

I can give some examples. For instance, at the Renmark system, where River Murray flows exceed 15 000 megalitres, there is a direct flow into the river through the Bookmark Creek, and it has been estimated that this in itself can supply a direct nutrient status increase downriver of greater than 1 per cent. A similar situation exists out of the Waikerie oxidation lagoon, where average flows exceed some 40 000 megalitres, and on average it would happen in perhaps only one out of every six years. That again provides a direct link with the river system and provides a direct impact and addition to the total nutrient load downriver from that outlet of greater than 1 per cent of nutrients.

I want to highlight some of the history of these oxidation ponds, bearing in mind that the situation goes back 20 to 30 years, when all local government areas fought very strongly against the requirement of the Government of the day to place those effluent ponds on the flood plain. Understandably (and I am more than sympathetic to the current feeling by the local government areas concerned at the moment) they think they have been discriminated against in terms of the pressure upon them by the previous Government for them to take total responsibility for the financial removal of these oxidation ponds. I know that it is always easy in retrospect to say that effluent ponds should not have been placed in those positions, but quite obviously they were quick fix solutions at the time and now potentially we have to pay the long term price for their ultimate removal.

I want to allude briefly to the financial options as they have developed in terms of the removal of those oxidation ponds. Back in 1990-91 the State Government of the day, through the E&WS Department, initiated a formal engineering study of the options and, in doing so, worked very closely with the working party from the Riverland Local Government Association. However, much to the frustration of the Local Government Association at the time they were not prepared to make any formal recommendations and only came up with the options *per se*. Although that was completed in November 1991, unfortunately the Government of the day failed and refused to give that information to the Local Government Association until well into 1992.

Then, in December 1992 prior to the Federal election, the Prime Minister Mr Keating, as part of the election carrots he was offering for the March 13 election, under the Healthy Rivers Program offered $30 million over three and a half years as part of the Commonwealth-State partnership in the National Landcare Program, using their potential removal as a carrot for that funding. In a big hurry, and putting pressure

on local government at the time, they were forced to lodge applications immediately. Unfortunately, that money seems to have evaporated for the past 12 months.

The current situation is that a new bid is being undertaken by the National Landcare Program. Under that program there has been a suggested agreement for one third Federal funding, one third State funding and one third local government funding. As part of the new Government I am pleased to support this and to make every endeavour to put the appropriate pressure on the Minister concerned. I am delighted to note that local government is prepared to accept a one third financial responsibility for a project, which is estimated to be in the order of $2.65 million, to remove those three oxidation lagoons.

As I say, I am delighted that the Government is prepared to be part of that program and we will be making every endeavour to make sure that the Federal Government is prepared to come good and accept it as a logical and a required program under the national landcare tripartite option. Time prevents me from making my final point, but I reinforce to this House that, because those oxidation lagoons are limited by the 1990 Water Resources Act, they have not been removed and it is retarding development in the Riverland.

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

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I support the Supply Bill and share with a large percentage of South Australians, including the member for Spence, in commending the Government, the Premier and his Cabinet for the positive leadership they have given since 11 December. There is a sense of enthusiasm and optimism in all areas of Government across South Australia, particularly in my electorate of Hanson. Due to the colossal mismanagement of the State's finances over the past 11 years, with which I am sure the member for Spence would agree, the change of Government is refreshing because many essential services in Hanson in particular were seriously affected during the lifetime of the previous Government. Community projects were cut. One community centre, the Camden Community Centre, almost closed its doors but the change of Government has saved the day.

Under the Arnold Government, STA bus services were cut to such a degree that in 1993 there were no services on Sundays on Anzac Highway to Camden Park, only hourly services on Saturday and no night services at all. This thoroughly inconvenienced the elderly and forced many handicapped people to be home-bound. Subsequently, this is now changing. The Camden Community Centre in Hanson focused on providing various activities for the needs of many people in Camden and surrounding districts. Over 1200 people go through the centre per week.

