HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 30 November 1995

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services): I move:

That the sitting of the House be continued during the conferences with the Legislative Council on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Appeals) Amendment Bill and the Local Government (Boundary Reform) Amendment Bill.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: RURAL POVERTY

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I move:

That the final report of the committee be noted.

My colleague and Presiding Member of the Social Development Committee (Hon. Bernice Pfitzner) similarly tabled this report in the other place yesterday. Over recent years much attention has been focused on the state of the rural sector and, while it is acknowledged that nearly all South Australians have suffered in some way as a result of the recent recession, people living in rural areas of this State have faced additional adverse conditions including drought, mouse plagues and low commodity prices. Contributions made by the rural sector to the State's economy are substantial with, for example, the 1994-95 annual report of Primary Industries South Australia indicating that field crops contribute about 20 per cent of total exports from the State. Consequently, it is obviously of great importance that a viable rural sector be maintained.

As members will recall, on 10 March 1994 the member for Ridley, a representative of one of the worst affected rural areas, moved a motion that set in place the committee's inquiry into rural poverty. The terms of reference for the inquiry directed the committee to look at the effects of rural poverty on all people living in rural areas in South Australia, with particular regard to be given to the delivery of Government services, education, health services, the demise of community organisations and any other consequences the committee felt was relevant to the need for social redevelopment.

On 4 May 1994 the committee tabled an interim report in response to the terms of reference. Although only a small portion of evidence had been received at that time, it was apparent to members that many people in rural areas were experiencing great hardship. The last evidence for the inquiry was held in November 1994 and between that time and March 1995 the committee had to produce two reports—one on family leave provisions and the other on unemployment—leaving little time for members to spend on the rural poverty inquiry. In March 1995 the committee's research officer left to take up another position, which resulted in a nine week delay while a replacement was found and, by the time a new research officer commenced work, the committee was absorbed in the process of hearing evidence for its inquiry into prostitution. The production of an interim report on prostitution tabled in July 1995 further delayed work on the rural poverty report. It was therefore not possible for a full evaluation of the rural poverty evidence to commence until August of this year.

While the committee regrets the delay in the production of this report, it helps underline the ongoing nature of problems facing the rural sector. It is encouraging to hear the current promising forecasts for large numbers of South Australian farmers, but this will not solve all the problems of rural communities. Many of the issues identified in the report as requiring attention are linked to the dispersed and isolated nature of the rural population and this will not alter as a result of an increase in the fortunes of our farmers. I therefore stress the importance of evaluating rural sector needs on an ongoing basis during good times and bad to ensure that problems are addressed as they inevitably arise.

The committee heard evidence from 123 people over the course of the inquiry and received written submissions from 62 organisations and 44 individuals. Members visited two of the most severely affected regions, with public meetings being held in Karoonda and the Murray Mallee region in late July 1994 and at Crystal Brook and Peterborough in November 1994. In addition, a video link up was used to take evidence from Eyre Peninsula in November 1994.

The committee heard from a wide range of individuals and organisations with an interest in the rural sector, including rural counsellors, teachers and their students, ministers of religion, representatives from charitable organisations, farmers, academics, health professionals, social workers, Government department representatives and district council officials. The committee appreciates the time given by all witnesses and is particularly grateful to those people who obviously found it painful to tell members of their personal experiences.

The terms of reference for the inquiry were framed in such a way that the content of the report was dictated by the concerns of those rural people who provided evidence to the committee. The report therefore highlights those issues that the evidence shows were of the greatest concern to rural people during the course of the inquiry. I stress that the report does not provide a blueprint to combat rural poverty: this was not the task set by Parliament. The report identifies issues affected by rural poverty and provides recommendations aimed at ensuring that these issues are addressed.

The word 'poverty' has been interpreted in a very broad sense for the purpose of the inquiry. The interim report discussed problems associated with defining the term and concludes that income alone was not a good determination of poverty, particularly in rural communities. Consequently, the report identifies areas of disadvantage experienced by rural people such as availability and accessibility of services. The report divides issues into four main groups, these coming under the chapter headings of general community concerns, education, health and social services, and primary producers.

General concerns identified in the report include the accessibility of Government services with associated problems of anonymity and confidentiality as well as the availability and cost of transport and the demise of social and recreational organisations. Recommendations have been made to address these concerns, including the need for all Government service providers to provide toll free telephone services for callers outside the metropolitan area. An entire section of the report is devoted to issues associated with education, ranging from the availability of preschool services through to the accessibility of further education.

In particular, concerns were raised with members about the level of subject choice and mode of subject delivery for

students in years 11 and 12 attending schools in the more isolated rural areas. While the Open Access College is seen to provide an excellent standard of teaching for students required to take subjects through a distance education delivery method, the committee believes that year 11 and 12 students required to study a large proportion of their entire subject load via this method may be disadvantaged. Members believe that it is important to provide students at years 11 and 12 with the option of remaining in their local community, and distance education delivery methods are an excellent way to do this.

However, the committee believes that assistance should be provided to students who are prepared to move away from home to avoid having to study the greater proportion of their subjects by distance education. Currently, assistance for isolated children funding is not available to students solely on the basis that their local school is unable to provide face-to-face teaching for the majority of their subject choices. The committee received evidence that many students are not suited to distance education delivery methods and that they are disadvantaged if required to study more than 50 per cent of year 11 and 12 subjects in this manner. Therefore, it was put to the committee that assistance for isolated children funding should be made available to all students who were prepared to move away from home as a result of more than 50 per cent of their subject choices not being available in a face-to-face manner.

Members gave this proposal careful consideration. It was felt that it was important to take into consideration the level of subject choice available in metropolitan schools and determine a list of 'core subjects' for which it would be reasonable for all students to have face-to-face access. The committee has, therefore, recommended that assistance for isolated children funding be provided to students who select 50 per cent or more of these so-called 'core subjects' and where more than 50 per cent of all subject choices are not available in a face-to-face manner.

Access to further education is also a major concern for rural people. Most people wishing to go on to further study after school must move away from their local community, and this can be prohibitively expensive. The committee, therefore, commends the recent UniTAFE initiative announced by the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education that will provide rural students with access to the first year of the University of South Australia accountancy degree at Berri and Nuriootpa TAFE campuses from March 1996.

However, this will not solve the immediate problems for the majority of rural students, particularly those from farming families identified in the report as finding it difficult to access Austudy. Members received evidence that many children from farming families are not able to go on to further education as their family does not have the money to support them to live away from home. Often these students are not eligible for Austudy, only because the value of assets held by their family is too great.

While the committee is aware of recent debates at the Federal level surrounding this issue, members believe that farming families are in a unique position in that the value of assets required to maintain a viable farm business is likely to be substantially greater than for most other businesses in similar locations. Consequently, the committee has recommended that the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education urge the Federal Government to exclude family farms from the Austudy assets test. The report makes a number of other recommendations about education in rural areas, details of which can be found in the report.

The report goes on to examine health and social services in rural areas, with the issues covered including hospital services, care of the aged, mental health services, suicide, domestic violence, services provided by the Department for Family and Community Services and certain eligibility requirements for social security payments. Evidence indicated that there were concerns in the community about the availability of mental health services, although it was unclear whether problems with service delivery were attributable to a lack of resources, poor coordination of existing resources or a combination of both factors.

Members were greatly concerned about the fact that rates of suicide in rural areas, particularly amongst young people, were significantly higher than in the metropolitan area. Members understand that a pilot project for a national initiative aimed at facilitating the formation of local networks in rural areas to address the problem of youth suicide is commencing shortly, and the committee has recommended that the Minister for Health take steps to ensure that South Australian communities are involved in this project.

Evidence given to the committee also identified rural people in their early fifties as being particularly vulnerable to suicide, with a suggestion that these people were finding it increasingly difficult to provide independently for the care of their families, something they had previously managed. The committee has therefore further recommended that the Minister for Health give consideration to the establishment of a project team to determine strategies for the prevention and reduction of suicide in South Australian rural communities, particularly focusing on adult suicide. Concerns about the availability of mental health services, combined with the disturbing data on suicide rates in rural communities, resulted in the committee recommending that the Minister for Health urgently perform a study of mental health needs in rural areas, with an emphasis on finding community-based solutions involving the coordination of service providers in the field.

The final chapter of the report focuses on issues important to primary producers. Members spoke with a number of rural counsellors about their role in assisting farming families and heard nothing but praise for these individuals. The committee was impressed with the dedication shown by the counsellors and gives strong support to the continuation of these services. Evidence received by the committee indicates that there is a great deal of confusion in the farming community about the Rural Adjustment Scheme, and the report recommends that some changes be made to the scheme. These include the need for a restructured rural adjustment program, with a new name, that continues to support the objectives of the current RAS program, with exceptional circumstances measures to be removed and made the subject of a separate Commonwealth-State agreement.

The report goes on to look at the findings of the 1994 rural debt audit. The committee is concerned that nearly one quarter of South Australian farmers were not considered to be viable under all or most circumstances at the time of the audit. Members heard that many of these struggling farmers are remaining on the land, with their families, despite receiving no assistance to do so. The committee fears that this may result in properties being run down as farmers attempt to produce greater yields in the short term. In addition, members are concerned that the pressures placed on family

members may result in behavioural problems, depression or even suicide.

The committee has therefore recommended that the Minister for Primary Industries should investigate the underlying reasons as to why these farmers are struggling with a view to determining how best they may be assisted to achieve long-term viability. In addition, the committee has recommended that, until such time as this investigation is completed, RAS funding in the form of interest rate subsidies and assistance with the development of property management plans, be made available to these farmers. The report also makes recommendations concerning financial mediation for farmers and looks at the issue of farm safety. My honourable colleague in another place has spoken in great detail on recommendations made in the report. I commend this report to the House.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I commend the committee on its report and look forward to perusing it closely. Rural poverty is a very serious problem, and I have raised this matter many times in my five and a half years in this place. The problem is largely hidden from the majority of South Australians. This report will highlight many of the problems and will remind the members of this House and the people of South Australia that these problems exist and that people are suffering in silence.

I have driven to farms in my electorate and have been shocked to see the living conditions of some of these people. We are not aware of these problems until we have a reason for getting close to these people. On speaking to them, on their properties, one sees the conditions in which they live, often for reasons which are not their fault. I know of situations where sometimes up to three families have been living on a holding of less than 1 000 acres. This is not country in the high rainfall areas; they are more marginal areas. Knowing as I do what it costs to live on farms in reasonable areas, I wonder how that can be so. One wonders how they make a living and how they educate their children, but they do.

The report that the member for Hanson just spoke to states that a quarter of South Australia's farms are said to be non viable. That is possibly the case, but I know of many cases where people remain on their farm purely because of pride, and the fact that the family farm has been handed down for several generations. They stay there not wishing to admit defeat and not wishing to sell the family farm, because they do not want to be the generation that lost the farm. I am pleased the committee got out and about and took evidence out in the regions. The member for Hanson mentioned the visit to my home town, Crystal Brook, which is capably looked after now by the member for Frome.

I hope the issues highlighted in the report attract the attention of our legislators, both State and Federal. I am pleased the committee has raised this issue, because many of those who are the subject of the report are suffering in silence. Another part of the problem is the unemployment amongst rural people, also mentioned by the member for Hanson, and particularly our young people. Unemployment in our regions is a very serious problem—over 40 per cent for young people. In fact, my own children have had to move from their community to Adelaide to obtain regular employment. It is a very serious situation, and every year it becomes worse. It will take very strong Government action to reverse this trend.

Access to further education by rural students, which was also highlighted by the committee, is a serious problem. I welcome the initiative by the Minister (Hon. R.B. Such), who has offered the Berri and Nuriootpa TAFE campuses to assist in the accounting area. Austudy has been an ongoing problem for the rural community. Ever since its inception, the argument has been: why should the family farm be included as part of the means test when determining whether a student is eligible for Austudy? I know many farms that are worth hundreds of thousand dollars, but that does not necessarily mean that the farm is producing an income. It is inequitable that this has never been addressed.

A child could have a lawyer or a doctor as a parent and still obtain Austudy, but a child with parents who own a farm that is not necessarily earning an income can be denied Austudy and therefore the right to complete their education. As the honourable member also said, the report touches on suicides in rural areas, which is an absolute tragedy. Now that we have a better season with better prices, a more sympathetic Government and this report, we can go a long way towards resolving and addressing the serious problem of rural poverty in South Australia. I commend the report and look forward to reading it in detail.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I also support the report. As the House would be aware, I am a member of the committee. I will not go into detail in respect of the recommendations of the report—the member for Hanson has already done that. I would like to state a few points and thank the member for Ridley, who brought this problem to the attention of the Social Development Committee as a result of his first-hand knowledge of what is happening in his area. As the committee found, the problems for rural people are not limited just to one area—it is wide-ranging across South Australia. Indeed, in many cases, the problems are similar for rural people throughout Australia.

I was honoured to be part of the committee that looked at the problems in a holistic and comprehensive way. I thank the witnesses for making us aware of the real problems in their areas, and for being frank with us. I understand the hardships that they endure. No doubt, the intensity of the problems occurs as a result of the cyclical nature of the rural areas, depending on commodity prices, droughts, plagues and so on. However, underlying these problems are the real issues of equity, access and social justice for people in rural areas.

We talk about this in respect of the metropolitan region, where there are areas of disadvantage, but the areas of disadvantage for rural people are very real; for example, the distance. Unlike people who live in the metropolitan area, rural people do not have access to all Government services. Whilst I commend the actions of previous Governments, and of course this Government in the past two years, in trying to deal with those problems, we must continue to review the procedures, because people who live in rural areas suffer continuous disadvantage.

Although I now live in the metropolitan area, I come from a rural background, not in this country but in another country. The situation seems to be similar wherever you go—people in rural areas at times are the forgotten people. However, they do provide many of the resources and much of the wealth of this country. That must be acknowledged. This report emphasises how important it is to look at how we can strengthen services in rural areas to ensure that people have equity and access to what many people in the metropolitan

area take for granted. When we talk about poverty, it is difficult to define, because poverty is all a matter of degree and it is relative. However, there is no doubt that, when we talk about access rich and access poor, people living in rural areas are access poor. I think that is the real basis of the equity issue: we must ensure that all South Australians have equal access to what many people in South Australia take for granted.

There are times when there are good seasons in rural areas and therefore access does not appear to be as much of a problem as it is at other times but, irrespective of the cyclical nature of the problems in rural areas, Governments of all persuasions must continue to be vigilant to ensure that the situation is reviewed and that people in rural areas have access to health, education, transport and banking services, and the cultural understanding that is necessary to deliver those services in rural areas.

I commend the report. I thank the member for Ridley for bringing it to the committee to look at it in a comprehensive way, and I believe we have done that. The report has outlined the problems and has made recommendations which should go some way towards alleviating some of them and making sure that there is a continuous focus on access and equity for private enterprise in rural areas. I commend the report.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I was most interested in this report, since I came from this type of background before I was elected to this place. I commend the member for Ridley for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and the committee. Therefore, it is with great disappointment that I put on record my feeling that this report is a little bit like the curate's egg.

Mr Foley: What does that mean?

Mr BRINDAL: It is good in parts. It has severe conceptual and intellectual problems in the way it is presented. The member for Custance looks askance, but I suggest that he have a good look at the report.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, and draw your attention to the Standing Order that requires members not to display things in the Chamber.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): The point of order is upheld: displays are out of order.

Mr BRINDAL: In the early 1970s—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: He will pay; don't worry.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will continue his speech.

Mr BRINDAL: When it came to power in the early 1970s, the Whitlam Government wished to be involved in education and it produced two absolutely definitive reports by Fitzgerald and Henderson. They clearly showed that probably the greatest single problem facing this country, as the member for Ridley would know, was poverty in rural areas. This was a compound of two problems identified in educational terms, the first being poverty itself—socio-economic disadvantage—and the second being isolation. So, two ongoing programs came into being. One was the Country Areas Program, which continues to this day, and the other was the Disadvantaged Schools Program.

Interestingly, the Disadvantaged Schools Program was promulgated by the Whitlam Government and still continues. It is a very valuable program, of which I know the member for Elizabeth has had experience. The Country Areas Program had its genesis a few years later under the Fraser Government, and again it is a very interesting and worthwhile program, as is noted by the report.

As you said in your contribution, Sir, and as the report notes, there is a difference between rural poverty and isolation. One of the problems with this report is that time and again it confuses poverty with isolation and makes the two things interchangeable. I have heard some people say that in the good cycles rural poverty gets better. In one sense that is true. In the good cycles, when the income of those who are benefiting from good crops goes up, they have greater capacity to purchase access to services, education and other things they cannot get when they do not have the money. In that sense, when they have more money, they can buy more with it and overcome their isolation. Surely, those two go together but, as you know, Sir, there are many people who live in Peterborough who are fettlers on the railway, unemployed mothers because housing is cheap, roo shooters and rabbit shooters—people who are not dependent for their income on the seasons and on the production of the soil. Their level of poverty and deprivation of service is a real and ongoing deprivation. When people say that this diminishes with the cycle, they should realise that it diminishes only for some people, not for all.

I will deal now with a few specifics and errors of fact. For example, the Country Areas Program does have a very complex formula, but the Country Areas Program is based on isolation. It seeks to address deprivation suffered because of isolation, thus the complex formula. It is not, as this report states, a formula of the Department for Education and Children's Services. It is a formula of the Commonwealth Government imposed on it by the State Government, and there is no way that the recommendation of this report, which is that the State Government change the formula, can be implemented. It is outside the knowledge and purvey of the State Government. Hence, the Minister must have special categories of schools and has put in four schools, but for this report to recommend that he change the formula shows a lack of understanding of the criteria on which the formula is based. The report should have recommended that the Minister for Education and Children's Services go to the Commonwealth Minister and have the formula changed, not that he change the formula.

I support the recommendation that the Disadvantaged Schools Program, which is about socio-economic disadvantage, should remain separate from the Country Areas Program, but the report misses an important point. The member for Ridley's area was one of the pioneers in the Country Areas Program. One of its great strengths was that, in the acquisition of services, schools developed the ability to share, to purchase between them a bus and to pool their resources so that together they could afford to buy what they could not afford to buy on their own. In my opinion—

Mr Lewis: That was no accident.

Mr BRINDAL: No, I know. The member for Ridley says that it was no accident and I realise that, because the member for Ridley was a strong participant in encouraging the schools and school communities in that area. He gave great strength to those schools. There is a campsite at Warradale which exists solely for the purposes of letting children come to the city and, for as minimal cost as possible, allowing them to have a city experience; in other words, to give them something of what they lack in the country—some of those services to which they do not have access. The RICE program, which is mentioned in the appendix, was another brilliant innovation by a former Government. I suspect that

it goes back about 20 years, but it was a very good way of looking at the twin problems of poverty and isolation in rural areas. It is to this Government's credit that, as far as I know, it continues.

In summary, I am disappointed in the report. I thought that the report could considerably add to our body of knowledge on rural poverty but, because it confuses rural poverty and isolation, I find it muddled and muddied. I find some of the recommendations good, but I find some of the other recommendations spurious. I would like to see the Social Development Committee completely re-examine this matter and provide the proper focus, as I am sure the member for Ridley would want it to do. It is a most important issue—you know that, Sir, and everyone in this House knows it. It deserves more than the attention this report gives it. I suggest to the Social Development Committee that it reopen the report, focus its endeavours and come back with another effort.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANS FOR TRANSPLANTATION

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Thursday 28 March 1996.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PETROL MULTI SITE FRANCHISING

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Thursday 28 February 1996.

Motion carried.

REFERENDUM (WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS) BILL

Second reading.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I support the Australian Democrats' Bill, which has come down from another place and which calls on the Government of South Australia to call a referendum on whether or not South Australians want the management of their water to be privatised. There is no more fundamental issue of importance to the people of South Australia than whether or not their water is privatised—whether or not their water is given over to 100 per cent French and British owned companies. The people of South Australia want the opportunity to speak on this issue. We are two years away from the next State election, which would be the ideal time for a referendum on whether or not we should privatise the management of our water.

At the last election, the Government did not spell out its real agenda: it did not spell out that its real agenda was to sell our State's water. That was simply not part of the Government's manifesto at the last State election. One of the characteristics of this Government is the mechanism of stealth, and through stealth it is selling off the management of our water for 15 years. We in the Opposition believe that it should not be up to the Government to make that decision: it should be for the people to decide. The issue of who owns, manages or runs the most fundamental of our services in this State is clearly not one for an arrogant Government that has been less than honest with the people at the last State election.

It is a matter for the people, and I appeal to the Government to give the people a chance to express their opinion as to whether or not we should privatise the management and operation of our water to a 100 per cent foreign owned company. The issue is a very important one, and it is one in which all South Australians should have the opportunity to participate.

A few polls have been taken, and we all know about some of them. We know that, the other night, Channel 7 did a phone poll: 3 800 people contacted that channel and 92 per cent of them wanted a referendum. Recently on ABC morning radio, 90 per cent of people who phoned in opposed what the Government is doing, giving me, the Leader of the Opposition, and all my colleagues great heart. We know that in excess of 90 per cent of the people support what we are doing.

Let us talk about another poll. It was revealed this week by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government has undertaken its own qualitative market research into whether or not the community likes the idea of privatising the management of our water. The findings of this polling are locked away in the vaults of the Government. It has claimed Cabinet confidentiality under freedom of information on a little bit of market research.

This Government is so sensitive to the negative electoral impact of this issue that it is hiding from the backbenchers, a number of whom I can see now: the member for Hartley, the member for Mitchell, the member for Florey, the member for Reynell and the member for Elder. All those members are being denied access to this research, because it says that there is no more fundamentally important issue impacting in the electorate than the selling off of the management of our State's water. If Government members want to support their Minister and their Cabinet, they can continue to do so. They can write letters to their constituents saying how they support what the Government is doing, but I tell those members that, come the next State election, I wish them every success in trying to explain and defend that issue to the electorate when they go doorknocking in the four weeks leading up to the next State election.

Believe me, the polling that the Premier of this State and the Minister have received is very, very damaging for the Government. Why else would they claim Cabinet confidentiality in terms of our request under freedom of information on what should be a little bit of trivial information? It is because this Government is frightened of that research and it is frightened to allow that research to enter the public domain. More importantly, given the divisions of recent weeks, the Premier does not want to do anything to upset the applecart further, by giving that information to backbenchers such as the member for Reynell, who sits on a 2 per cent margin. That polling shows a 4 per cent to 6 per cent swing away from the Government on the issue of water alone. The member for Reynell and the member for Elder, particularly, have about two years to work through whether or not they have been sold a pup on water. I suspect that they will think that through very quickly, because they have.

I come back to why, at the last State election, the Government failed to include in its election platform that the most important reform it would make in its four years of government would be to award the single largest contract of its type ever in Australia, the largest of its type ever entered into anywhere in the world in calendar year 1995—

The Hon. D.S. Baker: South Australia did it.

Mr FOLEY: Exactly. South Australia has attempted to do it and, in doing so, the Government has privatised, sold off or given away—whatever words you want to use—the management of our water for 15 years. There was no mention of that in your election manifesto or in your policies. Why? The answer is very simple—because you would not risk putting that question to the people of South Australia. You could not and you would not put it to the people at the next election, and you know full well that, had you been open, honest and frank with the people of South Australia, they would have rejected that policy. Many members, such as the member for Reynell and the member for Elder, and perhaps even the member for Mitchell, would not be with us today.

Ms Greig interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I can understand the sensitivity of the member for Reynell. She is sitting on 2 per cent and the policies of the Government are clearly causing her anguish. She has to doorknock down the streets of Hackham, Christies Beach and other parts of her electorate and explain to her electors why she did not tell them before the last State election that she stood for the privatisation of our State's water. You failed to tell the people of South Australia, the people of Reynell, that you stood for the privatisation of the management of our State's water.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): Order!

Mr FOLEY: The people of South Australia want to know—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr FOLEY: Through you, Mr Acting Speaker, the people of Reynell will want to know from their member at the next election why she deceived her electors.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: I can only make this comment: the ALP candidate for Reynell will be knocking on every door down every street—

Ms GREIG: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The member for Hart has accused me of deceiving my electorate. Might he think back to what his Government did to my electorate.

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

Ms GREIG: I want a apology for what he said. He has accused me of deceiving my electorate.

Mr FOLEY: The member for Reynell, at the last State election—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can move a substantive motion or she can speak in the debate. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: The member for Reynell and every other Liberal candidate at the last State election deceived the State of South Australia on the issue of what they would do with our water. The member for Reynell knows very well that she did not spell out to her electors, the good people of the electorate of Reynell, that it would be her Government that would sell off and privatise the management of our State's water. You failed to tell the electors—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr FOLEY: You failed to tell your constituents and, believe me, be it our candidate in the seat of Lee, Elder or most particularly in the seat of Reynell, one of the State's most marginals, we will be knocking on every door, walking down every street, putting out leaflets, putting out adverts and attending public meetings, saying that the members for Reynell, Lee, Mitchell, Elder and Florey all failed to be honest at the last State election and to reveal what was the true agenda of this Government.

Mr ROSSI: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ROSSI: The member for Hart is casting aspersions on my honesty by saying I was misleading the electorate. I was not adviser to the Premier at the time—

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member has the right to speak.

Mr FOLEY: The member for Lee is very sensitive, as he should be. He represents the State's most marginal seat. I can tell you we will launch an absolutely strong campaign in the electorate of Lee to make sure the electors of Lee understand that the member for Lee at the last State election deceived his electorate by not coming clean and being honest and open about this Government's secret agenda. We know what its secret agenda will be for the next election should it win: having done water, at the next election it will be electricity. That will be the agenda for the next term of this Government.

The Government has not released the polling research because it cannot afford to tell the member for Reynell that her margin has evaporated and that she will be only a oncer, as will so many of these members. They can put a lot of that down to the fact that they decided to privatise the management of our State's water. No single issue will be a greater factor in your losing your seats in this Parliament than the privatisation of our State's water. If you want to support that and go along with that, do so at your own risk.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. As I understand the proposition, it is that there be a referendum on the Bill. That proposition says nothing about what has happened or about either side of the case but suggests that there should be a debate on the merits or otherwise of a referendum.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I do believe that the honourable member is linking his remarks to the Bill.

Mr FOLEY: Again it does show the sensitivities of this Government, as point of order after point of order is taken. They cannot bear to sit and listen to my contribution this morning, which is pointing out some home truths. No single issue will send the members for Lee, Reynell and Elder into electoral oblivion more quickly than the decision to privatise the management of our water. If you are too silly to understand that—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr FOLEY: If these members are too silly to understand the devastating electoral impact on their electorates through this policy, I can only say that I am sorry for them. If you have sat back and allowed the Minister and the Premier to make such a decision, to privatise the management of our State's most vital resource, then you deceived your electorate because you did not tell the electorate you were wanting to do this. We strongly urge all members to support the call by the Opposition and the Democrats for a referendum. Give the people a chance to say that you, the member for Reynell, the member for Lee and all other members, denied the people of South Australia a chance to speak at the last State election. At last be honest with them. I now call on this Bill to be read a second time.

Mr BECKER (Peake): I think that is the most pathetic speech I have ever heard in my life.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The Deputy Leader may well say that I say that every time, but let me remind the Deputy Leader that, leading up to and during the 1989 election, and ever since, we have made no secret of the fact that we believe in and support privatisation, and that we believe in the outsourcing of government wherever possible. It was well known to the people of South Australia that we had a horrendous job to do, a horrendous task—to clean up the financial mess that we inherited.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Newland says, the Labor Party had set up the mechanism for the privatisation, and not the outsourcing, of the Modbury Hospital. This motion calls for a referendum on the Bill. Not once in the past 15 minutes did the previous speaker address the issue at all. In all the questions, in all the headline hunting that has been going on for the past two or three weeks, nobody has really got down to what it is all about. The Government has the right to outsource if it wants to. The Government has the right to privatise. The Government has the right to do what it wants to do and, if it is the policy of the Government, or if it is the desire of the Government, it can do it. I have had to sit here for 25 years listening to the Labor Party tell us what to do, but what the Labor Party cannot realise is that it is now in Opposition. It does not run the State, and it will be a bloody long time before it gets the chance again. I hope it is never in my life time.

The most important aspect of government in a democracy is that the Government that has been given the challenge by the people to right the wrongs of the financial mess of a previous Government have the opportunity to do it without the hindrance, the sabotage and the mischief-making that we have witnessed in the last few months in this State. Every time the Government puts up a proposition for the benefit of the people, we hear the whining, whingeing and knocking as we did back in 1979 to 1982. In any other country in the world, people who would sabotage the operations of the Government would be severely dealt with. We are lucky that we live in a democracy and that we put up with the opportunity for debate and to discuss the issues.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Newland says, a responsible and informed debate. The whole problem is that there is so much whistling in the dark and so much plucking out information that is mischievously fed by other organisations and individuals around the world in an effort to discredit the tenderers and contractors. What right do we have to go to the people and to spend approximately $750 000? Just think of the cost of a referendum to try to resolve this issue, if it is resolvable. The shop trading hours debate in the 1970s and the 1980s—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: —involved arguments, debate and a referendum. Why should we spend $750 000 to get an opinion from the people, who have already been mischievously misinformed by those who can see some clandestine move by the Government. There is no need for a referendum. The contract will be signed. Hopefully, when it is signed, the parts of the contract that can be released publicly will be so released.

