HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 31 July 1996

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

State Clothing Corporation (Winding-Up) Amendment,

State Lotteries (Unclaimed Prizes) Amendment,

Trustee (Variation of Charitable Trusts) Amendment.

SHOOTING BANS

A petition signed by 2 000 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to ban the recreational shooting of ducks and quails was presented by Mr Wade.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

O'HALLORAN HILL OPEN SPACE

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 9 July.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The CSIRO land at O'Halloran Hill in part forms a component of the regional open space character buffer between the urban nature of the Adelaide Plains and the newer suburban developments further south. Discussions regarding the future use of the land have been held at Commonwealth, State and local government officer level at various times in the past. Whilst the CSIRO has indicated its interest in considering the future use of its Glenthorne property at O'Halloran Hill the State Government has not at this time been formally advised by any Federal Minister that this land is surplus to the requirements of the CSIRO.

I understand that the Federal Minister and the local Federal member are currently seeking advice on the future of the land and have held informal discussions with officers of my department and members of the local community. It is understood that these discussions are trying to establish the process for considering the future use of the land.

The Government recognises that this area has significant potential particularly regarding part of the Metropolitan Open Space System and urban infill. Future decisions on the uses of the land will be made following community consultation.

I have been informed that as a result of the Federal Ministers initiative that a small working party, consisting of Federal, State, and Local Government representatives, community interests and related groups has been formed in order to set out the process by which the future of this land can be discussed. I understand that a reference group may also be formed to help with community input. The State Government supports a process by which all matters are considered before any final decision is made on the futures use of this land.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, for the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Rules of Racing—Racing Act—SA Greyhound Racing Authority—Rules

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

South Australian Council on Reproductive Technology—Report, 1995.

ACTIL

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I wish to advise the House that earlier today C.S. Brooks Canada Incorporated, Canada's leading home furnishing group, finalised the acquisition of some of the assets of Textile Industries Australia including the actual operation at Woodville North. The State Government has been working hard for over two years, and in particular for the past six months, to ensure the continuity of employment for the 650 South Australians who are employed at Actil. In a statement made this morning on behalf of TIA, the Chairman and CEO of C.S. Brooks said:

> TIA was an appealing property for Brooks due to the design leadership and global presence of the Sheridan brand and the organisation's advanced manufacturing and fabric printing plants.

The purchase of the Home Fashions Division of TIA includes all brands, manufacturing, distribution, design and administration plants in Sydney, Hobart and Adelaide, the United States of America, the UK, Japan and New Zealand. He said that the company planned for the Sheridan brand to increase the company's international presence. Sheridan was established in 1968 and is now sold in 40 countries and is recognised worldwide for its innovative design, colour, coordination and quality.

As members may be aware, Textile Industries Australia, the previous owner of Actil, has been under financial pressure for some years and this has brought with it uncertainty of employment. I am pleased to report that the completion of this purchase ends the uncertainty in a very positive manner for Actil's employees and for the South Australian textile industry. The previous assistance provided to Actil by the State Government has been transferred to the new owner, CS Brooks. This assistance, together with the Government's own efforts, have helped maintain the Woodville North operation as the major manufacturing site for the Actil, Sheridan and Carrington ranges of bed linen products, which are sold throughout Australia, Asia, Europe and the US, ensuring that 650 South Australians and their families enjoy the security of continued employment—that is our first priority.

As I have said before, South Australia is a small regional economy. We are dependent for growth on manufacturers who are active in finding and developing export markets for goods and services produced in this State. It is therefore doubly important that exporting enterprises such as the former Actil operation continue in this State. South Australia benefits from the presence of export-orientated manufacturers like CS Brooks to help ensure the future of textile manufacturing and jobs in this State. Furthermore, a condition of the acquisition is that Actil employees are offered employment with the new company. I am pleased to confirm that Mr Myron Mann will remain the CEO of the Australian group.

CS Brooks Canada is the oldest and largest home fashions producer in Canada, based in Montreal. It is a privately owned company formed in 1989. CS Brooks claims this acquisition puts the company in a position to take advantage of the emerging Asian markets and to further develop

Sheridan's existing base in Europe and North America. In conclusion, this is an excellent outcome for South Australia. Jobs at the former Actil site are preserved, the future of one of South Australia's export industries has been secured, and the presence of CS Brooks adds yet again to the list of global companies looking to Adelaide and South Australia as a good place to do business and a centre for operations in the Asia Pacific region.

ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I table the 1994-95 South Australian Government Implementation Report on the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. The Government has decided to change its reporting period from a calendar year to a financial year basis. Therefore, the report covers the period from 1 January 1994 to 30 June 1995.

The experience in South Australia over the reporting period and since highlights the frustration in addressing Aboriginal deaths in custody. In 1995, six Aboriginal South Australians died in custody. Of the six Aboriginal men who have died in prison custody, four died of suicide and two as a result of natural causes. This increase was reflected nationally. Information from the Australian Institute of Criminology shows that nationally there were 21 deaths of Aboriginal people in custody, 16 in prison custody and five in police custody.

In the eight months since October 1995, there have been no Aboriginal deaths in custody in South Australia. Whilst policy and practice are continually improving, I do not believe that these factors alone can fully explain this most welcome decrease. For the South Australian Government, the recent experience highlights three key lessons. First, there is not a linear relationship between deaths in custody and Government policy or actions. Secondly, we must be mindful of the many factors beyond the criminal justice system that lead to Aboriginal disadvantage, internment and deaths in custody.

Thirdly, in consultation with the Aboriginal community, we need to think laterally and to work creatively to develop strategies to improve the interaction between the Aboriginal community and the policing, justice and correction systems. The Aboriginal community is the most socially and economically disadvantaged community in South Australia. Aboriginal deaths in custody are both the most stark symptom of the disadvantaged and a key challenge for Aboriginal advancement in this State.

I hope that the implementation report will contribute to a greater understanding of the situation of the Aboriginal community and stimulate the development of fresh strategies to address Aboriginal disadvantage and deaths in custody. The South Australian Government is committed to developing fresh strategies. The Government renewed its focus on implementation of the royal commission recommendations during the second half of 1995. I have become personally involved in the meetings and work of the Aboriginal Justice Interdepartmental Committee.

The Department of State Aboriginal Affairs has re-engineered the *modus operandi* of the committee by establishing interagency task groups, with the monitoring agencies working closely with each group—juvenile welfare, custodial health, non-custodial sentencing options, policing issues, remand rates and Anangu Pitjantjatjara Land issues. Other agencies of Government have also renewed their efforts to address Aboriginal deaths in custody.

In July 1995, the Department for Correctional Services established a task force which provides a forum for wide agency and Aboriginal community discussion to assist in identifying and reducing the risk factors associated with Aboriginal incarceration. A list of approximately 37 agenda items concerning the well-being of prisoners has been identified. The group will continue to meet to ensure that the issues are addressed and to allow the perspectives of a group of prisoners, who attend each meeting, to be heard. It is the intention of other agencies to increase the levels of commitment necessary to ensure that the number of Aboriginal people having contact with the criminal justice system is addressed comprehensively and that those in custody are afforded due duty of care, including access to improved health services and opportunities for entry into programs for their effective rehabilitation.

The Government appreciates the value of involving the Aboriginal community in developing and implementing strategies to address Aboriginal imprisonment. To this end, the Aboriginal Justice Advocacy Committee is a full member of the Aboriginal Justice Interdepartmental Committee; it is an ex-officio member of each task group; it is a member of the Department for Correctional Services task force; and it is consulted in many other ways.

The implementation report which follows is the culmination of efforts over the past 18 months to keep the royal commission recommendations high on agencies' agenda and to ensure their full implementation. A number of very promising initiatives have been developing more recently. More information on these specific proposals will be included in the 1995-96 implementation report. The Government will ensure that the effort needed to reduce the likelihood of people dying whilst in custody does not diminish, and that due vigilance and the protection of human rights is maintained at all times.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I bring up the twenty-second report of the committee on environmental, resources, planning, land use, transportation and development aspects of the MFP Development Corporation for 1995-96 and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the thirtieth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr CUMMINS: I bring up the committee's report on the Racial Vilification Bill 1986 and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Premier, his office or the Minister for Transport now been briefed on the recommendations of the Brew report for Australian National, and will the Premier tell the House what the implications of those recommendations are for AN workers, their families and the City of Port Augusta? Will the Premier now agree to meet with AN workers?

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: While the Premier has told the House that he has not seen the Brew report, I understand that both the Premier and his Transport Minister have now received a private briefing about the impact of the Brew report's recommendations on South Australia.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have not received a private briefing on the Brew report; therefore, the Leader of the Opposition's basic assumption is quite wrong. As I understand, the Brew report is due to go to Cabinet today, and I can assure the honourable member that I received no briefing whatsoever from the Federal Government on the Brew report.

NATIVE TITLE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Premier advise the House of the response by the South Australian Government to claims made on Adelaide radio this morning by the Federal Labor Shadow Attorney-General Mr Melham concerning native title? On ABC radio this morning the Federal Labor Party claimed that Commonwealth native title laws are not hindering South Australian developers and industry and that the South Australian Government was 'undermining the Commonwealth's native title system'.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I happened to hear this comment on ABC news this morning, and the comment from the Federal shadow Attorney-General, that is, the shadow Attorney-General of the Labor Party, Mr Melham, absolutely astounded me.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You've got the wrong bloke.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am sorry; he is shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, not shadow Attorney-General. I point out that his comments showed astounding inaccuracy. First, he obviously had not been briefed by his own colleague from South Australia—the Deputy Leader, who happens to be the Shadow Minister and who should have dealt with this issue. This is the man that the Federal Labor Party would put up as the alternative Minister for Australia. He has no idea—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will come to the point in a moment. He has no idea of how the native title legislation works; he has no idea of the history of the issue. First, it is quite clear that he thought that the Attorney-General was questioning the principles of the High Court decision. The South Australian Attorney-General was not doing that and, as the Attorney-General said this morning, Mr Melham grossly misquoted what the South Australian Attorney-General said. I point out that the criticism from the South Australian Government concerned the administrative and legal processes around native title.

Everyone in this House should have some concern about that matter. Even the former Premier Lynn Arnold expressed considerable concern about the processes and the administrative procedures put down by the Federal legislation on native title. I see that his former senior adviser sitting on the other side of the House nods in agreement that the former Premier had those concerns. I highlight that it is quite clear that the shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, the man speaking for the Labor Party in Canberra, does not even understand that we have comprehensive and complementary legislation in South Australia. I quote to the House what he had to say, as follows:

> The right to negotiate processes in the native title have not been allowed to work because of recalcitrant State Governments.

He clearly has not been told that South Australia has appropriate legislation in place.

Mr Clarke: Thanks to the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thanks to the Opposition? It was this Liberal Government that put that legislation in place. It would appear that the shadow Minister does not even understand that that legislation did not go through.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Premier will not engage in chatter across the Chamber. I suggest to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he has already been spoken to once today. He understands Standing Order 137. The Chair is getting particularly tired of having to call members to order. The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out that it was this Liberal Government that got that legislation through, not the Labor Party of South Australia. It is about time the Deputy Leader went off and at least talked to the shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs at a Federal level and gave him a briefing. I point out that this clown from the Labor Party in Canberra went on to say that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Premier that it would be better to use other terms when he is criticising people.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has been spoken to.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This man in Canberra who calls himself the shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs claimed that developments are secure and said that in fact developers and industry should have no concern with these native title laws whatsoever, yet Justice French was one of those who came out and strongly criticised the whole process that native title has to go through. Everyone should understand that virtually every major developer dealing with Crown lands where there is a potential native title claim has expressed enormous concern over the processes and uncertainty that exist. In fact, it has been estimated here in South Australia that $10 million of mineral exploration has been lost to South Australia alone through the uncertainty of the process with native title—$10 million lost in this State in exploration effort.

So, I strongly condemn the shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs for the statements he made this morning. They are ignorant comments—and false, in terms of our own Attorney-General in South Australia—and I ask the Labor Party in this State for goodness sake to go off and talk to their Federal colleagues so that they have a little understanding and appreciation of the important issues. If the Labor Party here in South Australia does not think native title is an important

issue, it shows that it has not learnt a thing from the last State election, where it was defeated.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Minister for Primary Industries. What plans has the State Government drawn up to take back control and operation of the State's country rail network and the employment of AN railway workers to ensure the transport of our vital grain crops? Reports indicate that the Federal Government is planning to hand back to the States, including South Australia, some rail operations following its restructuring of Australian National.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the Deputy Leader for including me in that sort of question. Obviously, I have a lot of interest in what happens with rail. The major customer of rail in country South Australia on a lot of the small lines is definitely grain, and on some lines it is the only one, so we take great interest in it. As for the State Government having plans, I am the incorrect Minister to ask. I do not represent the Minister for Transport in this House, but I will be quite happy to try to obtain an answer from her.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson has continued to interject, even though he is back behind the column. The member for Florey.

POLICE CONFISCATION OF HYDROPONIC EQUIPMENT

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Police please outline what action the South Australian Police Force is taking to dispose of forfeited hydroponic equipment which has been used in the production of cannabis? I understand that seized hydroponic equipment has recently been disposed of through State Supply and that, at times, equipment marked with exhibit numbers from previous prosecutions has been discovered in new raids by police on cannabis cultivation.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the member for Florey for his question. It is somewhat of an embarrassment that some of this equipment is recycled. As members would be well aware, when equipment is used in the commission of an offence, it is automatically forfeited. In this case, hydroponic equipment is used for quite large cultivations. When material is seized when an offence is noted and an arrest is made, that equipment is sold. In the past, the equipment has been sold by State Services and the people who have bought the equipment have used it for the next round of drug cultivation. When they have discovered this equipment, they have found exhibit numbers on the it. It is a serious matter that, when we dispose of equipment which is used for illegal purposes, it is used again for those same illegal purposes. That is an untenable situation for any Government to sustain. Whilst the dollars might have been valuable, it is counterproductive that the same equipment is being used for the same offences.

The Government's decision on this matter is that, rather than allow the equipment to be sold on the open market, it should be utilised. There are a number of schools and research institutions in this State that deal in hydroponics for all the legitimate reasons. Horticulture in South Australia is a growing industry and enormous effort is being put into researching better ways of growing horticultural products. Hydroponics is one of the methods used for growing a variety of crops and plants. It is our intention to use the hydroponic equipment which has been seized for constructive and productive purposes to enhance some of the important industry areas of the State. We will no longer allow the equipment to be recycled and to produce more cannabis on the open market: we will ensure it is used productively.

ETSA COMPUTER SYSTEM

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. Has the purchase and installation costs of a new computer software package for ETSA's distribution division exceeded the $14 million bid price for the contract won by the German company SAP and, if so, by what amount? The Opposition has been informed that at a recent meeting of senior ETSA executives it was revealed that the purchase and installation costs of ETSA's new computer software package was set to blow out from $14 million to $20 million.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This matter has not been drawn to my attention, if it is in fact the case. However, I will seek some answers from the Electricity Trust for the honourable member.

INVENTIVE AUSTRALIA—CREATIVE ADELAIDE

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development inform the House about the details of a multimedia marketing package entitled Inventive Australia—Creative Adelaide and what benefits it will bring to South Australians? This morning this new Australian trade marketing program was launched by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Downer.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Commonwealth and South Australian Governments have joined together to re-market and reposition South Australia in the Asian market place. A program called Inventive Australia—Creative Adelaide seeks to redress the false, inaccurate and outdated perceptions of Australia. Several years ago the Commonwealth Government did some market research in the Asian region. They took the view that Australia had large farms and large mines, however they did not perceive us as having a sophisticated manufacturing society and research, development and technology that could produce a motor vehicle, for example, that could access five continents throughout the world on quality, reliability of supply and price. It is a matter of changing those perceptions.