It is a centre which prides itself on a literacy program, a creche, aged care and a young disabled program. Yet the former Government slashed the coordinator's fees from full time to 19 hours per week and then back to $8 000 or eight hours per week in 1993, desperately crippling the community centre. Such was its lack of concern for the welfare of the community through slicing the coordinator's fees, it effectively snuffed out the life of the Camden Community Centre. Now the centre relies on the generosity of the West Torrens council to provide $15 000 a year to keep it going. Had the former Government, of which we see a small number of members on the Opposition benches, been in power in 1994, we would have seen the complete demise of the Camden Community Centre.

I have had the pleasure of visiting a large number of high schools, primary schools and private schools in my electorate, and they greatly appreciate the Minister for Education's 'Back to Basics' philosophy, which is already being implemented. They have eagerly grasped the six-point plan by the Government to take head-on Labor's legacy of a huge maintenance backlog in our schools, with which members opposite would agree.

In 1993 a national study by the Australian Teachers Union revealed that South Australian schools were the worst maintained in the nation. The $230 million backlog in maintenance is the result of 20 years of neglect by Labor. The answer to the problems in education in South Australia is not a quick fix, as Labor tried to do, but a long-term strategy.

The Government's plan to rebuild our schools—and these things are being put into operation—includes a $20 million boost over four years in addition to maintenance and minor works spending (that has been put into operation) and supplying paint to school councils which seek to use parent volunteers to maintain schools, and that has already been put into operation. This Government will allow greater use of private contractors by schools and not insist on the use of SACON staff. There are fast tracking approvals for schools wanting to sell surplus land and use the funding for maintenance and minor works, and this is already being put into action. An expansion of the community service order scheme, which is occasionally used to help with school maintenance, has been put into operation. Finally, there is consideration of a scheme which, on a voluntary basis, uses the skills of the unemployed to address maintenance work within schools. All of these things are practical and basic.

This Government has made it quite clear that there will be no mass closures of schools, as we saw over the past 11 years under the Labor Administration. There were drastic unprecedented closures.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: It is all very well for the member for Spence, happy little vegemite that he is, to sit there and have a go at what I am saying. However, it is a fact that 71 schools have been closed since 1985-86. I am sure that, being the man he is, the academic, he has already noted that. This peaked after the 1989 election with 13 schools closed in 1990-91 and 19 closed in 1991-92, as the member for Spence well knows. This coincides with the promise in 1985 of no cuts to teacher numbers. Yet, since then, 1 200 teachers have lost their jobs.

Because of my interest in education, my focus is not just on the conventional school system. I, too, have a deep interest in education in Correctional Services institutions. I applaud the progressive 'no nonsense' policies of my colleague, the Minister for Correctional Services. The Minister recognises the need to overhaul our correctional services, which were badly run down by the former Government. He understands very clearly that there is a need for the basic educating of prisoners. There must be the opportunity to guide some inmates through secondary SACE and PES subjects and advanced tertiary programs. I believe that there is a great need in all correctional institutions in this State to have basic remedial and drama courses efficiently operated. This is long overdue.

To support my argument, I draw attention to the following reports from the Prisons Advisory Council given over the past three years on some of our institutions. The Minister for Correctional Services during this period was the member for Giles. His time at the helm was from 1984 to 1 October 1992. I will look, first, at the Northfield Prison Complex on 20

February 1990 and 11 December 1993—the day the *Titanic* finally sank; the last rearrangement of the deck chairs of the Arnold Government.

There they were; you could see them all—sunning themselves as the Government fell and as the *Titanic* went down! I quote from part of the report of 20 February 1990, as follows:

> There should be the establishment and facilitation of an appropriate pre-release program and council recommends the idea proposed by Tony Vinson of prison officers being responsible for the welfare of groups of prisoners. There is no-one looking at the person and following her through the prison system. The result is that women. . . miss out. The education officer. . . is doing a good job but there is a need for another person so that each institution can develop separately.

Whilst we appreciate that there are difficulties in administering programs and running institutions of this nature, I refer to page 2 of the report of 11 December, as follows:

> There is no work for inmates, which leads to boredom and tensions rising. This has led to vandalism, such as damage to the kitchen facility which was possible because of lack of supervision.