Mr Foley: The whole facts should be released.

Mr BECKER: The member for Hart says the whole thing should be released. That would be the ultimate. Had the Labor Party practised that in the past, I would agree, but we did not find out the details of the Grand Prix contract. We did not find out the details—as the member for Reynell knows—about Marineland. That cost us $10.5 million. I hate to think how much it will cost us in the future, because the member for Hart was one of the responsible people behind the clandestine deals leading to the bankruptcy of the people who acquired Marineland. It was the most disgraceful and shocking episode in the history of this State.

That was the lead-up to the 1989 election. In that lead-up, the Minister for Infrastructure, who is now in charge of this legislation, led the Liberal Party, and he was never ashamed to inform the people where he stood on privatisation or outsourcing. He is the very man who led this Party to obtaining 52 per cent of the vote without winning the majority of seats. What a disgraceful set-up that was.

Mrs Kotz: The gerrymander.

Mr BECKER: Poor old Playford was accused of having a gerrymander, but he was an amateur compared with what the Labor Party did in this State. All throughout the Commonwealth, wherever there is a Socialist Labor Party, they have the same system. Even in Malta, for years the Conservative Party kept getting 52 per cent of the vote but it could not govern because of the gerrymander. It was a world-wide conspiracy in terms of controlling electorates and the will of the people. Who would want a referendum? Who can justify spending $700 000-odd for a referendum? What is Parliament here for? Why have we been elected to make the decisions?

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BECKER: It was well known where we stood on privatisation. Our policy on outsourcing and our economic policy were well known. It was also well known that we, in our economic policy, were going to cure the ills of the financial situation that had been created in South Australia. It is time the Labor Party and the trade union movement realised that they no longer control and dictate the will of the people in this State. It is time they realised that no longer can they go out there and set up little clandestine groups to sabotage the operations of this Government. The people of South Australia have had enough. They want governments to make decisions—decisions that will, in the long term, benefit them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart has had his opportunity. I draw his attention to standing 142, which provides that no noise or interruption will be allowed in debate. The member for Peake has the call. This is the last day of sitting for some weeks. I warn the member for Hart for the first time, and I suggest that he contain himself. He will have the opportunity to respond when he winds up the second reading debate.

Mr BECKER: We have already heard about the fear and loathing campaign and how the Opposition proposed to charge $500 for people to meet their shadow Ministers and representatives of the Australian Labor Party. In a democratic society, as the member for Newland reminds me once again, how could we have a free and democratic referendum on this issue? This issue has been bubbling away under the surface for some weeks now because of Opposition members' lack of understanding and knowledge of Government and because they fail to realise that they are in Opposition. They are not running the Government. They do not have the numbers.

The challenge has been given to my Party to solve the problems and to provide leadership. Once the contract is signed and put in place, with the benefits that will come from that, the people of South Australia will then judge whether they made the right or the wrong decision, according to how the contract and the tenders are executed. It does not matter whether it belongs to a British or French company or to an organisation in some other country. Thank goodness we have racial vilification legislation coming in, because the Leader of the Opposition (who does not call himself the Leader of the Opposition; he calls himself the Leader of the Labor Party) has circulated a letter throughout the electorate slamming and criticising a French company.

He asks: why should we deal with a French company? If that is not discrimination, and if it does not come under the racial vilification legislation, I will be surprised. It is a disgraceful statement. The French and British have expertise in all areas. It is all well and good to be under parliamentary privilege and to slander the management of those companies. Nobody knows what those consortia are capable of doing, what they will do and what will be contained in the clauses of the contracts we are about to set up. South Australia is well known for leading the nation in many ways, and it is innovative. South Australians do it better, can do it better, will manage it better and will bring the benefits to the taxpayers they rightly deserve.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I rise to support the motion. It is not a motion I would normally support, but I do so for a couple of very important reasons—not only for the reason that the member for Hart gave earlier, namely, that this Government made absolutely no mention of this in its policies before the last State election. It claims it has a mandate to do this to our State—to sell off the operation of our water supply. Let us have no doubt about what it really means. Anyone who thinks that we can go and regain control of our water supply in years to come after the term of this contract is really naive in the extreme. We are talking about a long-term contract, and we are talking about a situation that cannot be reversed.

However, I support the motion not only because this Government made no mention of this matter before the last State election, or because we have now been told by this Government that the contract about to be signed is not all as it seems, but because, if this Government is not going to put this contract before parliamentary scrutiny, then it must be scrutinised by the public of South Australia. That is why I support this referendum.

Let us be in no doubt about the fact that this is the single hottest issue that has faced us since the change of Government two years ago. Everyone in this Chamber knows that that is the case and is aware of the polling that shows at least a 4 to 6 per cent drop in the Liberal vote just on this issue. How many of the Liberal backbenchers will that knock out? The member for Reynell is sensitive on this issue, because she knows she has gone. The member for Elder is similarly sensitive, and the member for Florey cannot sit back and relax either, because this is a very hot issue in his electorate.

Mr Bass: All I've got to worry about is you, Madam, and I've got no worries at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has to worry about Standing Order 142.

Ms WHITE: What is really making these Liberal backbenchers sensitive is the fact that this has come about by the hand of their single best parliamentary performer in this House, the Minister for Infrastructure, the Minister they had looked up to. What do they find now? They find that he does not have a handle on what is happening. The Premier and the Minister for Infrastructure do not have a hold on what has been happening with this contract; it is out of control, yet they will have a 1 January start. They are in a rush to sign this contract—this contract which has got out of control. They realise now that they cannot make the savings they predicted. Every Liberal backbencher in this House knows that. If they do not know it and are sitting back listening to their front bench colleagues saying to them, 'This is Cabinet confidentiality; you can't ask questions on that', I can tell the members concerned that their constituents want them to ask questions about it. If they are not asking questions, they are not doing their job. At the next State election, even those who have not already gone from the Liberal backbench—and we know there are quite a number of them: everyone here is aware of the polling, which shows us that—

Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:

Ms WHITE: The member for Kaurna interjects. She is very sensitive on this, because she knows that she also will be gone, because of a contract that will be signed, in a rush, without scrutiny. The Liberal backbenchers do not have a clue what is in it. They just have to sell it to their electorates, after it is done. Make no bones about this: this is the single most important issue in members' electorates at this time, and it will be the most important issue at the next State election. The verdict of the people in your electorates—and the polling has been done and members know it—

Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:

Ms WHITE: The member for Kaurna certainly does. A number of you have already gone. Your only hope is to stand up and start thinking about the interests of your electors and to vote for this motion for a referendum. If Liberal backbenchers do not, how can they go back to their electors and say, 'I stood up in Parliament and I said that you didn't deserve a say in this'? Because that is what they have to do: Liberal backbenchers have to go out in time for the next State election and say, 'I voted that you don't get a say in this.' That is the bottom line. It is their choice.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): This is certainly an interesting Bill, and I also find the debate rather interesting. It does not seem to have a great deal to do with the actual motion, but I am quite happy to keep my remarks around the same areas on which most of the other speakers have already spoken.

Ms White: As the senior Liberal woman parliamentarian?

Mrs KOTZ: Yes, if you like; I am glad you recognise that. The member for Taylor recently stood in this House and attempted to tell the Liberal backbenchers what their futures may be. Well do I remember, prior to the last election (and, in fact, the election before that), the then Government standing in this House and doing exactly the same thing. The members seemed to take delight in calling the members on the other side of the House 'oncers'. Unfortunately, when it came to that last election, what did we have? We had 37 people on this side of the House and very few on the other side. So, as far as the 'oncers' were concerned, we on this side took a great deal of delight in seeing some of those who called us 'oncers' no longer in this House.

The member for Elizabeth was the candidate for the Labor Party who stood against me in my electorate at the previous State election, and I do not know whether I need to thank her, but the outcome of that election was that in my electorate I

took the greatest swing against the Labor Party in the whole of the State. I do not know whether any of that is due to the Labor candidate who actually stood for that seat. I have one major disappointment in the fact that the member for Elizabeth did eventually get into this House.

It is quite obvious that in the public arena there is quite a perception that politicians seem to be liars. That is an unparliamentary term, but I say it in the general sense, because people in this State believe that all politicians are liars. Unfortunately, the member for Elizabeth seems to have the same idea. In fact, she came into this Parliament with the same idea and has continued to prove that point ever since she has been here, which is unfortunate.

Ms STEVENS: On a point of order, I believe the member for Newland is calling me a liar. I ask her to withdraw that comment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must cite the words used by the member for Newland to which she makes objection. I was listening very carefully to the member for Newland, because I am aware of the Standing Orders, and the honourable member made no direct statement as I recall it, that the member for Elizabeth was a liar. She used other terms fairly skilfully, and therefore I am of the view—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister will resume his seat while the Chair is addressing the House, or he may get an early minute. The honourable member for Newland was running particularly close to the wind in relation to imputing improper motives, and I suggest to the member for Newland that she bear that in mind, because it is contrary to Standing Orders to impute an improper motive to any other member.

Mrs KOTZ: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I certainly adhere to your direction.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has no alternative.

Mrs KOTZ: Of course, Sir, and I certainly would not imply otherwise. Members of the Labor Opposition have continually been extremely sensitive about the word 'privatisation'. The Liberal Government has not privatised anything in this State: it has outsourced management; it has contracted out management of areas. I can understand why Opposition members are extremely sensitive about the word 'privatisation', considering that when they were in power they set in place the mechanisms by which the Modbury Hospital was going to be privatised. In fact, a year out from the 1993 election all those plans to privatise Modbury Hospital were made by the Labor Government at that time.

I hope the member for Elizabeth listens to this and takes it under consideration, because she only has to go to the papers of the day to find the advertisements calling for tenders that were put out by the Labor Government at the time. There is no walking away from that fact. So, when Labor Opposition members in this place talk about their sensitivity on privatisation, they are being purely hypocritical, because they themselves started to put into place the mechanisms for the privatisation of Modbury Hospital. The people of the catchment area for patients of Modbury Hospital are now in somewhat of a dilemma because, thanks to the member for Elizabeth (in her latest responsibilities) and others like her in the Labor Party, quite a number of people in the area believe that Modbury Hospital is indeed private when, in fact, it is a public hospital that is running exceptionally well. And we do not need a referendum—

Mr De LAINE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule on relevance.

The SPEAKER: If the Chair were to adopt that strict interpretation of Standing Orders, the member for Hart would not have been able to complete his speech; therefore I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Newland.

Mrs KOTZ: Many of the speakers on the other side have talked about a mandate that they appear to believe this Government did not have to do the things that the Liberal Government believes are good and necessary for this State. We did indeed have a mandate. We had a mandate to pick up the bankrupt accounts of this State, amounting to nearly $9 billion. This is something that the Labor members in this place would like to forget, but the rest of us cannot forget it, because anyone acting in a responsible manner, anyone who looks to ensuring accountability for this State and for the people of this State, needs to take into consideration that the extent of the debt left to this State was so massive that it was going to take greater minds and greater vision than anyone that I have ever seen in the Labor Opposition.

Here was a group of people who, for 10 years, put money into dark, deep holes that disappeared never for us to see again: $900 million in interest paying off a debt that could be used for the health system, for the education system and for the policing of this State. All that is serving no purpose other than to pay off a debt of interest. If there is any response to the 10 years, it is the fact that, of all the people who sat on the Government side in the Labor Party at that time, not one member had the vision, not one had any business sense, that could turn this State around to the degree that the Liberal Government and its visions will achieve. The mismanagement we saw over those 10 years will never be forgotten. I notice a lot of quietness on the other side.

Ms Stevens: I am making notes.

Mrs KOTZ: I am pleased to hear it. I hope the honourable member is taking down notes about the privatisation with which the Labor Party was involved. I hope she is taking into account that the Federal Labor Government is also promoting privatisation, that the competitive policies put out through the Hilmer report must be followed. I would like to hear a conversation between the Leader of the Opposition and any of his Federal colleagues when it comes to talking about competitive tendering and competitive business regarding the Hilmer report in this State. What hypocrites! What do members opposite say when they talk to their Federal colleagues?

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I have been sitting here listening to the members for Newland and Peake, and I am very interested in addressing a number of the points they raised. I will also refer to one or two comments from the members for Hart and Taylor. The first issue is that of honesty. This Government is a little bit short on that. What did people know about the Government's plans to privatise water, to outsource to EDS and to privatise our hospitals?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS: We knew nothing. You will pay the price, but you know that already. You will see that the people of South Australia are concerned about the privatisation of water—

Mr BASS: On a point of order, Sir, the word 'you' is not supposed to be used in this place.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is correct. I suggest to the member for Elizabeth that she address her remarks through the Chair and, when referring to other members, use the term 'other members' or refer to them by their district.

Ms STEVENS: I move on to the issue of accountability, because one thing that has been so consistent in the Government's privatisation program is the fact that there has been little accountability—things have been done in secret and behind closed doors. In his contribution, the member for Peake said how difficult it would be to hold a referendum given all the misinformation that has been generated about the contract. If the Government had been up front and had told the truth for a change, perhaps we would not have this level of misinformation. We know that over the past three weeks in this Parliament every day it has been a constant process of dragging out information from the Government, trying to get the true picture of what is going on in this contract.

This is not the only contract in which this has happened: it happened with Modbury Hospital, and it is happening with EDS. When we talk about misinformation and the concern of members opposite that the community is confused, let us lay the blame for that at the feet of those who run this show and whose responsibility it is to do it in a proper fashion: it is the Government's responsibility.

I turn now to the comment, 'You do not know anything about this because you do not know about business'. This was mentioned about five times by the member for Newland, and I think also by the member for Peake. Let us think about that. Running a Government is not like running a business.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will have the right to respond in due course if they lodge their name with the Chair.

Ms STEVENS: The Government needs to understand that governing a community is not the same as running a business. When I look across to the other side, I see members who have not really run any sort of business—they have run only small businesses. That is all that members on the other side have had any experience with. Running a Government is different from running a business. When you run a Government, you have to look at the whole picture. Business has a role to play and we have things to learn from it, but governments are bigger than business. Business is part of government—it is not all of government

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call members to order. Some of the wails from my right sound as though members are being tortured rather than interjecting.

Ms STEVENS: They are being tortured because they do not like to hear the truth. People need to understand that, when you are in government, you need to bear in mind that, sure, business is important but so is the public sector, as is the non-profit sector in our community. Governance is the ability to work across those different areas. Members opposite like to point to the State Bank and say to us, 'Your Government failed'. Let us look at the State Bank.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth will stop referring to people as 'you' as it is antagonistic. I ask the honourable member to speak through the Chair.

Ms STEVENS: Let us learn from those issues. The State Bank failed due to people in business forgetting their responsibilities in terms of the wider issues. Let us learn from the past. Do not let us say, as members opposite are saying, 'Forget it all'. Members opposite should not simply roll back and say, 'We know everything, because we have been in business; run the State as a business.'

The member for Peake said that to spend $700 000 on a referendum would be a waste of money. The referendum would be on the issue that people in this State have acknowledged as the single most important issue. The member for Peake says that $700 000 is a waste of money, yet this Government has spent $2 million already on a royal commission into the beliefs of Aboriginal women—a royal commission that we know cannot have any significant result. If ever there was a waste of money, if ever a royal commission or inquiry was set up where money was wasted, that is it. In this case we are looking at the privatisation of our water, so it would be $700 000 very well spent.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, I ask you to rule on the fact that the honourable member is referring to something that is before the royal commission. The royal commission has the status of a court, and it is customary in this place that such matters not be referred to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has no point of order.

Ms STEVENS: I refer to the points raised by the member for Newland in relation to the privatisation of Modbury Hospital. As usual, the member for Newland has a very superficial understanding of the issues before us. This is a case in point. Before the Government changed, the previous State Labor Government had plans for the future of Modbury Hospital, which included the collocation of a private hospital on the grounds of Modbury Hospital.

Mr Rossi interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee.

Ms STEVENS: It did the same thing at Gawler and Flinders, but unfortunately the member for Newland, who is a little slow and unable to comprehend the complexities of these matters, has failed to understand—

Mr Foley: Runs a good motel!

Ms STEVENS: Runs a good motel, but it stops at that point. She has failed to realise that the critical point is the management of the hospital. There is no way that the management of Modbury Hospital or any other public hospital was in any way planned by our Government to be given to private management or handed over to companies like Healthscope and others. I suggest that you get your facts right—it is usually a good way to go.

Debate adjourned.

GRAND PRIX

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Greig:

That this House congratulates the Adelaide Grand Prix Board, organisers and officials, the Adelaide traders, CAMS, the taxi drivers, volunteers and residents for their efforts in making the EDS 1995 Australian Formula 1 Grand Prix the grand finale event that will be remembered throughout motor racing history

(Continued from 23 November. Page 715.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I seek to amend the motion. I move:

Leave out all words after 'officials' in the second line and insert—'racing drivers, the South Australian business community including Adelaide traders, workers and their trade unions, CAMS, taxi drivers, volunteers and residents for their efforts in making the EDS 1995 Australian Formula 1 Grand Prix the grand finale event that will be remembered throughout motor racing history; and also

recognises the efforts by the former Premier (Hon. John Bannon) for his achievement in securing the 11 Grands Prix for Adelaide and for making them the best events of their type in the world.

I support the main thrust of the member for Reynell's motion, but the honourable member left out two very important groups without whose involvement there would have been no Grand Prix at all. I refer to the workers and the unions who were responsible year after year for the provision, installation and dismantling of all the infrastructure to do with this great event. Each year, everyone could see the amount of work that was involved in this massive task. These people did that job, yet the honourable member gives them no credit. The other group that I wish to include in this amendment is the racing drivers themselves; without their participation there would have been no event, either. These are the people who put on the spectacle and took all the risks with their lives and bodies, and they too should be mentioned in the motion.

I refer later in the amendment to the contribution by the former Premier, the Hon. John Bannon. It was through that Premier's hard work and credibility at the time that we won the Grand Prix series for Adelaide for the 10 or so years that it was run. I well remember the environmental impact statement that was undertaken by the Premier at the time, and I marvelled at the details that the EIS looked at in the running of the inaugural Grand Prix. I remember distinctly matters as detailed as the effect it would have on the bird population of the parklands in relation to feeding habits, breeding cycles and so on. It also considered access for the residents while the infrastructure was in place and on the days of the events.

Access for ambulances, fire brigades and emergency vehicles was also taken into account in an enormous amount of detail, and every contingency was covered. It was a magnificent document, and in my view it will go down in history as one of the most thorough documents of its kind ever written. The magnificent organisation of the events and the facilities, which were universally acclaimed as being world's best, continued for 11 years. That magnificent effort and the fact that the event was won by the Premier of the time should be noted and recognised in the motion.

A lot has been said by the Government, especially in recent times, about the loss of the Grand Prix, and most of those comments have been absolute rubbish. The main reason the event was lost to Adelaide was the constant criticism and knocking year after year by members of the Government, who were then in Opposition. When the change of Government was imminent, Bernie Ecclestone was so concerned about the future of the Grand Prix because of this knocking and probable lack of support for the event that he pulled the plug on it. I believe that that is the main reason why Adelaide lost the Grand Prix. He made the comment that, as long as John Bannon was Premier, Adelaide would retain the Grand Prix for as long as it wanted it. The Liberals also criticised the then Government—

Mr BASS: I rise on a point of order, Sir: I understand that the mover of the motion should be speaking to his amendment and not giving an overview of what happened in the Grand Prix.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is including the general debate; there is no point of order.

Mr De LAINE: They criticised the then Government, the Grand Prix itself and even Dr Hemmerling. When the Brown Liberal Government came into office, there was an amazing about-face—180 degrees—and suddenly the Grand Prix was the best thing since sliced bread. It took those members nine years to wake up to that fact.

Another criticism they levelled at it was the losses it incurred. I agree that some losses in most of the Grands Prix were involved in setting up and dismantling the whole infrastructure each year, but they pale into insignificance in the overall result to the State's economy—in the massive bonus that it proved to be over the years. The amount of money that came into South Australia from interstate and overseas into hotels, motels and providers of food and accommodation was probably immeasurable. If it was calculable, the overall figure over the 11 years would be an enormous boost to the economy of South Australia in terms of tourism, trade and so on. It also put South Australia and Adelaide on the world map as far as a lot of other things go. A lot of spin-off came from a whole variety of interstate and overseas interests because of Adelaide's being the focus each year as the venue for the Grand Prix. I have said what I want to say in moving this amendment. I ask members to support it, to put the situation into context and give credit to the people who deserve to be credited with the running and the success of the Grand Prix over the past 11 years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Peake, in response to the point of order raised by the member for Florey I remind members that the whole motion and the amendment are under consideration. We are not specifically dealing with the amendment.

Mr BECKER (Peake): I oppose the amendment and support the motion before the Chair. The amendment of the member for Price seeks to include other persons in the motion, such as workers and their trade unions. I have no objection to including the workers who were responsible for putting up and taking down the infrastructure and staging the event. He goes on to amend the motion to recognise 'the efforts by the former Premier (Hon. John Bannon) for his achievement in securing the 11 Grands Prix for Adelaide and for making them the best events of their type in the world'. I have a tremendous amount of respect for the member for Price and am a little disappointed that he has moved this amendment, which now politicises the intent of the mover to congratulate those who worked so hard to make the final Grand Prix the best ever. But, by his suggesting the amendment, the motion has been politicised.

The reason I asked the Public Accounts Committee to look into the cost, staging and construction of the Grand Prix is that it was a closed shop. The unions screwed the Grand Prix for every cent they could get. It is a well known fact that, if the unions had kept their grubby, sticky little fingers out of it, we would have been a hell of a lot better off financially. I have nothing but condemnation for the unions' involvement in the Grand Prix. The children selling ice-creams, those people selling the pies and those doing all the menial tasks in catering all had to be a member of a union and all had to contribute to a particular union so much a day out of their earnings. If that is democracy, I do not know why we have a United Nations, because it is against the United Nation's charter to force unionism on anyone, let alone young people.

Hundreds of volunteers from the various service clubs gave up their time to work at the Grand Prix, and the money they were paid was donated through their service clubs to local charities. Many service club members were the attendants who showed people to their seats and helped to supervise, and all that money was donated to charity. But the unions had to get their little hands in it. It was a shame. The Labor Party has never learnt that, if it is going to bid for

major events, it must keep the unions out of it, because it has cost us dearly.

The amendment mentions John Bannon, and I give credit to John Bannon because he did what he was asked. Kym Bonython set up the opportunity for us to bid for the Grand Prix and, if members know anything about bidding for major sporting events, they would know that you do not secure a major event like this overnight. Thanks to the Labor Party and Kym Mayes, I had two years' wonderful experience in bidding for the Commonwealth Games and I learnt a lot, and I hope that knowledge will never be lost to the State, although it is not being used at the moment. It took years of planning and years of work and, when it came to the final crunch, the Premier had to go posthaste and meet face to face and discuss the contract with the main person. Bannon did it well, so full credit to John Bannon for doing that. He secured something for South Australia that we are very grateful for.

However, we never saw that contract. It is all very well for the Labor Party to slam the current Government about the water contract or any other contract, because we never saw that Grand Prix contract. Had we seen that contract we would have known jolly well that it was never tied up, that it was never secured, and that it was never finalised.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What happened to Christian charity?

Mr BECKER: There is no Christian charity when it boils down to these sorts of issues. Had we seen that contract, I am quite sure that my friends and supporters in motor sport would have said, 'This is not tied up. Don't trust this guy.' I say unashamedly that I am one of the greatest petrolheads in this Parliament. I enjoy motor sport and I will do anything for the benefit of motor sport in this State, whether it be motor cars, motor bikes or any other type of petrol-driven sport. This contract was not secured in the way it should have been.

To turn around and congratulate John Bannon for securing the 11 Grands Prix and making them the best ever is not true and it is not acceptable, because John Bannon had nothing to do with the last two Grands Prix. There was a change of Government and the Liberal Government changed the emphasis of the race, and it picked up some of the tab. I give full credit to the marketing people in Tourism South Australia, some of whom are not known to be Liberal supporters, who came up with Sensational Adelaide, and anyone who saw the race or who has seen a video of it knows full well that the words 'Sensational Adelaide' were flashed across everywhere and anywhere, be it photos, videos or films. It will always be remembered as the Adelaide Grand Prix, and it was well done.

The member for Reynell's motion picks up those who deserve support. For the Grand Prix to be a success, all we had to do was have a good coordinator, because we did not need 28 staff, but I will not go into any criticism of the running of it. Ecclestone told the board that, if they had any problems with the Government or the Parliament, that was its worry, and that was true. It had nothing to do Ecclestone. He was not worried about it. The Williams team was not worried about it. The tobacco companies were not worried about it. They were all worried about having a good event, a well-staged event and enjoying good old fashioned South Australian hospitality. It was up to the board and Hemmerling to deal with the Government and with the questions. As everybody knows, there is accountability in our parliamentary system in this country and, if anyone is frightened of it, they should not get involved in any way with any Government, because, as long as I am here and the many other members who will follow me, be they Liberal, Labor or others, there will always be questioning and probing about where our taxes are being spent.

I want to pay tribute to one group of people, because I am involved with them as the President of the Adelaide Motor Cycle Division of St John Ambulance. They provided 725 professionally trained St John volunteers for six days—that included two days apart from the main event—to assist with first aid and all other emergency first aid support and whenever they were required. These people came from Whyalla, Mount Gambier, the South-East, the Riverland and the Mid North. On race day, and the other days, there were enough volunteers to speak 13 different languages. What voluntary organisation in the world, let alone in Australia, can come up with first aiders who can handle 13 different languages and provide service and facilities to the crowd, who came from overseas and mainly from interstate. We have to thank the New South Wales and Victorian people for supporting that Grand Prix, as they have on every occasion and, again, their support was extremely generous.

The St John people treated 1 290 persons at the track during those four days this year. That was a record number because there were record attendances. In 1994, 693 people were treated. It is unfortunate that people require assistance because of health reasons and because of minor accidents and problems that can occur in any crowd, anywhere, at any time, but we do owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the 725 people who gave up six days of their time and who worked up to 14 hours a day to provide assistance, indeed, for just being there to help out in case somebody needed first aid. I dips me lid to all those who were involved in the success of the Grand Prix but, particularly, I pay a great tribute to all those St John Ambulance volunteers. As they do at every other major sporting event in this State, they made it possible for us to go along in the knowledge that, if anything happened, if an emergency occurred, the facilities and the trained people were there to assist in case of need. I believe that we owe them a tremendous debt of gratitude. I support the motion.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I will not detain the House for long on this matter, save to support my colleague the member for Peake, who put many points most succinctly. I, too, have the greatest respect for the honourable member who moved this amendment and I am surprised that he sought to move an amendment of this nature in the House. The member for Peake put it quite well and very pertinently that, if we were to include any individual in this motion, which I think is inappropriate, it should be Kym Bonython. It was Kym Bonython's idea, it was he who pursued it and it was he who got it off the ground with the Premier's support. But, after all, the Premier of this State is our elected first officer. Kym Bonython is a private citizen who has long been interested in motor sport, whose idea it was and who did a lot of footwork and, if we are to include anyone, let us include Kym Bonython.

As for the unions, why do we stop at the unions? Why do we not thank Uncle Tom Cobbleigh and everybody who was associated with the event. What about the birds who had their breeding cycles interfered with, as the honourable member said? The amendment goes too far. The member for Reynell is to be commended for the motion because it puts it succinct-

ly. The member for Price raises the issue that members on this side of the House criticised the race, and it has always been implied that somehow members on this side of the House helped to lose the Grand Prix. I was on the Economic and Finance Committee at the time and I believe that you were, too, Sir, and, if it is wrong for the Economic and Finance Committee of this Parliament to question the proper use of public moneys, let the Labor Opposition stand up and say so, because that is all that was done.

I am sick and tired of the fact that, because particularly the member for Peake and I, and perhaps even you, Sir, to a lesser degree, were checking the financials, that was always touted as a criticism of the Grand Prix. Had Bernie Ecclestone come to this State on any single occasion and found, by Opposition interference as it was then or Government interference as it is now, that the Grand Prix was diminished because we did not support the Grand Prix, he would have had a much better case. But for Bernie Ecclestone or any other person to involve themselves in the domestic politics of this State, apparently to wish to meddle in the affairs of this Parliament and to imply that somehow it is not right for the member for Peake or anyone else to question the application of public moneys I think is scandalous.