The South Australian Government was the first and only State Government to enter into a bilateral agreement with the Commonwealth Government under the auspices of Market Australia to undertake this new marketing program. In fact, South Australia with the Commonwealth Government is now having television commercials shown in the key markets of Asia, coupled with print publications, underscoring the Inventive Australia—Creative Adelaide theme. It is a process of trying to reposition, remarket and focus the Asian investment decision makers on Adelaide and South Australia and what it has to offer in the future. The program is costing some $500 000 on behalf of the Commonwealth and approximately $135 000 on behalf of the South Australian Government.

An honourable member: Good deal.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is a good deal. We have supported that with publications and a multimedia kit wherein people will be able to access a whole range of information based on cost advantage in Adelaide. Earlier this year the Premier referred to the cost advantage of Adelaide as a

location for investment vis-a-vis other States of Australia and the Commonwealth. It is a matter of driving home that competitive edge, making sure that the decision makers and investors in Asia understand the advantage of considering South Australia for investment.

In addition, last year the Premier called for business to be ambassadors for South Australia in the program of marketing the competitive advantage of South Australia. Publication of the multimedia kit entitled *The Case for South Australia* will support the Inventive Australia—Creative Adelaide theme. We will be able to have these television commercials, principally sponsored by the Commonwealth, shown in the key Asian markets ahead of every other State of Australia—and I guess it is showing a bit of inventive thinking by South Australia to do that. The publications, booklets and CD-ROMS will drive home the competitive advantage of construction costs here which are lower than the other capital cities of Australia and certainly lower than the Asian marketplace.

That is why companies such as Motorola, EDS, Compagnie Generale des Eaux, Thames UK and Lear Seating—and so the list goes on—have located their regional headquarters in Adelaide, South Australia. It begs the question, 'Why did they come to Adelaide?'—because of the competitive advantage, conducive business climate and policy direction being pursued by this Government. That is why. It is now a matter of our presenting to the wider community the investment case for South Australia.

The target is some $500 million worth of additional investment in the next couple of years to create another 3 500 jobs in the next couple of years so that the targets which were put down by the Premier in the election campaign in 1993 can be pursued through the course of this Government and into our next term as we give certainty and predictability in terms of policy direction for investment in the State of South Australia. That was underscored only today by the finalisation of the deal with C.S. Brooks—a good deal for South Australia based on the conducive business climate in South Australia.

AUSTRALIS MEDIA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier as Minister for Information Technology and responsible for Australis. How many people are currently employed at the Adelaide Australis operation and does the Premier believe that the company is capable of delivering the promised 700 jobs by 1999 under its reported $28 million deal with the Government given continued media reports that Australis is facing difficulties and is avoiding direct competition with Foxtel and Optus by concentrating on the smaller markets where these two largest companies do not operate? By leave, I will explain the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member has a very brief explanation.

Mr FOLEY: Very brief, thank you, Sir.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order. That was, in fact, an explanation of the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Chair was to insist upon relevance, then there would be few questions and answers given in the House.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. I will give a brief explanation to my question which is directed to the Premier. A report in yesterday's *Australian* states that the most recent prospectus given to US bond dealers for the company reveals:

Australis has given up competing with the cable pay TV companies Foxtel and Optus Vision and will now concentrate on areas where they don't operate.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, as the honourable member would know, pay TV is an area that is expanding very significantly indeed throughout the world, certainly here in Australia, otherwise members can be assured that the other two major operators that have come into the market would not be in there unless they saw a huge potential market within Australia. Although Australia was late into the field and Australis was the first of the Australian operators of pay TV, it obviously will be a significant market indeed.

I understand that the level of employment in terms of full-time job equivalents is about 250. I will check that, but that is my understanding on where it currently sits. There is a mix of full-time and part-time employees. It is impossible to forecast the expansion of that industry and, therefore, the role and size ultimately of Australis, but the honourable member would know—because he is a member of the IDC—the sort of assistance package that the Government gave. A general purpose telephone centre was built at Technology Park, a centre for which we as a Government are finding an increasing demand for a whole range of companies. Therefore, it is a facility that can be readily used by other companies as well.

Secondly, the Government provides specific training for people involved in the use of telephone centres. That is a commodity which goes with the people. The more people they take on, the more people who get trained with some Government assistance, and therefore the greater the benefit for South Australia. If they do not take on additional people then we do not pay the money for the training so there is no cost. I might add that the training goes to the people. It is a commodity and their ability to do this, whether with Australis or anywhere else, is therefore substantially increased.

There is forgone revenue which is revenue that would not otherwise be here in South Australia unless Australis was here. There is also a loan which was given to them for purchase of a licence and which is secured against the licence itself. That covers the broad areas of assistance given to the company. Therefore, I am confident that the pay TV area will explode considerably. I am confident that there is a huge demand and opportunity for telephone centres in South Australia. This morning I sat down and talked with yet another company which is looking at setting up such a telephone centre in South Australia and one for the Asian area.

I am confident that those two key technologies involved in this area are expanding rapidly indeed. Our information technology area and the telephone marketing area, which is linked into that, have created about 2 000 jobs in the past two years. It shows the extent to which this area is one of enormous opportunity and we will continue to attract companies which we believe will play a significant part in the development of those two industries.

KOALAS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Does the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources support the position taken by the Australian Koala Foundation that chlamydia be released on Kangaroo Island as a means of bringing the koala population under control. I am continually being approached by constituents in my electorate protesting the suggestion from the Australian Koala Foundation to release this disease. These constituents have been horrified by the suggestion,

saying that any release of chlamydia is cruel and unethical—and I totally agree with them. Does the Minister support this suggestion by the foundation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is commenting.

Mrs PENFOLD: Is he aware of how much money collected from Friday's Australian Koala Foundation badge day in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs PENFOLD: —will be spent in South Australia, and has he agreed to pay the foundation any consultancy fees in this State?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair points out to the House that that is a clear example of comment which is contrary to Standing Orders. It would appear to the Chair that that is a prepared question which may have been prepared in the Minister's office and I would suggest to the people who prepared it that they ought not continue in that fashion or they will be ruled out of order.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Despite the views of the Opposition, this is a very important question. I have received an enormous amount of representation on this matter, including very strong representation from members in the House. The member for Flinders is quite right in expressing her disgust at the suggestion that has been made. Other members, including the member for Coles, have made representation to me as well. I know that many people in South Australia have been strongly offended by the position taken by the Australian Koala Foundation.

I do not support any release of this cruel disease on Kangaroo Island. Although, as we would appreciate, this disease is present on the mainland I see no reason why we should infect a disease free population on Kangaroo Island. The suggestion is inhumane. Is the Koala Foundation also suggesting that, because mainland koala populations are also more susceptible to the risk of bushfire, we should then go ahead with starting fires on the island or even introducing foxes as predators? I would hope not.

I think we need to be much more specific, as I have indicated in the House before, and much more scientific in our approach. That is one of the reasons why I established a task force to examine the Kangaroo Island problem in more detail. Again, I point out that this issue has been around for some time—and it is interesting the comments coming from the other side.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I just wish that members on the other side might have had a few comments over the past 10 years when this problem has been growing and no action whatsoever has been taken by Ministers on the other side regarding this matter. Let them not be smart with their comments now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. The Minister has the call and he does not need any help or assistance.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, to touch on the other parts of the member's question, I read with interest comments from the Koala Foundation that little, if any, of the funds raised from the foundation's badge day last Friday will be used in South Australia. I find that very disappointing and hope that this is certainly not the case. If it is, I must question why an organisation such as the Koala Foundation came to this State, exploited the situation and has not returned any of the benefits to the people who have supported this movement for many years. In fact, I think it is worthy of South Australians who have contributed to write to the foundation pointing out their concerns about the lack of financial input into South Australia on the part of this organisation. Further, this Government will not pay the Australian Koala Foundation any consultancy fee.

Any organisation genuine about its cause would show the goodwill of other South Australians who have come forward with their ideas and concepts on how the problem can be remedied. I do not favour paying for advice if we do not even know the standard of the advice that we are likely to be given. This Government is committed to finding the most appropriate solution to the Kangaroo Island situation and considering all options, including conservation and animal welfare issues, as well as the wider social repercussions. I assure the House that, as Minister, I will handle this issue sensitively and with all of those aspects in mind.

INDUSTRY, INCENTIVE PACKAGES

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Why did the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development publicly divulge the cost of the submarine investment attraction package provided by the former Government while this Government continues to refuse to reveal financial details of the Government's deals with companies such as Australis? At last Thursday's South Australian Centre for Economic Studies July briefing, the Minister for Industry told more than 200 people that the cost per job of the previous State Government's incentive package for the submarine project was $36 000. In Parliament and publicly the Minister and the Premier have refused to provide the public with financial details of deals such as the Australis deal. In fact, the Minister stated in the House:

> No, I will not release the package which is similar to the practice of the previous Government.

The Minister has also stated in the House that 'the Government would not expose the incentive arrangements that have been put in place in the past'.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the view that, in future, questions such as that one, and the previous one, will be ruled out of order for unnecessary comment.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Whilst the member for Hart went into great detail, he left out of his question and explanation one important factor, that is, the benchmark upon which this Government is now putting in place incentive packages. I put that down as the high-water mark, established for all time in South Australia. Given the Industry Commission report and remarks from other commentators who have looked at the incentive support that we are putting in place for industry, the sentence that was missed was this: currently the incentive package given by the South Australian Government is averaging about a tenth of what was put in place by the former Government. That is what the member for Hart left off—very deliberately left off. In the past six months, there has been a rev down—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —of the level of support in the incentive package in supplying industry support in South Australia. What the member for Hart also overlooks is that 61 per cent of every investment dollar that we put in place in South Australia at the moment is to existing industry in this State—small and medium businesses—giving them the

capacity to reinvest with new plant and equipment and to expand in the future, unlike the popular perception that all the money is being used to attract interstate and international companies to come to South Australia. I repeat: 61 per cent of all dollars supporting industry expansion and development is provided to existing industry development or existing companies expanding in South Australia.

I am proud of the fact that, with the Government's policy to bring down electricity and water costs, to bring down the cost of doing business in South Australia to make it one of the most competitive locations in Australia, we do not have to put the cash up front because of the advantages that are in this State. That is why it is a good example to indicate how we have brought down the costs per employee per new investment in the State of South Australia. That is not a bad record in just three years.

Mr Foley: The rules have changed, have they?

The SPEAKER: Order! The rules have not changed. I warn the member for Hart under Standing Order 137.

PRISONS, DRUGS

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Correctional Services provide the House with information about tough new security measures that will be enforced on people visiting prisoners throughout the South Australian prison system?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: In this place on 21 February 1995 I tabled a comprehensive report on the investigation into drugs in the South Australian prison system. Members may recall that that investigation was conducted by Mr Arthur Grant, a retired former Assistant Commissioner of the Northern Territory police. He found in his investigations that no less than 50 per cent of the total prison population were active drug users and that the primary source of drugs entering the prisons was through contact visits. As a result, many new strategies have been implemented across the system to combat the drug problem identified by Mr Grant.

The latest initiatives that have now been implemented or are in the process of being implemented in the prison system will see visitors to South Australian prisons being subjected to a strict new security regime that is to be put in place. The new measures include a computer-based identification system for all visitors, including details of those visitors who are banned from visiting any institution in the State or who may be banned from visiting particular prisoners in the prison system. Only six people nominated by the prisoner will be able to visit a prisoner and, prior to being able to visit any prisoner in the system, those six people will have their credentials checked thoroughly by the Department for Correctional Services. Obviously, that figure of six visits does not include professional visits.

Visitors will be required to provide plausible identification so that their identity can be thoroughly checked. Surprisingly, that was not the case under the previous Government. A further measure is the closure of the toilets in the visitors area. The reason that has had to occur is that the investigator found that visitors to the prison system would smuggle drugs into the toilet, which would then be visited by prisoners who would pick up those drugs. If nature calls and visitors need to go to the toilet, they can leave the visitors area, but they can only come back into the visitors area after going through a thorough screening process to ensure that there are no drugs on their person.

These new procedures complement those already announced and introduced by this Government, including the Itemiser N or computerised sniffer dog, which is being used extensively throughout the system to identify 24 different drugs that may be carried by visitors or anyone else entering the prison system. In addition, a new computer-monitored telephone system is progressively being installed throughout the prison system, and the soon to be proclaimed legislation, which has passed through both Houses of Parliament, will enable prison officers to detain, if necessary, for strip searching by police any visitor reasonably suspected of carrying drugs on their person.

In addition to these measures, the drug rehabilitation program throughout the system is already being expanded and will be further expanded following the calling of tenders for the private management of the prison medical service throughout the entire prison system. A major component of this tender will be constructive, effective drug rehabilitation programs within the prison system. The prison telephone system has been installed at the Adelaide Remand Centre and Mount Gambier Prison, and it will be cabled through the entire prison system by the end of September. Under this Government, drugs in prisons will not be tolerated. We are doing everything that is humanly possible to reduce the incidence of drugs in our prison system.

HEPATITIS G

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Health now aware that hepatitis G has been diagnosed in a South Australian patient, and will the Minister inform the House whether diagnostic tests are available at our Blood Bank and elsewhere in South Australia to detect this disease? The Minister will be aware of the existence nationally and internationally of hepatitis G, a serious disease which is transmitted through blood contact. The Minister will also be aware that it has only been in recent years that the hepatitis C virus can be detected by the Blood Bank prior to blood transfusions. The hepatitis G virus has now been identified for the first time in this State and confirmed only this week by the Fairfield Infectious Diseases Laboratory in Melbourne. The Opposition has been asked about what moves are being made to develop diagnostic testing for hepatitis G in this State, including at our Blood Bank.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The whole question of blood-borne diseases and viruses is of enormous concern because of the susceptibility of a number of people, particularly those who require frequent blood transfusions. It is an area of great uncertainty and it is an area of evolution. In fact, what the recipients of frequent blood transfusions fear—and they include a number of people with blood disorders—is what is loosely known as TNV (The Next Virus). That is a way of identifying within that community the great uncertainties of whatever the next virus might be. I am aware of the isolation of this new form of hepatitis. Indeed, South Australia has led the way in the treatment and prevention of hepatitis C, and our programs are recognised Australia wide. A number of people in this House—and I am sure people in South Australia—have seen the hepatitis C helpline identified on the back of buses and so on. We will actively seek ways of diminishing exposure to hepatitis G but, as I say, our record in dealing with 'the next virus' is good—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: No, as I say, I understand that it is being tested in Australia. I will get details on

whether it is being tested from here on a routine basis. As I say, that is the uncertainty of 'the next virus'.

FISHING, OVERCAPITALISATION

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister for Primary Industries tell the House what South Australia is doing to prevent the overcapitalisation of the fishing industry in South Australian-controlled fisheries? I have been advised that the key note address at the World Fisheries Congress currently being held in Brisbane highlighted worldwide concern about overcapitalisation of fishing fleets.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: South Australia has an excellent record in both the international and national context with respect to the status of fish stocks and the degree of capitalisation of our commercial fishing fleet. The Spencer Gulf prawn fishery, rock lobsters and abalone fisheries in South Australia are not only valuable income earners with an export value approaching $200 million but they are also efficient and cost-effective and, at current fishing levels, they will remain sustainable. The problems experienced with fish stocks in South Australia are arguably less severe than any other region of the world. Members may be aware of some of the dramatic collapses in the northern hemisphere and, more particularly, the cod and halibut fishery off the north-east coast of North America.

The World Fisheries Congress in Brisbane that the member for Goyder mentioned has highlighted how far advanced Australia is over other nations in terms of sustainability and profitability of our fisheries. PISA and SARDI intend to work towards maintaining that situation and have plans to improve our management. This work plan will include, amongst other things, the complete recovery of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery, which has been a problem for a long time; the economic restructuring of the commercial scalefish fishery; the sustainable development of the recreational fishery; development of investment and industry development strategies for aquaculture and wild fishery sectors; and the maintenance of biodiversity through conservative fishing policies.