I refer to the Port Augusta situation, and again the member for Giles was the then Minister of Correctional Services. The course started very well, wheelbarrows and other things were being made, there was a very good garden and everything was fairly rosy, but a year or so later on 22 June 1991, with the member for Giles still at the helm, the wheels fell off, as follows:

> The notice board in the reception area contained at least four items which were of an objectionable explicit sexual nature.

There was virtually no work for prisoners. The report continues:

> The garden closed a year ago when the new building began . . . The workshop was closed a month ago. . .

And so the report goes on, with the whole thing falling down around their ears. Where was the Minister? Where was the member for Giles? Still sitting in his deck chair, I am sure.

I turn now to the last of the centres, the Adelaide Remand Centre, where there were obvious problems over a period of 12 months. The report refers to boredom and suggests that some programs be introduced. It continues:

> There is a need to set up a unit for prisoner assessment, however there is no point doing this until there are programs available.

On page 2 of the report, and this is a year later, it states that no programs were operating in the living units at that time. According to the report, some council members subsequently had a discussion with volunteer teachers. Mr Ken Gutte again urged the introduction of helpers and some constructive programs. Where was the Minister?

This will all change. There must be a revamp of the whole system of education in Correctional Services institutions. We cannot allow the continuation of a situation that was adverted to recently whereby a man who was illiterate when he arrived in prison was still illiterate when he left six years later. That is wrong. It is time for change. It is a time for reckoning. It is time for the rebirth of learning within our prison community, and under a Liberal Government this will occur.

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): This evening I want to address a very important area in our economy—small business. Under the previous Government this area was virtually destroyed because of some of the actions of the Government. Fortunately, that very important sector is moving out of those very difficult circumstances. However, I want to address some particular problems which small business has which are not the making of government but the making of the friends of the Labor Party, and that is big business.

A constituent who owns and operates a service station has contacted me. As part of his business he sells soft drinks. He has been advised by Coca Cola that as from Monday 28 February a handling fee of 5¢ per bottle will be charged and will continue to be charged on all 300 millilitre and one litre bottles of soft drink. It is worth noting that they are the only sizes of soft drink that are dispensed in glass bottles: in other words, they are the bottles which can be truly recycled. This manufacturer of soft drinks is now charging an additional 5¢ for every bottle that is sold. Why has this practice been introduced? I am sure members opposite will be pleased to know that their mates from Coles and Woolworths are responsible for this. As we would all know only too well, the previous Government gave in to Coles and Woolworths with the extended trading hours which virtually crippled small business, an action which was quickly turned around by the present Government. I know from the close contact that I have with small businesses in my electorate that this has had a major impact.

On Sunday I was talking to an operator of a small business in my electorate, and he stated that since trading hours have been brought back to a fair system he is now selling twice as much milk and twice as much bread. He is now again financially viable and, at the same time, has been able to employ an additional staff member. I make the point that the previous Government had no idea as to the importance of this sector in terms of employment.

Let us see what led to this 5¢ per bottle recycling fee that every consumer of soft drink in South Australia will have to pay because of the Coles and Woolworths of this world. According to my constituent, he was informed by Coca-Cola that they must provide a 5¢ recycling fee or these major supermarkets would not handle its product at all. It sounds to me like an awful lot of blackmail. Coles and Woolworths said, 'If you want us to sell your product then we will require you to pay us 5¢ for every bottle we handle.' This 5¢, of course, will not be carried by the supermarkets; it will be carried by the consumer. Therefore, unless the consumer returns a bottle over the counter before purchasing a new bottle of soft drink they will have to pay an additional 5¢.

As my constituent pointed out, the price list is now made up of three components: the unit price, the deposit, and the handling fee. The handling fee, make no mistake, is purely and simply to provide the Coles and Woolworths of this world with an extra 5¢ for every bottle they sell through their supermarkets. I repeat: it is the customer who will be paying that 5¢. My constituent, when he queried this with the sales representative from Coca-Cola, said, 'How on earth will I administer the handling fee?' The answer was, 'That's your problem.' He has now to instruct his staff that two selling prices will apply for soft drinks sold through his premises. My constituent, who calls himself quite rightly a fair trader, believes that this additional charge is an absolute rip off which has been introduced solely to placate the large supermarket chains.