Let me just say in conclusion to the member for Price, whom I deeply respect, that one of the reasons why I will not support in this instance on this matter any accolade for the former Premier—and I acknowledge publicly in this House there are many things for which he does deserve credit, but I do not believe this is one of them—is the comment of Mr Ecclestone: 'So long as John Bannon is the Premier of South Australia, it will keep the Grand Prix.' That disappoints me greatly. It is a matter of public record. It is also a matter of fact that there are one million voters in South Australia who determine who shall be the Premier of South Australia at any given time. Mr Ecclestone, as far as I know, is not a registered voter in this State and, if he were, he would have one vote, as everyone has. If anybody thinks that Mr Ecclestone should somehow determine the Premiership of this State because his Grand Prix is so important that we must keep the Premier to keep the Grand Prix, I am disappointed, but that is Mr Ecclestone's business.

I do not believe that the Hon. John Bannon was without probity or integrity. What disappoints me more is that a relationship was allowed to develop which became personal. The retention of the Grand Prix in this State, by Ecclestone's own words, depended on John Bannon. That is disappointing. I am quite sure that John Bannon, as a committed South Australian, as a dedicated Leader of this State, would have wished to leave the Grand Prix as one of his legacies. That he did not do it is most disappointing, and I think he would view it as one of his failures.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am not therefore inclined to support a motion which, as the member for Peake points out, is inaccurate in that it congratulates the previous Premier for 11 Grands Prix when he was associated with only nine. I am further not inclined to support it because of the special personal relationship that developed between the two supremos; that was a catalyst by which we lost the Grand Prix. That is disappointing but it is a matter of fact. We cannot condemn John Bannon for it, but we certainly cannot praise him for it either. Therefore, with reluctance, I oppose this amendment and support the very good words of my colleague the member for Peake and the excellent motion of my colleague the member for Reynell.

Mr BASS (Florey): I also support the motion but disagree with the amendment. My colleagues have clearly stated the reason why we object to the amendment. It clearly states in the motion moved by the member for Reynell that she is dealing with the finale Grand Prix in Adelaide. To alter that motion I believe would be wrong. In relation to supporting the motion, I have had some experience with large motor sports organisations, having had the privilege to referee the world speedway final in Wembley Stadium in 1981 and also the world best pairs final at the Ulevi Stadium in Gothenburg, Sweden.

Mr Becker: What a tough referee he was.

Mr BASS: I was. The organisation of these world championship events was a different scenario from the Adelaide Grand Prix: the venue was firmly established and in place. When the world final involving 20 motor cycle competitors at Wembley Stadium is held, the track is on the outside of the soccer pitch with seating for all the officials and spectators. It really does not come into the same category as an event such as the 1995 Adelaide Grand Prix.

I was also involved as an official at the world best pairs championship at the Liverpool speedway in Sydney where, again, the organisation was excellent. However, the track was already in place, so it was only a matter of organising 14 riders and their bikes to come over from Europe to join the two riders from Australia and we had a world championship event. To do what we have done with the Adelaide Grand Prix is exceptional.

The Mika Hakkinen incident really brought South Australia's organisational abilities to the fore. I can understand exactly how Mika Hakkinen feels today because, thanks to the skill of people involved in speedway in South Australia, I stand here today: if it were not for the skill of the St John Ambulance people, I would be dead. The Opposition might well say it is a pity, but on 17 December 1972, in a motor cycle accident in Whyalla, I stopped breathing after receiving a closed head injury. Again the St John Ambulance people were very quickly on the scene, revived me and took me to the Whyalla Hospital. I was unconscious for 28 days in the Royal Adelaide Hospital but, due to the excellent treatment that I received at the time of the accident, I eventually recovered to be able to go on with my life. I know exactly how lucky Mika Hakkinen is.

With respect to the way Formula One cars are constructed, it really is amazing the way the South Australian trained officials actually performed. When they build a Formula One car, for safety reasons, they build a monocoque. It really is like a coffin. It is rectangular in shape, designed for the driver to slide into it. In fact, it is built around the driver. The chassis is built around the driver so that, if there is an accident, the strongest part of the car is the monocoque. It is built in such a way that the driver cannot move when there is a big accident. We saw that Nigel Mansell made a come back last year but could not fit into his car, obviously because it was built for a racing driver who was slimmer and shorter than Nigel Mansell. So, to be able to remove a driver from the monocoque of a wrecked car is no mean feat. To do it with such speed so that the medical people could treat him was really an amazing feat. I do not think that people realise how good the team was that attended the accident. I have no doubt that the other teams around the track had been similarly trained and were competent enough to do that, irrespective of where an accident happened.

The television pictures of the accident showed exactly how well the St John people were trained. As anyone knows

who has had experience with people involved in accidents, the first thing you must do is to make the person safe so they can breathe and not cause any further damage. When the accident was shown on the television, we saw that the first official on the scene bent down, took Mika Hakkinen's helmet, lifted it very gently so his airways were clear, then held it and did nothing more until the crash crew that were trained in removing him from the monocoque arrived.

The team's performance in taking Mika Hakkinen out of the car was exceptional. The medical team's performance is really something that we in South Australia have come to expect from those people. It was a first-class effort, especially when one considers the situation in which they were working. They actually performed an operation at the side of the track, because of the driver's breathing difficulties. It is good for the people of South Australia to know that the techniques used in the treatment of that accident are available in any hospital in South Australia, because the medical people have that ability and are able to perform miracles for people who are injured.

The name Kym Bonython was mentioned by my colleagues the members for Peake and Unley. I, too, would like to express my admiration for Kym Bonython. He ran Roly Park Speedway during the first five years of my career racing motorcycles, and Kym really is an extraordinary man. Not only did he have a vision for the speedway but also he was—and still is—a great lover of jazz. He was one of the first promoters to bring jazz musicians to South Australia so that we could share his love of that type of music, and he has also been involved in operating art galleries, exhibiting paintings, etc. Kym Bonython, as I have said, is an exceptional sort of person. It was his vision that caused him to urge the then Labor Government to consider having a Grand Prix event in Adelaide, and he really has to take the credit for having that idea originally. I congratulate Kym Bonython.

As I said, I support the motion. I do not support the amendment, as the trade union workers were paid to do the job. If the member for Price wishes to introduce a motion to cover all the Grand Prix operation, it would be appropriate for him to do that. However, he should not spoil the member for Reynell's motion, which concentrates solely on the 1995 EDS Australia Formula One Grand Prix as the grand finale of the event in Adelaide.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise principally in support of the member for Price's amendment. I extend as much praise and congratulation as the member for Reynell has extended to those involved with the Grand Prix. As the member for Price has said, it is most appropriate that the workers and their trade unions be recognised for their running of the Grand Prix. In any other State of this country, over an 11 year period there would be every likelihood of some industrial disputation that would put at risk the running of the Grand Prix. Fortunately, because of the cooperative role of the trade union movement and the work forces, there has been no threat to the Grand Prix at any stage.

Indeed, when I was on the Trades and Labor Council Executive, I recall a situation involving South Africa's apartheid policies. There was a Grand Prix in South Africa, and various vehicles were being moved from South Africa to Adelaide. However, there was some danger that those vehicles would be banned or fuel deliveries stopped in protest against the apartheid regimes of South Africa. Fortunately for everyone concerned, the trade union movement, the workers, the Government and the Grand Prix board of the day were able to work through that issue, whereby each side could claim a victory on that matter, without there being any disruption whatsoever to the running of the race. That also enhanced our reputation in South Australia for very good and sound industrial relations policies.

That record has continued throughout the period of the Grand Prix. I find it sad—and churlish on the part of this Government—that, when this Government came into office, one of its first acts was to drop as a Grand Prix board representative a person nominated by the Trades and Labor Council who was eligible to be on that board, the UTLC having had the right to nominate a person to be on that board. Over the years, it has been in the main Barry Schultz, who is now the President of the United Trades and Labor Council and the Branch Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union. That union had many members working on the site, not only on the construction side but also in the delivery of many of the services provided to the hundreds of thousands of spectators.

Noel Stait, an assistant secretary of that same union, was the UTLC's most recent nominee to that board. He had his term cut short by the Minister for no reason other than that he was a trade union representative. There was no reason whatsoever for that person to be removed from office. There was no ground to say that the United Trades and Labor Council had not played a proper role in the running of the Grand Prix. It was just a simple ideological act of churlishness and mean spiritedness which saw the Government remove that person as a representative on the Grand Prix board.

In this motion, I wanted to recognise the former Premier of this State (the Hon. John Bannon) for bringing the Grand Prix to South Australia in the first place. He was not the only person involved in it and, quite rightly, Kym Bonython's name has been mentioned. I also join the member for Florey in extending my congratulations to Kym Bonython for the part he played. There were many others, both in very senior positions and in more junior positions within Government and within the various organisations associated with the Grand Prix, who helped us see such an outstanding success in Adelaide. They all deserve recognition.

As we all know, there are times when you need somebody at the top of the pyramid who has the drive, ambition and vision to make this thing work and bring together the necessary forces of Government agencies to make sure that a Grand Prix, on the scale that it was run in this State, was able to be run. It is not stretching the bounds of reason too far—and I am not making it a political issue—for this House simply to recognise in particular the role of former Premier Bannon in bringing the Grand Prix to South Australia in the first place.

Not to recognise him—and I heard the speech of the member for Unley on this point—indicates to me just how churlish and mean spirited political opponents can be. The Hon. John Bannon is no longer actively engaged in Party politics. It is now some two years since the last State election. I just get a little tired, as I think the general electorate is also getting tired, of the attitude that apparently the history of this State began only on 11 December 1993, at the time of the election of the Brown Government. Giving that recognition for John Bannon has not happened.

We have given credit to former Liberal Ministers and former Liberal Premiers, such as Sir Thomas Playford and David Tonkin, in areas where we agreed they had done a good job, and we have never been churlish or mean spirited

enough not to support a motion in this House that gives due recognition to those people, where their actions and our views have coincided.

No-one disputes that the Grand Prix has been a success, and everyone deserves credit for the way it has been carried out. Whether or not the present Government likes to admit it, it was the Premier of the day—John Bannon—who brought the Grand Prix to South Australia, and it was under his tutelage that the contracts were signed, right through until this year.

The member for Unley says that he is concerned because of Bernie Ecclestone's personal relationships, or whatever else it was that introduced politics into it. I suggest that it is more accurate that the whingeing, the carping and the politics brought in by the then Opposition's questioning the Grand Prix board and the cost of running the Grand Prix board just showed that at times, unfortunately, this town can be 'Tiny Town', a bit like 'Toy Town', with whingeing about a net loss of perhaps $1 million or $1.5 million on the running of the Grand Prix, versus the tens of millions of dollars the Grand Prix actually brings into this State. Every hotelier, tourist operator, taxi driver and the like in this State has welcomed the event with open arms as a much needed boost to South Australia's economy. All that this amendment by the member for Price does is formally recognise by name the former Premier under whom this contract was secured.

It is not written in a style that could politically offend members of the Liberal Party. It simply recognises the role that the former Premier played in securing the Grand Prix and the fact of its being an outstanding success in this State. If members opposite cannot give some simple recognition to certain basic facts, they are showing all the signs of being absolute ignoramuses, because the history of this State did not start on 11 December 1993. With European occupation we have been going here since at least 1836. There have been a number of Governments of different political persuasions, and we all owe a debt in some measure to those various Governments over time, because they did not do everything wrong 100 per cent of the time, no matter how much the Premier and certain members opposite might try to blame everything that ever went wrong with this State solely on the 11 years of Labor Government when we were most recently in office.

That is not the case, and I would ask on this occasion that members of the Government finally get out of their rut in terms of believing that history started in this State only in December 1993 and support the member for Price's amendment, which gives due recognition to everyone concerned and which is not offensive in singling out the Premier under whom this contract was won.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): First, I would like to thank all members of the House for their contribution to my motion. I cannot accept the amendment. If you read the motion that I put before the House, it was strictly non-political, very straightforward and related to our last Grand Prix. We have had years of Grands Prix in this State when members opposite could have put forward a motion congratulating all the workers. I acknowledge that the workers have done a good job, but I specifically wanted to commend the volunteers who have been involved and people who normally are not acknowledged. Therefore, in the amendment I see a reflection on these people; it does not give them the significance they deserve. I would be quite happy for members opposite to put forward a motion congratulating the trade unions, the workers, the former Premier and whoever they wish. But it is their job to do that: it is not fair to piggyback on my motion, which is non-political and which is aimed at all those others who were also involved.

The House divided on the amendment:

AYES (9)

Blevins, F. T.	Clarke, R. D.
De Laine, M. R. (teller)	Foley, K. O.
Geraghty, R. K.	Hurley, A. K.
Rann, M. D.	Stevens, L.
White, P. L.	

NOES (29)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Ashenden, E. S.	Baker, D. S.
Bass, R. P.	Becker, H.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Cummins, J. G.	Evans, I. F.
Greig, J. M. (teller)	Hall, J. L.
Kerin, R. G.	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.
Venning, I. H.	Wade, D. E.
Wotton, D. C.	

Majority of 20 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

TORRENS VALLEY INSTITUTE OF TAFE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Kotz:

That this House commends and acknowledges the international recognition of the excellence of the electronics course presented at the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE and further acknowledges the role played by the State's education and training facilities in the development of new industries contributing to South Australia's resurging economy.

(Continued from 26 October. Page 426.)

Motion carried.

WINE INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Andrew:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its failure to respond to the Industry Commission's inquiry into the wine industry, and for failing to use the opportunity to reject any options for an increase or change to the current taxation status of the wine industry.

(Continued from 19 October. Page 320.)

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 12.56 to 2 p.m.]

PATAWALONGA

A petition signed by 1 258 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to redevelop the Patawalonga River Basin in order to improve water quality was presented by the Hon. J.K.G. Oswald.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Corporate Affairs Commission—Report, 1994-95

Legislative Review Committee—Report on the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1978—Response by the Attorney-General

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

South Australian Tourism Commission—Report, 1994-95

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Department of Building Management—Report, 1994-95

Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to Determination—No. 3 of 1995—Ministers of the Crown and Officers and Members of Parliament

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

SAGRIC International Pty Ltd—Report, 1994-95

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

Office of the Public Advocate—Report, 6 March 1995-30 June 1995

Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee—Report, 1994-95

Dental Board of South Australia—Report, 1994-95

South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1994-95

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

State Aboriginal Affairs, Department of—Report, 1994-95.

LANGUAGES CENTRE

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Today marks the commencement of a highly significant partnership between the South Australian Government and South Australia's principal tertiary teaching institutions in a cooperative venture to promote and foster the teaching of languages. In an historic accord reached during a meeting last week, and cemented this morning by proclamations made by Her Excellency the Governor, a new Centre for Languages will be jointly administered by the Vice Chancellors of South Australia's three universities and the Chief Executive of the Department of Employment, Training and Further Education.

The centre's primary task will be to coordinate the teaching of languages at tertiary level, ensuring that available resources are channelled into language teaching programs which will contribute toward our State's commercial interests overseas through the provision of trade languages training; preserve and strengthen community languages spoken by South Australians who were raised speaking a language other than English; and protect and foster Aboriginal tribal languages which are threatened with extinction.

In addition, by agreement, the centre will be required to:

· serve as a focus for the provision of information on language education to the community, and the marketing of educational and training programs in languages;

· facilitate collaborative arrangements between educational institutions and other language training providers;

· set up working groups for specific agreed/funded projects, and establish their terms of reference and reporting timelines;

· introduce and administer a new Study Abroad scheme;

· run fee-for-service courses as required;

· promote and market language training programs;

· promote the development of high quality language/culture education and training programs;

· liaise with business and community sectors to gain support for the centre and the funding of its activities; and

· raise funds and material support to fund new initiatives.

It is an unfortunate fact that the number of students opting to study languages other than English has been declining at all levels of education. The new Centre for Languages, since it will be jointly owned by our tertiary teaching institutions, offers a new opportunity for a truly unified and focussed approach to languages teaching. From the outset, a new Study Abroad scheme will be an essential part of the new centre's activities. The scheme will provide promising languages students with the opportunity to study their chosen language where it is routinely spoken, thereby widening the pool of people fluent in languages other than English equipped to negotiate in dealings with other nations, and enriching South Australia's multicultural society. The scheme will be only one of a number of new programs for which the centre will seek to attract sponsorship from industry, commerce and the scheme's host countries. In addition, special language programs will seek to preserve and enhance Aboriginal languages.

The Centre for Languages will replace the South Australian Institute of Languages (SAIL) which has, since 1985, conducted a range of activities intended to achieve greater community awareness of, and involvement in, the teaching of languages other than English. Despite the best efforts of SAIL, its members and its staff, its establishment as a body separate from the very teaching institutions which it strived to serve has meant that many of its studies, recommendations and strategies have failed to achieve their objectives. It is, however, appropriate to acknowledge the work undertaken by SAIL, and the efforts of its Presiding Member, Mr Romano Rubichi.

Programs such as the 'hosted language' programs in Russian and Arabic, introduced thanks to Mr Rubichi's efforts, are continuing; and the new centre will carefully assess the value of those courses and others of SAIL's activities, with a view to retaining and developing those which have the potential to enhance languages teaching. Mr Rubichi, as SAIL's Presiding Member, has since the institute's inception worked hard to achieve its objectives, but to some extent the failure of its enabling legislation to establish clear lines of commitment and accountability, either to the Government or to this State's principal tertiary teaching institutions, tended to hamper his efforts and those engaged by SAIL as consultants. I am pleased to say that those constraints are not present in arrangements for the new Centre for Languages.

I wish to express my thanks to all members of the board of SAIL, who have worked often under difficult circumstances in their efforts to advance the cause of languages education in our State. I wish also to commend Professor Gavin Brown, Vice Chancellor of the University of Adelaide; Professor Ian Chubb, Vice Chancellor of the Flinders University of South Australia; Professor David Robinson, Vice Chancellor of the University of South Australia; and Mr Brian Stanford, Chief Executive of the Department of

Employment, Training and Further Education, for their visionary approach to the establishment of the Centre for Languages. The establishment of the centre is an exciting development in languages training, which holds promise through its inclusive nature of providing new impetus to the teaching of languages other than English, to the certain benefit of South Australia.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I think you will be pleased that you allowed me to do this, Sir, because it is about the Port Augusta Hospital. On 26 October I had great pleasure in informing the House that the Government had given in principle agreement for a new, publicly managed hospital to be built by the private sector at Port Augusta. Today it is my further pleasure to be able to announce that we are moving to the next stage with negotiations for the design, financing, building and owning of the new hospital, commencing with the consortium Woodhead Firth Lee/BZWA/Baulderstones. I expect the negotiations to be finalised and the contract to be ready for Government approval by the end of March next year. The new hospital, as I said before, is expected to be operating within two years. The hospital will have 85 public beds and will remain under public sector management. It will continue to offer the services it currently provides, including medical, surgical, obstetric and paediatric, inpatient diagnostic treatment and care services just as it does today, except in a much more efficient, new hospital setting.

The services that the hospital now offers are comprehensive and appropriate, and I would like to highlight the continuation of some important services, such as the hospital based allied health care services, which include physiotherapy, pharmacy, social work, dietetics, diabetes education, occupational therapy and speech pathology. Accident and emergency services will also continue to be provided on a 24 hour a day basis. Outpatient and support services for private medical specialists will continue to be provided, as will home and hospital based palliative care services. This is a great project for the community who come from far and wide to utilise the excellent services provided at Port Augusta, and I am delighted to be able to assure the House today that the project is progressing smoothly.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I bring up the first report, third session of the Printing Committee 1995, and in doing so I commend the Presiding Officer and all my colleagues for another excellent effort and due diligence in this difficult task which has come at a very affordable rate to the Chamber. I move:

That the report be received and adopted.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

HOSPITAL SERVICES

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Premier. What directions will the head of the Premier's Department give hospital administrators about cutting hospital based health services at a meeting on 13 December and why is the Premier's Department intervening in the management of our hospitals? A leaked memo sent to the chief executives of metropolitan hospitals is headed 'Rationing of hospital based services'. This memo explains a new strategy for hospitals to cut their services and how hospitals should try to sell these decisions to the community. The memo says that Mr Kowalick, the head of the Premier's Department, will meet hospital executives to discuss political and economic matters and 'assist in setting the contextual framework for this process'.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am delighted that the honourable member has raised this issue because, if she knew Mr Ian Kowalick, she would realise that he is a very positive, proactive person in terms of health care and is one who, in recent times, has been championing within Government the need for the Federal Government to go onto the front foot with health care and to be much more proactive rather than sit back and see the private insurance system collapse, as it has been doing. Mr Kowalick is overseas. He has not given me a copy of his speech but I will take it up with him when he comes back from overseas next week.

I know from a very lengthy discussion that Ian Kowalick, as head of the Premier's Department, has had with me, with the Minister for Health and with the head of the Health Commission that he believes, along the lines, that Australia is making some fundamental mistakes at a national level in the direction that health care is going, that if we are not careful we will end up making exactly the same mistakes as America has made, and that what we need to do is look at how we can change the delivery of health care in South Australia so that we do not make the same mistakes as America has made.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): In view of the excitement that surrounded the Premier's launch this morning of a five-year road safety strategy, and because members were detained here, will the Premier explain that strategy to this House?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am delighted to bring to the attention of members of the House that today the State Government has launched what is the most significant road safety campaign ever launched by a State Government in the whole of Australia. It is a five-year program that aims to cut road deaths and injuries by 20 per cent compared with other projections by the year 2000. If we could achieve this ambitious target, and it is no more than a target, we would reduce the number of road deaths from about 165 to 109. We would reduce the number of casualties on our roads by well over 1 500, and that would be an enormous saving to the State. Road accidents currently cost South Australia over $500 million a year, and that can be acted upon with the right Government policies.

We have announced today that, first, we will set up a new consultative body on road safety for South Australia, and that body will make recommendations to Government over the next five years. Secondly, we are taking a whole of Government approach, which has not been taken previously, by bringing together all the relevant agencies, from the Minister for Transport and the Department of Transport, the Minister for Health and the Health Commission, to the Minister for Emergency Services and the police. All Government agencies will become part of this major focus on road safety.

In particular, 10 specific recommendations have been put forward, and I urge members to look at the publication that has been released today which highlights the 10 priority action areas to be adopted over the next 12 months. One of those areas looks at voluntary breath testing by people with accurate machines as they leave hotels, which is very important. Sir Dennis Paterson has said that the voluntary testing equipment currently in hotels is inadequate because it is so inaccurate and, as I sure the member for Unley would agree, if testing equipment is to be available in such places, the first thing to ensure is that the equipment is reliable, otherwise people are likely to believe that they can drive only to caught by the police. Something must be done to reduce the risk of car accidents with inexperienced drivers, and we must look at the very high level of accident rates and fatalities on country roads. They are just three of the 10 measures that were recommended in the publication that has been released today.

Another important issue to note is that from now until the end of January we will see the most concerted road safety publicity campaign ever embarked upon by a State Government over such a long period. Of course, the Christmas-New Year holiday period is the highest risk period of the year. I am delighted to say that the media of South Australia are combining with this consultative body and Sir Dennis Paterson in this campaign. There will be a new theme each week for the entire two month period, and that was launched today.

My request to all South Australians is that, over the next two months, think very seriously about drinking and driving, in putting at risk not just your own life but the lives of your family, your friends and other road users. For goodness sake, slow down, apply common sense and put your No. 1 priority on road safety for everyone on the road.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Has the rationing plan for hospital services revealed in the leaked memo that I mentioned previously been introduced to distance the Minister from cuts to hospital services? The memo setting out plans for cutting hospital services says that 'opinion makers' such as hospital administrators and board members will be educated and that they should own the cuts. The November edition of *Hospitals Round* says that a budget shortfall of $13.5 million at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will mean a cut of 200 staff and a reduction of 5 000 patients this year. The Opposition has been informed that cuts will also result in a reduction of 2 900 patients at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: On Sunday last, the member for Elizabeth was present at the opening of the Women's and Children's Hospital at which the Government and I as the Minister for Health were commended by the Chief Executive Officer, Mr Jim Birch, of the Women's and Children's Hospital for being so flexible in actually providing extra casemix funding for the rash of births that have occurred at the hospital—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth has asked her question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —in addition to what was expected. It does not surprise us that that had occurred because of the magnificent facilities but it appears that the magnificence of those facilities might have caused the member for Elizabeth to forget what was said, because she was on the tour with us not half an hour after the Chief Executive Officer of the hospital had commended us for providing extra funding for those extra operations. Today she is talking about cutting hospital services. It is just one more example of the member for Elizabeth taking one fact and attempting deviously to turn it to make a political point when quite clearly the people in the services—the people who are doing such a wonderful job, the people who have decreased the waiting lists, the people who have increased the throughput in the hospitals, the ones that the member for Elizabeth continually knocks and who in fact are worthy of better than that—are telling us that we are providing extra money for extra services.

STATE TAXATION

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Treasurer provide details of progress made to date on improving State taxation compliance programs? I note that in the 1995-96 budget extra funding was made available to undertake specified targeted compliance programs.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Obviously, it is important that the State Government collect its just dues so that the budget is assisted accordingly and we do not have to cut more programs or reorganise our programs simply because we have a revenue shortfall. It was of concern to me on entering government that there was not a priority on compliance. We have spent a lot of time talking with the business sector and the lawyers, getting everyone together and saying, 'We have a taxation system. How do we make it easier for everybody to comply? Secondly, how do we ensure that everybody pays their just dues?'

The business community said, 'It is unfair in a competitive world if I am paying the tax due under State legislation but my competitor is failing to comply. That places me at a huge disadvantage.' We had the support of the business community. We have had a number of discussions. We have actually considered the way in which we operate in terms of looking at books and working out how to get better compliance in this area. There is no doubt that the State has lost tens of millions of dollars over the past five to 10 years, simply because not enough effort and focus was placed on this area. We have put enormous effort into liaising with the various people who have some responsibility—legal, business or in other sectors that pay various forms of taxation—to ensure that they are aware of the rules and that there is no mistake about what is required. That has been very successful as seen from one or two of our collections.

On the compliance issue, we set a target at the beginning of this financial year to collect $9.5 million through compliance. That covered the existing programs plus extra effort. I am pleased to report that, whilst the program did not get under way in any strong sense until August, we have already picked up $4.1 million in tax that had not been paid, and we believe that that target of $9.5 million, which we set at the beginning of the year, is not only achievable but will be exceeded. I am pleased that that effort is being made.

Importantly, I believe we probably have one of the best relationships between the Taxation Office here in South Australia and the business community. That is in contrast, I might add, to the Federal Government and the Australian Taxation Office and the way it operates. We attempt to advise our clients correctly on all occasions and to assist them in meeting their obligations, unlike the ATO, which will never

give a decision until you have actually placed the issue before the it and quite often you will find that the decision is not in your favour. We are trying to get away from that so that people can do business in this town with complete certainty whilst at the same time, we insist, they pay their full tax.

STATE ECONOMY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier agree with the statement given today by Professor Cliff Walsh, Director of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies and consultant to the Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections from my right.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Industry.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —that, and I quote:

> On balance the outlook for South Australia, as a result of both national influences and local trends, would have to be considered more pessimistic than it has been for three or more years. If we weren't already on the way down, there is a clear risk that we soon will be.

He further claimed that South Australia was becoming the contracting State, and that his double meaning was intended.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I realise that this is the last Question Time for the year and that a light-hearted note had to come in: I was waiting for the Leader of the Opposition to do that. The Leader of the Opposition suddenly wants to hold up Cliff Walsh as the man who produced the Bible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition on 30 April 1993 said that Cliff Walsh was Malcolm Fraser's economic valet.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Exactly right.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will cease interjecting.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not ask the Leader again. The Chair does not have to give any warnings before taking stern action.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is rather embarrassing for the Leader of the Opposition. Having referred to Cliff Walsh as Malcolm Fraser's economic valet, he then went on to say that Cliff Walsh is a good, knockabout, right wing journo. Why did he say that? It was because Cliff Walsh had just made the following comments about the South Australian Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was one of the key economic Ministers:

> It was a decade of policy inertia, a decade or more of policy drift. Across the decade, the South Australian Government steadily increased its taxation take. The traditional position of South Australia as having one of the lowest tax rates of the States—

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr CLARKE: Standing Orders require that the Minister at least attempt to answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he go back to the *Hansard* of the last Parliament and have a look at the rather skilful manner in which the now member for Giles answered questions, and he would not be taking a point of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He did not actually answer questions, Mr Speaker: he dodged questions but he did it very skilfully. I realise that the Leader of the Opposition now needs the defence of his Deputy Leader, who stands like a puppet, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —let me finish the quote:

> The traditional position in South Australia of having one of the lowest tax rates of the States has been eaten away because taxes in this State have grown faster than elsewhere.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, the former Government employed Cliff Walsh in the economic centre for quite a few studies. At some stage I will bring them to the attention of the Deputy Leader, who continues to interject. I point out that Cliff Walsh has rated the performance of the South Australian Government as being of credit standing—six plus.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Deputy Leader that, if he wants to be here to take part in the normal courtesies which are extended before Christmas, he should not interject.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: To finish with credit status at the end of the year is pretty good. To have achieved seven would have been a distinction and eight would have been a high distinction. I suspect that, under Cliff Walsh's assessment, even Genghis Khan could not have got to seven. I quote to the Leader of the Opposition what was said in the report. It states:

> The Government gets high—

Members interjecting:

Mr Brokenshire: Listen to the answer.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I would like to quote to the Leader of the Opposition what Cliff Walsh said in his comments this morning:

> The Government gets high marks in our book and that of many others for setting out a strategy and demonstrating its determination to see it through, despite unanticipated extra budgetary pressures from wage and interest rate rises in particular.