A key factor that will influence the success of the plan will be the level of industry and community participation in the implementation of the plans. With that in mind, we are well down the track with the integrated management committees and our fishcare volunteer program. An example of the exciting future development opportunities is the recently announced Playford Memorial Trust Scholarship relating to aquaculture and stock enhancement of King George whiting. This project has already attracted substantial sponsorship support and will place South Australia at the forefront in terms of innovative solutions to fishery management issues. South Australia is one of the few places in the world that can look forward with considerable confidence to the continued growth of commercial fisheries, aquaculture and, very importantly, the recreational fisheries in an ecologically sustainable manner.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Has Dr Kirke, the Director of Public Health, informed the Minister for Health that the percentage of deaths from legionnaire's disease this year is four times higher than average and, if so, when was the Minister told? Yesterday, the Minister told the House that he did not know how many people had contracted legionnaire's disease in the past 12 months or how many of these cases have proven to be fatal. Last night, Dr Kirke, the Director of Public Health, said on national television that, while on average only one in six cases of legionnaire's disease in South Australia is fatal, there have already been four deaths from seven cases this year.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The matter of legionnaire's disease and any deaths resulting from it depends upon which particular type of *legionella* one has. That is why I identified yesterday that I would get the exact figures, because the figures for death from *legionella pneumophila* are different from those from *legionella longbeachae*, which is caused by different bugs and is contracted in different ways. *Legionella longbeachae* is found in potting soil; *legionella pneumophila* is water borne, as we have found in the past few days.

Over the past 10 years the figures on average show either one or two deaths from *legionella pneumophila*, and the cases occur most frequently in the early part of the year. In other words, we would hope that henceforth the frequency is decreased, and that is quite valid statistically over a number of years. If, in fact, there have been four deaths from *legionella pneumophila* in the total for this year, two were from the identified outbreak. If we take the identified outbreak from *legionella pneumophila* out of the four deaths from *legionella pneumophila*, we have two deaths this year, which is standard for every other year, when there has been either one or two deaths.

CANCER TREATMENT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister for Health advise the House whether the South Australian community is making progress in reducing the incidence of cancer?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Morphett for this important question which revolves around national and internationally significant work done in the Health Commission. Today, I launched the eighteenth edition of the Health Commission's Cancer Registry Report. Importantly, it contains 19 years of data on the incidence, mortality and survival rates of people in South Australia with cancer between 1977 and 1995 analysed by type and geographic location, with a specific section on 1995. As everyone would realise, cancer is one of those deaths that affects men, women and children of any age. The latest data shows quite convincingly that, after adjusting for age, the cancer death rate in South Australia has been stable since the late 1970s. This, indeed, represents an achievement since the incidence of diagnosed cancers has increased by about 30 per cent over the period.

The health system has adopted a multi-faceted response to management which includes prevention, early detection, better forms of treatment and hospice care for the terminally ill. It is very important to acknowledge the role of public education, media campaigns and preventative health and health promotion strategies which have now been used for about a decade to reduce smoking and tobacco-induced cancers; to improve people's diet; and to raise public awareness about excessive exposure to the sun, particularly in childhood and adolescence where the majority of the damage is done.

There are improved outcomes for treatment now which are helping to keep the death rate down due to treatment and also to screening and other early detection initiatives. The overall cancer control effort in South Australia is very much shaped

by the data from the South Australian Cancer Registry and hospital based registries. These allow us intelligent data upon which appropriate planning decisions can be made as to how the cancer problem is changing, where we should target our efforts, where the programs and treatments are being successful, and the overall impacts of cancer control.

It is pleasing to see in the present report that, in women in particular since the late 1970s, although there has been a 60 per cent increase in lung cancer, it has at last levelled out. It is by no means pleasing that there has been an increase, but it is pleasing that it has reached a plateau. On the other hand, other cancers are increasing, for reasons as yet unknown. But, with appropriate information for anti-cancer strategies and research, I am sure that the excellent work that goes on in the cancer area in South Australia with this type of data will continue to reduce the incidence of cancer and thereby improve the health of all South Australians. I commend completely the work of Dr Kerry Kirke, Dr David Ryder and their staff on presenting this information of international significance.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Does the Minister for Health agree that public warnings about the dangers of legionnaire's disease from contact with unhygienic spa pools should not be issued because the public 'would get sick of them'? Dr Kirke, the Director of Public Health, yesterday told a national television program that he did not know what the public should have been warned about. Dr Kirke said, 'The public is going to get sick of being warned about minor risks.' Dr Kirke also said that, of the seven cases of legionnaire's disease this year, five had contact with spa pools and four had died.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Elizabeth refuses to acknowledge one fact: 30 per cent of South Australians have antibodies to *legionella*. One in three people has come in contact with the bug, which is ubiquitous. Their immune systems have fought off the bug and they have developed antibodies to the system. That is scientific fact. As a direct corollary, it is also scientific fact that the bug is in a lot of places. It is not everywhere, but it is in a lot of places. If every time the *legionella* bug was found, given that 30 per cent of people have antibodies to it, I am informed that it is absolutely impracticable to give a warning that would not be like the boy crying 'Wolf!' It is as simple as that. On the advice I have been given, where there is a ubiquitous bug it is simply impossible to create a meaningful warning to which the public would listen.

TAFE FUNDING

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House whether recent media reports are correct that the State Government has cut funding for TAFE? In recent weeks the Opposition Leader has made a number of allegations about TAFE funding being cut.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Colton for his question and his ongoing interest in matters related to TAFE. Recently the Leader of the Opposition was quoted in the media stating that funding had been cut to TAFE. I believe that a person called Uri Geller used to bend spoons: we now have a Leader of the Opposition who can bend the truth.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I think that the Minister should withdraw that appalling interjection.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Leader indicate to the Chair the actual words to which he takes exception?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 'Bending the truth like Uri Geller', Sir. Whilst we have heard 'squealing little rat' from the Premier, amongst other words—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —I think we do need some advice as to what is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. The Chair heard sufficient of the words. I suggest to the Minister that those words are not in the best interests of the House, and I therefore suggest he withdraw. The Minister.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I withdraw them and apologise to Uri Geller, as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will name the member for Giles. The Minister will withdraw his comment now, without qualification.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I withdraw, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the Minister answer the question precisely, or leave will be withdrawn.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Thank you, Sir. The Leader has been quoted in the media stating quite wrongly that there had been funding cuts to TAFE. He knows full well from the budget figures that funding for TAFE has increased in real terms in both the capital and recurrent areas. He can check the budget figures again if he is in any doubt. TAFE in this State now has in excess of 90 000 students, and in terms of student hours we are training in excess of 15.7 million hours. We have extended our capital works program, and the State contribution is the highest ever. We have 400 accredited courses, and that is a 20 per cent increase since 1993; and we are providing additional training for 3 800 new students for 1996-97. Many of these course areas are in aquaculture and viticulture.

Finally, as a result of maintaining effort, we got additional moneys from the Commonwealth. So, I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he look at the budget papers and stop travelling around the community purporting to state figures relating to TAFE that are quite inaccurate and misleading. He should know better.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Does the Minister for Health agree with the dissenting position taken by the Chairperson of the Select Committee on the Proposed Privatisation of Modbury Hospital? The select committee has issued an interim report which states that the committee's work is being frustrated by the failure of the Minister, Healthscope and the board of Modbury Hospital to furnish information. The Chairperson, Dr Pfitzner, issued a dissenting statement acknowledging that there has been some tardiness in supplying information and is reported in today's media as saying

that she believed that Healthscope, the hospital board and Dr Armitage 'haven't got their acts together'.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I look forward to addressing that with my colleague in another place. However, the most important thing that the member for Elizabeth failed to mention was that the information that was provided indicated that Healthscope has performed about 2 884 more in-patient weighted separations than was required under the contract. The out-patient separations were down by 184. Anyway, it is well over 2 700 (in that vicinity) more weighted in-patient separations, which clearly indicates something is going right.

The other thing that indicates something is going right in the Modbury Hospital contract with Healthscope is what the patients say. It is not what the Opposition, the member for Elizabeth, Don Dunstan's cheer squad—and I think there are about 50 of them even when he provides a sausage sizzle—Peter Duncan or the leader of the Modbury Hospital Action Group say that worries me. And I draw members' attention to the fact that the same person who was the leader of the Modbury Hospital Action Group about 18 months ago was the person who authorised Peter Duncan's campaign literature in the Federal campaign, so put that into context. What worries me is whether the people who go through the doors of Modbury Hospital are satisfied.

The member for Elizabeth would remember, but would refuse to publicise, that during the Estimates Committee I released a copy of a totally independent survey which indicated that 97.9 per cent of people who had been to Modbury Hospital were satisfied and they would recommend that their relatives and friends use it. To me, that seems like a glowing recommendation.

POLICE COMPLAINTS AUTHORITY

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier representing the Attorney-General in the other place. Why does the Police Complaints Authority never contact and speak with complainants when investigating complaints against the police? In all my years as an MP, I have assisted many constituents who have requested me to lodge a complaint with the Police Complaints Authority. On no occasion has the Police Complaints Authority contacted the complainant to get their side of the story. There has been contact on only a couple of occasions and that contact was initiated by the complainant and not by the authority.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It is correct that the reference should be to the Attorney-General, but I point out to the honourable member that the complaint is normally made to the Police Complaints Authority. Normally, the Police Complaints Authority hears the complaint and then asks the other side of the story. If something is not being undertaken according to the satisfaction of the honourable member, if he has a particular case, I would be pleased if he would provide it so that we can track it down to see whether all the information has come to hand, whether there has been a general understanding of the Police Complaints Authority about the nature of the complaint and whether there has been some transgression on behalf of the police officer. If the honourable member can provide a particular example, I can ask the Attorney to send it to the Police Complaints Authority for a response so that I can cover the honourable member's question.

HOUSING TRUST SALES INCENTIVE

Mr ROSSI (Lee): My question is directed to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. What encouragement is the Government providing to tenants who wish to purchase Housing Trust homes which they are currently renting?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am pleased to announce a scheme that the Housing Trust has implemented to encourage those tenants who wish to purchase their Housing Trust homes to do so. The trust has developed a new, very attractive incentive scheme for purchasers who sign contracts and pay deposits prior to 30 November this year. Under the current sales policy, tenants purchasing their rental properties are required to continue paying rent on the property until settlement. In the case of double units where services have to be separated and new titles created, this can take several months. We are offering tenants who proceed to purchase a very attractive incentive. As tenants are required to continue paying rents from contract to settlement, those who accept our offer, sign a contract and pay a deposit before 30 November will have the rent they pay from payment of deposit until settlement deducted from the purchase price up to a maximum of $1 000.

For example, a tenant in a double unit where a new title has to be created may pay a rent of, say, $80 a week over 16 weeks between deposit and settlement. This equates to $1 280 and of that $1 000 will be deducted from the purchase price. Or, in the case of a single house where a settlement may take two months, they pay, say, $95 a week for eight weeks, which equates to $760. So, in that case, the full amount will be deducted from the purchase price. Tenants can use this money towards payment of fees, rates and taxes adjustments or simply to reduce the amount of loan they require.

Letters have been mailed to 13 500 tenants across the State, but this does not preclude other tenants from purchasing, if they can afford to do so, no matter what style of trust property they live in. Tenants may make inquiries about the sales incentive at their local regional office or, for those tenants who receive a letter, by returning the response in the reply paid envelope provided. This is a scheme that I hope a number of our tenants will take advantage of so that they can become the owners of their own properties.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Following the sale by the Government of SGIC to the Western Australian based insurer SGIO, is the Treasurer aware of what efforts are being made by the new owners to improve customer service?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The State Government is very pleased with its sale processes, indeed the owners of those businesses about which the House has been informed on a number of occasions. The success of those operations has been a credit to the State and to all the people involved. In relation to SGIC, members would recall that we sold SGIC and its operations: the general insurance business was sold to SGIO Insurance Limited. It is pleasing to note that SGIO has been the first general insurer to gain accreditation to the highest international quality standard. This quality standard is the ASNZSISO9001 1994 standard, which was granted on 12 July after an extensive audit process by Quality Assurance Service. The registration covers the design, development and

provision of general insurance products and services in the personal lines and commercial areas of mining, industrial, corporate, local government, small business and rural. SGIO has put itself through the mill. It has subjected itself to an international test of competence and service. It has passed that test. It is now internationally accredited and we are pleased to have it on board in South Australia.

ETSA COMPUTER SYSTEM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart asked me a question during Question Time in which he indicated that ETSA had let a contract where the cost had blown out by some $6 million. I was somewhat concerned that, if this were the case, this matter had not been brought to my attention. On verbal advice from ETSA, I now understand why: no contract has been let.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Today I will dwell on the organisations that represent people in public housing. It is very interesting to hear the Minister talk about a scheme to help tenants to buy their own house—and I commend any such schemes that make it easier—but there are still some people who are not able to afford to buy their own house and still need to rent. Two of the bodies which assist such tenants are the Housing Trust Tenants Association and Shelter. Shelter is well known; it is part of a national organisation and provides support to a range of other housing related bodies in South Australia and Australia. It has traditionally provided advice and assistance to Governments on housing matters, so it has been very much a two-way street for assistance.

The Housing Trust Tenants Association in Adelaide began as a dedicated team of volunteer workers who were prepared to offer advice and assistance to Housing Trust tenants. Under the former Minister for Housing, the Hon. John Oswald—that very good Minister—Housing Trust tenants' funding was increased and the Tenants Association moved into a new office which provided it with the resources and facilities to properly do its job, and it was given access to full-time paid staff. So, it now operates with paid staff as well as its dedicated team of volunteers.

I understand that both these bodies have been living on tenterhooks in past months not knowing whether or not their funding will continue. The Housing Trust Tenants Association, the Minister advises, has not yet signed legal agreements to ensure its funding, but I believe that that agreement is of a nature that will ensure that the association will not be able effectively to lobby the Government and do its job, and that is why the agreement has not been signed.

It is well known that the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is about to be renegotiated and that there will probably be dramatic changes in the way that public housing is treated both as to funding from the Federal Government and the way it operates on a State basis. It is very important in this time of change that not only do we have the so-called experts—the bureaucrats from both the Federal and State Governments—talking to each other but that the people it will affect, the tenants, the people who are affected by public housing funding, have a chance to have their say. It seems that this Government is not prepared to properly consult and hear these voices, that it just wants to proceed with its own agenda.

A number of questions come out of the renegotiated Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The direction seems to be that rather than the Commonwealth funding the States for public housing it will fund individual people for rental subsidy. This raises a number of questions about the building of new public housing. Given that the Government has already dramatically decreased the rate of new houses, this begins to be very important because we need to ensure that there is a continuous stock of public housing and that the housing is responsive to the needs of tenants because smaller accommodation especially seems to be much more in demand.

It also raises questions about how maintenance will be funded; and very importantly for people in my area and in other areas of Adelaide it raises questions about the rehabilitation of Housing Trust houses in older suburbs and how that will proceed. A number of the Housing Trust houses that are 30 or 40 years old are in high concentrations in some suburbs and desperately need to be renovated and upgraded because they are very run-down. That is very much so through the northern and western suburbs of Adelaide. It is nearly at crisis point and we do not seem to be getting any further funding from the Federal Government: it has already done away with Better Cities funding. Important questions need to be asked about the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I am delighted to rise during this grievance debate and place on the public record once again something that is a good news story for our southern regions. Yesterday at the 1996 annual South Australian Farmers Federation Conference the branch that won the 1996 award was none other than the McLaren Vale branch of the South Australian Farmers Federation. A couple of reasons why it won the award were because it had had a 39 per cent increase in membership over the past 12 months, which is an amazing increase when one considers the number of farmers in South Australia today compared to, say, 20 years ago, and also because it has been innovative in its approach and had got in there alongside its members and come up with programs and policies to help implement a better direction for horticulture, viticulture and agriculture in general in the southern area.