While we are on that subject I commend an article written by Malcolm Newell in yesterday's *Advertiser* about the problems placed on operators of small businesses by the large landlords who unfortunately engage in, to quote Mr Malcolm Newell, 'questionable if not disreputable behaviour'. Mr Newell outlined some examples of what is happening in the

small business world and the attacks on small business by large landlords.

He spoke of one business owner being harassed by a landlord, demanding payment of his electricity account 'in 10 minutes'. The owner was told that if he did not pay the account within 10 minutes the power would be cut off. When the landlord was advised that this was illegal the landlord said to the small businessman, 'Okay, if that is the way you feel our lawyers can argue about that.' In other words, it involved the use of muscle—something which my colleagues opposite know only too well from the way in which the unions operate.

Mr Newell points out in his article that tenants—and he uses the word 'blackmail', and there is no other way to describe it—pay up to 40 per cent of their sales in rent. On top of this, exorbitant charges are placed on them for maintenance and management charges. I was absolutely staggered to read that centre managements now require small businesses to contribute towards the purchase and running costs of motor vehicles for centre management. I find that absolutely disgraceful. Mr Newell makes other points in relation to the way in which small business is being stamped on by some of these large landlords and the way in which they are being exploited and being made unprofitable because of the greed of these landlords.

Another example given in the article refers to a major shopping centre where the small business tenants are paying more than double per square metre than that which is being paid by the Coles and Woolworths of the world. In other words, this is discriminatory rental. The big supermarket chains are getting their premises at half the cost per square metre to that paid by small business people, and we wonder why these small businesses just cannot compete.

I agree with Malcolm Newell that legislation must be introduced, and I am delighted that the Attorney-General is at the moment reviewing these practices to look at the protection that this Government can introduce in order to protect small businesses from the Labor Party's colleagues—the big business people.

I know of one case within my own electorate where a businessman had built up his business to the point where he had one shop and then took up another shop. The landlord came and said, 'Sorry chum, we know you have done a good job, but we now want this for another purpose. You are out on your neck.' That very successful businessman has now lost everything—all his goodwill—and he has absolutely nothing left of all the work he put into developing that business. As Mr Newell rightly points out, the tenants are trapped, because they cannot walk away; if they do they lose everything they have to sell, including goodwill, and this is being exploited unmercifully by some of the large landlords. There is no way that these small business people can survive.

Again, Mr Newell refers to the add-on charges such as $57.60 for reading an electricity meter, $80 a square metre for unspecified 'outgoings' and, as I have already pointed out, charges to purchase and allow vehicles to be run by centre management. There is another example of a small tenant paying $800 per square metre in a shopping centre to a national landlord. If one considers that, within two years that rent paid would purchase not only the entire premises but also the land on which they are built. Is it any wonder that small business people have reached a stage where they are saying, 'The present Government has done a fantastic job already. We need your help now to overcome these problems.'? They are not looking for anything but a fair deal—a deal that they are not able to obtain at the moment. I am certainly looking forward to the present Government's introducing the protection that is so desperately needed for this very important sector of our business community, that is, the small business person.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (PRISONERS' GOODS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 February. Page 139.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Although it is not the Opposition's intention to oppose this Bill, we want to put a few remarks on the record before we proceed. The basic provisions in the Bill deal with the question of the control of the manager or the governor of a prison in terms of how to deal with articles of mail and parcels in particular.

From the Minister's second reading explanation in respect of this matter, he seems to be making the case that this Bill has stemmed from a judicial review of the provisions that shows a loophole in the current legislation which can be interpreted in such a way that the governor of a prison does not have control over every article of mail that comes into that prison.

Under the provisions of this Bill, every article of mail that comes into a prison can be searched and refused to a prisoner under a broad range of circumstances, being disposed of either by returning it to its sender, sending it to the family of the prisoner, giving it to the prisoner upon his or her release or, if the circumstances arise, being sold or disposed of once the prisoner has left Her Majesty's prison.