The report goes on to say:

> It has to be said that the Government has done much that is at least in the right direction.

Quite clearly, the national economy of Australia has been turning down: we all know that. That is exactly what Cliff Walsh is acknowledging. What we have is a Federal Government that has used excessive interest rates to turn down demand right across Australia. The interesting thing—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell. The Chair has caught the member for Mitchell continuing to interject when he knows it is clearly out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The interesting thing is that it is South Australia that has performed extremely well compared with the other States of Australia. I gave some of that information to the House yesterday, but I bring to the attention of the House further information today from the Bureau of Industry Economics. If we are going to attract

industry to and promote industry growth in this State, the most important thing of all is making sure that we have a competitive State. What the former Labor Government did, in terms of the State Bank disaster, which more than doubled the State's debt, substantially increased taxation, as Cliff Walsh himself has highlighted in that report of 1993. Let me read what the Bureau of Industry Economics has had to say about South Australia. It has come out with what it calls the price index and states:

> Victoria offers the cheapest basket of infrastructure services. That's mainly due to their cheap electricity, which has the largest weighting of any industries included. South Australia offered the next cheapest basket of infrastructure services, offering the cheapest gas supply and waterfront charges in Australia. It also offered the cheapest rail freight, although this is due to Australian National being included in the South Australian figure.

Quite clearly, because of the policies of this Government in saying that it would not go out and increase taxation, we have been able to reduce substantially our position within Australia in terms of level of relative taxation on a State basis. We can now boast that State taxation *per capita* in South Australia is up to 30 per cent lower than that of some of the Eastern States of Australia. That is a huge benefit for any industry, including existing industry, in South Australia. It is one of the reasons why companies are now saying that South Australia is a very competitive place in which to manufacture, particularly for the export market. I bring to the attention of the House the fact that the Sealand operation at Port Adelaide has reported that it has put through 7 500 shipping containers in the last month. In December, it expects to put through 8 500, which is a record level. On an annual basis, that would take us to about 95 000 containers per year, which is more than double where the previous Government had it.

The other important fact that I bring to the attention of the House is that just this morning on ABC radio it was reported that Drake International said that the level of demand, particularly in terms of new job vacancies in South Australia, was higher than that of most other States. That shows that, in comparison with the rest of Australia, South Australia's economy is at the top end of the scale, although I am the first person to acknowledge that the Keating Federal Government has wreaked a lot of damage on the economy, right across Australia. If the honourable member wants any evidence of that, I suggest he go and talk to his colleagues Wayne Goss or Bob Carr, because they are very critical indeed of what Paul Keating has done to the national economy.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Despite reports of a slowing of the national economy, will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development tell the House of any indications provided by the Economic Development Authority of the South Australian economy being on the rebound?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Further to the Premier's reply yesterday, when he clearly indicated some indicators that economic activity in South Australia was looking prospective—and I talk particularly about retail sales—there are a number of other factors that I would like to bring to the attention of the House in terms of economic development in South Australia, some of the benchmarks and some of the activities that this Government has been able to put in place in the course of the last year. Let me just read to the House a list of companies that have consolidated their operations, relocated interstate or established new facilities in South Australia. It is not a bad list in a little over 18 months of our operating, having come from a very low base and a position of low economic activity that we inherited from the former Administration, during whose term a psychological blanket had descended upon South Australia as a result of its inertia and lack of activity.

These companies include Almondco, which has upgraded its major facilities in South Australia; Australis Media, which has established its customer service centre in South Australia; AWA Defence Industry Air Training, which has relocated its avionics training centre to South Australia; Bankers Trust, which has made a recent announcement to locate its customer service centre in South Australia; Beerenberg, which has just undertaken a major upgrade and which was opened only last Friday; British Aerospace, which has upgraded its facilities in South Australia; Castalloy, which has expanded its motor wheel manufacturing and which is the sole source of chrome-plated wheels for the Harley Davidson motor cycle in the United States; Frederick Duffield, which has relocated from Singapore and which is a hydraulic componentry manufacturing company; Fullborn Energy Recycling Pty Ltd, which is a tyre recycling plant established in South Australia; Gerard Industries which, of course, is at Strathalbyn; Lear Seating, which the Premier opened only a few weeks ago and which is a US company to establish a seating manufacturing facility in South Australia; Motorola, one of four locations worldwide, which is establishing at Technology Park; National Jet Systems, which is developing training facilities in Adelaide; Philmac, which has had a major capacity expansion and which supplies irrigation fittings for the export markets; R.M. Williams, which has relocated its headquarters into Adelaide; ROH, which has established Australia's only steel truck wheel plant; and SABCO, which has relocated its head offices out of Victoria into South Australia. One of these happened to be out in the Leader of the Opposition's electorate. I presume he will not ignore the consolidation of that manufacturing facility in South Australia and what it does for jobs in this State.

The list continues: Tandem Services announced the establishment of an advanced development centre; Transition Optical/Sola, which the Premier opened last Friday, which is a new manufacturing facility, and which is at the leading edge internationally with what is being achieved; Vision Systems, which has established expanded facilities at the syndicated R and D activities at Technology Park; Westpac National Loans centre, which will create 900 jobs for South Australians and which will start with 580 jobs on opening day; Southcorp, to which I have already referred, a consolidation of manufacturing facilities out of Victoria into South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —and GEC Marconi tomorrow will be opening further facilities in South Australia. And the list goes on. That is the list of companies that have either relocated out of the Eastern States into South Australia or expanded existing facilities in South Australia. In other words, that is not a bad signpost for economic activity and future jobs in South Australia.

PUBLIC SECTOR OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier now acknowledge that the Government has failed to apply appropriate due diligence to its EDS and water outsourcing deals? Our friend Professor Cliff Walsh, in the

released version of the mid-term assessment of the Brown Government's economic and budget strategies, in relation to due diligence of outsourcing contracts, said:

> This is a two-way process. The Government needs to know more about the businesses it is planning to do business with, and Ministers clearly need to know much more about the finer details of bids that their advisers are recommending should be accepted.

During his briefing today, Professor Walsh said the Brown Government lacked the requisite skills to handle large-scale contracting out. That is from the unsuppressed report of your and Malcolm Frazer's economic valet.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is commenting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is interesting to see that the Leader of the Opposition did not quote what Cliff Walsh put in bold type in his report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: That would have destroyed the argument.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I know. In bold type, in his report, he is talking about outsourcing. On page 12, item 4, he talks about the enormous benefits that can be achieved from outsourcing, how it can produce higher levels of productivity, lower costs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —and build up industry in South Australia. He then goes on to say:

> The big ones so far, water and IT, could prove to be the most innovative things done in South Australia at least since Playford.

And the Leader of the Opposition somehow missed that bold type.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For the second time today, I call the Leader of the Opposition to order. I suggest—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is just not aware of where that voice came from, but the member could be named if I locate him or her.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What Cliff Walsh said is that the Government should continue to outsource along the lines we are doing. In fact, he compliments the State Government for doing so, and particularly for taking such a bold initiative. I might add that I do not agree with everything that Cliff Walsh says, even though he gave us a credit rating. I point out to the House that Cliff Walsh said that we should actually go further: that we should cut health services and education services further in South Australia, and that we should increase water and electricity rates. I disagree with those, and the fact that Cliff Walsh should say that and be critical of the fact that we are not doing that does not fuss me one iota.

In fact, I am proud of the fact that we are not taking his advice in cutting education and health further or increasing water rates or electricity prices. Cliff Walsh also advocated that we should be looking at a levy of $550 for everyone in this State who has a job, to pay for the crash of the State Bank. He says that that is what South Australia is paying in equivalent interest rates every year—$550 per person (with a job in this State) just in State Bank interest.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Of course, the Leader of the Opposition—who is sitting there looking very uncomfortable at this stage—was a member of the Cabinet that produced the State Bank disaster for South Australia. He is one of those, as highlighted by Cliff Walsh, responsible for the fact that the percentage of State tax revenue that had to go to pay interest on that increased debt went from 14 up to 28 per cent. We have got it back to 25 per cent, but that is the sort of monumental financial disaster that the current Leader of the Opposition, together with his Cabinet colleagues, inflicted on all South Australians. That is why Cliff Walsh is saying that we should go even further, because of the magnitude of the disaster brought about by the former Labor Government.

How can the Leader of the Opposition stand in this House today and make any criticism of economic management policy when he himself as Leader of the Opposition produced the biggest financial disaster of any Government in the developed world in the past 50 years?

HINDMARSH ISLAND PROPERTY

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Treasurer inform the House of what action the South Australian Asset Management Corporation has taken to recover a debt owed to it by Hindmarsh Island developers Tom and Wendy Chapman? In today's *Advertiser* a story states that Tom and Wendy Chapman have surrendered their Hindmarsh Island home to creditors following legal action taken by the South Australian Asset Management Corporation. The article goes on to say that when Sheriff's officers executed the warrant of possession on Thursday of last week they found the cottage, machinery and stock sheds empty.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the member for Mawson, one of the quieter members of this House—

The SPEAKER: That is debatable.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: —for his question. This matter has been brought to my attention. There had been a process of negotiation over some considerable period of months as to when the SAAMC could have vacant possession of the property on Hindmarsh Island owned by the Chapmans, recognising that the legal debt of the Chapmans is over $14 million and the book debt nearly $3.8 million. There was a requirement for the Chapmans to give up their house. After some considerable negotiation there was agreement on the vacating of that property, which also was to ensure that the premises were left secure. The Sheriff attended the property on the day after it was vacated, which was 23 November 1995. The Sheriff reported the following matters in his report on 24 November:

> There were no locks or handles on any doors so the house was completely open and such things as the hot water service, two hand basins, light fittings and globes, the stove, window treatments, were missing, with evidence that they were recently removed. Outside, paving had been ripped up, a rainwater tank removed, and shrubs were pulled from the ground and left. In the surrounding yards, gates, fencing, trucking yards and a shed roof have been removed.

Whilst we cannot ascertain the source of that damage, the police have been called in to investigate.

PUBLIC SECTOR OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Premier now acknowledge the enormous risks of outsourcing major Government services to a sole supplier as in the EDS and United Water contracts? In today's mid-term assessment of the Government by the SA Centre for Economic Studies, which gives the Government six out of 10, its Director—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I apologise: six plus, if that is what it says.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Premier to order.

Mr FOLEY: I will start that explanation again. In today's mid-term assessment of the Government by the SA Centre for Economic Studies, which gives the Government six plus out of 10, its Director, Professor Cliff Walsh, says, in a quote that the Premier has not revealed to the Parliament:

> Outsourcing to a sole supplier carries the risk of the Government being held to ransom in future over costs or charges and other conditions, despite penalties in the contracts, and also the risk of it becoming dependent on its sole supplier for expertise and the risks of the sole supplier falling behind best practice and technology over time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, one problem is that Professor Walsh has not seen the details of the contract.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have seen the details of the EDS contract.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, I have not seen the details of the water contract because it still has not been finalised. I point out that I have said throughout that, of course, in any contract there are some risks. In outsourcing you take some risks. But I also pointed out that doing nothing is far worse for South Australia than taking some risks, which risks can be minimised, as this Government has shown.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just wait. I cite the very quotation that the member for Hart read out from Cliff Walsh, because he highlighted the fact that we face the possibility over a period of ending up paying higher rates.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That's right.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am glad that the member for Giles has made the same mistake as Cliff Walsh. What he has failed to do is understand the fact that we have market reset mechanisms in the EDS contract as we will have in the water contract on a regular basis. People are acknowledging that what we have been able to negotiate in market reset mechanisms in the EDS contract is unique for an outsourcing contract where, at certain stages, the first after only three years, we can go out and reset the price compared to the most competitive price in the world.

I am highlighting to the House that this contract has been drafted specifically to minimise and, where possible, eliminate those risks. I stress that, if South Australia had kept heading in the direction in which the former Labor Government was taking this State, the risks would have been horrendous. We would have been placed in official bankruptcy within three years if we had pursued the policies the former Labor Government had been inflicting on South Australia.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

Mr BASS (Florey): Has the Minister for Industrial Affairs been advised of the Federal Government's response to South Australia's request for the dual appointment of all new members of the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission to the Federal Industrial Relations Commission? All members of the State Industrial Relations Commission appointed by the previous State Labor Government are also members of the Federal Industrial Relations Commission. Since December 1993, the State Liberal Government has made four new appointments to the State Industrial Relations Commission, but I understand that they have not yet been appointed to the Federal commission.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: After waiting some seven months for a reply from the Federal Minister, we received—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We have had the support of the UTLC—your mates—and that has not helped, and so we would like to—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Federal Minister for Industrial Relations wrote to us and said that he has no intention of making the appointments to the Federal commission because this State Government is not prepared to change its policy on unfair dismissals. That is the most disgraceful thing any Federal Minister can do, particularly when every business in this country criticises the Federal Industrial Relations Commission's unfair dismissal policy. The Federal Minister expects this Government to change its policy—after 25 years of jurisdiction in unfair dismissal—to the worst possible position in the whole of Australia.

The disgrace of the whole exercise is that in 1992 Senator Peter Cook, the then Federal Minister for Industrial Relations, came to South Australia and set out the dual-appointment arrangement for our commission. He brought together the State and Federal commissions because he believed it was in the best interests of industrial relations in this country. He made the comment that he believed that all Deputy Presidents should have similar status in both Federal and State commissions. When, for the first time in the history of a State Industrial Commission, a Federal Minister ignores the position of the President of a State commission and is not prepared to appoint him to the Federal bench, it is a disgrace. The problem is that we have a Federal Minister who just wants to play politics. All he wants to do is to keep out—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Members opposite argue that both the State and Federal Industrial Relations Commissions ought to be independent bodies. I remember the Deputy Leader in this place standing up—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: —and saying that we should have independent people. We have independent people; we have equal union members; and we have equal employer members in the State commission. Every person respects the President of the commission, including the Deputy Leader who has made that statement publicly, yet the Federal Minister is not prepared to do anything about it. It is a disgrace.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the willingness of United Water, North West Water and Lyonnaise des Eaux to appear before the Upper House select committee on the water deal during the next eight days, will the Minister for Infrastructure now also agree to appear and give evidence before the committee about the contract and about the diligence and integrity of the tendering and negotiating processes?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Until the negotiating phase is complete, no, I will not. The simple fact is that we have seen

constant misconceptions and lies pedalled by the Labor Party—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —in relation to the establishment of this contract. It is untenable for any commercial negotiations, on behalf of the Government of South Australia, to be undertaken in this gold fish bowl put in place by the Opposition. The Opposition had the good grace—and I referred to this yesterday—to say, 'Well, at least in the interests of South Australia we will let the negotiations with respect to the EDS deal be completed. We will then look and scrutinise.' However, it has not been prepared to do that with the water contract. It has not been prepared to let the negotiators at the table work out the best deal for South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is warned for the second time.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Opposition has attempted to frustrate and thwart that process, when all we are doing is negotiating to capture the benefits of the proposal for South Australia for the next 15 years. The Opposition might want to wreck that, but I certainly do not.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House of the outcome of citrus exports to the United States this year, and how will PISA continue to support the citrus industry with the fruit-fly protection program? This week I led a deputation of Riverland citrus growers to report to the Minister on these important issues.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the member for Chaffey for his question and continued interest in this matter and the well-being of the Riverland. It is correct that I received a deputation of citrus growers from the Riverland who wanted assurances from me that the State Government will continue its fruit-fly free status surveillance. I was able to give them that assurance. In fact, over the summer months we will conduct a program to be known as Freedom, in which we will spend quite a few taxpayer dollars to bring the message home to both country and city people about the importance of the fruit- fly free status to the Riverland. In fact, each outbreak—and there were five in the metropolitan area last year—costs about $120 000. Last year we spent $800 000 on eradication programs after outbreaks of fruit-fly. Exports from the Riverland are worth some $500 million annually. A very prominent market is starting in the United States, and the head of the Department of Primary Industries and I visited Florida earlier this year. DNE Worldwide Exports—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: No, we were over there selling oranges for South Australians. Exports last year amounted to 500 000 cases of oranges, which fits a window of opportunity in America when a lack of oranges occurs in that market. The potential for that market is one million cases of oranges. We inspected the oranges in supermarkets and, with more quality assurance programs in our packing sheds, the industry can only improve. The oranges are of outstanding quality, and it is giving South Australia a very good name. That name is there only because of our fruit-fly free status. DNE Worldwide Exports, as single-desk sellers from South Australia and importers into the United States, has a very good market which will continue for many years if we service it properly.

Growers from the Riverland tell me that they are now receiving between $800 and $1 200 per tonne for navel oranges. That is a vastly different story from two or three years ago when the price was something like $40 to $50 a tonne. With proper marketing, a fruit-fly free status and help from the member for Chaffey, South Australian Riverland fruit growers are in very good hands.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Premier advise what penalties can be applied against the Government by EDS under the Government's computer outsourcing contract? The Premier today acknowledged the risks associated with the EDS outsourcing contract. However, the Opposition has been informed that the Government has agreed to clauses in its contract with EDS that will allow EDS to sue the State Government for damages of up to $50 million for non-performance by the Government.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member would realise that he asked me a question about penalties under this contract about two weeks ago and I brought back a detailed response from the Crown Solicitor. I will do the same on this question, but I highlight—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, I pointed out to the House that I wanted to give a comprehensive answer, as I did on the previous question on exactly the same issue. I highlighted to the House all of the steps—and they were very detailed in terms of the actions the State Government could take against EDS—including action for multiple breaches and for single breaches, for non-performance in terms of down time of computers and a whole range of other activities. I will get exactly the same information in reply to the question the honourable member has just asked.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Is the Minister for Infrastructure aware of plans to use the forthcoming Federal election to spread misinformation in the community about the contract between United Water and the South Australian Water Corporation?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank the member for Colton for the question, because we can see the Labor Party lining up already in terms of the strategy it will put in place.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. As far as I am aware, the Minister for Infrastructure is not responsible for the conduct of the Australian Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown: Nobody wants to take responsibility for that.

The SPEAKER: Order! Everyone, including the Premier, will allow the Chair to respond to the point of order. The Deputy Leader is correct: the Minister is not responsible for the Labor Party, but he is responsible for the substance of the question, namely, the outsourcing of certain departments, and he is entitled to answer the question.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can understand the sensitivity of the Labor Party on this question. It is especially relevant, given that we are drawing to the end of the year and it allows the House to review the activities of the Labor Party over the course of this past year and analyse what we can expect next year. Labor has had in place a concerted and deliberate effort

to lie, mislead and deceive the people of South Australia about this contract.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister said that members of the Opposition were lying in relation to this issue, and that is contrary to Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister referred directly to members as having lied, that is out of order and I ask him to withdraw. If he did not imply it directly, it is a fine line and unwise in the view of the Chair, but it is not technically out of order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I was referring to Labor's running a concerted campaign to distort and twist the facts. The facts really speak for themselves, and I will quote some of them to the House. We have seen Federal Ministers get involved in this in the lead up to the next Federal election campaign in a desperate effort to boost Federal Labor. It has already foreshadowed that in Western Australia the campaign will be on industrial relations, in Victoria it will be on education, health and privatisation of the power stations, and it is looking for opportunities in South Australia. The only opportunity is to continue to repeat the distortions, mistruths and deception that it has put in place over the course of the past year.

Some of these examples do not even mention the shameless lies, such as the introduction of sprinkler licences. We all remember that, with licences waved in front of the television cameras. We were also told that water pipes would start to leak because the Government was going to outsource the water contract. That was another claim. We were told that pensioners' water would be disconnected—another infamous line used by the Opposition.

Clearly in front of us with the Federal election, in a range of States throughout Australia, is a fibfest from the Labor Party in terms of trying to recapture some of the lost ground because of its own policy direction and inaction. I assure members opposite that, despite the deceit during the course of this year, the signing of this contract will not remove the savings, it will not remove the job opportunities and it will not remove the export opportunities for South Australia. Let us look at some of the quotes when it was announced that SA Water was to be privatised. Mr Rann told the ALP State Council:

> The battle over privatisation is about to begin.

He also said:

> I am opposed to plans to privatise the running of South Australia's water supply.

This is the other line:

> The complete contract for the privatisation of the operations of SA Water. . .

That was a line from the Opposition spokesperson, Mr Foley. The fact is that SA Water is not being privatised in any form. Nothing is for sale and nothing will be for sale. The Government, through SA Water, will retain control and ownership of the assets and the water—that means the pipes, the treatment plants and the water itself.

That grouping of misinformation and lies is the favourite line from members opposite. From a political Party whose flagrant mismanagement of the State saw the loss of 33 000 jobs and billions of dollars of taxpayers' money, it is not surprising that members opposite fail to understand the simple fact that nothing is for sale. They have also used quotes such as:

> SA Water is being sold: selling off SA Water management will cost consumers thousands of dollars.

Wrong! They also said:

> The Brown Liberal Government is planning to sell control of our water supply to the highest bidder—just to make a fast buck.

Wrong! They further stated:

> Don't sell off the fundamentals like hospitals and water.

Wrong! They also said:

> South Australians do not want the management of their water supply sold to a private company to be run for profit.

Wrong! All of those statements are fundamentally wrong and have nothing to do with what we are negotiating at the table at the moment. In relation to whether it is water being privatised, water being sold, losing control of SA Water—which we are not—or whether the prices will rise, as we have score cards out today we ought to put a ranking on those statements. For hypocrisy, top marks, 10; stubborn ignorance, top marks, 10; deliberate distortion index, top marks, 10; and, absolute repetition, absolutely 10.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Has the Premier read the EDS contract in detail and, if so, why is he unable to advise the House whether the State is exposed to a clause in the EDS contract that would allow EDS to sue the State Government for up to $50 million?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am delighted to say that I have been through all of the provisions in the EDS contract. The honourable member needs to appreciate that there are over 1 000 pages of documentation in the contract and the attachments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I said to the House when the same question was asked in relation to the penalties against EDS, I will bring in a detailed response from the Crown Solicitor. It is only fair that I make sure that I get all the relevant sections out of the 1 000-plus pages to bring it in in terms of any other action. Of course, one would expect some penalty against the State Government if we fail to pay our accounts. Normally, anyone who fails to pay their accounts can have some action taken against them.

FIRE PREVENTION

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Does the Minister for Emergency Services consider that the public has made adequate preparation to avert the threat of wild fire and to minimise the risk to property across South Australia for this fire danger season?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Ridley for his question and for his ongoing interest in and support of the Country Fire Service. Regrettably, the answer to the question is 'No': not all members of the public have made adequate preparation for the coming fire season. The 1995-96 fire season is already gearing up to be one of very high risk, with fire index indicators showing areas now capable of burning. The Country Fire Service, along with local government fire prevention officers, has been active in promoting and issuing to the public its information kit entitled 'Nothing's sacred from bushfire', with the key to this program being education and prevention by property owners.

The program involves, amongst other things, council fire prevention officers and Country Fire Service regional commanders being key contacts to help the public implement appropriate action plans to protect their families, homes and

assets; greater public recognition of the role of the media in communicating fire danger warnings in their various phases; the introduction of daily fire danger ratings from the Bureau of Meteorology, taking into account factors such as fuel loads, temperature, wind speed and direction and humidity; and the extension of fire safety education in schools through partnerships between fire fighters, teachers, parents and care givers.

The public has been encouraged to work with fire council prevention officers and CFS regional commanders on bushfire prevention survival plans, including developing reserve water supplies; ensuring their home is a safe refuge from fires; the safe storage of flammable materials; protection of livestock fodder, shelter beds and wood lots; safe harvesting operations; identifying faulty machinery and vehicles; checking their fire extinguishers; and knowing regulations and obtaining permits to light fires.

Despite all this effort, I have now been advised by the Country Fire Service that, in the Adelaide Hills area alone, 60 per cent of house and property owners have failed to implement adequate safeguards against fire for this summer and need to consult urgently with council fire prevention officers and their CFS regional commanders. The CFS and I encourage and urge the public to make this contact, to develop appropriate bushfire prevention plans and to read and act on the available material. While this State has some 18 000 volunteer fire officers ready, willing and able to fight fires, they need the help of the public in as far as is humanly possible preventing the spread of fire. I urge the public to take this action.

LYELL MCEWIN HOSPICE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): What action has the Minister for Health taken to ensure that the hospice at the Lyell McEwin Hospital is not forced to cut palliative care services or close because of a funding crisis? The hospice at the Lyell McEwin Hospital cares for up to 70 people at any one time. As a result of casemix funding, the hospice is under-funded this year by $133 000.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am interested to hear the member for Elizabeth complaining about services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, because the whole object of the amalgamation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Health Service into the North-western Adelaide Health Service was to pour services from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital into the Lyell McEwin area which, as we all recognise in this Chamber, is represented by a member of the Opposition Party both federally and State (and has been forever) but which was neglected by the previous Government. However, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Health Service amalgamation was designed to put services into the Lyell McEwin Health Service—into the northern area. What did the member for Elizabeth do? She complained, knocked and fabricated. The process was intended to move services into the Lyell McEwin Health Service. That is a matter that the North-western Adelaide Health Service is, quite appropriately, there to do. It is quite appropriate for the board to determine those things.

While we talk about palliative care services in the northern and north-eastern area of Adelaide, it is fascinating to look at what happened to the Modbury Hospital, because again that is a project that the member for Elizabeth has knocked and fabricated about in an attempt to draw a veil of secrecy over what is good. I visited the Modbury Hospital on several occasions in the denouement of the event, when the private sector management contract was about to be announced. Because of the excellent services that were provided in the Modbury Hospice, when I visited there, the nurses quite legitimately asked me on a routine basis, 'What will happen to our hospice under a private sector management contract?' I said, 'Because of the wonderful reputation of the Modbury Hospice, I am absolutely confident that it will be completely safe from any change.'

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth will not make any more interjections.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It is very important that everyone in the Chamber knows, given the concentration of the member for Elizabeth on palliative care in the north-eastern area today and given her concerns about private sector management of the Modbury Hospital—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Do you know what happened? The day that Modbury Hospital went to a private management structure under Healthscope, the nurses from the palliative care sector went to management and said, 'With the freedoms you as private sector management are giving us, we believe we can improve the services and provide more beds.' So, on the day that Modbury Hospital was taken over by the private sector, an additional two palliative care beds were put into that area.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suspect that in her previous occupation the member for Elizabeth did not tolerate insubordination. She has been warned: one more word and the honourable member will be named. She has a bad habit of continuing to interject when advised not to do so by the Chair. She might be aided and abetted by some of the Government members on the cross benches, who have not been helpful. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

FORESTS

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier rule out any sale of one of our State's most valuable resources, our State forests?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes. I would make a quick point that, given that today appears to be the day for allocating scores and performances, Cliff Walsh gave this Government a credit rating of 6 plus out of 10. That was interesting, because a few years ago the community gave the Labor Party a ranking of 2 out of 10—or we might say 10 out of 47—in terms of its performance and 10 years of Labor Government here in South Australia. Quite clearly, it did not get a credit rating: it just failed miserably.

ENVIRONMENT VALUATION

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources tell us what efforts are being undertaken to put a dollar value on South Australia's environment? Many South Australian companies are committing substantial funds to environmental upgrades and projects. However, because no dollar value is placed on environmental elements such as land, wildlife, vegetation, air or water, difficulties are being experienced in gauging accurate returns on these efforts. Some companies also say

that the lack of dollar value discourages investment in the environment.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The question that the—

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The question that the member for Mitchell has asked is very important and one that I am very anxious to pursue. I think that efforts to put a dollar value on the environment and our natural resources are very much overdue. By applying such a value, investing in the environment would be seen for its true financial worth. Also it would ensure that the environment and our natural resources were held in the same regard as other assets, and it is important that that should be the case.

There are a number of moves to devise formulas that give a monetary value to the environment in South Australia. The accounting profession is currently developing such techniques outlined in a publication, which I launched recently, entitled *A Review of Environmental Accounting*. The South Australian company Earth Sanctuaries has also made clear that it is exploring this issue. It has stated that, while it can place a dollar value on visitor numbers, sales of goods and so on, the core resources on which this industry are based have no recognised dollar worth. This makes it increasingly difficult to attract investment in the environment, and that is totally unacceptable. Similarly, our national parks might attract thousands of visitors, yet they are given no financial value in dollar terms as an asset.