I would like to commend three people who have been active in further developing the success of the South Australian Farmers Federation, McLaren Vale branch. Martin Lightfoot, the Secretary, is a fantastic visionary in the district and is himself leading the way with a lot of the new technology with respect to viticulture and also has a good winery in the region; Don Oliver, the President of the Farmers Federation, comes from the traditional Oliver family of the McLaren Vale region that has been producing first-class grapes in the district for generations; and someone who is well known to many of us in the Chamber, John Harvey, who has just finished as State Chairman of the wine grape growers section of the South Australian Farmers Federation.

What is even more significant about this is that it reinforces the Government's commitment to the south in the areas of the extension of viticulture and horticulture and tourism hospitality. This has been backed up by virtue of the Wine Tourism Council being formed in the last few months by Graham Ingerson, the Minister for Tourism, and it backs up the fact that the Government is on track with both the money and effort that it is putting into the south in these two areas.

For my electorate, for the constituents who live in the northern part of the electorate around Woodcroft and Morphett Vale right through to those living up the southern end towards Willunga and out to the east towards Kangarilla and past McLaren flat, this is good news because it shows that those job opportunities are coming through, and that there is expansion in horticulture and viticulture in the area. I would encourage all young people in my area who are looking at jobs outside the universities and trade skills area to have a close look at the tourism hospitality and diversification opportunities that exist across the broad spectrum of horticulture and viticulture.

I had the pleasure of opening the McLaren Vale branch of the Farmers Federation information day a couple of weeks ago. It was interesting to note that well over 150 people attended, and that again said to me that there was a lot of activity in the area. It was also interesting that people came from the member for Custance's electorate up around Clare and from the Premier's electorate around Langhorne Creek to join in and to share the knowledge that was being put out that day by the Farmers Federation, McLaren Vale branch.

Very soon an opportunity will be provided for horticulturalists in our area via Mr Tom Stubbs, who is in charge of spatial information with DENR. It is fantastic to see now that the Government and DENR in particular have a program via satellite whereby they can film the vineyards and, through special technology, identify potential diseases or diseases that are in a particular vineyard. This is how much on the cutting edge South Australia is when it comes to technology. It reinforces what the Premier said earlier today in Question Time about the 2 000 brand new technology jobs that have recently been created in South Australia. I know that Minister Wotton is committed to see spatial information and technology further enhanced through DENR, and I know that already, through talking to the Farmers Federation and some of the wine grape growers in my electorate, they are keen to see this new opportunity.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Recently while I was out in my electorate on one of my Saturday morning visits I met a woman whom I had known for some time. She had brought her teenage son out for a walk to give the family some peace at home. She was a loving and very patient mother, not unlike many other mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters who daily care for a physically disabled or intellectually disabled child. Many carers are in this situation and they have the total responsibility of care 24 hours a day, seven days a week, each month of each year. Sometimes these families have more than one child to care for and I know of one such family. From time to time, over some 10 years, I have seen these twins and watched them grow. I have seen the patience and love of their mother, her commitment to give them the best options available and the struggles she has, like many others have, endured.

I raise this topic today because recently I regained contact with an organisation that caters for the needs of such families. Help at Home gives assistance to families in various ways, as do many other wonderful organisations. This organisation has grown from a small but significant organisation and has progressed well beyond the cottage industry stage. Of particular interest to me was the holiday program that it has initiated to give families a break from the stresses of their every day life. It caters not only for the person with a disability but also for the family as a whole. These holidays allow the family unit to take a break, get away together, spend time in surroundings away from the normal day-to-day grind and enjoy the opportunity to have fun together in a very relaxed atmosphere, sometimes with other families in the same or similar situation and, importantly, with a carer to take over the caring role of the parent, help with the daily needs of the disabled person and allow the family a break from the constant stress associated with total responsibility. They manage to do this at a cost which is structured to suit the family means so no family is disadvantaged due to lack of moneys, though money does limit the number of services that the organisation can provide.

I thought of the mother whom I had recently met and wondered what such a holiday would mean to her and her family. Her son was a loving boy and, in fact, while standing on the street corner he hugged us all on numerous occasions. However, his attention span was limited, he became agitated and required undivided attention. This limited the opportunity for conversation with his mother in any real depth but her patience was not stretched. She calmly spoke with him, eventually took him for a walk down the street to draw his interest in the things around him and give him some peace. There were several of us standing on the street corner and we watched her walking down the road holding her son's hand and calmly talking to him. For a while we were all quiet and dwelt on how lucky we were and marvelled at the patience and perseverance this woman would draw on to deal with the stresses she and her family (and many other families in similar situations) must suffer, but they must do it on a continuous basis.

On many occasions I have raised some of these difficulties of parents and carers and the lack of facilities for respite care and the lack of money provided to cater for our intellectually and physically disabled people. The deficiency is so great that it is a disgrace. I am aware of the provision of funds recently announced by the Minister for Project 141, but these funds fall far short of the real amounts needed to truly provide a proper service in our communities. Not one of us would wish to be in a position of absolute care of a family member who requires the whole of our existence to be dedicated to them and their needs and where our commitment to other members of the family is diminished by the fact that our time is not our own and there is not enough to share around.

No-one seeks charity. What is wanted is a recognition of needs by way of proper and suitable services to give those about whom I have spoken a reasonable and fair quality of life and the expectation that the intellectually or physically disabled persons they care for are given the same rights as able bodied members of the community. From time to time I will speak of the services of Help at Home to constantly remind members and the Government that there is a need in the community and that that need is real.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I rise today to strongly support the Federal Government's plan and mandate to sell one-third of Telstra. I call on the Labor and Democrat Senators in South Australia to put the national and State interests ahead of party politics and support this sale. There are two major issues which I believe Australians and their Governments must face up to over this proposed Telstra sale. First, there are the environmental issues. The Federal Coalition Government has a comprehensive strategy. The South Australian Government has also developed a wide-ranging set of programs and there is general support for these initiatives in the community. To implement national strategies resources need to be mobilised and in this case it is recognised that significant spending commitments will be necessary to maintain and replenish natural resources in this country. A clean up of the Murray River is recognised in this State and nationally to be the highest priority. I will mention this shortly.

The second major issue is with respect to telecommunications policies. The Australian telecommunications market has nearly doubled in size during the past three years. We need to recognise the international trends and market realities and what is in the public interest. Currently, Telstra's only competition is from Optus which has recently entered the local market interstate. From 1 July 1997 there will be full and open competition from foreign companies when they will have access to the Australian telecommunications market and, undoubtedly, they will be aggressive price cutters with much lower cost structures.

Both the environment and telecommunications areas will substantially affect the lives of the next generation of Australians, yet both nationally and in South Australia we have Opposition Parties and minor Parties which use misinformation and out-of-date arguments to stir up misplaced concern over this sale of one-third of Telstra. A sale of one-third of Telstra would raise an estimated $8 billion, of which $1 billion would be used to establish a natural heritage trust. From the money invested in that trust, $693 million will be used to fund five capital projects including $163 million over five years for the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling basin to address its serious land and water management issues. Recurrent expenditure on environmental projects and ongoing development of sustainable agriculture will be funded by interest from the natural heritage trust. This includes a natural river care program costing approximately $85 million over five years.

The significance of the Murray-Darling basin cannot be underestimated, particularly its significance to South Australia. Time does not permit me to go into all the details of its value to this State. Suffice to say that it has an influence in this State of approximately $10 billion, $3 billion coming from irrigation. Food processing is the second largest industry in Australia and irrigation is vital for a reliable supply of high quality produce. It is under threat. South Australia is leading the way in conjunction with the initiative taken by our Premier in relation to the Murray-Darling 2001 project in this regard.

For the Murray-Darling basin to have a sustainable future, existing commitments by all major political Parties must become a reality. General community support, which recognised the vital importance of the basin to the nation, occurred prior to the Federal election. Yet we now face unacceptable delays in the necessary funds brought about by the non-coalition Senators in Federal Parliament. I maintain that their opposition to the partial sale of Telstra does not make any sense. If the sale does not go ahead, we not only forgo environmental expenditure but also face a deterioration on the future for Telstra. A top Telstra executive, Mr Paul Rizzo, recently reported to the Senate Standing Committee:

> After the industry is to be thrown open to foreign competition in 1997, public ownership would limit Telstra's capacity to compete with privately owned overseas companies.

A drop in market share of just 5 per cent would result in a loss of revenue of $750 million and I have already indicated that the top 22 telecommunications companies are either privatised, partially privatised or expected to be by 1997. In addition, I maintain that the Federal Government's plan for partial privatisation of Telstra is crucial if it is to be positioned for commercial success in an open market place. Yet what does the Opposition say about this? The Democrats, before the Federal election, said, 'We need to be persuaded that it is in the public interest.' I particularly urge the Democrats to take another look at the public interest in the telecommunications area. Do they want Telstra to survive?

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I should like to spend this time talking about a highly successful program which aims to rehabilitate young offenders and assist youth at risk. That program is called Operation Flinders. Operation Flinders was established in 1991 by the late Mrs Pamela Murray-White, who was a teacher, former army officer and mother, and who recognised the benefits to young people of experiences in a wilderness-type environment, together with other young people and safely supervised by responsible adults. As a result of her work and the work of many others who shared that ideal, we have the program called Operation Flinders.

The program involves giving young people aged between 14 and 18 years, referred from a number of agencies such as family and community services, education and correctional services, the opportunity to experience a group survival program in a wilderness area. The area concerned is Mooloolo Station near Parachilna Gorge in the Flinders Ranges, a particularly beautiful area in our State. There is a 100 kilometre circuit, and the young people are divided into teams of eight to 10. They have two leaders working and staying with them, and they progress through the 100 kilometre circuit, undertaking various activities along the way.

A number of groups operate at any one time but they never come into contact with each other, and essentially their mission is to complete the 100 kilometres with their own group. They have to carry their packs and look after themselves as they undergo various activities at various stages. Some of these include rock climbing with the Star Force and a sojurn with two old miners at the abandoned Nuccaleena copper mine. At another stopping point they meet with members of the local Aboriginal community and they learn about Aboriginal culture, Aboriginal cooking and other issues. At another place they undergo and participate in a group problem-solving exercise involving construction of a raft to cross a body of 'contaminated' water.

I visited Operation Flinders earlier this year at Mooloolo Station and I was able to spend 1½ days there. I had a chance to speak with a number of the young people involved as they were going through the activities. I spoke with leaders and I spoke with the support crew. Some of the young people were from secondary schools in both the northern and southern regions, and some were from the Cavan Training Centre. The

leaders involved were teachers, correctional services staff, police officers and army personnel. Some of those staff and support people were on annual leave and committed their spare time to this program.

I was highly impressed with the program. Indeed, I was highly impressed with the commitment of the support staff and others and, as I said, many of these people do this in their own time. I was highly impressed with what I saw of the young people in terms of what they were getting out of the experience, the fact that they had to resolve problems together, they had to work through issues, they had to face conflict and they had to face challenges. I heard from them in relation to their feelings about being able to achieve the goals set for them.

I recommend to all members that we look at programs such as Operation Flinders as a real alternative for working with young people. I urge members to look at the program, and I urge the Government to work with Operation Flinders so that it has ongoing funding that will ensure that it survives long term. I understand that the Government is committed to doing this and is working with executive officer John Shepherd and his board members and supporters to achieve this. I believe that Operation Flinders is a program well worth continuing, and that we need more programs like this. We also need programs that will pick up young people when they return from programs such as Operation Flinders to give them one-to-one support in communities to enable them to go forward with what they have gained from their experience.

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

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I want to put a couple of brief comments on the record about things that are happening within my electorate. The first is very important and concerns organ donation—it is a speech about organ donation with a twist. I should like to put on the record my support for a constituent of mine from Noarlunga Downs. Her name is Valma Cole and she was born in 1929. She has not had an easy life. She is what one would call a true worker, a true trier, in our community. Valma does not have the best of health and spends quite a lot of time at the Flinders Medical Centre.

On one of her visits to the Flinders Medical Centre, as she describes it, during a time when she was finding it difficult to sleep, she happened to see the organ donation poster on display. Her immediate thought was, 'Well, that's fine, it is nice that they have put it on display. However, it is a pretty boring poster.' She sat there for the rest of the night and came up with some ideas about how that poster could be changed. Members of this place are probably displaying the current poster, which I find interesting and which is a good change from the old one, which in Valma's words was quite boring. I will put on the record what Valma thinks about it, and I quote from *FMC News*, as follows:

> I feel very strongly about organ donation as it has been an important issue faced by members of my family. My mother always wanted her organs to be donated for medical research and when she died her wish was granted. My son's organs were also donated when he passed away suddenly five years ago.

I want to bring the poster to the attention of the House, and I know that I am not allowed to display it in the Chamber so that makes it difficult to describe it. People are drawn in the form of bone marrow, liver, lung, pancreas, heart, kidney and cornea, which represent the organs for donation. Valma has cleverly designed them in such a way that they have taken on human form, so the kidneys are shown walking and talking to one another with eyes, legs and arms. That really makes a difference to the whole poster.

It is interesting to me that an idea of a member of the community can be followed up in this way. I also congratulate the Health Promotions Unit at Flinders Medical Centre, which took Valma's idea seriously enough to take it to the art department to get some ideas about how it could be made into a poster. It has followed it all the way through and has now produced a poster. I think it is a very good poster and I extend my sincere congratulations to Valma for having the idea in the first place. It is a good job well done.

I also congratulate the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education on his initiative with respect to the traineeship scheme that has been introduced through the Government. As most members know, a target figure of 1 500 young people will be trained through a range of Government departments and go on to full-time work. I should like to put it on the record that the trainee whom I have had in my office for 12 months, Lisa Dagnall, came to my office as a fairly raw student from Christies Beach High School. She was not terribly self-confident at that time but she has progressed extremely well over the past 12 months. I am very proud of Lisa and she is now fully employed, and that is as much to her credit as it is to the credit of my personal assistant who was responsible for training her.

I also congratulate two other young people in my electorate, Richard Laan and James Cockburn, who have been responsible for the idea of the Noarlunga interchange murals, the design of those murals and, in terms of James's talent, painting the murals on the new walls of the Noarlunga interchange.

MOTOR VEHICLES (TRADE PLATES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July. Page 1831.)

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise to speak very briefly in favour of the Bill. I know the problem we have had with trade plates over the years, and I know what an asset trade plates have been to the industry. However, trade plates have caused confusion and have involved some rorting of the system. Trade plates were never designed to be used by industry or anyone else to forgo the legal registration of vehicles. We know that over the years certain industry people have chosen not to register their personal vehicles. Instead, they have used their company trade plates. They were never designed for that, and this Bill certainly tightens up that area.

As a collector of old motor vehicles, many years ago we used to see quite a few trade plates on historic vehicles, but we do not see that occurring any more. The Act has been tightened up, and this Bill makes it a lot easier, because it incorporates a single system rather than having multi plates, as was the case under the old system. Anything we are able to do to assist our industry people, particularly those in the car trade where the registration of a vehicle on a lot has expired, so they can use plates and move that vehicle about without having to register the vehicle for a further six or 12 months, is to be commended. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I thank the honourable member for his support of this measure. I commend the Minister for Transport for her initiative and I thank the House for its support of the measure.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Opposition has studied the Bill with more than its usual care. The purpose of trade plates is to allow people in the motor trade and the agricultural implements trade to move their stock of vehicles on public roads for business purposes without having to pay the full cost of registration, stamp duty and insurance on each vehicle. The Government seeks to expand the number of motor traders to whom the trade plate can sensibly apply.