We accept the necessity for the control of mail, particularly parcels, going into prisons. We accept the Minister's argument that food parcels in particular could contain drugs and that the problem of testing every single parcel coming in, however suspicious it may be, would be difficult. We also accept the argument that, under regulation 6(a), I believe, the only items which can be denied to a prisoner are those which are not appropriate or which contravene this regulation with respect to going into a prisoner's cell.

We are well aware that the Government has made a number of statements about the future of prisons. In fact, the Opposition has been watching a series of publicity stunts for the past 90 days or so which have indicated in areas of emergency services and correctional services that we are now seeing a tougher and much more rigorous approach. If we ever wanted to see that, we only had to open the *Advertiser* in January and see a whole series of rather bizarre comments about who would be in control of the prisons. Most of those comments did much to inflame the situation in prisons. This Bill is historic in the sense that it is the first piece of legislation that has been introduced into this House for debate this session, other than the usual Supply Bill and the Address in Reply.

We are hoping that this provision will not be abused. In fact, I would seek an assurance from the Minister that this power will not be used unwisely but that it will be used with a great deal of discretion. Where men and women are incarcerated, the sadistic denial of mail and other items for reasons other than security would be a particularly vicious act. We would like an assurance from the Minister that this is genuinely an attempt to plug a loophole in the current Act found by the judicial process, that all prisons will use this

legislation in the spirit in which it is intended, and that it is a necessary provision and not one to make the life of prisoners more miserable than it is already.

Depending on the Minister's response, most of the provisions are such that we will not debate them in Committee. Certainly a number of questions could be asked about this Bill but, in essence, they centre around the matters already outlined to the Minister and, if we are satisfied with his response, we will have no problem in moving straight to a third reading debate.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Correctional Services): As pointed out in the second reading explanation, this Bill essentially ensures that what has been occurring in our prisons system for a number of years can occur within the framework of the Act. As was pointed out in the second reading explanation, a loophole was found in the Act whereby some goods, which for a number of years have been withheld by prison management, for very good reason, could not legally be withheld. There is no more sinister reason than that. I am pleased to give the member for Playford my assurances that the only reason that this Bill has been introduced is to rectify that loophole. It is an eminently sensible Bill that was put forward by the department: it is not a Bill that was directed to the department by the Government.

I take exception to a couple of the comments made by the member for Playford that cannot be left undefended. He referred to a series of publicity stunts conducted by the Government over a tougher and more rigorous approach by this Government. No publicity stunts have been engineered by this Government over the implementation of its policy. Before the election we highlighted our policy changes; since the election we have commenced the implementation of those policies changes. I make no apology for that. We will continue to implement our policy changes for the safety of all South Australians. The member for Playford also referred to bizarre comments about who was to control the prison system. I know not to what article the honourable member refers, although I do recall some rather bizarre statements made by the member for Playford when, as the correctional services spokesman, he referred to *Hogan's Heroes* and made some bizarre analogy between that program and the prisons system in this State.

The only statements that have been run in the press by this Government have been a reflection of its policy statements and an indication that those policies are being implemented. It is not a matter of who does or does not control the prisons system: it is a matter of whether the prisons system is run efficiently and effectively. Regarding the truth in sentencing legislation to which the honourable member might have been referring, the Attorney-General and I are having that legislation drafted and it will be debated in this House on another occasion.

I do not think that any member would stand in this place and challenge the fact that this Government is moving forward to ensure that our community is safer through an appropriate prisons system, be it through the move toward appropriate penalties, the appropriate use of home detention, the appropriate use of a disciplinary structure within the prisons system or the implementation of appropriate rehabilitation, education and work programs in our prisons system. That is what this Government is about and that is what it intends to implement.

The member for Playford also mentioned regulation 6 under the Correctional Services Act and indicated that there are powers under the present Act to allow goods, other than those already approved for use in a prison, to enter the prisons system. The member for Playford is correct in that statement. The difficulty is that items of foodstuffs which can be bought in a prison canteen are allowed into prisons, and other foodstuffs may be allowed in the prison cell under the current regulations.