It is important that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources take a lead in this area, and I have asked the Natural Resources Council also to address the issue. As a first step, it is planning a seminar on the subject early next year. Efforts to place a value on our natural assets will benefit the whole community. It can be used to better justify expenditure and investments in both public and private enterprises. This includes, for example, the properties managed by Earth Sanctuaries, to which I have already referred, as well as our national parks and reserves. I also believe that, had a dollar value been placed on our environment previously, assets such as our waterways would never have been allowed to fall into the degraded state that they are currently in. Valuing our natural resources to bring them into the sphere of economics represents the future for natural resource management, and I commend the member for Mitchell for raising a very important issue.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Last week, chief executive officers of metropolitan hospitals received a memo from Carol Gaston, the Executive Director of the Metropolitan Health Services, and I should like to quote parts of this memo for the information of the House. It states:

> It is proposed that the chief executive officers of metropolitan hospitals, their board members and clinicians be involved in developing a framework for decision making regarding resource allocation and for this to be underpinned by a program of community education.

It advises that a meeting will be called on 13 December, and it sets out some of the issues that will be discussed at that meeting, as follows:

> 1. A discussion around the political and economic context. It is proposed to have Ian Kowalick, Chief Executive Officer, Premier and Cabinet and Peter Boxall, Under Treasurer, assist in setting the contextual framework for this progress.
> 2. A discussion regarding the ethical framework for resource allocation.
> 3. A discussion regarding the appropriate criteria for resource allegation.
> 4. A discussion regarding an appropriate community education program.

What is really happening here? Let me translate this bureaucrat speak into the real information about what is going on in our health system. We know that there have been massive cuts to the health system. In the Estimates Committee earlier this year the Minister told us about the activity cuts that were to be levelled across the system in order to make the books balance and to take in the funding cut. We know that metropolitan hospitals have been told to expect a 2 per cent general activity cut across the board.

This memo sets out the way in which we are going to do it. Everybody will be called to a meeting, and they will be lectured by the Premier's Department and the Treasury. Those officers will say why we have to make the cuts and they will put it in a political and economic context. Then they will get together and work out how the cuts will be made. After that they will work out a way to tell the community that these cuts are okay. They will work out a way to educate the community so that people will not get upset when they find out that there are 2 900 fewer patients days or patient services at the Women's and Children's and 5 000 fewer services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I want to quote the last little bit from this memo because it is just beautiful, as follows:

> A fundamental principle of this proposal is to have the outcomes owned by both the South Australian Health Commission and the CEOs, board members and the clinicians of the metropolitan health system.

The Government is saying, 'You make the cuts, you own them, you sell them to the community, you get on with the job and you keep us out of it.' The Health Minister has been supplanted by the Chief Executive of the Premier's Department in this little exercise, but it is a mark of a desperate Premier that seeks to place the onus on hospitals to sell the idea that budget cuts and rationing of services have nothing whatsoever to do with him. It is a novel approach but it will not work. The community knows that this Government is sacrificing the health of the citizens of South Australia. The people of South Australia will not take it lying down.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): What a lot of rubbish! The member for Elizabeth has talked about rationing. In its truest sense, rationing can be provided in many ways, and one of the most effective ways of rationing in the health service is to have long waiting lists, because that is exactly what rationing is all about. Rationing services is the *sina qua non* of waiting lists, because that is exactly what long waiting lists do: they ration the services.

Let us look at the most recent history of waiting lists over the last six months of the previous Government and over the first two years of this Government. As I have told the Chamber on a number of occasions, in the last six months of the last Government there was nothing more and nothing less than a fiddling of the books to remove patients from the waiting list in the immediate pre-election climate. There was

no sense whatsoever of whether it was good, bad or indifferent for the clients.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The honourable member knows the consequences. One more word and she will not see out the rest of the afternoon. The Chair really should name the member now but, because we are close to the end of the session, the Chair has been more tolerant. The Chair is absolutely determined on the course of action it will take.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: There was no sense whatsoever of what was good, bad or indifferent for the patients, as long as it looked okay politically. The Labor Government said, 'Let's see if we can have a quick fix. Let's move the patients off the waiting list by stealth and by misleading the public.' That is the way the previous Government handled it. This Government has addressed the issue. Instead of sweeping it under the carpet, we have made a number of changes to the system and, as a result, waiting lists are down by 13 per cent.

The previous Government had an appalling record, with huge numbers of people waiting for more than 12 months for their operation, but that list has been cut by 37 per cent. So, they are very good figures. That is a way of stopping rationing—by making sure the waiting lists are coming down. So, if someone needs a service, there is a fair chance they will get it, rather than being on a long waiting list like the previous Government had.

The member for Elizabeth talks about massive cuts to make the books balance. Maybe the member for Giles as a former Treasurer could actually give her some basic lessons in economics, because Government is about making the books balance. I realise that the previous Government was completely and utterly profligate with the taxes of South Australia, but this Government is not. We will get the State back into economic health. In doing that, we have returned money to the Treasury and we have increased the admissions to the hospital by 4 per cent during 1994-95 and some of the other figures are even higher than that. We have decreased the waiting lists and increased admissions whilst, at the same time, making the books balance.

I ask the member for Elizabeth: what is wrong with changing the paradigms? I know it is difficult. I know it threatens a whole lot of positions. It threatens empires, and it is actually threatening to the member for Elizabeth, but what is wrong with changing the way things are done if you are improving them? One of the paradigms in health care today is the fact that you do not need to be lying in a hospital bed for 14 or 21 days or whatever if you can get those services elsewhere. People want that nine times out of 10, and that is exactly what the Government is doing and what the meeting the member for Elizabeth talks about is doing. There are discussions about appropriate community education programs. One of the facilitators identified is a world renowned commentator and academic in the area of community medicine. People prefer to be treated in the community, and that is exactly what we will do.

Recognising the time, it is fascinating that the member for Elizabeth criticises us for attempting to put the onus on the hospitals, yet not three months ago in this Parliament the biggest problem she could find with our Health Services Bill was that we were too centralist. The whole objection from the Labor Party to our Health Services Bill, which was attempting to make health better provided, was that we were too centralist. Now we are trying to put some responsibility back into the hospitals, and we get criticised for that. I cannot believe it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): The Minister for Health has taken up five minutes of valuable grievance time for backbenchers, but he certainly had a case to answer, there is no doubt about that, and he did not answer it very well at all. What this Minister for Health forgets, every time he gets on his feet, is that we are talking about human beings. We are not talking about economic units lying there in hospital: we are talking about sick people. For the Minister for Health to constantly forget that he is supposed to be doing something for sick and injured people rather than just some crude balancing of the books I think is appalling. He is without a doubt the worst and the most uncaring Minister for Health that I have come across in 20 years. Not once does he ever mention patients. Not once does he ever mention people. All he mentions is balancing the books, cutting the hospitals and attempting to make the hospitals responsible for the cuts when they are political cuts, cuts instigated by the Minister for Health.

Just one other example of how this Minister for Health has absolutely no interest in the health system as regards delivering services to real people, as opposed to this crude notion of balancing the books, concerns my electorate of Giles, where the Northwest Health Education Unit, based in Whyalla, is under threat from this Minister. I have spoken about this before in the House. I want to refresh members' memories in the few minutes available to me.

The Northwest Health Education Unit services nurse education throughout the north and the northwest of this State. It is not just my electorate: it is in the electorates of the members for Flinders, Eyre and possibly even some others. I know that the threat over this unit greatly concerns all nurses, all the hospitals, and all the health units throughout that vast area. What this Minister wants to do is centralise nurse education into Adelaide so that people will only occasionally have access to any kind of continuing education in nursing, rather than having the unit based in the country where it is very highly regarded and where the nurse educators, when they go out to the communities, have almost 100 per cent attendance at the programs that are presented. This will cease the moment that the Health Commission gets its hands on it and centralises it in Adelaide. That is what it wants to do.

I know that the Northwest Health Education Unit and about 20 other units in the area have contacted the Minister and they have all said, 'Please do not do that.' This is only a relatively small unit, with about three people, but it is very active in the area. They go out to the 20-odd health units in the country areas and are highly appreciated. It is the kind of program that a Government that had any regard for country people would continue; but, no, this Government puts it under threat.

What I find particularly disturbing is that not one member opposite who comes from the country area has in any way stood up to the Minister and said, 'Don't take this program out of the country areas.' Nobody in the Liberal Party room is prepared to stand up for country people. They have sold country people down the river over this past two years like I would not believe. I appreciate that it is an eastern suburbs crew that runs the show, but surely the country members in the Liberal Party ought to stand up and defend services in country areas.

This Government is running down services in country areas. It is depopulating the country towns and country areas. To in any way give lip service to being a Government that represents the whole of South Australia is absolute hypocrisy, because every action it takes is to take services out of country areas to the detriment of country people. I think the dozen or so country members who sit opposite in the Liberal Party ought to be thoroughly ashamed of themselves for the way they fail to stand up and defend country people on any occasion.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I rise this afternoon to commend the 'Sutch is Light' committee in my local town of Gawler. Last night I represented the Premier whilst attending a function within my own electorate in Gawler of the lighting of a Christmas tree. The Christmas tree is not just an ordinary Christmas tree because it contains some 23 000 lights. The tradition was started by Derek Sutch, a businessman in Gawler, who unfortunately died a number of years ago. He commenced the lighting of the tree entirely at his own expense. Following his death, it was decided that the community would continue the tradition where it is now quite an event on the calendar in Gawler. I am not good at estimating crowds, but at least 5 000 or 6 000 people last night attended the lighting of this Christmas tree.

In 1993 the now Premier (Hon. Dean Brown) turned on the lights. Last night Bazz and Pilko (and Peter Plus) arrived to turn on the lights of the tree. The 'Sutch is Light' committee, headed by Mr John Thorpe, does a tremendous amount of work in the lead-up by gaining support from local businesses to subsidise the lighting of this tree and to put on quite an event for the local community.

Tied in with the lighting of this tree last night was a commemoration of the 50 years of the end of the Second World War. The committee organised a flyover of planes over the township of Gawler at about 500 to 1 000 feet. Along with that, we had the taping of what would have been the bombing of London, with the sound of bombs dropping and the explosions as well. So it created quite an atmosphere for the people who were there.

The Gawler business community is to be commended for fostering what is becoming quite a tourist event in Gawler, as well an event for the local people. I also commend Qantas, as there was a raffle on the night and Qantas donated a trip to anywhere in the world for the winner of that raffle. Also 65 other companies became involved in the sponsorship of this event. Again, I commend the committee. I believe it has done an excellent job, and we can only wait for next year to see just what highlight John Thorpe and his team come up with.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Today, I want to talk about AIDS Awareness Week, and commend all members to support the AIDS Council during AIDS Awareness Week, particularly tomorrow. I am disappointed that the State Cabinet has noted but not endorsed the current State AIDS/HIV strategy, and neither the Premier nor the Minister for Health is appearing at an AIDS Awareness Week event. Of course, we should all be concerned that the current Government does not seem to appreciate the concern within the community about HIV and AIDS. It is interesting to note that last year they could not find a Liberal politician willing to launch some major things in the AIDS area, so they asked the Leader of the Opposition.

It is quite clear, too, that gay men and other homosexually active men account for 85 per cent of new HIV infections, yet prevention and education for this group accounts for only 15 per cent of funding in South Australia. So it is also clear that HIV funds are not being spent as well as they could be, because they are being wasted on marginal programs which do not contribute to the reduction of infections, which is the only target that counts. As a former Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, I am also concerned that HIV programs in Aboriginal communities are inadequate and that we risk a significant epidemic of HIV in this area, unless there are better strategies for the future.

HIV/AIDS is a virus that brings out the best and worst in Australia. It exposes some of our worst prejudices, born of ignorance, but it also highlights to us all the courage and commitment of dedicated Australians, individually and in groups, who serve others and give support. But there is no doubt that prejudice still impedes the sensible discussion of AIDS, despite all that has been achieved—prejudice at the political level (which is why you do not see the Premier or the Minister for Health involved in a high profile way) in the media and in the community.

Unfortunately, there is also prejudice in the surgery. Every day people affected by HIV/AIDS are confronted with extraordinary prejudice and ignorance. They confront prejudice in our health system, in doctors' and dentists' surgeries, in our hospitals, as well as in the wider community. I am told that the offices of many general practitioners are still rife with discrimination. Last year, when I raised these matters, I got a letter from a dentist, Dr T.J. Harrington, who apparently practises in the Mount Barker and Richmond areas. It states:

> Dear Mr Rann,
>
> You appear to be perpetuating the paranoia that persists in our population. People only expose themselves to the AIDS virus when:
>
> 1. they engage in promiscuous homosexual activity;
> 2. visit brothels in countries where AIDS is endemic;
> 3. are intravenous drug users not using proper hygiene.
>
> Please read this article and get things into perspective.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> T.J. Harrington.

I wrote back to Dr Harrington that I was most concerned about the nature and content of his letter. He claimed that only those groups exposed themselves to the AIDS virus which, of course, I said was quite wrong. It concerned me enormously that any health professional would not have mentioned the fact that the HIV virus can be and has been transmitted to health workers through needlestick and other forms of transmission. Fully informed medical personnel would have also been aware that many heterosexual women, including monogamous spouses, have contracted HIV from their infected partners, and someone does not have to be a promiscuous homosexual, intravenous drug user or brothel visitor to be affected with HIV.

Many Australians suffering with haemophilia would be most interested in Dr Harrington's letter; so would the parents of children who have contracted HIV through blood transfusions. That is basically what I wrote to Dr Harrington. This was a year ago, when I made a speech on AIDS Awareness Week. That is just an example of the extraordinary stupidity, prejudice and ignorance that people with HIV/AIDS have to experience in the community. They should not have to experience that type of ignorance and prejudice in dentists' or doctors' surgeries.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): On 17 November I read a letter I had sent to the boss of the Formula One Grand Prix, Bernie Ecclestone, and I have since received a reply, which I would like to quote. It reads:

Dear Steve,

Thank you for your letter of 16 November. Firstly, I was really happy your event went off so well. Secondly, I am a little unhappy that it was seen to be the last event. I am not sure whether it is going to be that easy for anyone to follow what you have managed to achieve over the last 11 years. I am quite sure Melbourne will be the people that will give it a good try.

I would like you to feel that I'm certain my association with Adelaide has not come to an end and, one way or another, our paths will cross again. I will look forward to seeing you again in Adelaide.

Warmest regards,

Bernie.

The reason I brought up this matter is that we lost the Grand Prix. We in this State have to realise one thing: we can do things better than can be done anywhere else in this country. We have proven that with the Adelaide Festival of Arts. Victoria has been trying to knock us off our perch for many years now with regard to the festival, but it will never achieve that aim. They may be able to pay more money and buy the Grand Prix, but they will never diminish the Adelaide Festival of Arts.

We did the Grand Prix in great style. We put on the Fringe Festival, and it is now becoming a world-class event, with people not only coming to perform from all over the world but to watch us. Womadelaide has become a world-class festival. The Come Out Festival has again been a world-class winner. In addition, Melbourne, which has the third largest Greek population of any city in the world behind Athens and Thessaloniki, cannot put on a Glendi Greek festival that comes even within cooee of this State's effort. Melbourne itself will never emulate a Grand Prix that will come anywhere near that which we have achieved.

One only has to look at its performance in putting on an AFL grand final to see that. For years we have seen the same old drab entertainment, the same old bags releasing the balloons of the competing teams' colours, the same Mickey Mouse-type performance before and during the game. We should look at what they are afraid of. They did not even have the decency to put their own people into organising the Formula One Grand Prix, because they were afraid of failure. So what do they do? They take Judith Griggs and Mike Drewer—home-grown products from Adelaide—and they put them in the two most important positions on the Grand Prix, because they did not have any confidence in Melburnians being able to do the job properly. Sydney is putting on an Olympic Games—the first Olympic Games in Australia for nearly 40 years. What do they do? They go and get Mal Hemmerling, because they do not have the confidence in the ability of their own people. Adelaide breeds people of enormous personality and outstanding qualities.

What we should be doing now is getting ready to give the world a world-class food and wine festival, and it should be held in the Victoria Park racecourse. Our restaurateurs should be invited to come out, and we should invite chefs from all over the world, because our seafood and produce is the best. We are becoming the food bowl of South-East Asia, and it will all happen from here. That food and wine festival should involve chefs from all over the world who can demonstrate their ability and talents in our international hotels—the Hyatt, the Hilton, the Intercontinental and the Parkroyal—and at our leading restaurants.

The one thing we must remember about South Australians is that the reason we do it better is our commitment, our skills, our pride in succeeding, our desire to be the best and our ideal population, which means that we are a caring community. Let us put on the very best: let us make an international food and wine festival that can become the standard not only for Australia but for the whole world to follow. I believe that we can put on a food and wine festival that will draw far more people over a two week period than the Grand Prix ever dreamt of.

WITNESS PROTECTION BILL

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a program to give protection and assistance to certain witnesses and other persons; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to formalise existing procedures by South Australia Police in relation to the protection of Crown witnesses who may be under threat or in danger of physical harm from some other criminal party.

Organised crime, violence and official corruption frequently taint the peacefulness of today's society. In these cases, the evidence of informants can often be vital to successful investigations and prosecutions of those involved. These witnesses, as a direct result of their co-operation with law enforcement agencies, frequently place themselves and their families at risk of injury or even death. Their safety is essential to the effective administration of the criminal justice system with law enforcement agencies having a duty to provide any necessary protection.

The increasing incidence of "organised crime" has also added a new dimension to the problem. It is clear that persons involved in activities of this nature are quite prepared to resort to violence and intimidation to prevent criminal enterprises being exposed. In extreme cases, it may be necessary for witnesses to be re-located outside of South Australia and provided with new identities, involving a change of passport, tax file number, Medicare number, etc.

The witness protection program currently operation by South Australia Police attempts to address this situation by demonstrating to the community that those who are prepared to assist in the enforcement of the law may confidently expect to be protected by it.

While the South Australian program has been operating effectively for several years, it has done so without any formal legislative endorsement. The need for formalisation is not apparent and has been somewhat hastened by the recent federally enacted *Witness Protection Act 1994*. This Act established a program for the protection and assistance of certain witnesses and other persons involved in proceedings within the Commonwealth jurisdiction.

Section 24(1) of the Commonwealth legislation now puts all States and Territories on notice by stating:

> Commonwealth identity documents must not, after the end of 12 months after the commencement of this Act, be issued for a person who is on a witness protection program being conducted by a State or Territory unless:
>
> *(a)* an arrangement is in force between the Minister and the relevant State or Territory Minister relating to the issue of Commonwealth identity documents for the purpose of that program; and
>
> *(b)* a complementary witness protection law is in force in the State or Territory.

Given that the *Witness Protection Act 1994* commenced on 18 April 1995, South Australia has until 18 April 1996 to enact complementary legislation and comply with section 24 of the Act if it wishes to continue utilising the change of identity arrangements.

There are several aspects of this Bill which deserve particular mention.

- The Commissioner of Police will be authorised to establish a State Witness Protection Program.
- Prior to inclusion in the Program, witnesses will be required to disclose certain personal information such as outstanding legal obligations, debts, criminal history, bankruptcy, business dealings, etc.
- A memorandum of understanding must be signed by the witness. Some of its provisions include agreement to undergo drug or alcohol counselling or treatment, allow fingerprints to be taken, comply with reasonable directions in relation to the protection and assistance provided, etc.
- If a new identity is to be established, authority in the form of an order must first be obtained from the Supreme Court.
- Among other things, this will require certain State authorities such as the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to make the necessary record entries to facilitate changes of identities.
- Various offences have been included to penalise unauthorised disclosure of information relating to witnesses or the Program.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause defines various terms used in the measure and contains other interpretative provisions.

Witness is defined widely to mean—

- a person who has given, or who has agreed to give, evidence on behalf of the Crown in right of this State, the Commonwealth, another State or a Territory in proceedings for an offence or in hearings or proceedings before a declared authority; or
- a person who has given, or who has agreed to give, evidence otherwise than as mentioned above in relation to the commission or possible commission of an offence against a law of this State, the Commonwealth, another State or a Territory; or
- a person who has made a statement to the Commissioner, another member of the police force or an approved authority in relation to an offence against a law of this State, the Commonwealth, another State or a Territory; or
- a person who, for any other reason, may require protection or other assistance under the Program; or
- a person who, because of their relationship to, or association with, such a person may require protection or other assistance under the Program.

Clause 4: Establishment of State Witness Protection Program

This clause requires the Commissioner to maintain the *State Witness Protection Program* under which the Commissioner and members of the police force who hold or occupy designated positions, arrange or provide protection and other assistance for witnesses, including things done as a result of powers and functions conferred on the Commissioner under a complementary witness protection law.

Clause 5: Inclusion in Program not to be reward for giving evidence, etc.

This clause prohibits the inclusion of a witness in the Program as a reward or as a means of persuading or encouraging the witness to give evidence or make a statement.

Clause 6: Arrangements with approved authorities

This clause empowers the Commissioner to enter into an arrangement with an approved authority about any matter in connection with the administration of a complementary witness protection law.

Clause 7: Authorisation of approved authorities

This clause empowers the Minister to authorise an approved authority to perform functions or exercise powers conferred on the Commissioner under this measure for the purposes of any arrangement entered into between the Commissioner and the approved authority.

Clause 8: Witness to disclose certain matters before inclusion in Program

This clause provides that the Commissioner must not include a witness in the Program unless the Commissioner is satisfied that the witness has provided all information necessary for the Commissioner to decide whether the witness should be included.

The clause sets out the information that a witness must disclose, which includes details of the witness's legal and financial obligations and liabilities, courts orders to which the witness is subject, the witness's bankruptcy status, immigration status, medical condition, criminal history and financial situation.

The Commissioner may require the witness to undergo medical tests or examinations and psychological or psychiatric examinations and make the results available to the Commissioner. The Commissioner is also empowered to make such other inquiries and investigations as the Commissioner considers necessary for the purposes of assessing whether the witness should be included in the Program.

Clause 9: Selection for inclusion in Program

This clause imposes on the Commissioner sole responsibility for deciding whether a witness should be included in the Program, including cases where an approved authority has requested that a witness be included. A witness can only be included in the Program if the Commissioner has decided that the witness be included and the witness agrees and signs a memorandum of understanding.

The matters that the Commissioner must have regard to when deciding whether to include a witness in the Program include—

- whether the witness has a criminal record, particularly crimes of violence (and the risk to the public of including the witness in the Program); and
- psychological or psychiatric examination or evaluation of the witness's suitability for inclusion in the Program; and
- the seriousness of the offence to which any relevant evidence or statement relates; and
- the nature and importance of any relevant evidence or statement; and
- whether there are viable alternative methods of protecting the witness; and
- the nature of the perceived danger to the witness; and
- the nature of the witness's relationship to other witnesses being assessed for inclusion in the Program.

Clause 10: Memorandum of understanding

This clause provides that a memorandum of understanding must set out—

- the basis on which a participant is included in the Program; and
- details of the protection and assistance to be provided; and
- a provision to the effect that protection and assistance under the Program may be terminated if the participant breaches the memorandum of understanding.

The Commissioner can vary a memorandum of understanding, but not so as to remove the above matters from it. A memorandum of understanding may also include—

- the terms and conditions on which protection and assistance is to be provided (including withdrawal of protection and assistance if the participant commits an offence, engages in specified conduct or compromises the integrity of the Program); and
- an agreement by the participant not to compromise the security of, or any other aspect of, protection or assistance being provided; and
- an agreement by the participant to comply with all reasonable directions of the Commissioner in relation to protection and assistance being provided; and
- an agreement by the participant, if required by the Commissioner—
  - to undergo medical, psychological or psychiatric tests or examinations; and
- to undergo drug or alcohol counselling or treatment; and
- to allow his or her fingerprints to be taken; and
- allow photographs of himself or herself to be taken; and
- a list of the witness's obligations and an agreement as to how those obligations are to be met; and
- a financial support agreement; and
- an agreement by the participant to disclose to the Commissioner details of any criminal charges and civil and bankruptcy proceedings against the participant.

The memorandum of understanding is also required to include a statement that advises the witness of their right to complain to the Police Complaints Authority about the conduct of the Commissioner or another member of the police force in relation to the matters dealt with in the memorandum.

A witness becomes included in the Program when the Commissioner signs the memorandum of understanding.

Clause 11: Register of participants

This clause requires the Commissioner to maintain a register of participants, in conjunction with which the Commissioner must keep the original of each memorandum of understanding, copies of each

new birth certificate issued under the Program and certain other documents.

Clause 12: Access to register

This clause restricts access to the register of participants, and documents kept in conjunction with the register, to the Commissioner, members of the police force who hold or occupy designated positions and are authorised by the Commissioner, participants, the Police Complaints Authority and persons allowed access by the Commissioner (if the Commissioner is of the opinion that it is in the interests of the administration of justice).

Clause 13: Action where witness included in Program

This clause requires the Commissioner to take such action as the Commissioner considers necessary and reasonable to protect the safety and welfare of a witness included in the Program or being assessed for inclusion (while also protecting the safety of members of the police force). The Commissioner may—

- apply for documents to allow the witness to establish a new identity or otherwise to protect the witness; and
- permit members of the police force to use assumed names in carrying out their duties in relation to the Program; and
- relocate the witness; and
- provide accommodation for the witness; and
- provide transportation for the witness's property; and
- provide payments for the reasonable living expenses of the witness (and family) and other financial assistance; and
- provide payments to meet costs associated with relocating the witness; and
- provide assistance to the witness to obtain employment or access to education; and
- provide other assistance for ensuring that the witness becomes self-sustaining; and
- do other things that the Commissioner considers necessary to protect the witness.

The Commissioner cannot obtain documentation that represents the witness to have qualifications that the witness does not have, or to be entitled to benefits that the witness would not be entitled to apart from the Program.

Clause 14: Dealing with rights and obligations of participant

This clause requires the Commissioner to take such steps as are reasonably practicable to ensure that any outstanding rights or obligations of a participant are dealt with according to law, and that any restrictions to which the participant is subject are complied with. The Commissioner may—

- provide protection for a participant while he or she is attending court; and
- notify a party or possible party to legal proceedings that the Commissioner will accept process issued by a court or tribunal on behalf of the participant.

If the Commissioner is satisfied that a participant is using a new identity provided under the Program to avoid obligations incurred, or restrictions imposed, before the new identity was established, the Commissioner must notify the participant that unless the participant satisfies the Commissioner that the obligations will be dealt with according to law or the restrictions complied with, the Commissioner will take such action as he or she considers necessary to ensure that they are so dealt with or complied with.

Clause 15: Cessation of protection and assistance

This clause requires protection and assistance to a participant under the Program to be terminated at the participant's request. The Commissioner may terminate protection and assistance to a participant if—

- the participant deliberately breaches a term of the memorandum of understanding; or
- the Commissioner discovers the participant to have knowingly given information that is false or misleading in a material particular; or
- the participant's conduct or threatened conduct is in the opinion of the Commissioner likely to compromise the Program; or
- the circumstances giving rise to the need for protection and assistance for the participant cease to exist; or
- the participant deliberately breaches an undertaking given in relation to a matter relevant to the Program; or
- the participant fails or refuses to sign a new memorandum of understanding when required to do so; or
- in the opinion of the Commissioner there is no reasonable justification for the participant to remain in the Program,

and the Commissioner is of the opinion that, in the circumstances of the case, protection and assistance should be terminated.

Clause 16: Restoration of former identity

This clause empowers the Commissioner to take such action as is necessary to restore the former identity of a participant who has been provided with a new identity under the Program if protection and assistance to the participant is terminated. The Commissioner may require the former participant to return all documents relating to the new identity. If the person refuses to do so without a reasonable excuse, he or she commits an offence (maximum penalty—$1 000 fine).

Clause 17: Authorisation for establishment of new identity or restoration of former identity

This clause empowers the Supreme Court, on application by the Commissioner, to make orders for the purpose of—

- establishing a new identity for a witness; or
- restoring the former identity of a witness provided with a new identity.

An order may require a prescribed authority (the Principal Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles or a person or body declared by regulation to be a prescribed authority)—

- to make entries in a prescribed register; or
- to issue new documentation, including certificate, licences, permits or other authorities.

An order cannot authorise the issue of documentation for a person that represents the person to have qualifications that the person does not have, or to be entitled to benefits that the person would not be entitled to if the witness were not included in the Program.

The Court may only make an order to establish a new identity if satisfied that—

- the making of the order is necessary and reasonable to protect the safety and welfare of the witness; and
- the witness and the Commissioner have entered into a memorandum of understanding; and
- the witness is likely to comply with the memorandum of understanding.