Another reason the Government says it is amending the law on trade plates is that it thinks it is being abused. The abuse of which the Government complains is the use of trade plates on vehicles other than those contemplated by Parliament when it inaugurated trade plates. Section 66 of the Motor Vehicles Act provides:

> Any person may drive the vehicle for any purpose connected with a business carried on by the trader.

The Minister alleges that some traders were driving trade plated vehicles from their homes to work and back. This enabled those drivers to avoid the cost of registration and insurance. Now that I have read the Bill, I am on the lookout for these things. On Saturday I espied on my way back from Yankalilla a trade plated car with a family enjoying a weekend drive.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: For the benefit of the member for Mawson, I was attending the Australian Young Labor camp at Dzintari, a Latvian camp above Normanville, where I organised a 100 question quiz night for Young Labor.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): Order! The member for Norwood is out of order and the member for Spence will come back to the Bill.

Mr ATKINSON: This is not a use of trade plates that the Minister would encourage. The purpose for which trade plates may now be used will be specified in regulations, much as the purposes for which a vehicle with a limited trader's plate may be used is specified in section 67(3)(b) of the existing Act. This section will now be omitted from the Act because the distinction between general trader's plates and limited trader's plates is to be abolished. The purposes for which a trade plate may now be used will be relocated to the regulations.

Misuse of trade plates carried a division 8 fine, currently a maximum of $1 000 and expiable on payment of $150.

Clause 6 of the Bill provides:

> The Registrar of Motor Vehicles may, in deciding whether an applicant for a plate satisfied the requirements, seek the advice and assistance of a person or body that represents the interests of those engaged in a business of the kind in which the applicant is engaged.

The Government tells me that it has the Royal Automobile Association and the Motor Trade Association in mind. The Opposition transport spokesperson has criticised this arrangement on the ground that it gives these private organisations a privileged status that may be used to recruit new members.

The governing Party has always criticised any law or administrative arrangement that encourages employees to join a trade union, yet the Bill before us makes it a primary criterion in considering the issue or renewal of a trade plate that the applicant is an MTA member or an RAA approved repairer. Our spokesperson is worried that the law on a person's entitlement to trade plates may not be uniformly or normatively applied if its application is delegated to two or more private associations. I ask the Minister: why is it that membership of the MTA in accordance with the rules of the MTA takes an applicant halfway to a trade plate?

I acknowledge that the Bill allows a person to apply for a trade plate directly to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. There is no obligation to go through the MTA or the RAA. The Government argues that, by permitting these two to make the initial assessment of applicants for trade plates, it saves the SA Police the cost of making the assessment. It is noteworthy that the RAA and the MTA propose to make the assessment, at least according to the Minister, for no reward, whereas the police are, the Minister says, eager to be rid of their assessment duties so they can cut costs. Can the Minister advise the House why the RAA and the MTA would selflessly agree to do these assessments, if they were genuine assessments?

I notice that clause 62(3) allows a fee for service arrangement, although the Minister said she was unaware of either of those organisations demanding a fee for their services in assessing these applications. If an assessment were to be negligently false, let alone recklessly false, how would the Registrar discover this and, if he did, what could he do about it? In passing, I note that vehicles may now be driven onto or off a transporter without trade plates, and the insurance applying to such vehicles on the road would be that of the transporter. The Opposition acquiesces in the Bill and expects to read a review of its operation promised by the Minister 12 months from the Bill's proclamation.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I note that there will be no charge for a trade plate required for the agriculture industry. I thank the Government for that. The Bill also provides for a trade plate to be issued for a period of up to three years. That is another great advantage because, as the Minister knows from being in the motor vehicle business, updating trades plates annually is a great hassle. We will charge a $20 fee for one or three years. I hope that all people in the trade will avail themselves of the three year option, because not only is it easier for them but it saves the Government in the administration of fees.

This Bill has another innovative approach in that vehicles being loaded or unloaded from an unloader will now be covered by a special third party provision that the owner of the transporter can negotiate with the Government. When you take a new vehicle which has no registration from the unloader to the showroom, it will now be covered, because the Government has allowed the transporting company to cover that via the third party insurance option. Like everything else, within a period of time we eventually get it right. To the Government's and the Minister's credit, we are now practically spot on. The Bill is commendable.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): As one with some past experience in relation to trade plates and their application, I therefore make a final contribution to the debate with some background knowledge. The

honourable member opposite asked why the MTA and the RAA should be involved in the process. Industry representative bodies would well understand who would be associated with the motor vehicle industry and who would be logical and appropriate people to have access to trade plates. The honourable member asked, 'Why should they do this at no fee?' No doubt, in providing a service, the respective organisations might as a result of the good quality service they have given, attract membership. I guess that is a matter which has not gone unnoticed by either the RAA or the MTA in working with the Government to supply this service.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We are just balancing the books from many decades. In relation to transporters, the honourable member raised the issue of there being no requirement to use a trade plate off transport onto premises. The practical reality is that many transporters park kerb side, reverse into the kerb and then proceed straight into premises. So, there is a very limited area. In a practical sense, this addresses the realism of the circumstances whilst maintaining—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I know you were not being critical of it but you raised the point and I want to respond in a practical sense. I am glad the honourable member had the experience of seeing the misuse of trade plates on his recent excursion to the inner country areas of South Australia and how trade plates have not been used on many occasions for the appropriate purpose and task as previously defined. However, I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure. I note that it will monitor the position after 12 months, which I would ordinarily expect of an Opposition for a measure of this nature. I thank the Opposition for its support and commend the Bill to the Parliament.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION (LEVY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Atkinson, S.J. Baker, Clarke, Mrs Rosenberg and Mr Scalzi.

POULTRY MEAT INDUSTRY ACT REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 July. Page 1925.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition is opposed to the repeal of the legislation. I will expand on our reasons for that later. However, whilst the Opposition is opposed to the repeal of the Act, it does not oppose the need for a review of operations. Rather than repealing the Act at this juncture, we believe it would be far better to conduct a review involving all the stakeholders in the industry and, in particular, to seriously address the concerns of the chicken growers of this State.

Mr Lewis: Where have you been, sunshine?

Mr CLARKE: It is interesting that the member for Ridley interjects: I presume he will speak in support of the Opposition's opposition to the repeal of this legislation and, if needs be, join us should there be a division on this proposition. I would have thought that, if he believed in the retention of this legislation, he would welcome allies and not hurl insults at them. The issue with respect to the repeal of this legislation is that the growers' major concern is their ability to negotiate equitable outcomes in the absence of any legislation. In fact, as I understand it, one fewer processor operates in South Australia today than in 1976, about the time this legislation was first enacted. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the industry is now mature and can self-regulate itself. However, I find that difficult to comprehend because, from my limited knowledge (I admit) of the industry, it would seem that the growers lack any bargaining strength with the processors in the resolution of any contractual disputes that may arise between them and the processors.

Indeed, it is not totally analogous to but not far off the situation in which many self-employed people find themselves or that in which former employees find themselves subcontractors to their former employer. For example, a truckie who once worked as an employee of Woolworths and who transported goods from warehouse to warehouse and supermarket to supermarket may suddenly be told that they are self-employed. They have to buy their own truck and run all the operating costs but, for all intents and purposes, they have to pick up X number of goods on a certain date and time and deliver them to various sites at a certain time and date or risk losing the contract. In fact, they have all the disadvantages of not being an employee and very few, if any, advantages of being self-employed.

The industry has come to the end of a strong growth phase, and the ever increasing scrutiny of the ACCC against collective bargaining or action by groups places the growers in a far worse position than ever existed prior to the legislation of 1976. I find it somewhat curious about the ACCC that it could be interpreted that these growers' acting collectively to set a price is anti-competitive, given the huge disparity in bargaining strength between the two chicken processors in this State and the 80 growers, the enormous capital costs for an individual grower to establish their own sheds and the limited opportunity for that grower to bargain on an individual footing on an individual basis with the two major processors.

On the issue of anti-competition, as I understand it, the ACCC usually looks at trying to break down collective agreements between growers or particular groups of people on the basis that, if you have too much cosying up to one another, the consumer loses out in the long run because of higher prices. In fact, as I understand it, Ingham Enterprises, one of the two processors in this State, has stated that the impact on the consumer in terms of price is very small indeed. It has calculated it to be .05 per cent of the retail price, or $72 000 of a total cost of production of $44 million per annum. I suggest to the House that that is a very small price to pay for a system that implements best farming methods for the benefit of consumers.

Tasmania has no legislation such as that in South Australia or the other States. I am informed that recently six growers were told by Inghams that it did not intend to place chickens on those growers' farms. There are no other processors in Tasmania, so those farms were effectively out of business. Inghams has since agreed to continue to utilise those farms

but only after the growers agreed to a fee reduction of 10 per cent. As I will continually repeat throughout my second reading contribution, we are not dealing with large corporations doing battle with one another on an equal footing. We are talking about two large processors in this State having all the power in terms of their bargaining position with 80 growers who are told at this time that they cannot collectively negotiate prices with those processors, because that is anti-competitive and contrary to the ACCC, and that no dispute mechanism can be put into place.

I would challenge those assumptions, because we must find answers for those people. We are not talking about just 80 chicken growers: we are talking about an increasing growth in self employment in this State and Australia generally, where, as I said earlier, people are basically being forced to compete for their own jobs as subcontractors or having their jobs franchised out. Indeed, until members opposite voted in 1994 to remove it from the then South Australian industrial legislation, a rather good piece of industrial legislation existed which benefited not trade unionists or trade union members *per se* but people such as the so-called self-employed truck drivers, who could approach the Industrial Commission and seek to have their contracts varied or voided if they were harsh or oppressive because of the circumstances that prevailed and in particular because of the unequal bargaining strength between the principal contractor and themselves as subcontractors.

That legislation was in place for only a short time. When we were in government we could not get it through the Legislative Council until 1993, and it survived for only about 12 months before the Liberal Government removed it from the statute book, but it is that type of legislation that is necessary to protect not only the type of people that we are talking about today, the chicken growers, but also an increasing number of people who are now self-employed and who are dealing with very large principals.

Those principals have all the bargaining power and can manipulate one against the other in a huge cost reduction, fight or competition where each person undercuts the other to the detriment of their own families and livelihood. I do not think the individual consumer receives too much benefit by way of reduced prices: more likely, it is the principal who pockets the difference in their own back pocket. I understand that the State Government's position on that issue is that, frankly, the growers should go away to the ACCC and seek some form of exemption or approval for collective bargaining. It is all very well for the State Government to say that but, as far as that is concerned, it should take a far more pro-active role by assisting the growers to—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: As we have.

Mr CLARKE: The Minister interjects to say, 'As we have.' I will be pleased to hear what he has to say about that. His second reading explanation was somewhat scarce on detail as to the type of efforts, work and assistance of his department to assist the chicken growers of this State regarding their submissions to the ACCC. I understand from the Minister's second reading explanation that a review of similar legislation in New South Wales occurred in 1991-92 and that that review recommended the repeal of the New South Wales legislation. However, the Minister failed to add in his second reading explanation that, following further consultation, the New South Wales Government did not repeal the Act but, as I understand it, strengthened it instead.

The South Australian chicken growers did not request a report on the industry: it was the former Minister's idea to appoint a facilitator. We know that the former Minister for Primary Industries has always had a great ideological bent towards deregulation. I might add that it would seem to be for the sake of deregulation only as an ideological totem rather than being based on any real appreciation of the hardship that such deregulation would have on the individuals concerned.

I also add—and the Minister did not mention this in his second reading explanation—that the two chicken processors in this State are not supportive of collective arrangements. What a surprise that would be. That is my information. I do not know whether the Minister has something more up-to-date than that, but my information is dated 21 July this year. If that information is correct, as I believe it to be, that would not overwhelm me, because why would the two processors want to persist in collective arrangements with growers when they know the best way to make an extra quid for themselves is by the divide and rule process?

The key issue in the growers' battle to retain legislation is that they believe they must have the legal right to negotiate collectively and, in the event of a dispute, to find a path to collective arbitration, which need not necessarily be an overly expensive process. There are many situations in our legislation and normal contracts where processes are set up and, in the event of disputes, parties have access to a mediator and finally an arbitrator who rules on the merits of each case. The growers in this State need that arbitration protection because without it the strong will always say, 'Take it or leave it' in so far as the prices are concerned. It has happened in industrial relations between employers and employees over the years. The Australian arbitration system commenced in this country in 1904 precisely to address the problem of unequal bargaining powers between employees and employers—and the chicken growers are in exactly the same position.

I am sure our shadow Minister in another place will have far more to say on this legislation than I have said to date. Again I point out that we in this State have a very strong responsibility for this industry. I am aware that the flavour of the past decade has been to deregulate everything. We have tended to overlook quite considerably—and it is a criticism of both political Parties—

Mr Cummins interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): Order! The member for Norwood is out of order.

Mr CLARKE: The member for Norwood is very vocal on this topic, but I would like to see the honourable member put his money where his mouth is because, on many issues and legislation in this House where at times the honourable member has expressed a view perhaps a little contrary to that stated by his Government, when the acid was put on him on issues in which the honourable member believed dearly, the honourable member did not vote with the Opposition on those occasions. Unlike you, Mr Acting Speaker, who have from time to time—not often, I grant you—voted against your Party's position on issues which you believe—

Mr Cummins interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Again the member for Norwood interjects about whether I or any other—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood is notably out of order. The honourable member will have the opportunity to speak shortly; please take it and do not interject.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, for your protection. As the member for Norwood knows only too well—and we make no secret about it on our side of the

House—as members of the Labor Party we sign a pledge whereby once a policy position is adopted either by the Caucus or the Party on a particular issue, unless it is a social issue which is declared a conscience issue, we vote collectively as one. We make no bones about it; I am perfectly happy with that situation. I can say my piece in the Party room or within the forums of the Party and I accept the majority decision. Everyone who votes for Labor Party candidates at a general election knows that is our stated position, unlike members of the Liberal Party who pretend to be free to do what they like but, when the acid is put on them, they are found wanting.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader must link up his remarks.

Mr CLARKE: I was just coming back to the Bill, but I have been provoked by a particularly unruly interjection from the member for Norwood. At times, the issues of deregulation have caused a great deal of distress to people who are not in equal bargaining positions. I am not trying to pretend that the fate of 18 chicken growers in so far as this State is concerned is something of great State importance. It is very important to the 18 growers concerned and their families but, in terms of the overall State, most people would say that it means very little. The principle is extremely important because there is this increasing growth to self-employment where people are forced out of the traditional mode of employment that we have known hitherto in this State; that is, leaving school, working for an employer and the like. They are increasingly being told, 'You are subcontractors; you are being franchised out.'

We need legislation in place to ensure that we do not develop a two-class system, with an under class in this country, where people who are legally independent employers are, in effect, wage slaves but without any of the benefits of a wage earner or an employee. They do not have recourse to the Industrial Relations Commission in the event of a dispute over their wages or working conditions or a levelling up of the bargaining power between employer and employee such as a direct employee has.

We need to introduce and keep in place legislation which enables people such as the chicken growers of this State to be able to bargain collectively; maximise their muscle, because they are dealing with two extremely large companies; and, in addition, to have the right to be able to go to a cheap and efficient method of arbitration so that their concerns can be addressed impartially and without fear of retribution.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): First, I place on record the fact that the Labor Minister for Agriculture requested a review of the poultry meat legislation in 1987 following a dispute about entry into the industry. The review became part of the Government's regulatory review process, and subsequently green and white papers were released for comment in 1991 and 1994 respectively. The white paper made clear the Government's intention to repeal the legislation and supported the establishment of a non-statutory negotiating committee, if the industry wished to form one. I have many concerns regarding this matter. I have had considerable meetings with the poultry meat chicken growers in my electorate. I place on record the very good job the growers in my electorate are doing for the industry and for our economic wealth in the region. Seventy per cent of all the chicken meat growers in South Australia grow their chickens south-east of Anzac Highway but, unfortunately, the two major processors have their processing plants in the north. That is particularly disadvantaging my constituents who are growing chickens.