The difficulty is that ingredients, particularly of a drug related nature, can be incorporated in a tube of toothpaste or a cake, and for that reason may need to be inspected by prison management. I accept the honourable member's comment that some goods ought to be allowed into the system, but some of those goods that are currently permitted in cells may need to be inspected because other ingredients can be incorporated in them. That is one of the reasons why we have a prison canteen within the prison system so that items of foodstuffs can be purchased by prisoners with no risk of ingredients being added and passed in by visitors. So, it is for a very good reason that those changes need to be in place and why in the past those goods have not been allowed in.

Naturally, managers will approach compassionately all items to be given to prisoners. I assure the honourable member that a prisoner will not be refused a birthday cake simply because it may be of a prohibited nature. All those items will be looked at properly and management will talk to visitors who want to bring in those goods. I expect prison managers to exercise reasonable, fair and compassionate judgment in deciding whether to allow or not to allow goods into the prison system. I commend this Bill to the House.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): It is with no pleasure that I rise this evening in this adjournment debate to draw attention to a problem that has been worrying me for more than 14 years, and that is the problem of falling income in rural South Australia. During the course of remarks in this Chamber recently, I drew attention to the kind of problems that have arisen in my electorate in consequence of the adverse seasonal conditions of last summer, which resulted in the mouse plague of last winter. We are now confronted again by the same prospect in this coming autumn.

Mouse numbers were not sufficiently reduced. The other problem within that general framework is that there has been no attempt to coordinate mouse control across the border by the Victorian and South Australian Governments. I think that is a gross inadequacy in the previous Government's strategy for dealing with the mouse plague.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: As the member for Playford would know, mice cannot read maps, and even if they could they would probably only eat them rather than respect the lines drawn on them. Victorian mice do not regard themselves as having no permit to come into South Australia; indeed, they simply go wherever the inclination and food take them. That has occurred, and reinfestation along the Victorian border has been intense. More particularly, reinfestation of those properties which were treated and retreated last winter has occurred because adjacent properties, national parks and the like were not treated at all. Clearly, on this occasion, if the

weather conditions continue to favour the development of plague numbers of mice, we need to move swiftly and immediately toward blanket applications of bait.

It is absolutely inane for the people who care about the environment—and I am one of them—to argue that the use of bait to control the mice puts other species at risk. Native animals are at much graver risk of losing their food supply. More particularly, some of the rare orchids in roadside vegetation and in national parks were simply eaten out by the mouse plague when it migrated out of the farmlands into those areas. The bulbs and rhizomes were taken as food. Mice do not discriminate between species which are endangered and those which are plentiful: food is food as far as they are concerned.

Compounding the problems they have suffered, the people I represent, in common with the people on Eyre Peninsula, are also suffering from very depressed incomes. I begin by pointing out that, in an article published in the *Advertiser* of Friday 4 February, Stefani Raethel stated:

> In June, 1993, the poverty line before housing costs was $371.49 for a 'standard family' of two parents and two children.

That being so, if we multiply that out by 52 weeks, we find it comes to $19 317.48 being needed by such a household for it to be at the poverty line. One would assume that incomes above that figure would be said to be above the poverty line. That is the opinion of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. In the course of its remarks, it has reported in that article that there are over 1.2 million Australians below the line. I can say where a fair few of those 1.2 million Australians live, and you, Mr Speaker, would know, too: they live on Eyre Peninsula, in the Murraylands and the Murray-Mallee.

How do I know that to be so? From my own research into the productivity of each of the counties in the area of Ridley that I represent, if I multiply that productivity by the price to be realised per unit of that produce to get a gross income for the county and divide that by the number of families who live in the county, if it is an area in which farming is undertaken, and who are farming, I can easily calculate the average income. When I then take another set of statistics and tally up the costs that are involved in producing that income—well established costs by experts in farm management—I can see that those families have had negative incomes or close to negative incomes on the average for all that period. Notwithstanding those calculations, I am deeply indebted to Ed Rush in the *Advertiser* and Tim Satchell for an article which appeared in last Saturday's *Advertiser* of 5 March, in which they pointed out, on their analysis of the Australian Taxation Office statistics publication, that, of the poorest 10 places in South Australia, six are located in my electorate. With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the rest of the House, I seek to incorporate in *Hansard* a table which shows that to be so from that *Advertiser* article.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that it is purely of a statistical nature?