The Court may only make an order to restore a previous identity if satisfied that protection and assistance to the witness under the Program has been terminated.

Proceedings for orders under this provision must be conducted in private and unless authorised by the Court, records of proceedings are not open to inspection.

Clause 18: Non-disclosure of former identity of participant

This clause authorises a person who is provided with a new identity under a witness protection program to refuse to disclose their former identity if the Commissioner or an approved authority has given them permission to do so. It also makes it lawful for the person to claim in legal proceedings that the new identity is their only identity.

Clause 19: Special commercial arrangements by Commissioner

This clause empowers the Commissioner to make commercial arrangements with a person under which a participant is able to obtain benefits under a contract or arrangement without revealing their former identity.

Clause 20: Offences

This clause makes it an offence for a person, without lawful authority, to disclose information about the identity or location of a present or former participant in a witness protection program, or information that compromises the security of such a person (maximum penalty—imprisonment for 10 years).

The clause also makes it an offence for a prospective, present or former participant in a witness protection program to disclose—

- the fact that he or she is such a participant; or
- information about the operation of the program; or
- information about a member of the police force involved, presently or in the past, in the program or any person who is assisting or has assisted in the program; or
- the fact that he or she has signed a memorandum of understanding; or
- details of a memorandum of understanding signed by the person.

(Maximum penalty—imprisonment for 5 years). However, the Commissioner or relevant approved authority may authorise a disclosure. A disclosure may also be made if it is necessary to comply with an order of the Supreme Court or for the purposes of an investigation by the Police Complaints Authority.

The clause makes it an offence for a person to make a record of, or disclose or communicate to another person, any information relating to action under clause 17 to establish a new identity for a person or to restore a person's former identity, unless it is necessary

for the purposes of this measure, to comply with an order of the Supreme Court or for the purposes of an investigation by the Police Complaints Authority (maximum penalty—imprisonment for 10 years).

The clause does not prevent a disclosure that is necessary for the purpose of action under clause 17 to establish a new identity for a person or restore a person's former identity.

Clause 21: Provision of information to approved authorities

This clause authorises the Commissioner to provide an approved authority with certain information about a participant and the Program if the participant is under investigation for, or is arrested or charged with, an offence.

Clause 22: Commissioner and members not to be required to disclose information

This clause provides that the Commissioner, a member of the police force, the Police Complaints Authority or a prescribed authority cannot be required to disclose certain information or produce certain documents to a court, tribunal, Royal Commission or approved authority except where it is necessary to do so to carry the provisions of this measure into effect.

The location and circumstances of a participant in a witness protection program can only be disclosed to a judicial officer in chambers (but not if other persons are present). The judicial officer is required to keep that information secret.

Information about a financial support arrangement for a present or former participant in a witness protection program can be disclosed if it is provided in such a way that it cannot identify their location, or prejudice their safety.

Clause 23: Requirement where participant becomes a witness in criminal proceedings

This clause requires a person who is provided with a new identity under the Program, who retains that identity and who has a criminal record under their former identity, to notify the Commissioner if the person is to be a witness in criminal proceedings under that new identity maximum penalty—$1 000).

After the Commissioner receives such notice the Commissioner may take such action as he or she considers necessary, including disclosing the person's criminal record to the court, prosecutor and the accused person or their legal representative.

Clause 24: Identity of participant not to be disclosed in court proceedings etc.

This clause provides that if the identity of a participant in a witness protection program is in issue or may be disclosed in proceedings, the court, tribunal or Royal Commission must hold the part of the proceedings relating to the participant's identity in private and order the suppression of evidence to ensure that the participant's identity is not disclosed.

Clause 25: Immunity from personal liability

This clause gives the Commissioner, a member of the police force, a prescribed authority or any other person involved in the administration of the measure, immunity from personal liability for an honest act or omission in the exercise or discharge, or purported exercise or discharge, of a power or duty under the measure. Liability lies instead against the Crown.

Clause 26: Delegation

This clause limits the delegation of the Commissioner's powers under this measure to a member of the police force who holds or occupies a designated position. The delegate cannot sub-delegate the power.

Clause 27: Annual report

This clause requires the Commissioner to keep the Minister informed of the general operations, performance and effectiveness of the Program. It also requires the Minister, in consultation with the Commissioner, to prepare an annual report (in a manner that does not prejudice the effectiveness or security of the Program) and table it in both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days of its completion.

Clause 28: Regulations

This clause empowers the Governor to make regulations.

SCHEDULE

Transitional Provision

Clause 1: Transitional provision

This clause provides for those persons who, immediately before the commencement of this measure, are included in the Witness Protection Program operated by the South Australian police force, to automatically become participants in the Program established by this measure.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Correctional Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to make various amendments to the *Correctional Services Act 1982*.

The first amendment relates to the work release program. The vision statement for the Department for Correctional Services is 'To contribute to a safer community by providing offenders with opportunities to stop offending'.

A progressive prison system provides for a graduated security regime which reduces in intensity as prisoners progress through the system and attitudinal and motivational changes occur. These changes are primarily as a consequence of the rehabilitation programs offered within the prison system.

One of these programs is work release, where selected prisoners are able to undertake daily work in the last six months of their sentence. This program operates from the Northfield Prison Cottages and duplicates as closely as possible, conditions prisoners can expect to encounter upon their release.

Since 1985, the Department has deducted a sum of money from wages earned in outside employment, up to a maximum of $80 per week. This figure closely resembles the market rate for shared accommodation in the general community. This payment is also viewed as a contribution by prisoners towards the cost of their board at the Northfield Cottages.

An agreement authorising the deduction of such monies is signed by participating prisoners.

Legal advice previously obtained failed to reveal any impropriety in this practice.

However, recent legal opinion has suggested that the Correctional Services Act does not allow the Chief Executive Officer to charge prisoners for the cost of board as a condition of their participation in the Work Release Program.

The Work Release Program is an important step in a prisoner's rehabilitation and it is considered necessary for such prisoners to experience conditions as closely resembling those encountered in the general community as possible to assist in their successful assimilation back into the community.

Amendment of the Act is considered essential to the continuation of this very important program.

Secondly, the Act provides the Department with the authority to release eligible prisoners onto the Home Detention Scheme.

Home detention is an intensive supervision option for prisoners who meet appropriate criteria to be supervised in the community prior to their ultimate release.

An amendment to Section 37a of the Act that came into operation on 21 December 1990 unintentionally precluded Federal offenders who were serving 12 months or more, but who were subject to a recognisance release order, from being considered for home detention. As a result, interim measures by the Federal Minister for Justice were introduced to release recommended offenders on Federal licence under Section 19AP of the *Crimes Act 1914*. These provisions have proved to be cumbersome and due to the lapse in time now no longer apply.

One of the amendments in this Bill therefore aims to ensure that Federal offenders serving 12 months or more, but having a recognisance release order, are eligible to participate in the Home Detention Scheme. It will also ensure that the Department for Correctional Services has the authority to revoke the home detention orders of those Federal offenders breaching conditions of release, consistent with legislative provisions relating to State offenders. Currently the Department is required to apply to the Magistrates Court to deal with a Federal offender on home detention who has breached the conditions of release and the offender must be notified 14 days in advance of the intended court hearing. A magistrate must then determine whether the offender should be returned to prison.

A further amendment in this Bill will ensure that the term 'residence' also includes, if the prisoner is an Aborigine who resides

on tribal lands or an Aboriginal reserve, any area of land specified in the instrument of release.

As part of its 1993 election policy, the Government undertook to conduct an investigation into Drugs in Prisons in South Australia. The inquiry has been completed and the recommendations of that investigation are now being implemented.

The Investigation into Drugs in Prisons recommended that:

Correctional Services Officers be given the authority to stop, search and detain any person, on prison property, who is reasonably suspected of attempting to bring drugs or other contraband into prison.

It is recommended that section 33 of the Correctional Services Act 1982 be amended to allow for the examination of all incoming and outgoing mail, with the exception of items from those agencies referred to in section 33(7).

The Investigation found that although satisfactory cooperation existed between prisons and police, it is not always possible for police to respond to an alert that a visitor to a prison may have drugs in their possession. As a consequence, the only option available to prison management is to challenge the suspected person with the result that they generally leave prison property and may pass any contraband which they are carrying to another person for delivery to a prisoner.

Those detected are subsequently banned from entering all prisons for a given period of time.

It also needs to be recognised that the types of drugs entering prisons are not limited to 'prohibited substances' such as heroin or cannabis, but include 'prescription drugs' and 'drugs of dependence', such as Rohypnol, Serepax and Rivotril. These drugs are not illegal but when used with other substances or in large doses, can have a severe reaction.

Consistent with the recommendations of the Investigation into Drugs in Prisons in South Australia, for the Department for Correctional Services to take more effective action in preventing drugs and other contraband from entering prisons, it must provide prison management with the authority to stop, search and detain any person on prison property, who is reasonably suspected of attempting to bring drugs or other contraband into prisons.

Failure to provide this authority currently allows suspected persons who have been challenged and asked to leave the prison to pass drugs or contraband to another person for transmission to a prisoner. Eviction from the institution is the only effective option which prison management has at its immediate disposal.

The wider issue of what constitutes a drug is also relevant. Legally prescribed drugs such as those previously referred to (Rohypnol, Serepax and Rivotril) have become 'popular' with prisoners and while it is currently illegal for visitors to have them in their possession when they enter a prison, it is difficult to establish that a visitor intended to pass them on to a prisoner.

It is therefore proposed to amend the Act to require persons entering prisons to obtain the approval of the Manager to carry any prohibited item (this includes prescription drugs) which is needed for a lawful purpose.

Where a person fails to obtain consent from the Manager, the onus will be on them to prove that they did not have the drug in their possession for the purpose of supply to prisoners, and if they discharge that onus, a lesser penalty applies.

I refer now to the handling of prisoners' mail.

The Act provides that mail cannot be opened except under certain circumstances.

Subject to the Act, a manager may, with the approval of the Minister, cause—

(a) any letter sent to or by a prisoner who is, in the opinion of the manager, likely to attempt to escape from prison;

(b) any letter sent by a prisoner who has previously written or threatened to write, a letter that would contravene the section; or

(c) any other letter, selected on a random basis, sent to or by a prisoner,

to be opened and perused by an authorised officer for the purposes of determining whether it contravenes this section of the Act.

The ability of prison management to peruse mail is considered vital in detecting illegal activity and therefore the Investigation into Drugs in South Australian Prisons recommended that section 33 of the Act be amended so that all incoming and outgoing mail, with the exception of legal and Parliamentary items, may be opened and examined.

The current provisions for the handling of prisoner's mail are considered cumbersome and operationally inefficient. They require the Minister to authorise the appointment of officers to open prisoner mail. Additionally, all prisoner mail opened must be officially stamped and notated.

Existing practices for handling mail must be amended with greater authority being given to prison managers if control of the entry of drugs and contraband, and restriction of illegal activity by prisoners, recommended in the Investigation, are to be achieved.

It is considered inefficient for the Minister to maintain responsibility for the appointment of authorised officers and to approve the opening and inspection, or perusal of all mail. It is proposed that this responsibility should be transferred to the prison manager to permit the perusal of all mail except for certain legal, Parliamentary and other approved items.

Similarly, given that all mail is now to be opened, it will be unnecessary for an authorised officer to indicate on all mail that it has been opened, perused or examined and therefore it is proposed that this requirement should be removed from the current Act.

The final component of this Bill seeks to provide for wider flexibility in the release of information relating to prisoners.

Section 85B of the Correctional Services Act 1982 states that *'An employee of the Department must not, except as required or authorised to do so by law or in the course of employment, disclose to another person any information contained in a file maintained within the Department in relation to a prisoner, or a person on probation or parole.'*

In addition, Crown Law opinion has recently been received concerning Section 77 of the Act. This opinion indicates that whilst, under the present provisions of the Act, the Parole Board may provide appropriate information to victims of crime, it may only do so under its statutory function. Disclosures beyond the requirements of its statutory function may not be regarded as bona fide.

The Government's 1993 Correctional Services Policy states that a Liberal Government will '*allow police to make submissions to the Parole Board on a prisoner's application for parole, and victims may be notified of the application where violence was involved in the original offence.'*

In addition, the Government Policy for the Attorney-General and Law Reform states that a Liberal Government will '*provide more information to victims about investigations, bail and transfer and release of offenders.*'

The Department for Correctional Services, in consultation with the South Australia Police Department and the Victims of Crime Service, has established a 'Victims Register' for 'bona fide' victims who have expressed a desire to be kept informed about their offenders.

Under the proposed amendments, the Department for Correctional Services will have a discretion to provide appropriate information to these victims, to the prisoner's family, friends or legal representatives , or to any other appropriate person.

In addition, the Parole Board is given the power to provide information to selected members of the community concerning the release of an offender on parole.

Constraints caused by the Correctional Services Act 1982, the Freedom of Information Act 1991, Cabinet Administrative Instruction Number 1 of 1989—*Information Privacy Principles* will be overcome by amending Section 85B of the Correctional Services Act.

The effect will be to provide the Department for Correctional Services and the Parole Board with the discretionary right to provide information to specified classes of persons. Such information will include sentence details, release date, approval for home detention, transfer details, approved leave details and escapes.

The discretion to release information should not be limited to victims of crime. The present legislation also prevents the Department for Correctional Services from responding to legitimate inquiries, ie persons wishing to visit an offender cannot be informed where the prisoner is being detained unless the prisoner's consent is first obtained. The large number of these inquiries makes this a significant problem.

Other third parties include Government and semi-Government agencies (State and Commonwealth), and other persons who may have a proper interest in the release of the information, such as the Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Service and the Victims of Crime Service.

The proposed amendment does not compel the Department for Correctional Services or the Parole Board to release information to victims of crime or any other person or organisation. In some cases an offender's health or well being may be put at risk by the release of such information. It is proposed that the Chief Executive Officer

of the Department or the Parole Board have the discretion to refuse to meet requests where circumstances dictate. It is further provided that a decision by the Chief Executive Officer or the Board as to whether a person is an eligible person, or to grant or refuse an application for information, is final and is not reviewable by a court.

This Bill serves to demonstrate, amongst other things, this Government's commitment to victims of crime and to stamping out drugs in prisons.

The above amendments are considered essential to the smooth workings of the prison system.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement of the Act on proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 27—Leave of absence from prison

This clause amends the section that empowers the CEO to grant leave of absence to prisoners for certain purposes. It is provided that the CEO may make it a condition, if leave of absence is granted for paid employment, that the prisoner pay an amount by way of board and lodging while he or she is so employed.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 33—Prisoners' mail

This clause provides that the manager of a prison may cause all letters (with certain exceptions) sent to or by prisoners to be opened and examined for the purpose of determining whether any letter contravened the section. Letters will no longer have to be marked as having been opened. It is provided that authorised officers for the opening of mail will be appointed by prison managers.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 37A—Release of eligible prisoners on home detention

This clause provides two definitions in relation to the home detention provisions. First, 'non-parole period' is defined to include the minimum term of imprisonment to be served by a Federal prisoner who is subject to a recognisance release order. Second, the term 'residence' is defined to include Aboriginal tribal lands or reserves specified in the home detention order made in respect of any particular Aboriginal prisoner.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 51—Offences by persons other than prisoners

This clause provides that if a person is found guilty of introducing a prohibited item into a prison without permission, a lesser penalty is available if the defendant proves that he or she did not intend to part with possession of the item while in the prison.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 77—Proceedings before the Board

This clause makes it clear that the Parole Board has a discretion to release details of any order it may make in relation to a prisoner or parolee to certain specified persons or to any other person (e.g. a media representative) the Board thinks has a proper interest in the release of the information. A decision of the Board to release, or not to release, information is not reviewable by a court.

Clause 8: Substitution of s. 85B

This clause inserts a new provision in the Act giving the manager of a prison the power to cause any person (whether a staff member or visitor) to be detained and searched if there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that the person may be in possession of a prohibited item without the permission of the manager. Vehicles entering the prison may similarly be searched. The rules for conducting a body search are much the same as those for searching prisoners, except that nothing may be introduced into a body orifice and two other persons must be present at all times. If a prohibited item is found as a result of a search, the person (or driver) may be detained until handed over into the custody of the police. Prohibited items may be retained as evidence or disposed of or dealt with in accordance with section 33A. New section 85C recasts the existing confidentiality provision to give a wider flexibility in the release of information relating to prisoners to, for example, appropriate interstate authorities. The penalty for breach of this section is increased from $2 000 to $10 000 in line with modern confidentiality provisions. New section 85C empowers the Chief Executive Officer to release certain information to specified eligible persons or to any other person (*e.g.* the media) who the CEO thinks has a proper interest in the release of the information. A decision by the CEO as to whether a person is eligible or whether to release information to a particular person is not reviewable by a court.

Clause 9: Amendment of penalties

This clause amends all penalties in the Act so that they appear in dollars, in line with Government policy.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (OVERCROWDING AT PUBLIC VENUES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 November. Page 798.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition is pleased to support the second reading of the Bill. As I indicated to the Deputy Premier last night when the Bill was introduced for the first time in this House, the Opposition will facilitate the passage of the legislation in less time than would normally be the case, where normally the Bill would lie in the House for at least a week, now that this is expected to be the last sitting day until February next year. Our reason for doing that is fairly self-evident. Given that the festive season is almost upon us and that this issue deals with public safety, the Opposition wants to do all it can to provide effective powers for the police to ensure that there is no overcrowding of places of public entertainment.

The Bill provides police with considerable powers that they have not previously had. Senior police officers will have the power to order people to leave premises and effectively close down a venue if the opinion is formed that there is serious risk of injury or damage due to overcrowding. Traditionally, the policing of overcrowding has been the responsibility of the Metropolitan Fire Service. The definition of 'public venue' is also interesting. The Attorney tells us at that it is deliberately wide and goes well beyond the premises that would previously have been considered to be places of public entertainment. For example, a very wide range of sporting events takes place outdoors at public venues; these will be covered. Local concerts or barbecues organised by charity groups, community groups or local councils may also be covered by this legislation.

Presumably, commonsense will prevail and the opportunity for overcrowding must, in general terms, be less than for confined spaces, including indoor venues. The Opposition queries why churches and places of public worship are excluded from the definition. I appreciate that the title of the Bill is 'public entertainment', so that may well be the case.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: As the Minister interjects, perhaps there will be divine protection. We appreciate that the police may be reluctant to intervene in a religious ceremony, but it must be remembered that the police would be able to take action only if a senior police officer considered that there was serious risk of injury or damage due to overcrowding. In practice it will never be a problem, one hopes, but the question is still raised as to why churches and other places of worship are singled out as exceptions. The additional police powers that I noted earlier in my contribution in relation to overcrowding must be seen in the perspective of existing police powers.

These powers are considerable in relation to people loitering in public places (which is covered by section 18 of the Summary Offences Act) and in relation to public meetings generally (which are covered by section 18A of the Summary Offences Act). In any event, we support the second reading of the Bill. Issues have been raised with the Attorney in another place along the lines of those that I have raised in this contribution. I commend the Bill to the House and wish it a speedy passage through to proclamation to give greater protection to public safety.

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

[Sitting suspended from 3.58 to 5.30 p.m.]

OFFICE FOR THE AGEING BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (FORUM REPLACEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION (CONSTITUTION OF COMMISSION) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WATER RESOURCES (IMPOSITION OF LEVIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 3 (clause 10)—After line 28 insert new section as follows:

'Report as to degradation of water in watercourse, etc.

38AA. (1) The Minister or a catchment water management board may prepare a report—

(a) on the degradation of water in a proclaimed watercourse, lake or well and the factors causing the degradation; and

(b) suggesting measures to improve the quality of the water; and

(c) setting out an estimate of the cost of implementing those measures.

(2) The Minister or the board may cause the report to be published in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the State.'

No. 2. Page 3, lines 30 and 31 (clause 10)—Leave out subsection (1) and insert new subsections as follow:

(1) Where a report has been prepared and published under section 38AA in relation to a proclaimed watercourse, lake or well, the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, declare levies in relation to the taking of water from the watercourse, lake or well for a financial year that does not commence more than five years after the report was published.

(1a) Levies declared under subsection (1) may raise the amount estimated in the report as the cost of implementing measures to improve the quality of the water or an amount that is more or less than that amount.'

No. 3. Page 11,lines 5 to 16 (clause 10)—Leave out subsections (1) and (2) and insert new subsections as follow:

(1) Money paid to the Minister in satisfaction of a liability for levies or interest under this division must be paid into a fund to be called the Water Resources Levy Fund.

(1a) The fund must be applied for the following purposes in such shares as the Minister thinks fit:

(a) providing funds to boards established under the Catchment Water Management Act 1995;

(b) any other purpose relating to the management, or improving the quality, of the State's water resources.

(2) The Minister must, as far as practicable, allocate money comprising the fund so as to benefit proportionately the water resources in relation to which the money was paid.'

No. 4. Page 11 (clause 10)—After line 18 insert new subsections and new section as follows:

(4) The Minister may invest money standing to the credit of the fund that is not immediately required for the purposes referred to in subsection (1a) in such manner as is approved by the Treasurer.

(5) Income derived from investment of the fund must be credited to the fund.

Accounts and audit

38K. (1) The Minister must cause proper accounts to be kept of money paid to and from the fund.

(2) The Auditor-General may at any time, and must at least once in each year, audit the accounts of the fund.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

SOUTH EASTERN WATER CONSERVATION AND DRAINAGE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (GENERAL OFFENCES—POISONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 5.45 to 9.17 p.m.]

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the House no longer insist on its amendments.

I move this motion because there are important facets of the Bill which the Attorney-General does not wish to see lost. The issue of appeals was a matter that was valiantly fought for by this House. I was pleased with the support that I received from the other side of the House. It should be put on the record that the other place did not support victims and the right of appeal, and that is a great shame. In the past four years there has been one case which the DPP considered could have gone through this process where it was felt that a mistake had been made in either fact or law. One case in four years—yet members in the other place could not support the right of victims to justice. That is what it is all about. It is an absolute matter of justice, whereby people can feel that the courts are doing the job for which they have been appointed.

What it really says to the people of South Australia is that the judges can continue to make decisions and they can acquit people wrongly, yet there is no redress. There is precedent which shows quite clearly that it is competent for this Parliament to provide a set of rules which allows for the scrutiny of an acquittal where the DPP believes that an injustice has been done. It was not the view of the ALP or the Australian Democrats that this should be the case. I believe that it is a grim day for South Australia when the judiciary goes without scrutiny, when there is no appeal.

There is the right of appeal in the Magistrates Court, and we know that there are many competent magistrates. It is felt that it is just for decisions in the Magistrates Court to be put

under scrutiny and an appeal launched if there has been a mistake in fact or law. However, a judge sitting alone, making his or her own decision, is not subject to scrutiny, not subject to peer review—not subject to anything. I believe that the courts are in need of repair. In recent years they have come under notice for some of their decisions and the way they have taken them. They have come under notice in terms of the discriminatory comments that have been made. Here was an opportunity to restore some faith in the courts, yet the Opposition and the Democrats failed to take the initiative. I believe it is a criminal act on behalf of the Opposition and the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that members calm down.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I reflect on the decision taking and decision making capacity of the Opposition and the Democrats in this case.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will not take much time on this matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: You should not encourage me because I will take the full time: I will, absolutely. If you want me to double it, I will.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker: wise as ever.

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: There should not be so much laughter, Sir, and I mean that quite respectfully. The fact is that the Deputy Premier is not only 100 per cent wrong when it comes to the practicalities of this issue but he is 100 per cent wrong on the morality of this issue. I realise that, when we deal with morality, this bankrupt Liberal Government has absolutely no morality at all. I appreciate, Mr Speaker, that you have to differentiate between being a member of a bankrupt political Party and being the member for Eyre, and I am extremely conscious of the difference.

With respect to this whole issue, no person should face double jeopardy. I can understand certain emotions amongst the ill-informed in our community, aided and abetted by certain sensationalist journalists within our community and by the ignoramuses who largely occupy the Government benches. Mr Speaker, I appreciate that you are silently cautioning me on that issue, but generally Liberal members of Parliament are ignoramuses. I do not hold that against them—they happen to be elected to this Parliament and I have to tolerate them. However, the issue I take on this point is simply this—

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The chief ignoramus, the member for Wright, fortunately will not be here in two years. The Deputy Premier has said that there was perhaps only one occasion over the past four years where the Director of Public Prosecutions may have—and I emphasis the words 'may have'—sought to appeal a decision taken by a judge on his or her own. That is very important, because it shows that all that the Government has reacted to is the knee-jerk, red-necked reaction of public opinion with respect to penalties awarded without regard to the facts of not only an individual case that may have excited the saliva of public opinion but the issue with respect to the population as a whole.

The Government has said that it wants to change an ancient tradition and law with respect to the rights of defendants in this whole matter simply because it is politically embarrassed by the actions of certain judges, whether they are right or wrong. As the Deputy Premier said, in the past four years there has been barely one case where the DPP might have considered appealing.

As we look at the traditional foundation of Anglo-Saxon law in this country, I echo the thoughts of the member for Florey, who has had the absolute guts and determination on this issue to stand up to Executive Government *vis-a-vis* the knee-jerk reaction of the general populace, and I commend him for that. In political terms, I will work off my rear end to defeat the member for Florey at the next State election, but he has shown incredible guts—a very courageous opponent on a fundamental principle of Anglo-Saxon law in this State.

It may be a case for the master groveller, the member for Unley, to try to traduce the points made by the member for Florey in this area, but I commend the member for Florey because he has shown an enormous amount of courage. It is not easy for any of us who are Party politically affiliated to say that we disagree with our Party so much that we will cross the floor on a particular issue. He has shown an enormous amount of guts and determination in this area and I commend the member for Florey for that. He may use my comments in his re-election campaign. I am sure he absolutely welcomes my comments of commendation.

I am reading a book, *Profiles and Courage*, written 40 years ago by the former President of the United States, the late President Kennedy. In it, the former President, then a Senator in the 1950s, wrote about a number of politicians in the United States, at the State level as well nationally, who were prepared to stand up for principles against the so-called prevailing public opinion. The member for Florey was prepared to do that on this occasion, and I commend him for it. At the end of the day, he is still a mongrel—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Deputy Leader has nearly gone far enough.

Mr CLARKE: I agree, Mr Speaker; I retract that comment. Notwithstanding my accolades, the reason that the member for Florey still chooses to remain a member of the Liberal Party escapes us. I thoroughly support the Legislative Council's position in this area. I commend it to the House and support the actions of the member for Florey.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 10 insert new subclause as follows:—

'(5A) However, if a worker who is within 6 months of retirement age or above retirement age, becomes incapacitated for work while still in employment, weekly payments are, subject to the following exceptions, payable for a period of incapacity falling within 6 months after the commencement of the incapacity.

Exceptions—

(a) weekly payments are not payable under this subsection for a period of incapacity falling after the worker reaches 70 years of age;

(b) weekly payments are not payable under this subsection to—

(i) a worker who is, at the commencement of the incapacity, employed by a body corporate of which the worker is a director; or

(ii) a worker who is not, at common law, an employee of the employer unless the Crown is the worker's presumptive employer under section 103A.'

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Mr CLARKE: I thank you, Mr Chairman, for the enthusiasm with which you have greeted my rising to my feet on this issue. I understand the reality of politics.

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Mr Chairman, with respect to this matter—

An honourable member: Sit down.

Mr CLARKE: When I see the member for Unley waving his paw, encouraging me to sit down, that only encourages me to go further. Indeed, I could go on for hours, but I will not.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is grossly mistaken. If he is repetitive, he will be seated. Repetition is not permitted.

Mr CLARKE: The issue with respect to the amendment made by the Legislative Council is quite simple. Under the workers' compensation legislation, the Government's original intention was that a worker over the age of 65 would not receive income maintenance. The Labor Party's position was simply that that person should receive income maintenance for not less than 12 months. That is not an unreasonable position, particularly given the circumstances that I outlined concerning a constituent of mine, Mr Doug Oliver, with respect to the Woodroffe company. Mr Oliver was injured in the course of his employment overwhelmingly because of the negligence of his employer. That employer cannot be sued under the Workers Compensation Act for negligence. That person, who is married to a younger woman, needs to pay off his mortgage and he needs to keep his wife and wants the security that, should he pass away, his wife will be able to afford to maintain their family home.

In his reply at the second reading stage last week, the Minister said that he opposed the Opposition's amendment to provide 12 months' income maintenance, but he gave out some hope. Unfortunately, I am only too well aware of the politics of the situation, and the Minister and the Australian Democrats have come to an agreement in the form of the amendments that are now before the Committee. If I understand them correctly, they provide that, instead of 12 months' maintenance, an injured employee over the age of 65 years is entitled to six months' income maintenance provided they are not over the age of 70 years. That is a demonstrable improvement on the former position of the Government but it is nowhere near as fair as that which was put forward by the Opposition.