It was interesting to listen to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on this occasion because he drew some fairly long bows. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was trying to tie in the fact of an employee ombudsman and opportunities for individuals to negotiate with the situation in the chicken meat industry. A person who is working for a company which wants to negotiate an enterprise bargaining agreement has far more flexibility, opportunity and protection than the chicken meat growers in South Australia. A worker can use an employee ombudsman, a union, or they can nominate someone who they feel is a strong negotiator for them and so on. The general worker in South Australia has more protection opportunities now than they ever had before the Brown Government came to power: there is no doubt about that and I want that on the public record. When it comes to the chicken growers, in my opinion it is very much a different story.

We all know that the previous Government, under Labor Prime Minister Paul Keating, got Professor Hilmer to do a review and subsequently write a paper, the National Competition Policy for Australia. South Australia is in a position where it cannot go in any other direction than to support the National Competition Policy, which has been endorsed by the current Government and we are committed to that, generally speaking, if we are to survive with respect to opportunities for South Australia. Listening to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition one would have thought that the Labor Party had never driven any of this. We all know that it was the Labor Party which drove this hard and fast, and Mr Keating, when he was Prime Minister, was the major driver behind it.

What I have been witnessing has been quite disturbing, and I want to go through a few of these issues now. I would have hoped that Steggles and Inghams, but in particular Steggles, which I believe has been quite dissident when it comes to what it should have been doing to work through these issues, would be prepared to work more closely with my chicken growers. Recently I received a paper from one chicken grower which states:

> The committee—

and when I talk about the committee, I talk about a committee of chicken meat growers—

> has tried several times to discuss the proposed new contract with Steggles' representatives but to no avail. The company claims that because of ACCC regulations it cannot deal with the growers collectively. However, when approached by individual growers the company claims that it wants a uniform contract and will not discuss the changes. At a recent meeting with the growers the company promised that authorisation was to be sought from the ACCC to allow collective bargaining to take place. It now appears that Steggles has gone back on this commitment and will no longer seek authorisation.

Yet, on the other hand, I have had reports as recently as last Saturday, when I met one of my chicken meat growers, that he had had three fairly pressurised attempts by Steggles in the past week to sign a contract. I understand that Steggles has signed contracts with a couple of growers, but if one assesses it one will see that there are hidden reasons why growers accepted those contracts—like the one who, under the Environment Protection Act, only has a couple more years to operate a chicken meat growing farm and, therefore, was hamstrung. Another one had to renegotiate a mortgage—

Mr Clarke: Do you support the Bill?

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I don't support the Bill. Another one had to renegotiate a mortgage with the bank. Will a bank finance anybody if they do not have a contract? Clearly, the answer is 'No'. It is hard enough trying to get finance for rural opportunities now, let alone when you do not have a contract or a sustainable future necessarily in an industry. I know that as a dairy farmer, because we have had the rug pulled from under us when it comes to guarantees of continuity for our milk pick-up if we happen to sell our farms.

I understand the benefits of the Hilmer report but I do not believe that we have to deregulate everything just for the sake of deregulation. Have a look at what has happened with the dairy industry. In this State we have gone from about 1 400 dairy farmers 10 to 12 years ago to fewer than 900 dairy farmers today. We have seen a situation where, in the past 12 months, $8 million of Victorian UHT long life milk has been brought into this State, and that is causing problems for dairy farmers now.

Another example is the car industry. Have a look what happened under the previous Labor Government, particularly when Senator Button was there, with respect to tariff reductions. Because of that initiative of the previous Federal Labor Government and the reduction in tariffs we have a situation today where 50 per cent of all motor vehicle sales in Australia are now for imported cars. That was never the case before we started to reduce the tariff rate.

I do not have any problem in saying that South Australian chicken meat growers, farmers and manufacturers should not become more competitive, but that should occur on a reasonably level playing field. However, there is no reasonably level playing field when you look at the examples I have just quoted. That is why I have a major concern in seeing this Act repealed, although I understand that my chicken meat growers are in a difficult position if this Act is not repealed, and I know that the Minister will talk about that when he closes the debate.

I would like to see more time given to the chicken meat growers to be able to sit down collectively and not as individuals, not so that they can be pushed into a corner and have a gun held at their head and told, 'You will sign under our terms or you can get lost.' That is not the sort of thing I want to see for my chicken growers: I want to see the opportunity for collective bargaining by the chicken meat growers with these monopoly companies. Whether that can be done legally now remains to be seen, but I would like to see that, even though I understand that some people say I am out of order when I put that proposition.

Chicken meat growers in South Australia are already way behind the eight-ball when it comes to their payment structure. If you look at CPI over the past three years (real term growth) and what has happened to chicken meat growers, they have been put way behind the eight-ball not only because they have not had the catch-up payments that they should have had and should have been entitled to have but also because of the reductions in the number of birds that they have been able to run in their chicken sheds. I believe that the companies have already been breaking the contracts that they have with the chicken meat growers, and I do not want to see that happen when a new direction is finally fixed for the chicken meat industry in this State.

There is a popular belief that legislation has a detrimental effect on efficiency and that consumer price levels are therefore erroneous in this case. I put on record that it is important in my opinion to compare Western Australia's achievements against other States in the area of the growing fees. Since 1990, the percentage change in the fee is as follows: in Tasmania, the only State with no legislation, it is 20.63 per cent; New South Wales, 19 per cent; South Australia, 15.48 per cent; Victoria, 12.93 per cent; Queensland, 12.71 per cent; and Western Australia, where it is supporting legislation for its chicken growers, 11.32 per cent.

In model size terms, by way of the number of birds per annum going through, I can say that in the current review model that Western Australia has looked at, it will be recommended by the grower that they increase their model by 41 per cent. The following figures indicate remarkable comparisons again between States: Western Australia has 550 000 birds per annum; South Australia, 299 171; New South Wales, 302 032; Victoria, 422 320; and Queensland, 396 317. If you look at the Western Australian model as far as efficiency and production goes, it is doing very well. As far as the through-put goes—and the processors would have to be happy with what is happening over there—it appears to be a process that is working for both the processor and the grower.

Very few people would agree with the concept of competing in a pool system for their wages. The growers do, in my opinion, to the tune, on average across Australia, of a 15 per cent variance. Not only does the grower have to compete for their wage component but also for other aspects of their salary which other people take for granted such as superannuation, holiday pay, sick leave, council rates, insurance—just to name a few of them—all to the tune of a 15 per cent variance being put back in.

If this is not keeping with competition, what is? I have mentioned before that I believe that we need more time to get this together so that the chicken meat growers in this State have a fair and equitable opportunity for a sustainable, viable future. At the moment, I understand that the companies, particularly Steggles, realise that the Act probably must be repealed. It realises that it is holding the big stick and, therefore, it is having a real go at chicken meat growers. That was never the intention when the review processes took place in 1987; it was never the intention to see chicken meat growers screwed to the wall.

It is interesting to look at other issues that could arise with respect to chicken meat growers. The USA and Asia now want to export processed chicken to Australia, something that was initiated by the previous Labor Government and, whilst I have not had this confirmed, also the previous Liberal Government. An opportunity still exists for that meat to come into Australia. Yet overnight Burger King America can tell the Australian beef producers that it is not taking any more beef.

Farmers (whether chicken meat growers, dairy farmers or beef processors) are finding it difficult. Why must Australia always give other people an advantage over and above what is a level playing field? In my opinion, the processors are not complying with the current contract and we have seen nothing that indicates that processors will work out a fair and reasonable deal with the growers. Therefore, as a member who has chicken growers in my electorate, I do not support the repeal of the Act.

I know that in the past few days there has been a significant improvement in attitudes between growers and processors. I am yet to see in writing any confirmation that chicken meat growers in my electorate will receive a fair deal. I ask Steggles to review the situation. South Australia produces only about 8 per cent of all chicken meat in Australia.

Knowing that there is an opportunity for deregulation around Australia, a company like Steggles can say that it will knock off the chicken meat growers in South Australia, give them hell and screw them to the wall, because that will make the job easier for it nationally.

As a South Australian member of Parliament who represents efficient and dedicated chicken meat growers, I am not prepared to accept that. Joes Poultry, which has been innovative, is a plus for the industry. In fact, it is a bit like Vilis in that it is a food processing company which has established markets that I have not previously seen with some of the more established companies. I say to the three main processing companies in this State that they should not be too hard and too unfair on the chicken meat growers in this State. They should be reasonable. The chicken meat growers are prepared to be reasonable but they want an opportunity to sit down as a collective group and work through a contract that will guarantee a sound and solid chicken meat industry in South Australia for the future and will return a fair and reasonable income to the growers and their families in this State. I am not in favour of the repeal of the Act.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION (LEVY) AMENDMENT BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Terrace Room East at 6 p.m.

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

That the sitting of the House be not suspended during the conference.

Motion carried.

POULTRY MEAT INDUSTRY ACT REPEAL BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I am angry. The arguments on behalf of the people who have invested an enormous amount of capital in the infrastructure necessary to grow chickens from brood stock as young birds through to market, whatever size and age that may be, have been well canvassed by the member for Mawson. The problems that the industry has, as it looks at the circumstances confronting it at the present time, are well stated. It is important for us to examine the history of the industry to understand how we arrived at this sorry pass. It was the Labor Party that made this mess.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

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

Mr LEWIS: The previous Labor Government brought in the legislative structure which we now have and which produced this sorry pass where the legislation as it exists is not working anyway. It was the Labor Party that put producers in the invidious position of being unable to buy their brood stock anywhere to grow out. It provided the licences to the processors who were also the people who owned the breeding stock and the hatchery. You were always going to screw the man in the middle, and that is exactly what has been happening. The ways you can do that are subtle: they are not as obvious as may appear on the surface when you examine the structure of the legislation.

The member for Ross Smith and other members opposite and anyone on this side who cares to listen ought to understand that there is a big difference between chickens and chickens. Those that come from pullets will never perform as well as those that come from older hens in the breeding cycle. Those chickens are incapable of doing that for reasons which are included in their genetic make up. That is a known scientific fact.

If you happen to be the annoyed, middle manager in one of these small number of processors and breeders, the middle manager who supplies you with the chicks that you have to grow out, he will give you a batch of chicks that come from pullet eggs. Then your pool returns will be below average because your performance will be below average, yet you cannot prove anything. You have to suffer and cop it. What is more, the grain which is used in the rations varies. Members opposite would know that just because it is an oat (*avena fatua*) does not mean it is all the same, and the same applies for barley and wheat.

If the grain in crushed form as a component of the feed mix is inferior because of the ratio between protein and carbohydrates, and/or if the meat meal in a batch of feed is rank, your chicks, at whatever age, will never do as well. However, if you take that feed mix to a laboratory and have it analysed as to the source of the protein, you will find that it is no different to a feed batch from which the chicks do extremely well. Again, the middle manager from the meat processing company and the chicken breeding company can screw you, and there is nothing you can do about it. Your pool results will come out poorly again, so you have to be nice to these people. You have to nose up to them, and that is because the legislative structure which, as I said at the outset, gave the licences to the people who do the killing and processing also gave them a monopoly on the genetic material from which the young stock is obtained for that purpose.

They control it and they use an iron fist to do it. You will do as you are told, even though you have hundreds of thousands of dollars tied up in infrastructure equipment. You will look after those birds to make sure that they perform as well as possible because you are in competition with every other grower in that pool as to the price you get. If your conversion ratio, for instance, from feed to birds is below average, you will be docked. If it is above average, you will get a bonus, but your bonus will never be as much as you are docked if you are the other way around.

Do members opposite reckon that is a fair system? That is what Opposition members want me to believe, that is what they want the Minister to believe and that is what they want the public to believe. It is not fair! It is stupid! Had that provision been put in the original legislation so there had to be divorcement of those people who run the business of breeding the stock used for reproduction from those people who are given the licences to process, we would never have reached this sorry pass in which we find ourselves today.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, you are. The Labor Party set it up. It is a marvellous socialist model, but it just does not work.

Mr Clarke: We turned the chooks into socialists.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, you turned the industry into a socialist model. There are other aspects of the industry's function which deserve review—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): Order!

Mr LEWIS: I do not mind what the member for Ross Smith plays around with or where he puts it. He can fit himself out wherever it is comfortable on his anatomy. The

member for Mawson has detailed the areas where careful consideration needs to be given to the interests of those people who have staked their homes and the land on which they are situated, along with their sheds, before they are thrown to the wolves, but it is too late. The legislation lapses any way whilst we are in recess and cannot function, so there is no choice if for no other reason than that. The other reason for it is, quite simply, that the Federal Government's competition policy requires the legislation to be repealed, or we do not get our slice of the cake. That has to happen now or never, or we permanently lose that small amount of the total payment being made to South Australia for making its industries competitive.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: The least the member for Ross Smith can do is acknowledge the truth of the simple, historical facts that I have put before him.

Mr Clarke: That the chickens are socialists.

Mr LEWIS: No. It is the Labor Party which is socialist.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made a relatively interruption-free second reading contribution. I ask that the member for Ridley be shown the same courtesy.

Mr LEWIS: I now find myself between a rock and a hard place where I can do no more than pray that the people who run those processing industries will be fair and reasonable in the way in which they deal with chicken meat growers in South Australia in the short term. I am working flat out to provide them with another means by which they can use the sheds and other facilities that they have, such as feed storage and so on, instead of using it to grow chickens.

Because I am his parliamentary secretary, I know that the Minister understands the urgency with which we must pursue this alternative form of production to provide those families with the means of obtaining an income, and that is in fish farming, since it will be possible to stimulate fish into growth much faster than is otherwise the case in the wild if we control the environment and things such as the day length. Some of those species are known to respond to that kind of treatment, which will be possible in the sheds which are currently constructed for chicken production, with modifications which will cost some money but which, given that we know that the market is substantial, profitable and growing very rapidly, will provide them with that means.

The one thing that I want to emphasise is that we must not allow those people who have access to the fingerlings—the brood stock—to become the fish merchants at the other end who take the grown stock off the producers. We must never get ourselves into the mess which we now have in the chicken meat industry. The mess we have now would be like taking away all the semen and the bulls which are presently in the public domain and open to free market forces in the dairy industry and giving them to the principal dairy product manufacturers, the people who do the value adding, and in doing so give them control of the feed which they require those dairy farmers to give their cows, and then pay the dairy farmers according to the feed conversion rates that they obtain.

The only reason why that is somewhat ridiculous in proposition is that the feed required to produce high quality milk does not come alone from a feed mill: it comes in the main from the pasture. The dairy farmers could never be conned into that. If that were to be so you would understand, Mr Acting Speaker, as I understand, the ridiculous situation in which dairy farmers would find themselves, locked in to taking whatever calves are given to them, whatever feed is delivered and paid whatever price the milk processing company wants to give them per litre of milk on their production, and then expect the dairy farmers to negotiate a price which will enable them to survive, to remain profitable, to obtain some return on the capital they have invested.

I could give the House other examples of the kind of model which currently prevails in the dairy industry, about which I have made such frank and disparaging remarks, a model which was conceived by the Labor Party and introduced by the Labor Party when it was in Government. In all the circumstances, we need to get on with the establishment of that industry—aquaculture—and the species that can be grown in those sheds need to be made available rapidly so that growers who find themselves hard done by can obtain assistance to convert their chicken farms into fish-producing enterprises.