Mr LEWIS: Absolutely.

Leave granted.

RICHEST AND POOREST
Mean Taxable Income

TOP 10		BOTTOM 10	
1 North Adelaide	$37 735	1 Parilla	$12 453
2 Olympic Dam	36 232	2 Geranium	12 717
3 Walkerville	35 067	3 Cooke Plains	16 032
4 Burnside	34 694	4 Milendella	16 287
5 Leigh Creek	34 347	5 Alawoona	16 448
6 Glen Osmond	34 340	6 Parndana	16 545
7 Kingswood	33 878	7 Port Neill	16 909
8 Glenside	32 696	8 Brady Creek	16 983
9 Unley	32 536	9 Colebatch	17 022
10 Stirling	32 059	10 Mundulla	17 053

Source: Australian Taxation Office Taxation Statistics 1991/92

Mr LEWIS: Parilla had a mean taxable income of $12 453. Members can see that Geranium had only $12 717; Cooke Plains, $16 032; and so on. Milendella, Alawoona and Colebatch are the other places in my electorate, all of which were in the bottom 10 and all of which had a lower mean taxable income in those postcode localities than any place in the so-called metropolitan area, the lowest there being $19 678 in Virginia.

Of course, we all know that in Virginia there is a fair bit of interest in pot plants and other things from which people are able to derive a cash income from time to time. I am not sure how much of that the Taxation Office would know about, although I do not reflect unduly on those people. One would have thought that in places like Woodville North, McDonald Park and Ferryden Park, which are said to be poor areas, people might be worse off, but that is not the case: they are much better off than people in any of the localities in the electorate I represent.

When I went through the list, I found that the people to whom I refer had incomes of $20 000-plus, well over the poverty line, compared to the incomes received by the people I represent. The mean incomes for those people are tragically low: $16 520 for all the places in the Murraylands, in that entire list. Of those places, with the exception of Murray Bridge, the sum of $19 287 was the average mean taxable income of those families, which is still under the poverty line.

Is it any wonder that I get so many telephone calls throughout the afternoon and night? People are in despair, not knowing what to do or where to go, and the impact which that is having on them and their families, their institutions and everything else in the community is enormous. Any associations with football and netball clubs and other activities simply have to be forgone because there is not sufficient money to even live, let alone travel for recreational purposes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ross Smith.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): As the Deputy Premier and Treasurer is present, I would turn my attention to the representations made to me today by representatives of the Finance Sector Union concerning the interests of their members employed by the State Bank. In particular, I refer to the Government's position, which is to deprive about 600 State Bank employees of their rightful superannuation entitlements. Every member of Parliament probably received a letter from the union this morning setting out the union's case.

Certainly, I received letters from constituents in the Ross Smith electorate as employees of the State Bank stating their case as members of the old State Government superannuation scheme. At the meeting I had this morning with representatives of the union and their rank and file representatives from the State Bank, it was patently clear that the present Government has ratted on its undertaking given to the union in October last year. I was shown the letter the union received from the former Deputy Premier and Treasurer, the present member for Giles, which gave an unequivocal commitment that with the corporatisation of the State Bank all employees covered by what I term the old State Government superannuation scheme would have their rights preserved and their

rights to accrue beyond the date of the corporatisation of the State Bank.

They also showed me a letter received from the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, issued a few days after he had been given a copy of the former Deputy Premier's letter, in which he gave an unequivocal commitment on behalf of the Liberal Party that the same arrangements agreed to by the then Labor Government would be adopted by any future Liberal Government. That is clear and unequivocal and there is no way of back sliding out of that pre-election commitment; certainly, there is no way to do so with any honour.

What we have ascertained since the election of the present Government is that there has been a great deal of back sliding. Following a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition about a week ago, the Deputy Premier was careful in his choice of words in reply and said effectively that the rights of the 600 employees—members of the old State Government superannuation scheme—would be preserved as at 30 June this year. Of course, the corporatisation is effective from 1 July 1994.