The Democrats have shown on this issue, as they have done on so many occasions, that, when it comes down to real workers and to what interests workers in this society, they are little better than the Liberal Party. They seek to pretend that they are supporters of the working class but, when it comes down to legislation which deals with working class issues—and you cannot get anything more working class than workers' compensation—the Democrats fade into the background. In fact, that terminology is too kind: they disappear at a rapid rate of knots. I must say that, at the end of the day, the Democrat amendment, whilst not being as good as the Labor Party's amendment with respect to workers over the age of 65 years, is better than the Liberal Government's original proposal that they receive no income maintenance.

What really concerns me is that too many injuries at the workplaces of this State are so easily avoidable but, because employers are so slapdash, so lazy and so inconsiderate with respect to workers' health and safety, they allow those injuries to occur notwithstanding very simple actions that they could undertake which would allow—

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I am very pleased that the member for Peake should interject whilst out of his seat, because he has actually enthused me to go longer.

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I am getting there. All I am simply saying is that, with respect to workers compensation and rehabilitation, this Government has given a lot of lip service. But what they should do is send an inspector down to Woodroffes sheet metal at Regency Park and ask why they had a situation that allowed Mr Doug Oliver, a constituent of mine, to injure his back at age 67 by manually pushing a truck weighing over three tons in the imperial measurement. He is too frightened to report it officially, as he is trying to support his much younger family, and he is being substantially disadvantaged.

On this particular occasion, workers such as Mr Oliver may be protected, because he thinks his injury may only affect his ability to work for between three and six months. He may be retained for six months in terms of income maintenance, but let me remind members that that worker has no right to sue a negligent employer no matter how negligent at common law. At no time has that person any right to sue at common law. All the Opposition sought for that worker over the age of 65, still in employment but injured, was a maximum of 12 months income maintenance, yet this Liberal Government opposed that worker's right. In Mr Oliver's case, there is no doubt in my mind that he was exposed to hazardous working conditions to which no worker should have been exposed, particularly at his age.

There is no reason whatsoever why this community should have to pay through increased workers compensation premiums on the part of employers to put up with slap dash employers on safety issues, and that is an issue which should not be forgotten. All we are offering under this Democrat amendment is that this particular worker has no right at common law to sue his employer for negligence, whereas if he or she had walked into David Jones, John Martins or Myers, and a wall had fallen onto them or they had slipped over on a wet floor, where that person could have sued that company at common law, that person has been denied that right under this legislation.

My constituent, Mr Doug Oliver, is perfectly entitled to be able to support his family with a decent standard of living. All I asked was that this man be granted up to a maximum of 12 months income maintenance—a man who flogs his guts out, working as a press operator in a heavy metal industry, 2 000 times a day on a sheet of metal three metres long by 400 millimetres wide. That person deserves the protection of this Parliament, and all this Government and the Democrats in this State are prepared to offer that 67 year old worker, looking after his wife and family and their commitment, is six months income maintenance, irrespective of the fact that the company can be totally negligent in terms of its safety on the spot. That is an absolute disgrace. The amendment should be opposed and the Opposition's original position should be maintained.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Deputy Leader was part of the committee and of the Party that took away common law rights from every worker in this State in 1986

when they set up the existing workers compensation scheme. Whilst I understand the honourable member's concern—as would most members—for a person who is 67 and who is injured, it is absolutely hypocritical for the honourable member in particular and for the Party generally—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Ross Smith has concluded his remarks.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: —to talk in this Chamber about common law rights. It was his Party (and the member for Giles was the Minister at the time) that deliberately took out common law, which is the issue the Deputy Leader is talking about, because the Labor Party believed at the time that weekly benefits at 100 per cent of the earned rate for the first 12 months was the way we ought to go and that it should not be at common law. It needs to be put on the record that, whilst we feel sorry for this man, it was the Labor Party that put him in this position. I would like to make another point (and I made this point to the Deputy Leader yesterday): with a breach of the Occupational Health and Safety Act in this State, a $50 000 claim is available to that person. As he knows, on other occasions other companies have been taken to court for breach of that legislation. All I say to the Deputy Leader—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Ross Smith is warned. The House has been extremely tolerant of his behaviour this evening.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the Deputy Leader has any evidence of that, any Government—and this Government in particular—would be prepared to take that matter up.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 11.4 p.m. to Friday 1 December at 11 a.m.]

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RACIAL VILIFICATION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

HINDMARSH ISLAND BRIDGE ROYAL COMMISSION

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

That upon presentation to the Speaker of a copy of the report of the Hindmarsh Island Bridge Royal Commission, established pursuant to the letters patent approved on 16 June 1995 and as varied from time to time, the Speaker is hereby authorised to publish and distribute such report.

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (BOUNDARY REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I will explain to the House what is happening. We are waiting on a report from the deadlocked conference. It first met at 10 a.m. and then at 10.50 a.m. We are awaiting the outcome of that second meeting to determine when the conference might be able to report to both Houses.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 6 February 1996 at 2 p.m.

I take this opportunity, as this is the last day of sitting, to wish all members of Parliament and all staff associated with the Parliament a very happy and joyous Christmas. Of course, this time of the year is a period when all members are relieved that they have finished an entire year of sitting. Certainly, for the fairly long period I have been associated with this Parliament, this is probably one of those days where every member is relieved and a little weary but looking forward to Christmas.

I take this opportunity, on behalf of all members, to thank the staff of the Parliament. To the *Hansard* staff, to the staff of this Parliament itself, and to the staff who so diligently work to ensure we are fed and who look after us in so many other ways, I take this opportunity to thank them all and wish them a very happy and joyous Christmas, and also thank them for their enormous efforts over the year. It has been a very busy year. It has been a year of change in that we have rearranged the sittings of the Parliament; and that, in itself, has placed additional pressure on the staff of the Parliament. Traditionally, there have been only two blocks of sitting: at the beginning of the year and then in the second half of the year.

This year we have had three blocks of sitting: at the beginning of the year; the introduction of the budget and the various committees associated with the budget; and then we came back to deal with legislation in this final session. I appreciate the way the staff of the Parliament have cooperated in bringing about this fairly significant change. I also appreciate the work of the staff because the legislative load this year has been particularly heavy. If one looks at the number of Bills that have now been passed by both Houses of Parliament, one appreciates the fact that it is a substantial increase on the number that were put through last year. There have been some long sittings and, for that, I would like to thank all the staff involved.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: And the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: And the Opposition, if that is what the Leader of the Opposition would like. To all members of the House and to you, Mr Speaker, I wish a very happy Christmas and a break from the pressures of the sittings of the Parliament. It is a period where all members like to sit back, refresh their thinking and look forward to the new challenges for 1996. I wish everyone a happy New Year, and I look forward to seeing everyone back here early next year after a relaxing break.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): In seconding the motion that we return on 6 February refreshed and rejoiced after the break, I would like to thank you, Sir, and all members of this House for the way in which business has been conducted. It is fairly true that we have an adversarial form of government in this State, but we are not in the Balkans: we actually resolve and settle things and, outside this Chamber, there is a degree of camaraderie and professionalism which underscores the fact that we are all patriots in this Parliament who want to see this State proceed forward.

I join with the Premier in thanking the staff of the Parliament—the Clerks, the attendants and the *Hansard* staff who, whilst reporting us accurately, often put a finer gloss on

our grammar and diction. I also thank many of the other staff in the areas of catering, the kitchen, the blue room and Centre Hall, the police, the telephonists, the clerical support and the travel section—a vast army of professionals who ensure that we do our work as diligently as possible. I thank them all for their work this year in particular because not only have there been major changes to the running of this Parliament in terms of the three sessions rather than two and the changes in the way we do Estimates Committees and so on but also substantial building work is being undertaken, which has been frustrating as well as most welcome. That has put added pressure onto staff in terms of where they are located, the noise levels they have to put up with and so on. It has been taken in the best spirit of going forward and improving the way in which the Parliament operates, and it is gratifying to see that the staff have been able to perform so well under pressure.

I wish all members and staff of this place a very happy Christmas, a good break and a return in February of next year so that again we can conduct the business with expedition, knowing full well that, with this large legislative workload, most of the legislation is supported, as it was when we were in Government, by all sides of the Parliament, but that is never reported.

The SPEAKER: On behalf of the staff I thank the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for their kind comments. The staff provide an excellent service to members, sometimes under difficult circumstances, and they always do it in a pleasant and cooperative manner. On their behalf, I thank members for their comments. Hopefully when Parliament resumes in February Old Parliament House will be fully functional and available to the committees. I could say that the committees have been the worry of my life, but it may be wise if I do not proceed along that line. I thank the Premier and the Leader for their comments and wish everyone a happy Christmas and a prosperous and productive new year.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 11.15 a.m. to 3 p.m.]

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 3 (clause 5)—After line 24 insert new subclauses as follow:

'(2) SAHT will be the principal property and tenancy manager of public housing in the State.

(3) SAHT should—

(a) provide affordable, secure and appropriate public housing that meets the needs of its clients; and

(b) ensure that rental housing provided by SAHT is well located, of adequate size and condition, and meets reasonable standards of health, safety and security; and

(c) ensure that public housing built by or for SAHT after the commencement of this Act incorporates modern standards of energy efficiency; and

(d) aim to provide public housing that provides reasonable access to community services.'

No. 2. Page 4 (clause 7)—After line 4 insert new paragraphs as follow:

'(ea) build, alter, enlarge, repair and improve houses or enter into contracts under which houses will be built, altered, enlarged, repaired or improved on behalf of SAHT;

(eb) convert buildings into houses;'

No. 3. Page 4 (clause 7)—After line 11 insert new subclause as follows:

'(2) If SAHT sells an interest in residential property, the net proceeds of sale received by SAHT must be applied towards a purpose or purposes associated with the provision of housing within the State.'

No. 4. Page 5 (clause 12)—After line 20 insert new paragraph as follows:

'(ab) must refrain from taking part in the deliberations or a decision of the board on the matter; and'

No. 5. Page 7 (clause 16)—After line 31 insert new word and paragraph as follows:

'and

(c) achieving appropriate social justice objectives and the fulfilment of SAHT'S community service obligations.'

No. 6. Page 10, line 26 (clause 23)—After 'However' insert the following:

'—

(a) the Minister must not act under subsection (1)(b) unless he or she has first given, by notice in the *Gazette*, preliminary notice of the proposed transfer at least two months before the publication of the relevant notice under that subsection; and

(b) [The remainder of subclause (3) becomes paragraph (b)].'

No. 7. Page 11, line 11 (clause 25)—Leave out 'all rates, duties, taxes and imposts, and to assume all other liabilities and duties,' and insert 'all or specified rates, duties, taxes and imposts, and to assume other liabilities and duties (either generally or of a specified kind),'.

No. 8. Page 11, line 15 (clause 25)—After 'in effect to' insert 'either (or both) of the following'.

No. 9. Page 11, lines 25 and 26 (clause 25)—Leave out subclause (4).

No. 10. Page 12, lines 9 to 13 (clause 26)—Leave out subclause (6) and insert new subclause as follows:

'(6) If the Minister receives an amount from SAHT under this section, the amount must be applied towards a purpose or purposes associated with the provision of housing within the State.'

No. 11. Page 13—After line 17 insert new clause as follows:

'Code of practice and charter

29A. (1) SAHT must prepare—

(a) a code of practice; and

(b) a charter.

(2) The code of practice and charter must conform with any requirements of a current Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement but otherwise the content and form of the code of practice and charter will be determined by SAHT after consultation with the Minister and housing consumer groups nominated by the Minister.

(3) SAHT may, with the approval of the Minister, amend the code of practice or charter at any time.

(4) On the code of practice or charter, or an amendment to the code of practice or charter, coming into force, the Minister must, within 12 sitting days, have copies of the code of practice or charter, or the code of practice or charter in its amended form, as the case may be, laid before both Houses of Parliament.'

No. 12. Page 16, line 7 (clause 33)—After 'land' insert '(other than residential property occupied by a tenant of SAHT)'.

No. 13. Page 16, line 10 (clause 33)—Leave out 'this section' and insert 'subsection (1)'.

No. 14. Page 16 (clause 33)—After line 11 insert new subclause as follows:

'(2a) A person authorised by SAHT may enter residential property occupied by a tenant of SAHT if (and only if)—

(a) the entry is made in an emergency; or

(b) the tenant has been given written notice stating the purpose and specifying the date and time of the proposed entry not less than seven days and not more than 14 days before the entry is made; or

(c) the entry is made at a time previously arranged with the tenant (but not more frequently than once in every four weeks) for the purpose of inspecting the property; or

(d) the entry is made for the purpose of carrying out necessary repairs or maintenance at a reasonable time of which the tenant has been given at least 48 hours written notice; or

(e) the entry is made with the consent of the tenant given at, or immediately before, the time of entry.'

No. 15. Page 17—After line 32 insert new clause as follows:

'Triennial review

41A. (1) The Minister must once in every three years cause a report to be prepared on the operations and administration of SAHT.

(2) The report must be prepared by a person who is independent of SAHT.

(3) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving a report under this section, have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.'

No. 16. Page 18, lines 7 and 8 (clause 42)—Leave out subparagraph (i).

No. 17. Page 19 (Schedule 1)—After line 29 insert new paragraphs as follow:

'(ha) by striking out from section 25(1) 'all rates, duties, taxes and imposts, and to assume all other liabilities and duties,' and substituting 'all or specified rates, duties, taxes and imposts, and to assume other liabilities and duties (either generally or of a specified kind),';

(hb) by inserting 'either (or both) of the following' after 'in effect to' in section 25(2);

(hc) by striking out from section 25(2)(b) 'in the case of a statutory corporation that would otherwise be exempt from the liability to pay council rates,' and substituting 'council';

(hd) by striking out subsection (4) of section 25;'

No. 18. Page 21 (Schedule 2)—After line 26 insert new clause as follows:

'Code of practice and charter

2A. SAHT must prepare the code of practice and charter required by section 29A within six months after the commencement of this Act.'

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Members will recall that the Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements) Bill, which was before the House some time ago, reorganised the Housing Trust. The entire department changed some time back and, as part of that reorganisation, we turned the department into a very strong, viable economic unit with a strong management emphasis. The Legislative Council, in its wisdom at the time, decided that it wanted the Housing Trust Bill separated from the combination Bill at the time, which covered not only the Housing Trust but the administration of the department, the formation of the new Urban Projects Authority, what we were going to do with cooperative housing and so on.

At the time, the Government cooperated with the Australian Democrats and brought back another Bill which, basically, has now been through the House twice. Consequently, I will not speak at length on it, other than to say that we have now completed the reorganisation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We have now separated the Housing Trust into two separate entities: Property Service and Tenancy Management are two separate business units within the Housing Trust. The trust has been operating like this for over a year now, and the result has been very successful. We are now very much in tune and leading the way in national housing policy as far as public housing is concerned.

It has enabled the Housing Trust to look inwards at its internal management, to identify the cost of housing, to identify the debt structure within the Housing Trust to know the cost of the properties and to know what it is losing, to see the income streams or lack of income streams and identify them, and to enable the Government to have policy input through the board into how the Housing Trust is administered. I believe that we have a very strong, workable department that can have policy input on behalf of the Government. Yet, we still have retained a Housing Trust Board, which will tend to the day-to-day management of that organisation.

The Housing Trust has existed in South Australia for a long time. It is one of the best public housing entities in this country. For some time now it has been plagued with a very real cash flow problem. The $300-odd million of very high cost money which has been invested in public housing, for which the Housing Trust is paying over 10 per cent interest, is a considerable drain on the Housing Trust. By separating Property Services and Tenancy Management, we can now identify where the cash flows are going and where the debt is, and we can start to do something about it.

Members have heard many debates now on the debt structure of the Housing Trust, so they should understand that the Government is addressing that issue; and members should realise that, when we do sell properties, the money is reinvested back either into the retirement of internal debt in the Housing Trust or it is used in bricks and mortar in new starts or for refurbishment. We have a real dilemma in the Housing Trust in that declining funds are coming in from Canberra through the CSHA. We are in the process of renegotiating, hopefully, a better deal for South Australia through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. At the end of the day, we have to have a strong, viable administration running the Housing Trust so that we can continue to lead Australia in the standards and provision of public housing.

The Government is happy to accept the amendments, which were inserted in the Bill by the Australian Democrats. I think that, when members read the amendments, they will see that they do not mean a lot. There is not a lot of substance to them, but that, perhaps, is fairly normal for some of the amendments that the Democrats bring forward: it is just the policy of that Party. However, the amendments have not detracted from the main thrust of what we are trying to achieve in the Housing Trust, and I believe that the trust can now go forward without this problem of having quite significant changes to its legislation constantly hanging over its head.

It now has a Bill within which it can work, and that Bill links the policy of the Housing Trust and its administration through my office as Minister for Housing and Urban Development so that the Government can have significant policy input into the way the trust runs. I commend the Bill to the House. We are happy to accept the amendments from another place.

Ms HURLEY: We are pleased to agree to the amendments. We are still not sufficiently convinced that this Government has sufficient commitment to public housing in this State in the existing form, but we recognise that a Government should be given the ability to arrange its affairs in the way it sees fit. We have allowed the Government reasonable scope to do that while trying to limit the effects of any such actions on the tenants of the Housing Trust who are generally in lower income groups and are deserving of support and secure and affordable public housing.

The Minister referred to the Democrats' amendments, some of which we supported and which are reflected in this

schedule. We are particularly pleased to see the Labor Party amendments in this schedule, and particularly the amendment to delete the clause which gave the Government the ability to change Housing Trust tenancy agreements virtually at will. We want to ensure that Housing Trust tenants are in secure accommodation under conditions of which they are fully aware and that they have no fear of the Government suddenly deciding to cut short their tenancy or make any other changes to their conditions of tenancy which would adversely affect them.

We have deleted that clause, which means that any changes to the tenancy agreements need to come back before this Parliament to be ratified, which will give people the ability to comment on any changes and to thoroughly scrutinise them. The other amendment which I am particularly pleased to see is the continuation of the triennial review of the Housing Trust, because it allows Parliament to have an overview of what is happening in the Housing Trust and allow some consideration of the long-term focus of the Housing Trust. It also enables Parliament to assess how the trust has performed over the previous three years. In this way the Opposition can keep a watchful eye on what the Government is doing with the Housing Trust and ensure that the people in this State who need public housing and who are in a position where they rely on public housing are treated with the respect and consideration that they deserve.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PETROL MULTI SITE FRANCHISING

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

That Standing Order 339 be so far suspended as to enable the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication as it thinks fit of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the House.

Motion carried.

GUSCOTT, MR J.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I have received correspondence from a relative of the late Jack Guscott, a former head of the Lotteries Commission, in relation to concerns raised two years ago on the *7.30 Report* about the appointment of Genting as technical adviser to the Adelaide Casino. On 28 November this year, the *7.30 Report* reported that the Australian Broadcasting Authority found that references to Mr Guscott in a report on the ABC contravened the ABC's code of practice in that they were not accurate, impartial and balanced. To its credit, the *7.30 Report* has acknowledged that decision.

I should like to point out quite clearly that, whilst I raised concerns about the vetting of Genting, I did not and never have made any accusations about any individuals involved in the Lotteries Commission, particularly Mr Guscott. Indeed, I knew Mr Guscott well and I had a great deal of respect for him.

On 28 July 1995, the Adelaide Casino announced that the consultancy arrangement between the Casino and Genting had ceased, effective from 30 June 1995. Genting's contract with the Adelaide Casino could have continued until the year 2015.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that the conversation across the Chamber is particularly productive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Giles and the Deputy Premier wish to continue their discussion, I suggest that they do it in another place.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (BOUNDARY REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL

At 3.35 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendments Nos 1 to 5—That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendment No. 6—That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but makes the following consequential amendments—

Clause 10, page 6, line 9—Leave out 'seven' and insert 'eight';

Clause 10, page 8, lines 22 to 25—Leave out subsection (2) and (3) and insert new subsections as follows:

(2) A quorum of the Board consists of five members (and no business may be transacted at a meeting of the Board unless a quorum is present).

(3) A decision carried by a majority of votes of the members present at a meeting of the Board is a decision of the Board.

(3a) Each member present at a meeting of Board is entitled to one vote on a matter arising for decision by the Board, and the person presiding at the meeting has, in the event of an equality of votes, a second or casting vote.

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 7 to 19—That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendment No. 20—That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to Amendment No. 21—That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but makes the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 10, page 9, line 37, page 10, lines 1 to 4—Leave out all words in these lines after 'Part' in line 37.

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 22—That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendment No. 23—That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but makes the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 10, page 10, after line 18—Insert new word and paragraph as follows:

and

(c) significant benefits for ratepayers under this Act.

Clause 10, page 10, after line 26—Insert—

(ia) that ratepayers should be able to receive a reduction in their council rates through the implementation of structural reform proposals under this Part;.

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 24 to 39—That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 40 and 41—That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

As to Amendment No. 42—That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto and that the Legislative Council make the following consequential amendment:

Clause 10, page 18, line 4—After 'community' insert ', including through rate reductions'.

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 43 to 47—That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendment No. 48—That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment and makes the following amendment in lieu thereof.

Clause 18, page 19, lines 25 to 38, page 20, lines 1 to 4—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

Limitation on general rates—1997-98 and 1998-99 financial years

174A.(1) Subject to this section, a council must, in each of the 1997-98 and 1998 and 1999 financial years, aim to recover from general rates charged on land within the area of the council (in total) an amount that does not exceed the total revenue raised from general rates charged on the same land under this Division for the 1995-96 financial year, adjusted to reflect changes in the Consumer Prices Index between the March quarter 1995 and the March quarter 1997.

(2) However—

(a) a council is not required to comply with this section if—

(i) a poll of electors for the relevant area is conducted on the matter; and

(ii) the majority of persons voting at the poll vote in favour of the proposition that the council is not required to comply with this section;

(b) the Governor may, by proclamation, grant a council an exemption from the requirements of this section on the basis that the Governor is satisfied that extenuating circumstances exist that justify the exemption.

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 49—That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

This afternoon we have seen introduced into the Parliament what will be one of the most significant pieces of legislation that we will pass in South Australia for many years. Its impact, if it all comes to an absolute conclusion, will be the reformation of the local government sector in South Australia. The local government sector was set up just after colonisation. In many areas of the State, local government boundaries have not changed. As we toured with the MAG committee, it became obvious that many councils were very efficient, knew what the reform agenda was all about, and prescribing to bring themselves up to the twenty-first century to be very strong, economical and viable units in South Australia. It also became very obvious that many councils, through a sheer lack of resources or the geographical size of their council area, just did not have the resources to be strong, viable and economic units.

One of the things that came through in Victoria very strongly with the commencement of its local government reform agenda was the total irrelevance of local government in that State. By the time the reform agenda was finished, suddenly local government was a very relevant part of the governance in Victoria. There is no reason why that cannot happen here. In Victoria there was a time when people did not consider local government issues. It is now an important sector. It is a strong, viable sector and I do not see any reason why we should not strive for that here.

It is also interesting that, as we travelled the State, we found that many councils were just not interested in talking with each other. The thought of ever contemplating amalgamation was something quite foreign to them. During January, when we first started the program, councils were quite opposed to the thought. By May or June, councils were coming to us saying, 'We know something is on; we know we have to reform; we do not have the resources expected by the State and Federal Government, but the Hilmer policy is lurching around the corner and we know we have to be there.' Since then there has been general movement to get involved. It is interesting that now some 50 or more councils are talking to each other, actively considering the prospect of amalgamating with their neighbours, and we are there to encourage it.

The conference was a good one. Certainly, I appreciate the input of the various members from here and from another place who attended. Both sides had a very strong, positive agenda and they certainly had to represent various points of view. I went to that conference quite determined that rates savings were achievable to this State, and I resolved not only to ensure that we set up a board and a very strong and efficient organisation to bring about amalgamation and see reformation change in local government but also to see the anticipated savings passed onto ratepayers. The conference addressed 49 amendments. We were able to agree to many of them fairly early in the conference, but we had a considerable amount of debate on others before eventually reaching a resolution.

It is fair to say that the Bill has been saved. Whilst I understand that various members from both sides have had input into the Bill and that both sides have made some changes, the basic thrust and philosophy remain in the Bill. We need this basic thrust so that we can set up the board and know that it will be successful. The matter of size and composition of the board was addressed. We came out of the conference with four members to be nominated by the Minister, two by the Local Government Association, one from the UTLC and an executive officer, so we now have a board of eight members. There was some debate and early agreement about public meetings and the rules by which the board would operate if it became involved in matters of a confidential nature.

There was considerable discussion on the three-year financial and management plan. I did not think it would take so long to talk about the word 'and', but there is a significant difference between a financial management plan and a financial and management plan. My view—with which there was disagreement for some time, but I appreciate the conference coming around to the Government's way of thinking—is that we cannot ask a council to put in a three-year financial management plan, which is just that—a financial plan—if it is to set up its future over three years. When setting up a council's financial and management plan, it is not just the financials that are of interest; it is every other aspect of the running of the council right through to union agreements; so, I appreciate the conference agreeing to include the word 'and'.

For example, the Enfield-Port Adelaide proposal—and members are welcome to come to my office and see the contents of it—does not address financial management: it talks about financial and management issues and puts them together as a total package for that city.

The hurdle of the poll provision has been lowered from 50 per cent to 40 per cent. In other words, only 40 per cent of voters will need to turn out, and 50 per cent of the 40 per cent can vote and negate a proposal. The Government was happy to accept that. I do not think it will make a material difference, because we have postal voting as well. Without postal voting, of course, it would perhaps have been an easier hurdle, but with postal voting there should not be too many problems.

The Australian Democrats put forward a lengthy set of amendments on ILAC, which would have expanded it considerably. I appreciate the support of the Opposition to go back to including in the Bill—the Opposition has put forward

a form of words which I am happy to accept—a provision that will mean that the door is open for councils which want to make an ILAC proposal. All they have to do is put the proposal together, come to the board and justify it to be trialled, and the board will be authorised to let them act upon it. It should be borne in mind that even those who are promoting ILAC at the moment are not convinced that it is the right way to go. However, when they firm up on what they see as the ideal model for ILAC, they will see that the opportunity is there for them to go to the board.

The rate-setting powers of councils took some time to resolve. We worked mainly on the rate-setting powers last evening and again today. In line with the proposal agreed to by the conference, we have looked at the objectives and the principles and incorporated in both a reference to the fact that there will be significant savings in the councils and those savings should be passed on.

In the objectives we have added a new subclause stating 'significant benefits for ratepayers under this Act'; it identifies them, and the expectation is that they will be passed on. A new principle, (ia), has been added which reads:

> that ratepayers should be able to receive a reduction in their council rates through the implementation of structural reform proposals under this part;

That means that in those two areas of 'objectives' and 'principles' it is now enshrined as a principle in the Bill that the Parliament has this expectation that the significant savings generated will in fact be passed on. Clause 174A has been modified so that the rates are capped and frozen over certain years: 1995-96 becomes a base year. There will be a CPI adjustment between the March quarter of 1995 and the March quarter of 1997. In the year 1998 there will be a rate freeze based on March 1997. It is a very reasonable compromise and one towards which I am sure local government will be able to work.

The public generally expects local government to play its part in becoming efficient and doing whatever is necessary to ensure efficiency. Federal and State Governments are going through enormous reform at the moment, forced on them by the economic circumstances of the State, and local government cannot be spared the pain. We have now an opportunity to redress it.

In summary, the board will now be set up. We have the council-initiated proposals intact, albeit with some slight modifications to them. Modifications were put in by the Opposition, which I am very happy to support. They are minor modifications and I leave it to members to go into the details if they are interested.

In brief, the council-initiated proposal is very simple: that, if the councils agree, they go to the board with their three-year financial management plans; they get a tick by the board, they go to the Minister and then to the Governor to be proclaimed. A board-initiated proposal goes to the councils and, if the councils on consideration decide to agree with it, it goes straight across to the board, to the Minister and then is proclaimed.

With those councils that do not agree, of course, we have the opportunity for the board to carry out its efficiency auditing, to work with the councils in the preparation of financial and management plans and, ultimately—an important part of the Bill—it has to go to a voter poll. That is where you have the 40 per cent turnout requirement and postal voting.

If it is rejected under those conditions at the voter poll, that is the end of the matter. If the turnout provisions are not met, the board has to step in and make a decision. The interesting part here is that the Bill has had inserted in it a provision whereby the councils can appeal to the Minister if they believe that the board has not made the right decision. Under those circumstances the Minister will write a report based on the reasons given to him or her by the council, will send it back to the board for reconsideration, another report will come to the Minister and he or she has to make a decision on whether to reject it, send it back to the board for further work or pass it on to the Governor to have the proclamation read. I do not expect there to be very many board-initiated proposals that actually end up with voter polls.