If they want to grow chickens, they will have to put up with the kind of difficulties that currently confront them because this Act, which the measure before the House will repeal, is not working, even now. The whip hand held by the processors is too strongly held. No bargaining advantage is available to the processors in the current context. I have suggested that there ought to have been divorcement and, when I did that as a management consultant over 20 years ago, I was laughed at by members of the Labor Party, because it did not provide them with what they considered to be the necessary control or regulation to ensure that chicken farmers got what they needed in the way of good feed and good stock to grow out. That was the argument and that was the reason given for the current model. What a lot of piffle!

If the industry had survived any longer without the necessity for this country to go into the national competition policy State by State, which we now have, it would have been screwed in the same way as subcontractors in the building industry are screwed into joining a union because they are simply contractors. Even though a subcontractor on a building site owns his tools and the equipment he uses to do the job, if he wants a job he has to join the union. No ticket, no start; the site is black. That is exactly what the Labor Party had in mind when it did this. It is the same model it has used in so many other industries.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: If you ever got back into government you would. But you will never get back into government while there is breath in your body and while you have any ability to speak in this place. It will not be me who determines that: it will be the people of South Australia. They have had an absolute gutful of the policy models which have been used by the Labor Party to bring this State to its knees. There is a measure of indifference to what must be regarded as fiduciary responsibility in administration and philosophical insight into what makes a successful, vibrant society that continues to be efficient and relevant in the things it does to provide a living for the people of which it is comprised. I am terribly disappointed that it comes to the position we now finds ourselves in and that we have nowhere to go, other than to simply lean on the processes to ensure that if they do not play the game we will give adverse publicity to the ways in which they treat any one individual or the rest of the industry unfairly in this evolutionary phase into which we go at this time.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Members who spoke previously pointed out some of the anomalies that exist within this

industry, one of which is the fact that the growers do not own the birds. They are basically an employee, even though a contract exists. So, it creates a grey area within the industry. To be fair, some 18 months ago I took a delegation of chicken meat producers to the previous Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Dale Baker. At that meeting it was suggested that the growers, the Minister and the processors get together and work out a form of contract acceptable to both parties. Members who were at that meeting agreed with that form of action. Numerous growers have since talked to me about it, but the matter has not gone back to the Minister as to what they want in a contract, and I am disappointed that that has not happened.

However, let us consider deregulation. It takes me back to when the egg industry was deregulated. I hear arguments now similar to those I heard then. Let me place on the record that at that time of deregulation I was an egg producer and in favour of deregulation of the market, because deregulation in any situation encourages the person who produces the product at the cheapest possible price. In the egg industry we finished with a situation where the cost of production was talked about being $1.20 or $1.30 a dozen. There is no one single cost of production that applies to all growers. You can suggest areas such as cost of feed and feed conversion, as has been referred to tonight, but one cost of production does not apply to every grower. Every grower's cost of production is different, because everyone is a single manager in that business.

Along with that management technique comes the fact that some people will be able to produce birds of a very high quality with a high percentage out of a batch, and some people will have different results, purely because of people's individual management. The current legislation in this State restricts people from entering the industry. I do not believe that that is the right way to go. The Liberal Party says that everyone should have the opportunity to enter and operate in an industry. This is one such industry where, unless you have a contract with the processors, you cannot enter.

There will always be resistance to change; I can understand that. The same arguments were raised when the egg industry was deregulated. People said that there would be massive change, and there was. But no industry, whether it be manufacturing, agriculture or whatever, stays the same. You always have to consider change. Consider the micro-economic reform taking place in Australia at the moment and the car industry, for instance, where tariffs are being reduced. Those industries have to consider restructuring, realigning and becoming more efficient. The same is being forced on this industry because the legislation is being repealed.

The issue of reduced bargaining power regarding growing fees is concerning: there is no doubt about that. I have heard it said that no chickens will be grown and that, unless we agree to what a company says, all chicken meat will be imported into South Australia. The same argument was suggested in the egg industry whereby, unless you accepted what Woolworths or Coles offered you, everything would be imported from New South Wales and Victoria. If you consider what took place, that has not happened, neither will it happen in this industry.

Deregulation allows for efficiencies to be made within the industry and for new entrants to enter the industry. The growers who are currently involved might ask, 'Why would anyone want to invest $500 000 or $800 000 establishing a farm when you cannot make any money from it?' If the person thinks rationally, unless there is profit in the industry or that person considers that they can get a profitable return, they will not invest in the industry—unless they particularly want to throw away $500 000 or $800 000. I do not believe that there will be an influx of people entering this industry, unless there are abnormal or large profits being made. That is no different from any other industry. When people say that there is a profit to be made, you will get new entrants. The margin of profit will go down until a market situation applies.

Through deregulation there will be greater emphasis on the production of quality birds. There is no doubt that in the egg industry people were required to increase their management expertise, to upgrade the technology that was employed in their sheds and to ensure that they produced the best possible product. Again, that is what will happen in this case: there will be increased pressure on growers to ensure that they produce the best possible product. When new industries are established there is often involvement by Government to ensure that the industry starts on a reasonable footing. I believe that that is what will happen here. Similar to the car industry situation, protection will be given to ensure that the industry can establish itself into a stable position, producing profitably. At that stage, the Government has no further role in those industries. When they are on their feet, have established a market and are operating profitably, it is then the time for Government to withdraw.

As has been said by other speakers, there may well be a problem with the ACCC in terms of competition if this legislation is not repealed. So, I believe that maintenance of the protection that this industry currently has cannot be justified. I recognise the problems that growers will have and have now in dealing with the large companies, and that is a matter of their sitting down and being able to discuss it with them. I recognise the difficulties in doing that, but measures are available to people by way of the consultative committee that will be set up to ensure that the processes do not act against the Trade Practices Act.

I do not wish to say a great deal more other than that I believe that, as in other industries that have been deregulated, deregulation will ensure that the best growers will remain in the industry and that the product is produced at the most efficient price and at the highest possible quality. It will allow new entrants if they deem that there is a profit and it will also encourage the use of the latest technology that is available, in both shed design and management technique. This means that those producers who are currently in the industry will have to make sure that they are up with the latest techniques, that their management skills are very sharp and also that they become good bargainers in terms of negotiating with the processing companies.

I am pleased to see that there is another entrant in the market in the form of Joe's Poultry, which is becoming more active in the market place in looking at taking up contracts with people. That is good for the industry, and Joe's Poultry will give the other two processors some competition over what they offer in their contracts. I believe that this is a step in the right direction. I recognise that, as in any other industry, it will cause reorganisation of the industry and of the players in it but, given the competition rules that exist now, following the Hilmer report and the ACCC, I do not believe that we have a choice.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I will speak very briefly on this Bill, which I support but with a fair bit of concern, because—

Mr Clarke: Two bob each way.

Mr VENNING: It is very difficult to know what will happen in the future. I was never in favour of deregulating the grain, potato or egg industries or anything else, but we are living in the twentieth century, and in this modern day and age we cannot have protected industries. I argued long and hard against deregulating the grain industry. Since we have deregulated, I have to say that we have done quite well, thank you. I do not know that it will always be that way: in fact, it worries me when we have an over-production of grain—very much so. As the Minister would know, I still have great concern about deregulation, but in this modern day and age, to be consistent, when we are asking everyone else to get out there and face the marketplace, we really cannot protect any industry. This is one of the last that are left.

I share the concern of the members for Mawson and Ridley and others. It is distressing to realise that the players in this industry are two multinationals—and big ones at that—in Steggles and Inghams. With the member for Light, I am pleased to see at least a third player coming onto the scene in Joe's Poultry. I hope there will be more than that on the scene. When you have an industry controlled by multinationals—in other words, no individual face, just a massive company—you can understand what can happen when you are dealing with individual growers.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I know that the farmers can work through the Farmers Federation, as the Deputy Leader says, but farmers usually come off second best when it comes to dealing with big companies such as this. The market for growing chickens is characterised by extremely high degrees of concentration of market power in the handful of processing companies, and the long-term tying contracts between the processors and the growers. This has been a longstanding process since the first Act was passed in 1974. A typical grower contract provides for the supply by the processor of the day-old chickens and all the necessary materials, such as the feed and medications; the growing of the chickens according to the detailed specifications of the processor; and payment to the grower for the rearing of the chickens.

At no stage does the grower own the chickens. It is extremely rare for growers to switch between the different processors. Rather, they have a long-term arrangement with a particular processor, on whom they are entirely dependent for business. Growers will typically invest up to $600 000 in sheds and equipment, land and other facilities. As I would know, that investment can be recouped only over a 12 to 15 year period. In order to understand this fully, you have to consider the history of what has happened over the years and also the current industry situation.

It is very difficult to realise that after 25 years we will throw away the existing Act and change the industry completely. I have some difficulty in deciding my personal feeling about this Bill but, as I remind the House, as a member of the Liberal Party I am allowed the privilege of voting as I like in this House. I remind the House that the Labor Party does not give its members that right. In this instance, I will support the Bill, purely from a 'wait and see attitude' as far as I am concerned. I am confident that in the long term the growers will be better off. I know that in the short term the growers will have a lot of angst and anxiety. It particularly concerns me that we are the first State in Australia to be doing this. That worries me, because I know that other States are waiting and that this will have a domino effect. I would wish that we were not the first, because—

Mr Clarke: What about Tasmania?

Mr VENNING: Tasmania and New South Wales are the same: in both States the industry is waiting to see what happens here. Every other primary industry in this State has been deregulated or is well on the way to deregulation, and I cannot see any reason at all why this should be any different from the egg or potato industries or any other industry. I know that the potato growers are now happier. If we could pay the egg growers back the hen levies that they are owed by the Government after we get through this legal problem, I am sure they too will be happy.

I am also pleased that through this Bill we will allow growers to get together and discuss their contracts, which under the existing Act is against the law. I wondered about that. I could never understand why that was illegal under trade practices. If you and I do a transaction, I cannot understand why I cannot talk to my colleague about that. It sounds to me a very sinister way of doing business; I have never wanted to be as secretive as that. Under this measure, surely when growers enter into contracts or arrangements with processors, they will be able to discuss it freely and compare notes with their neighbouring grower, or even with the Farmers Federation. It should always have been that way.

We can never support a closed industry, and that is the reason why I will support the Bill—purely because no-one has a guaranteed right to be locked into an industry. Nobody who wishes to come into an industry should be excluded. This is the most difficult part about the current legislation. It does exclude anybody from coming into the industry and growing chickens for either processors. It has been a closed industry; that is the main point that helps me decide to support this Bill, and I do that.

Again, the Bill gives us much more flexibility. I hope the growers will appreciate the flexibility and the latitude that they will have. I am sure they will be advantaged in the long-term. I was lobbied long and hard on this issue. I met a delegation from Victoria regarding this matter. I was also present at a dinner when all the States came together to discuss this matter and I know full well the difficulties that they foresee. As the member for Light said, change is always difficult. It is always feared. It was feared by me as a grain grower when the Government deregulated the grain industry because we get very comfortable inside protected industries. I can say with the benefit of hindsight that since it has been deregulated the industry has been advantaged. There have been many cost savings. We are not hiding behind an inefficient mantle.

I support the Bill, but it is a very much a wait and see situation. I apologise for the fact that I cannot support most of the growers in this instance, but I will watch what happens with much interest and, if anything does happen to their disadvantage, we can look at it again. In the interim, I support the Bill.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries): I thank all members who have spoken, including the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, for their contributions. As always, it shows members of the Government have a right to voice any view they wish. The member for Custance raised the point that, at the end of the day, despite resistance at the moment, the chicken meat growers will be better off. That is a point that could be argued at great length. I tend to agree with that point of view, but for those close to the industry I know it is hard to understand that point of view and no-one really knows what the outcome will be. At the outset, I point out that in my discussions with growers and processors a

certain level of agreement has been reached concerning what is required if and when deregulation is to go ahead. We have been closely monitoring that progress and will continue to do so between now and when the Bill is dealt with in the Upper House to ensure that we are happy enough with the progress being made between the processors and the growers at that stage. That should not in any way be seen as a reason to be tardy and it is a message to the processors to keep the process moving.

As always, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke very eloquently. He called for a review. This Act has been under review for almost a decade and to call for another review is not sensible. This issue has been progressed over many years and for me as Minister to call for yet another review would be a cop out and I will not do that. It was clear from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's comments that he certainly did not agree with the position set down by the former Federal Labor Government under the COAG agreements and the competition policy. It shows that, obviously from the comfort of Opposition, it is easy to oppose some of the matters which you may find difficult to tackle in Government. In his philosophical way he probably understated the importance of the poultry meat industry in South Australia by concentrating on the bigger arguments.

The Deputy Leader mentioned that growers were told to go away and get an ACCC authorisation. That is not right. At a meeting, which I attended, it was agreed by grower representatives to continue down the track of authorisation. The representatives pointed out that they would take that track except for the fact of affordability of the authorisation. My understanding at that time was that the financing of an authorisation, or a ruling that an authorisation was not required, may well have been the final hurdle. At a subsequent meeting with processors they agreed to get advice on whether an authorisation was required and, if so, to pay for same and I had hoped that that might have removed the final hurdle. I was somewhat disappointed to find out afterwards that the growers had had a change of mind but that is their prerogative and their right.

I want to deal with several points. First, there has been the long period of consultation. There was the green paper in 1991, the white paper in 1994—and certainly discussions preceding those papers—and the announcement made by the previous Minister in June 1995. The preparation time for this legislation has been long. I recall very well soon after becoming Minister having a long meeting with grower representatives and for about an hour listening to the problems within the industry. I certainly had sympathy with many of the problems raised but, at the end of the period, although the issues raised were very important, I could not see how they were tied up to deregulation because they were occurring under regulation. We had three options from which to choose. First, the *status quo* option, that is, the do nothing option, which has a few problems. There is one regulatory problem but, apart from that, the Act has become unworkable.

I understand that nationally chicken meat growers may well be very concerned with what happens in South Australia. A better job was done on some of the Acts in other States at the time they were proclaimed, but the growers in those States would be very concerned that, if we move to deregulation in South Australia, it may well have the domino effect referred to. I do not think the *status quo* is an option for South Australian growers. On having gone through it, a decent ACCC authorisation is a better option in South Australia. Certainly, our responsibility does not lie with the national industry but to the South Australian industry.

The second choice is to go down the track of new legislation and to have greater regulation. All the States have been party to COAG agreements. For that reason, it is not on and also, in this day and age, going down that line would only lead to perhaps greater inefficiencies in the future.

Thirdly, there is the deregulation path, which is the one we have chosen. Most of the fears have been discussed at great length. The ACCC authorisation, as initially discussed, would cater for most of those fears and, in most ways, be superior to the current unworkable situation. Certainly, it is true that it has not been all plain sailing, but both growers and processors must continue to work towards solutions. Unfortunately, that has not proceeded as smoothly as perhaps I would have liked: it goes in fits and starts. Certainly, the chicken meat industry in South Australia is characterised by family type operations. I understand totally that they work long hours and they work hard. However, one of the other things that characterises the industry is a lack of goodwill, which is very unfortunate.

I suggest to both growers and processors that their combined future prosperity is best served by a far more cooperative approach—and I know that is hard to arrive at. The growing of chickens is essentially a partnership arrangement between growers and processors and the chicken meat industry will not be truly efficient until the current mistrust is overcome and all in the industry start working together as partners. I am sure participants will acknowledge that but everyone has some difficulty in agreeing how that will be achieved.

The member for Light correctly pointed out that when industries are set up there may well be a need for some initial Government protection. This industry is one which has got to the stage where deregulation for the growers is difficult. If, at the time of drafting the legislation, a sunset clause had been inserted so that the protection was there for, say, a five or 10 year period after which everyone knew what was going on, it would have been much better. It would have served us better in the situation that we now face.