What the Deputy Premier did not say (but which is a fact) is that the rights that they have accrued up to 30 June would be preserved but would not carry on past that date; they would not accrue any further entitlements to their existing superannuation scheme. This would mean a loss for many career bank officers of literally tens of thousands of dollars. Many of these career officers started when they were 15 or 16 years of age. Many of them, as part of their routine tour of duty with the bank, did much work in terms of country postings and then returned to the city for a more permanent posting in the metropolitan area, then purchased their home at a more advanced stage of life (the late thirties or early forties) when their expenses were at their greatest.

Also, State Bank employees, unlike permanent public servants, are able to be compulsorily retrenched. We also know from the accounts of the State Bank that it has earmarked X amount of dollars for the compulsory retrenchment of employees after the corporatisation of the bank. This is well known amongst the bank's employees and was confirmed to me today in my discussions with those employees and with their union representatives. If any of those 600 employees are compulsorily retrenched, their only entitlement will be a maximum of 79 weeks severance pay.

In terms of any retrenchment component that they currently enjoy under the existing State superannuation scheme, that is forfeited as of 30 June of this year. All they will receive is their own money, and we will find an example of that given in the letters that were distributed to all members of Parliament today by the Finance Sector Union. One of those examples was that an officer of around 38 or 39 years of age would, depending on his salary (although I think this was a reasonably average salary for the banking community), receive something like $16 000 in superannuation benefits for what he had paid into the scheme, plus a maximum of 79 weeks severance pay.

In terms of the additional amounts that they could otherwise have enjoyed, under the existing superannuation scheme of which these people are currently members, if they are 45 years of age and are compulsorily retrenched, they are entitled to receive a superannuation payout as if they are 60 years of age. These officers stand to lose a huge sum of money. We are not talking about a theoretical amount of money: it is a fact that is well known to every employee of the State Bank that there will be compulsory redundancies arising from the corporatisation of the bank.

They understand that, although they do not necessarily like it, but what they expect is to be given fair and equitable treatment. Above all, they expect—and very reasonably—that the Deputy Premier and the Government of which he is a member will honour the undertakings given to them and publicised to their own membership in the lead-up to the State election. It is not something that this Government can lightly dismiss and say, 'That's only a pre-election commitment; we can easily ignore that.' You are dealing with the livelihood of significant numbers of South Australian citizens who, when they joined the State Bank, were not asked if they wanted to join the State scheme voluntarily but were compelled to do so.

They entered into a compulsory superannuation scheme and over a number of years have been given to believe, quite rightly, that they were entitled to certain benefits under the superannuation scheme if they served X number of years with the State Bank. As I said, this has caused a great deal of distress. I spoke to one of my constituents this morning. This man, who is in his late forties, has a number of financial commitments and is an employee of the State Bank who is absolutely terrified that, if the Government's corporatisation Bill goes through without any protection in respect of the superannuation component (he is a member of the old scheme and he is targeted for compulsory retrenchment after 1 July), his financial status will be shattered.

That is all because the Government is expecting those few people to maximise any sale price for the bank, to clear the bank of those accrued liabilities in connection with superannuation. Those few career bank officers are expected to sacrifice their superannuation entitlements to clear the books of that debt and to enhance the sale price of the State Bank, whether through a public float or a trade sale. That is a disgrace. Many of those persons in the State Bank who were directly responsible for the fiasco and the financial disaster of that bank shot through. They either got retrenched or they exited fairly quickly, and when they exited they got the full benefit of that Government superannuation scheme, where all the big money was. Now we are just talking about a relatively small number of people who, having given a lifetime of service to the State Bank, are facing the prospect of compulsory retrenchment and losing tens of thousands of dollars, simply because this Government will not honour its election pledge at all. It has been absolutely disgraceful in its negotiations and backsliding with respect to the Finance Sector Union and its members. When this matter is debated, we on this side of the House will not let that issue lie.

Motion carried.

At 10.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 March at 2 p.m.