I expect the move is on out there. A week or 10 days ago I was told that it was 50; I would not be surprised if the figure was even higher now. With the passage of this legislation this afternoon, I think that we will see the numbers start to escalate even more. The mechanism is there now and it is really up to us to get the board under way. The benefits for local government are strong, economic, viable units that can run their cities in a businesslike way and can reduce the rates.

If you follow the business plans that we have set up, you will see that there will be rate reductions over three years, albeit not large reductions, but at least the boards now have to address this whole question of rate reductions and running their cities as strong, viable business units. The role of the board has to be that of the honest broker; and it has to be there to facilitate reform and to cooperate with local councils. Let there be no mistake about that: regardless of what elements in the community might say, the board is there to cooperate, facilitate and ensure that the amalgamations are a success and that it gets councils together which believe in what they are doing and which have sound, strong business administrative plans. Clearly, it is pointless putting councils together if the whole exercise is going to fail. It is the board's purpose to ensure that that does not occur.

The next step is to set up the board, which has until may 1997 to complete its work. The next step, which runs parallel, is to accelerate the reform of the legislation, and I will be putting together a team, which will start work in January. In fact, some preliminary work has already started on the rewrite of the Local Government Act, to be completed by the end of 1996 and into 1997 so that it can be legislated and in place before the local government elections in March 1997.

I commend the Bill to the Committee. As I said initially in my remarks, because of the impact it will have on local government generally, I think it is one of the most significant pieces of legislation we have had in the House. It will affect people's lifestyle in South Australia for many years. It will initiate a reform process which has been stalled now for many years. We have had many attempts at amalgamations or getting the various processes up. We have been tinkering around at the edges. I hope that everyone in a position of authority who genuinely believes in amalgamations will get behind the Bill and get behind the intent and purpose of the legislation so that we will see reform in local government, which has to be good for the whole economic viability and welfare of the people of South Australia. I commend the Bill to the Committee.

Ms HURLEY: There has been a long process in this State of attempting to achieve boundary reform in local government, and we have reached the stage now where there is fairly general agreement that there should be some sort of boundary reform in South Australia. It has been part of Labor Party policy for some time. There has also now been fairly general agreement within local government and quite a

willingness to facilitate the process. So, in many ways I am very surprised to find that we had to go through this long process and long conference to achieve this final form of the Bill. I cannot help feeling that, if the Government had properly consulted with local government and been genuinely prepared to find out local government's needs, we would not have gone through this long process at all. However, we have finally agreed to a compromise.

I am happy that we have been able to achieve what is now a workable boundary reform process so that council amalgamations proceed in this State, but not at the expense of the democratic process of local government. At the same time, we have achieved significant benefits for ratepayers over several years, rather than the short term, one year rate reduction that had been offered by the Government in what seemed to be fairly patently an election year gimmick. So, I believe that what we have in this Bill is a system that local government can put into place and come up with a reasonable structure within the State.

Initially, there were quite a number of suspicions, particularly in relation to the draft Bill on local government, that this was an attempt to conduct a Kennett style slash and burn to local government which would have seen job reductions, reduced services and a severely reduced role for local government with the State Government dictating what local government should do. Labor believes that our current system has three tiers of government, and that local government plays an important role. We were simply not prepared to stand by and let the State Government undermine the role of local government in this State. As I said in an earlier speech on this Bill, we believe that local government has performed exceptionally well in South Australia over the years, that it is doing a good job and has shown its willingness to undertake reforms. This whole process has proved to me that local government is not unwilling to face the changes ahead of it, but it simply wants a reasonable say in the process, a reasonable result and reasonable recognition of its role by the State Government.

We now have a process under which amalgamations can take place. We will have the possibility for reduced rates for ratepayers and efficiencies among councils. But, more importantly, we will have a democratic process. We have reduced the 50 per cent ratepayer turn-out for ratepayer polls to 40 per cent. History has shown that 40 per cent is an achievable figure, which is what we are aiming for. We are looking for an achievable figure so that ratepayers will know, if they take part in a poll, that there is some chance of their vote counting. At the moment with nearly every ratepayer poll not enough people attend to vote so, by default, amalgamation is achieved. We have also included accountability mechanisms in the Bill to ensure that the democratic processes are followed. We have put in those accountability mechanisms by providing for public hearings and making ministerial reviews possible so that councils or individuals who are unhappy with the process at least have some form of appeal to the Minister.

We have also cut back the original almost draconian powers of the board so that it now needs to consult with councils during the process and, as a result, councils now have some opportunity to make a difference in the process. We have also succeeded in putting a representative from the United Trades and Labor Council on the board, which we believe is very critical. Local government staff have proved their willingness to work with the staff of local government bodies in enterprise bargaining and other areas. They have coped with change, along with local government. We believe that it is only practical to ensure that they are represented on the board so that they support these amalgamations because, quite honestly, it will be the workers on those councils who will make the amalgamation process work in the end, and without them amalgamation simply may not proceed.

Another important achievement is the increased consultation in respect of the criteria on which boards will decide amalgamations. The board must publish the criteria and bring it back to Parliament by means of regulation. Therefore, if there are significant problems with the criteria, Parliament can disallow the regulations. This is important because it is obvious to us that the Government is still keen on pursuing an agenda—which was a hidden agenda, but which has now become more obvious—in which it wants to interfere with the processes of local government. It wants to effect the management of local government and set criteria for local government with which local government may not and probably will not agree. It wants to impose reforms on local government which it has not been able to achieve with respect to State government.

But the Government is willing to impose that on another tier of Government. This is the sort of agenda which has come out even more strongly over the last few days and with which the Labor Party strongly disagrees. Basically, we have a workable amalgamation system which will deliver to ratepayers an effective and achievable level of rates and which will give rate benefits to ratepayers without unduly constraining councils and without imposing on the State as a whole, including those councils which will not amalgamate, a 10 per cent rate reduction that would have been totally unworkable for many councils. The Port Adelaide and Enfield proposal, which the Minister referred to, illustrates the point we have made all along, that councils are very willing to pass on savings to ratepayers and to undertake amalgamations where that is feasible. That has been illustrated in that proposal.

We will not force councils to pass on benefits: they will pass on benefits and have passed on benefits to ratepayers either in the form of rate reductions or increased services. Many people in the country as well as the metropolitan area are looking for improved services from their councils. We are talking about a better local government system—not necessarily a one-year, one-off rate reduction which might give some kudos to the State Government in an election year. That is the focus we have maintained all through the Bill. We have restricted this to boundary reform only and have tried to achieve a sensible, democratic, workable reform process that delivers benefits over a longer term to ratepayers.

Mrs ROSENBERG: I am pleased to comment on the conference's outcome and to note the member for Napier's opening words when she said that it has been Labor policy since the early 1970s to get local government reform. It is quite surprising, therefore, that it has taken nearly 25 years and that a Liberal Government has achieved it. I appreciate the compromises made in the conference, because without them we would have ended up with a Bill that simply changed lines on a map. There would have been no obvious benefits to ratepayers of South Australia except that their council boundaries would have changed. They would have seen it as a lot of pain for no gain. In this situation, I will refer to only a few of the items that have been compromised.

First, there was agreement that we would be able to force the board to look at financial and management plans. This is a major compromise, because to expect a council to come to

the board with a three-year financial plan alone would mean, in one way, that ratepayers have no ability to examine the financial plan and to scrutinise whether the council through its management structure will be capable of putting that financial plan into place. It is extremely important that the management process by which that financial plan is to be successful is available and clearly identified for ratepayers to scrutinise.

The other issue was the reduction from 50 to 40 per cent in clause 21(13) with respect to board initiated amalgamations. I have a problem with the fact that the majority was reduced. The member for Napier said that that reduction to 40 per cent actually made it more democratic. I can never quite understand why with fewer people voting it becomes more of a democratic process. So, I thought that that meant that fewer people had a say. However, as I said in my second reading speech to this Bill, we have been constantly told that, amongst ratepayers, the amalgamation process is an amazingly emotive and important issue. I have continually said that if it is such an important issue we should expect 50 per cent of ratepayers in an area to vote, especially since they can lodge a postal vote. As we know, those councils that provide for postal voting achieve about an 80 per cent voter response on most occasions. I accept that there has been a compromise there but I do not accept the reasons put forward for it.

In terms of rate reduction, I had a problem with the suggested amendments in that we were being asked to accept a Bill that changed lines on a map, which gave no incentive to councils to do so, and in which there was no incentive for ratepayers to support their councils in trying to make changes to their boundaries. Boundary reform without rate reduction and without benefits in efficiencies that can be measured through rate reduction or increased service to the community was not worth doing. The compromise that has been achieved with what can be seen as an overall rate reduction in real terms over three years will be well accepted by the community.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I, too, support the recommendations of the conference, but I should like to make a few comments on them. First, I believe that the overblown tripe that the Minister subjected us to was pretty well ridiculous. He said that this was the most significant Bill that had come before the Parliament in decades, and I have never heard such a load of nonsense in my life. It was absolutely nothing of the sort. In fact, I would argue that, from the Government's and the Minister's point of view, the handling of this Bill has been abysmal, and that is not just my point of view. Professor Cliff Walsh said exactly that on TV last night, that on this issue, the Government has behaved abysmally. Who am I to argue with a professor?

The results of conferences are often strange and I wonder sometimes whether the process is worth while and whether it should not just be fought out on the floor of the Chamber. I am quite sure that, at times, we would all understand the thinking behind the results more than we occasionally do. The Minister suggested that there was some compromise in the question of the mandatory reduction of rates as a result of amalgamation. There has been no compromise. In simple terms, the Minister has capitulated, because he went into the conference looking for and demanding a 10 per cent reduction in rates when an amalgamation took place. Before the Committee is a recommendation from the conference that says nothing about compulsory reductions of 10 per cent or otherwise. In fact, it allows a CPI increase for two years, as I read it, and open slather after that. I cannot see where the compromise is. In these recommendations, which I support, I can see only a total capitulation. In fact, I was a little bit concerned when I saw that. From the Labor Opposition's point of view, the member for Napier has been acting like a nascent statesperson and, as I said in my second reading speech, that is not something that I would have done.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, you have ruined my Friday, so I am about to ruin yours. I would have never made any claims to this. The member for Napier has saved this Bill for the Government, and that is the kind of thing that statespersons do; but, for me, the member for Napier has got the Government and this Minister off the hook. I have never seen such a half-baked load of rubbish come before a Parliament. The recommendations from the conference, which have the support of the member for Napier and, therefore, my support, have done exactly that. It has got the Minister right off the hook: it has got the Government off the hook.

In almost incredible fashion, this Government has managed to offend every group of supporters it has, whether it is the police or local government, at least 90 per cent of whom are Liberal supporters, if not Party members. I was happy for them to be offended. I thought, 'Hello, there's a political opportunity here; we might get one or two of these people to see the light.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I agree with the member for Florey: it isn't very likely that they are capable of seeing the light. But, nevertheless, I thought the circumstances had been established to give them the greatest opportunity. For this Government, in its blind stupidity, its blind ideology, to copy Kennett—to do even a pale imitation—is absolutely nonsensical. I support these amendments, which were suggested by the conference and which, to a great extent, have alleviated my concerns. But I am concerned about what will happen in the country because, for reasons completely unknown to me, all the country councils are absolutely hopping mad over this Bill, and they got no support whatsoever from their local members. That I do not understand. That was an issue for metropolitan councils, not for country councils.

Yet I have had letters—and I know members opposite have had exactly the same letters—from country councils, pleading with me to oppose this legislation and to save the country councils from Liberal Party members. I do not care about the metropolitan councils; I concede that quite freely. They can do what they like. I am interested only in country councils. Country councils that normally would not give me the time of day have written to me and pleaded with me to support them, and they have put their names to their letters. I am pleased that I have been able to do that, through the member for Napier. Not one member opposite from the Liberal Party—with the exception of the Hon. Jamie Irwin—has stood up publicly and supported those country councils.

But Jamie Irwin said that he was ashamed of the Liberal Party. and I can agree with that. I know Jamie Irwin, and I have worked with him. He is truly an honourable person—on this issue, at least. Given the member for Napier's speech, coming up there is a review of the Local Government Act—again. I have been here for 20 years and, for as long as I have been here, the Local Government Act has been under review. I am sure that it was under review 50 years before that and will still be under review in 50 years. I hope that the exercise we have gone through is a lesson not to the Minister, because

this Minister will not be handling it—and rightly so—but to this Government, that it should not come into this Parliament with a Local Government Act full of half-baked propositions, which have not been negotiated properly with local government and where local government has not been treated with considerable respect. This Bill is offensive and patronising to local government and the process ought not be repeated.

As I said, I must congratulate the member for Napier, although, as I said in my second reading contribution, I would not have given this Bill anywhere near the consideration she did: I would have been home on Thursday afternoon. So it is with mixed feelings that I congratulate the member for Napier on putting together the results of this conference. I hope it is a very real lesson for the Liberal Government. If it will not take it from me, it ought to take it from Professor Walsh.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am delighted to hear from the member for Giles. I wondered when the member for Giles was going to speak up, because some elements of his contribution are worth reflecting upon. Offensive and patronising was the charge made against the Liberal Government by the honourable member, but those words apply to him to a large degree. The member for Giles was saying that, if we left everyone to their own devices, it would all have worked out. There was good and bad news regarding the Bill. The good news was that this Government had the foresight to build up the energy to initiate local government reform, after 25 years of councils sitting on their hands and doing their own thing. They had no accountability or responsibility and a useless secretariat. They let that sort of system run on without any new initiative or drive whatsoever. That was the contribution made by the member for Giles, and that is where we would have been stuck in 10 years.

I congratulate the Minister for having the courage to take on something that the Labor Party could not do for 20 years. When it did try, it fell flat on its face. I can remember the pitiful attempts of the Hon. Geoff Virgo and the Hon. Anne Levy to introduce reform. By this process alone councils have been talking to each other and recognising their own deficiencies. For the first time in South Australia people have said, 'It is about time you sorted this out.' Congratulations to the Minister. We have seen nothing for 20 years, except an absolute shambles. The good news about the passing of this Bill is that all the energy and the goodwill that has been created in this process will actually reach some form of fruition.

The Government had two choices: to drop the Bill, because we were not happy with certain aspects of the outcome, or to proceed with it. The result hung on the knife's edge because we were not satisfied that we had achieved what we wanted in the Bill. However, reason prevailed at the end of the day. We believe there is enough momentum today, as a result of the Government's initiative, to see the process reach a point where—as the Minister pointed out—councils will become more accountable and responsible, deliver efficient services and be stronger economic units.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Giles says it is highly offensive to councils. Can the honourable member explain why then, if it is offensive, councils are talking together for the first time?

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The honourable member has made his contribution. He is on overtime. He should be in Whyalla. That is where he belongs. This Bill did hang on the knife's edge. We were not satisfied with all the outcomes, but we believed it was important to see reform in South Australia. We have proceeded with the Bill and we intend to ensure that the momentum is not lost. Congratulations to those involved. I now refer to rate reductions. Unless we deliver rate reductions, there is no positive outcome from this whole process. Whilst we have had inserted in the Bill the reference to rate reductions, it must have power through the board. Let us be quite clear—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Giles should read the Act. Let me inform the member for Giles that we have said, 'If the worse comes to worse—bottom lines—you can have CPI.' Then you have—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Hold it.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I warn the member for Giles.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: We have said, 'If you are experiencing some difficulties, in 1997-98, you can have CPI, but in 1998-99 you are not allowed to increase.'

Mrs Geraghty: What about next year?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: If councils increase beyond the CPI next year, they must come back, so there would have to be a rate reduction. They would have to reduce their rates in 1997-98: it is simple mathematics. Perhaps the honourable member should do a mathematical estimate or get some briefing on the Bill. What the Bill says is that as an absolute maximum this is what is expected of councils. What the Government says is that it expects much more than that: it is quite clear that the Government expects rate reductions as an outcome. So, the Government expects the board to proceed down the line of getting those efficiencies, savings and outcomes that the Government believes are possible in South Australia. We have not achieved that in the sense that we wanted to in the Bill, but I assure members of this Committee that that will be pursued as a matter of priority and that that matter will be referred to the board by the Minister. We are not walking away from rate reductions. We had to accommodate a Bill which, at the end of the day, was not comfortable for the Government, but rather than see local government reform fail we decided to accept the Bill in this form.

The one thing that I said when we embarked on this process of local government reform was that unless we had passage within the association and the secretariat it would be a shambles. Despite all the hijacking that has gone on in this process and the statements that have been made to people's faces with five minutes later the opposite statements being made to councils—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It sounds like the Chamber.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No, I am just talking about the Secretary-General, and I am saying this to his face. I make quite clear that the activities of the association, which have not been consistent from what I have seen and heard from councils, are not tolerable. I expect that position to be repaired. I expect that everyone will get on board and make sure that the process works, that we will all head in the same direction, so that we will not have these departures that we have seen in the past. So, whilst I am not satisfied that the Bill is as good as it could have been—I respect the fact that we have made some compromises, which always occur in these situations—the Government is still firmly of the view that there must be fundamental reform, and that will be pursued.

Mr CLARKE: I want to take a few moments to respond in part to the points made by the Deputy Premier. I had not

intended to enter the debate until the Deputy Premier came forward with some misinformation. In particular, I note that, with regard to the issue of amalgamation, the Deputy Premier is somewhat like Paul on the road to Damascus. The Deputy Premier was well known as the Defender of Mitcham during the Mitcham-Happy Valley merger a few years ago: nothing would stop him as the member for Mitcham defending the right of that council, the City of Mitcham, to remain totally independent. However, I would like briefly to respond by pointing out to the Deputy Premier that it was a Labor Government that abolished the Local Government Department with some considerable savings to the South Australian taxpayers and that a memorandum of understanding was signed between the then Labor Premier and the Local Government Association in true partnership and following proper consultation.

The irony of this is that, as the member for Giles pointed out, many local government bodies or councils are run by people who have a different political persuasion from ourselves, yet at no time has a Labor Government (when in office) had the same state of relationship with the Local Government Association compared with the relationship between the Local Government Association of today and this Liberal Government. The Deputy Premier has the hide to demand the way in which he believes the relationship between the Local Government Association and his Government should exist in the future: he requires the Local Government Association to lick the Government's boot straps. Let me assure the Deputy Premier that local government in South Australia will not act as a lickspittle for this Liberal Government now or at any time in the future—it will not do that.

The Deputy Premier, even in his wildest delusions of being *Il Duce* with respect to local government, will just not have that aspiration fulfilled. Prior to the local government Bill being introduced there was the MAG report, which did not last for very long and it has joined a long list of other reports commissioned by the Government collecting dust as a curio in the State Archives. However, it did send a spasm right through the rural backbench of this Liberal Party. Those members fought it tooth and nail and effectively gutted the MAG report. However, the Government resurrected the MAG report under the original Bill as tabled—not the Bill currently before us, which has been considerably improved due to the efforts, in particular, of the member for Napier and the Hon. Paul Holloway in another place.

However, this Government, in soothing the fears of its backbenchers said, 'We will give you, to aid your re-election chances, a compulsory 10 per cent rate reduction.' Lo and behold, it is in 1997—a few months before the expected date of the next State election. They were told, 'So, whatever pain you have to put up with as your local government boundaries are changed, infuriating your local electors, here is the soft sell: you can go out to your constituents and say, "I gave you a 10 per cent rate reduction for one year at least".' Is it not miraculous that it happens to be in an election year?

Let me now inform those backbenchers, who probably do not understand it, that not only is there not a rate reduction of 10 per cent but the total freeze on rate increases is in the year 1998-99—one year after the State election. So, when the members for Frome, Custance and the like go back to their electorates, when the boundaries are being redrawn by local government, and get their country councillors, all upset, coming to see them, they can say, 'Yes, we have achieved a total freeze on rates, but for 1998-99 and well after the State election.' So I ask them to think about it. I am sure they will ponder on it and draw the appropriate conclusion. They have been duded and done by all with respect to this whole issue. They now have local government totally off side and they have nothing really tangible to show for it.

Mr VENNING: I am absolutely and totally amazed at the attitude and comments of the Labor Party. Before I came into this place I spent 10 years in local government and we were heavily involved in the amalgamation process. We were dealing with Government all the time, and whose Government was it? A Labor Party Government! Who was the Minister? Geoff Virgo! The gentlemen in the gallery know about all this.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will not refer to people in the gallery.

Mr VENNING: Mr Hullick, Meredith Crome and others know about this. The Government was trying to do things then. When I hear the words today of the current Labor Party—the Opposition—I have never heard so much hypocrisy in my life. We have been trying for years, but here today, for purely political reasons, they go back on all the work done in the years gone by. This is landmark legislation. This is a great day for local government in South Australia. The comment I heard from the member for Giles was that this is highly offensive to councils. If he came to my electorate he would find that most of my councillors are very pleased with this legislation—not all, but most of them.

To say that it is highly offensive to councils is rubbish. With this package of legislation, we had, first, to create an atmosphere for change. We did that via the MAG report. I do not want anybody to underestimate the position of the MAG report position or what it did, because it became a benchmark and it created an atmosphere for us to introduce legislation. Secondly, we had to encourage councils to participate, and we have done that via this legislation.

This is landmark legislation. I only wish that the Labor Party had a little more courage and nous because, if this legislation was defeated, how long would it be before we attempted it again? Local government needs to have guidelines. It needs to have support to plan for local government in the future. It has been a long journey, but the vision is now accomplished, not as I would have completely wished, but certainly we have legislation that will now assist most local governments to do what needs to be done. I hope the process is successful and that the councils will create and control their own agenda.

I congratulate the Minister very much on this legislation, because it has been a long and hard road. Many Governments and many members have tried to achieve this. Today, we finally have a Bill through the Parliament that will help local government plan for the year 2000 and beyond.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I want to congratulate Labor's negotiating team on this matter. Some months ago, we saw the MAG report, which the Premier was desperate to get enacted, but he was rolled in his Caucus when we put pressure on individual backbenchers and when councils put pressure on individual backbenchers.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Premier went into his Caucus room and got rolled and we know why—although it is good to know on this issue that the Premier and the Minister for Infrastructure are starting to reconcile, and I am told that their food tasters have even started negotiations about menus at State dinners. So, things are going well for them.

The Deputy Premier of this State has talked about reform. We remember what he said in this Parliament and outside this Parliament about the Mitcham-Happy Valley amalgamation to create the city of Flinders. It was the end of civilisation. He talked about land rights for Mitcham. He said, 'Over my dead body'. Let it serve notice on the people of his electorate, on the council of Mitcham today, that this Harper Valley hypocrite is right behind them merging with Happy Valley, Enfield or anyone else—let us put it altogether under the Stephen Baker plan.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you members. The Leader will recall that the Chair defended the Leader himself from such comments in the House only two nights ago. The Leader is asked to speak through the Chair and refrain from addressing members by their names, rather than their electorate, and also to address all of his comments through the Chair rather than, antagonistically, referring to the members by their names. I expect the Leader to extend the same courtesy that I extend to other members.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. It is important to ensure that local government does have clout. We have seen, one by one, members opposite cave in. When push came to shove, when local governments in different parts of the State talked about running candidates against honourable members opposite, we saw how they flaked and caved in, and that does not come as any surprise to us.

The Labor Party and local government working in tandem rolled the MAG report, and that is good. It made Kennett's actions seem subtle. In the negotiating process we see the achievement of 40 per cent, the achievement of accountability and the achievement of the powers of the board being reduced. We see accountability being improved. We have seen consultation with councils made part of this Bill rather than the reverse. We have seen a UTLC representative and, most importantly—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, absolutely right. Most importantly of all, we have seen this gimmick of the one-off rate reduction put in by the Labor Party to have years of rate relief rather than a one-off effort. I can tell members that our view was a 10 per cent rate reduction was simply not enough. It was a gimmick, a shabby gimmick, and Government members know it. Now, because of our actions, rate relief has been locked into the process over the years.

We are pleased to have worked in a constructive way with local government. I think the Deputy Premier's comments about the Secretary-General of the Local Government Association reflect the extraordinary contempt that this Government has for elected representatives in local government. Let us remember that a few years ago we had a situation where the Government, supported by the then Opposition, reached a compact with local government to ensure that the Local Government Department was wiped out and that there was a devolution of responsibilities to the level of government where it was. We talked about that being in the Constitution of Australia, with the three levels of government not dictating to each other.

What we have seen from this Liberal Government is an extraordinary contempt for local government. We know it wants compulsory competitive tendering—and members opposite are nodding. But they do not want compulsory voting—not at all. They do not want people involved in local government. They want local government to be the agents, the colonies and the provinces of State Government. They have been rolled in the process and they know it. Here we have the Deputy Premier of this State, the man who was going to lay down under the bulldozers, who was going to stop the amalgamation of Mitcham with Happy Valley because it would be the end of it all for his electors, wanting Happy Valley and Mitcham to merge. Well, there will be some very interesting direct mail being put out in his electorate, I can tell him.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 6 February 1996 at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 28 November 1995

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LIQUID PETROLEUM GAS

17. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. What has been the highest and lowest price charged for LPG per litre anywhere in the settled areas of South Australia any time during 1995?

2. Is there a State licensing fee at present on outlets which sell LPG for the LPG sales and equipment and if not does the Government contemplate introducing any such licence fee?

3. To the nearest 100 000 kms, how many kilometres per year are driven by Government employees in Government vehicles?

4. What would it save the Government if it had purchased LPG fuel instead of petrol or distillate for those automobiles during 1995 if cars mechanically suited for conversion to LPG had been fitted with LPG equipment?

5. What would be the cost to the Government of purchasing and fitting in bulk contract LPG conversion equipment to all cars it purchases, category by category and what would therefore have been the gross cost of so doing for all vehicles which were purchased during 1995?

6. What was the motor car fuel bill for the past financial year, department by department?

7. What incentives are provided, if any, by the South Australian Government to purchasers of new and/or second-hand cars to convert them to LPG fuel?

The Hon S.J. BAKER:

1. The Prices Surveillance Authority undertakes price surveys of petrol, LPG and distillate for Australian capital cities. For the 6 month period until June 1995 average Adelaide retail LPG prices have varied form about 24 cents per litre to 38 cents per litre.

2. The South Australian Government is not involved in the determination of retail automotive LPG prices and no excise fees are charged on LPG. The Government is not contemplating any plans to introduce such fees, nor is a licence currently required to sell LPG.

However, under the Petroleum Products Regulation Act 1995 there are a range of flat fees payable for premises at which liquefied Petroleum Gas is authorised to be kept. The fees, based on the aggregate capacity of containers for keeping LPG at the premises, are as follows:

Exceeds	But Does Not Exceed	Fee $
560 Litres	20 Kilolitres	94
20 Kilolitres	100 Kilolitres	268
100 Kilolitres		433

3. State Fleet vehicles travelled approximately 101m kms in 1994-95 (it should be noted that this does not cover the total government fleet because the SA Police Department and ETSA vehicles were not transferred until 1 July 1995. In addition, there were transfers throughout the financial year so the estimated kilometerage relates to the vehicles whilst covered by State Fleet).

4. Approximately $1 000 per annum for those vehicles which are considered suitable for conversion. These would be predominantly 6 cylinder passenger and commercial vehicles. These comprise approximately 34% of the fleet, i.e. approximately 2 000 vehicles as at 30 June 1995.

5. Estimated cost would approximate $2 000 per unit. Just in excess of half of the 2 000 vehicles would have been purchased in the 1994-95 financial year. Thus, the cost of fitting these vehicles would be in excess of $2m. It is not practical to provide information on a category by category basis.

6. State Fleet vehicles incurred a fuel bill for $8m during 1994-95. A department by department breakdown of this cost cannot be provided readily at this stage.

7. There are no subsidies provided by the South Australian Government to persons considering conversion to LPG. However an excellent free advisory service is provided by the Energy Information Centre to consumers wishing to obtain details on the benefits of converting to LPG.

COFFIN BAY ENVIRONMENT

22. **The Hon. M.D. RANN:**

1. When will the Government comply with the undertaking given by the Premier to provide the Action Group for the Protection of Coffin Bay the results of the Environment Monitoring Program for Coffin Bay?

2. Has data from the Monitoring Program been made available to other interested parties and, if so, who received this information?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER:

1. A copy of the results have been sent to the Action Group.

2. Yes. Copies of the report have also been made available to the President of the South Australian Oyster Growers Association Mr Bruce Zippel and the Presiding Member of the Aquaculture Committee of the Development Assessment Commission, Mr Bob Teague.

CROYDON HIGH SCHOOL

27. **Mr ATKINSON:** How much money was spent on maintenance and minor works at Croydon High School in the years 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Croydon High School has received the following maintenance and minor works funding:

Breakdown Maintenance—Services SA	
1992-93	$48 485
1993-94	$34 299
1994-95	$52.486
Programmed Maintenance Minor Works Program	
1992-93	Nil
1993-94	$10 896
1994-95	$110 000
'Back to School' Grant Program	
1992-93	$250 000
1993-94	$74 742
1994-95	$52 740