The chicken meat industry in South Australia faces major challenges. The problems will not go away whether or not we pick up any of the three options. I suspect that some may try to blame these problems on deregulation, even though they occurred under the regulated system. Mr Des Cain, who was appointed by my predecessor in consultation with the growers to report on the chicken meat industry, identified significant inefficiency, and that inefficiency is assisted by regulation and will not serve the industry in South Australia well as it tries to meet the realities of the next decade.

One reality which the chicken meat industry, with other industries, will have to meet is the possibility of import competition becoming a greater factor. If industries here are not made efficient—and sometimes that almost means dragged into being efficient—they will not be able to compete with imports. That is no good for processors, growers and the economy. Do not forget that growers will maintain the same protections as other people in business who enter contracts: that is one thing that should always be remembered. If growers and processors can work together in a spirit appropriate to doing business in this era and the additional allowances of an ACCC application are applied, this industry will have a sound footing to become an industry with excellent prospects.

The problem with the chicken meat industry is not whether or not it is regulated: there are problems at the moment. That is unfortunate, and what is also unfortunate and probably unacceptable is the lack of goodwill, and that cannot be addressed by regulation but only by the resolution of issues between the players. I like to think that we can do as much as possible to try to achieve that, but I know that no one person in the industry can solve that; it really is a problem that faces the industry. I think that we all would like to look forward to better times for the industry. We encourage both growers and processors to continue negotiations positively and constructively.

In concluding, I point out again that this Bill will not be dealt with in the Upper House until after the break. In the meantime, I will continue to closely monitor the processes and hard work that has put in place the measures which are necessary to give protections to the growers under deregulation and which have been agreed to in our meetings. I will not tolerate that not being able to occur as a result of tardiness on the part of the growers. I encourage everyone in the industry to work together towards those ACCC authorisations, or at least a protocol which mirrors that, so that they can go ahead in a spirit of some cooperation and, hopefully, in the medium to long term, work towards a much greater partnership. I commend the Bill to the House.

The House divided on the second reading:

AYES (30)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Buckby, M. R.	Caudell, C. J.
Condous, S. G.	Cummins, J. G.
Greig, J. M.	Hall, J. L.
Kerin, R. G. (teller)	Kotz, D. C.
Leggett, S. R.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Penfold, E. M.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (11)

Atkinson, M. J.	Blevins, F. T.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Clarke, R. D. (teller)
De Laine, M. R.	Foley, K. O.
Geraghty, R. K.	Hurley, A. K.
Quirke, J. A.	Rann, M. D.
Stevens, L.	

PAIRS

Brown, D. C.	White, P. L.

Majority of 19 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I wish to raise a matter of denial of natural justice to a constituent, Mr Michael Geesing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order. There is too much conversation.

Mr De LAINE: Michael joined the South Australian Police Force on 29 December 1966 as a cadet and resigned on 29 September 1989 as a senior constable after serving 22 years and nine months. On 4 May 1990 Michael was issued with a police certificate of service which contained no reference to his conduct during his service with the force. Because he required a certificate of service to pursue other employment opportunities, he made a request to the Police Department for this omission to be corrected. He then received a certificate of service issued on 8 June 1990 which stated that his conduct was unsatisfactory.

In 1993 he applied for a position with the Correctional Services Department but his application was rejected because of the unsatisfactory comment on his certificate. The Correctional Services Department advised him that they would place his application on hold until he sorted out the matter. Since that time he has tried on several occasions to see the Commissioner of Police or his deputy but has been refused an appointment.

In early February last year a police officer friend advised him that the Police Department was keen to re-enlist former police officers into the force. He was very keen to re-enlist as he liked the job and he feels that, with his almost 23 years experience, he has something to offer. Michael was advised by the recruiting section of the South Australian Police Force that the first thing that would be done in relation to his re-enlistment application would be to check his previous service record. On several occasions during February last year he telephoned Assistant Commissioner John Murray's office requesting an appointment to speak with him about problems with his personal file and possible re-enlistment. Each time he was told that the Assistant Commissioner was not available, but on the last occasion he was advised that 'John Murray does not wish to meet with you and the matter is closed'.

I have in my possession a copy of a Police Department personnel services document in relation to charges laid against former senior constable Michael Geesing. Michael has never received any particulars of the charges, and the charges were not proceeded with. These charges emanated from allegations only and no proof has ever been produced. During the time of these alleged breaches of regulations and charges, Michael was experiencing enormous stress with respect to his personal life. His marriage had broken down and he was involved in personal and property matters connected with this situation. A close friend was tragically killed in a road accident and another friend became permanently incapacitated with serious brain damage. At this time Michael considered that his severe stress was affecting his ability to perform his police duties to the level he wished, so he sought the help of his commanding officer at the time, Chief Inspector Leditschke, who gave him no help and merely told him 'just get on with your job'.

This refusal to even speak to Michael Geesing is a denial of natural justice and something that conflicts with my idea of the South Australian Police Force and its place in the justice system of South Australia. I wrote to the then Minister for Emergency Services on 28 March 1995 informing the Minister of the situation, and I quote the last four sentences of that letter, as follows:

Everyone has a right to be heard and I request that the department that Michael served so loyally for 23 years extend to him that courtesy.

The charges should either be proven in writing or deleted from his records. The reference on his certificate of service to his so-called 'unsatisfactory conduct' does not give a true record of his loyal service of 22 years and nine months.

Minister I seek your intervention in this matter to ensure that Michael is afforded the courtesy of some degree of natural justice.

At this time Michael lodged a complaint with the Police Complaints Authority. The Minister responded to my letter on 3 May 1995, as follows:

I refer to your letter of 28 March 1995 on behalf of Mr Michael Geesing, concerning matters relating to his conduct during his service with the SA Police Force.

The Commissioner of Police advises that the matters raised in your letter are the subject of a complaint made by Mr Geesing to the Police Complaints Authority in March 1995. On 5 April 1995, the PCA requested that preliminary inquiries be commenced.

Under these circumstances, I am unable to reply to the issues raised. However, once the inquiry is completed the Commissioner of Police will provide the Minister with further advice and he will write to you again.

On 26 July 1995 I again wrote to the then Minister (Hon. Wayne Matthew) advising him that Michael wished to apply for police and correctional services positions but could not do so until his file was sorted out. I also requested an urgent meeting with the Police Commissioner to enable Michael to discuss the situation with him. I again wrote to Minister Matthew on 24 August 1995, as follows:

Michael's request to meet with the Police Commissioner has borne no fruit at this stage. He has had a brief meeting with Commander Geoff Edwards which achieved nothing.

The Police Complaints Authority has informed Michael that he can do nothing, and a subsequent request by Michael to speak again with Commander Edwards on 'neutral ground' and with the possibility of a neutral mediator has been refused.

The conclusion that I draw from these circumstances is that Michael is being denied 'natural justice' and invites the question 'What are the police trying to hide?' All that Michael requires is some answers to his questions and to be treated like a human being with compassion.

Minister, I respectfully request that Michael be given the courtesy of being heard and a genuine attempt be made by the police to resolve the conflict one way or another. If this doesn't happen, I will consider it my duty to put the matter on public record by raising the issue in Parliament.

Michael then received a letter from the Police Complaints Authority dated 4 December 1995 advising him that there was nothing that it could or would do for him. In my experience, this is par for the course as far as the PCA is concerned. In my view, the authority is absolutely useless.

I then received a letter from the new Minister for Police, the Hon. Stephen Baker, on 10 January 1996 informing me of the PCA's determination. I wrote again to Minister Baker on 22 February 1996, as follows:

I refer to a letter to me of 10 January 1996 in relation to Mr Michael Geesing. I am becoming quite weary of the negative and evasive responses to all the previous letters I have written on behalf of my constituent, Michael Geesing. . . Minister, I am very disappointed, and indeed, quite angry over the way Michael has been treated by being continually 'fobbed off'. I ask the question again—what does the Police Department have to hide?

I am also far from satisfied with the report of the Police Complaints Authority. Minister, I am requesting that you open up an investigation again into the situation with Michael's file and request, once again, that a meeting be arranged between Michael and the Commissioner (or his nominee) and I wish to also be present at this meeting!

When I read Michael's certificate of service I see that his conduct for 23 years was 'unsatisfactory'!!! God help all South Australians if it took the Police Force 23 years to work out that Michael's performance was unsatisfactory or, alternatively, that the Police Force was stupid enough to carry an unsatisfactory performing officer for 23 years!!! I do not believe that this is the case and, if not, why doesn't his record show, e.g. 22 years exemplary, very good, good or satisfactory service and one year unsatisfactory [if indeed it is proven to be so!]

Michael has missed employment opportunities in recent years because of his certificate of service conduct report. He has applied for a position recently as a 'speed camera operator' and has been told he was not successful. At the interview stage, and on my advice, Michael informed the panel of this 'unsatisfactory' entry on his police record. We fear that once again he has been passed over because of his record [which hasn't been proven]. Surely a person with his long experience as a police officer, and since then his record as a driving instructor and someone who is dedicated to road safety, would be snapped up by the department for this speed camera operator duty. I would like to know why Michael was not successful in his application for the job.

Minister, I respectfully request this matter be resolved once and for all and the police 'put up, or shut up!' If a resolution is not found very soon I will raise the matter in Parliament. All the man wants is a little 'natural justice'.

I emphasise that I wrote that letter on 22 February this year and, as yet, have not received a response from the Minister even though I said that it was a very urgent matter. I am a very patient person, but my patience is at an end. If the Minister and the Police Commissioner do not make an effort to try to resolve this issue, I will raise the matter outside Parliament. All that Michael Geesing wants is a little justice and to be given the courtesy of being listened to.

Mr BECKER (Peake): I wish to raise the strongest protest possible over the behaviour of the Local Government Association and the attempt by some of its members to capitalise on the poker machine industry in this State. For some time since the establishment of poker machines, the Local Government Association, which is as weak as dishwater, has not been setting out proper controls or recommendations to local councils and, therefore, in some areas the councils are endeavouring to capitalise on what they perceive to be the benefit of poker machines that are installed in sporting clubs on council land.

Local government must remember that it is under the microscope. I have complained to Local Government Association staff members over the years that we need a public accounts committee to look into local government and the behaviour of local government. It is really not accountable to anybody. I remember the very first time I moved down to Glenelg, and, when my wife complained about something in relation to the Glenelg council, the local councillor said, 'If you don't like it, move out,' and we moved the councillor. In my opinion, local government is battling to justify its existence, and I am very disappointed.

I have received a letter from the Licensed Clubs Association of South Australia, which states:

Following on from our meeting [a few days ago] with regard to the relationship between local government (councils) and members of the Licensed Clubs Association of South Australia, I set out below for your information details of the concerns that have arisen since the introduction of gaming machines.

Hackham Community Sports and Social Club—Noarlunga Council.

I have enclosed copies of correspondence forwarded to me regarding this club's problems. It is quite evident that the Noarlunga council has a problem with clubs who have installed gaming machines.

The member for Mawson has raised the issue of the Hackham Sports and Social Club by way of grievance, and I commend him for it and I also commend him for the action he is taking to help that organisation. In my opinion, there is no doubt that there has been clear discrimination by Noarlunga council. The letter continues with reference to the Modbury Bowling

Club, which is in the Tea Tree Gully council, and that has enough problems of its own. The letter states:

This club first applied for a gaming machine licence in June 1995. Their long-term plans include amalgamation of all nearby clubs. They are located in an excellent area and have a great opportunity to develop their facilities. However, from day one council tried to stop not only this club but other clubs from applying for gaming machines. After a lot of pressure and toing-and-froing, an application was lodged in December and finally granted on 5 February 1996. A delay of some six months due to council's intervention to further highlight the heavy hand of local government.

I have been to the Modbury Bowling Club, and it is in a wonderful location and a beautiful setting. It is a very well run, very well managed and very impressive club. It is on local council land, but it is there for the benefit of club members and can be of benefit to all other sporting and social clubs.

One can read all the excuses in the world that local councils put up, but who is the instigator behind the delay in the approval of these applications to councils by the clubs for the extension of their licence and/or applications for poker machines? I fear that behind all this we have the Hotels Association. They are not the lilywhite people they make out they are. They are not as clean as they make out they are. The association has set up a huge fund and it is sending out literature or propaganda that says, 'Look at us. We are good people because we give donations to organisations and clubs.'

What the Hotels Association does not tell the people of South Australia, particularly the suckers or the patrons, is that a licensed club must buy its alcohol via one of the local hotels, and they have to nominate a hotel. If there is ever any kickback in commissions, this is it. If the hotel management decides to distribute some of its profits to the local community, it can do it, but they sit back there very comfortably knowing that every bottle, every keg, every ounce of alcohol that has to be purchased for the benefit of the members must come through the local hotel. That cartel or monopoly has existed in this State for many years. What the hotels are doing to sports and social clubs is shameful, and the brewery itself would not be without question in this situation, as well. Over past years, we have seen all sorts of things in relation to licensing hours and the power and the pressure of the Hotels Association.

The letter to which I have been referring also lists the Athelstone Football Club, which is in the Campbelltown council area, and it states:

The above club first initiated a request for gaming machines in February 1995. Once again, council's involvement delayed the granting of a licence to 3 April 1996 [some 14 months later]. During this time, council delayed and made it near impossible for that club to extend their trading hours. To this date, there has been no resolution regarding this club's extended trading hours.

That is a terrible situation. Here again it is the power of the little men—the little mice—who want to dictate the wishes of one or two people on the whole community, and damage is being done to the members of sports and social clubs. The letter also mentions the Colonel Light Gardens RSL Club, which is in Mitcham council. Mitcham council—what more can I say? The letter states:

The Mitcham council, through a local councillor, delayed the granting of both extended hours and gaming machines for this club. A residents' group was formed to oppose the club and it became a very ugly situation between RSL members and some local residents. This club has operated for 45 years from their premises. There had never been a complaint or dispute before with the council or residents.

That is just typical of what is going on in local government and it is high time that we investigated this problem, took these people to task and looked at the allocation of licensing. I am further advised, as follows:

The club is on freehold land, yet council saw fit to oppose its application for gaming requesting the club to seek planning consent to permit it to install 10 gaming machines.

What a joke! It continues:

This request was despite the fact that the same council had not required any such application be lodged by any of the clubs and hotels within its council area that had previously applied for a gaming machine licence. A good example of council seeking to exercise planning powers that it simply did not have.

But it got away with it. These councils are annoying and frustrating, and they are discriminating against these clubs. That is only a few examples. Why are we having these problems? We are told that it is supposed to be a level playing field but, when we voted for the legislation to introduce poker machines, I was of the belief that it was for licensed clubs and licensed clubs only. I promoted it years ago, and, when we found out there was a mistake in the legislation, the unions, the Labor Party, and the Liquor Trades Union, in particular, through the Hotels Association, put on all the power and pressure, and then we found out what was going on.

Here is the real truth. It is all very well for the *Advertiser* to run its little campaign, as it does from time to time, about the evils of poker machines, and I am disappointed at the way people have behaved over this issue. I was not aware that there were so many compulsive gamblers in South Australia. There are 415 operating sites in South Australia with poker machines, and there are 9 370 poker machines as of last week. There are 345 hotels with poker machines and 70 clubs. Only 70 clubs throughout the whole of the State have poker machines compared with the greedy 345 hotels. That means that the hotels control 83 per cent of the gaming sites in South Australia. A third of those hotels could not pay their liquor licence fees three or four years ago: they were on the bones; they were in real strife.

Nearly 17 per cent of the gaming machines are in licensed clubs, and that is what is hurting the community, that is what is doing the damage, and local government has a case to answer. I hope that some time in the near future the Economic and Finance Committee will look at this situation to see whether we can do something about the imbalance. Alternatively, a committee of Parliament ought to look at the role of local government interfering in this area.

Motion carried.

At 6.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 1 August at 10.30 a.m.