HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 8 February 1996

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the eighteenth report of the committee on the Southern Expressway: Stage One be noted.

The Department of Transport proposes to improve the level of services for access to the southern areas by providing a new arterial road from Darlington to Old Noarlunga, termed the Southern Expressway. The need for such an expressway has grown over recent years for two main reasons: first, urban development has continued in areas south of Darlington while employment continues to be concentrated in central metropolitan Adelaide. This has led to increased traffic demands on the existing north-south arterial road network during morning and afternoon peak periods, particularly along the Main South Road.

Secondly, good transport services and easy access are socially and economically important to the continued progress of the southern areas. Currently, the region's transport needs are not adequately supplied when compared with the wider metropolitan area. Studies show that in 15 years time residents of the southern suburbs will spend twice as long travelling to workplaces north of Darlington than they do currently if the Southern Expressway is not built. As the demand for additional capacity is predominantly for northbound traffic in the morning and southbound traffic in the afternoon, the road initially will be developed as a single carriageway, one-way reversible. This will meet present demand and maintain flexibility to cater for future requirements.

It is proposed that the Southern Expressway be constructed in two phases: Stage 1, from Darlington to Reynella, to be completed by the end of 1997, and Stage 2, from Reynella to Old Noarlunga, to be completed by the year 2000. The staged approach taken for the construction of this expressway necessitates staged approvals. The report deals with, first, the concept of Stage 1 of the Southern Expressway; and, secondly, the commencement of a very small element of Stage 1 of the project, involving a contract for the removal and stockpiling of unsuitable materials, which are reactive clays in the vicinity of Majors Road. These materials are unsuitable for reuse in the road formation but can be used in noise and landscape mounding and in lining of stormwater wetlands. These works can be undertaken efficiently only in the drier summer months, so it is imperative that these works be commenced at the earliest opportunity. This element of the work will cost less than $1 million and will not influence future development of the alignment and connections at the northern and southern ends of the Southern Expressway, which is subject to the outcome of further environmental assessments and planning work.

The small section of Stage 1 covered by this report will not impact any buildings or sites on the Register of State Heritage. However, there are some Aboriginal heritage issues arising from future work associated with Stage 1, and the Transport Department is continuing discussions with the Kaurna heritage group. The committee will closely monitor the progress of this issue. The remaining segments of Stage 1 will come before the committee as the project proceeds. When completed, the Southern Expressway will provide improved facilities for public transport, bicycles and emergency vehicles and will be pleasantly landscaped with native flora. The road will initially have two lanes, with shoulders for breakdown and emergency access, and an additional slow lane for merging at junctions and climbing and descending the escarpment will be provided.

In addition, the road will be grade separated along its entire length, with the Southern Expressway presently proposed to go over Marion Road, under Seacombe Road, under Majors Road and over Landers Road. This expressway will be a one-way reversible road. High technology video systems will monitor the operation of the road and the change-over periods. Signs linked to the central control room will advise drivers of the traffic direction at all times. The same equipment will be used to identify breakdowns and accidents so that emergency vehicles can be sent. This will ensure that the expressway is totally adaptable, whether to changing patterns of normal traffic demands, as established by continued studies, or to the need of special events.

Consideration will be given in planning the road for future upgrade and ultimately two-way operation and the provision of a dedicated public transport corridor. The basic philosophy for constructing the road and determining its location has been debated publicly for more than 10 years. During this time, extensive public consultation has been taking place via large information signs, distribution of information brochures throughout the project's neighbouring area, the 1800 information line and an expressway newsletter.

The committee has examined extensive evidence of the consultation process and is satisfied that all reasonable avenues have been pursued to inform people who may be affected by the proposed development. As a part of the consultation process, the committee invited public comment and has subsequently received several submissions. The committee has considered carefully all the evidence presented in these submissions and acknowledges that issues relating to the future construction still need to be resolved. As these issues arise, the committee will invite any interested parties to give further evidence.

In summary, the committee agrees in principle with Stage 1 of the Southern Expressway and believes that it will satisfy the region's basic functional transport needs and result in significant public and social benefits. Such benefits include transit time savings, vehicle cost operating savings, reduced fuel consumption and fewer accidents.

In addition, the Southern Expressway has the potential to provide increased accessibility to Fleurieu Peninsula and enhance economic development, tourism and local industry. As a result, the committee believes that the excavation of reactive soils should proceed without delay. However, the committee advises the Department of Transport that further approval will be required prior to the completion of the remaining sections of Stage 1. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it agrees in principle with Stage 1 of the proposed works and that they should commence.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I want to add a few words to the remarks of the member for Morphett in relation to the Southern Expressway. The Southern Expressway, with total

expenditure of $112 million, is one of a number of projects in the southern region proposed by this Government which will increase investment in that area by in excess of $400 million. This project was part of the Government's election platform with work to commence by December 1995.

The Public Works Committee received a number of presentations from the Department of Transport, Maunsell's (the contractors), and also community groups in relation to this project. The Public Works Committee report deals with Stage 1 of the project and, in particular, the area around O'Halloran Hill. Further presentations are to be made to the Public Works Committee in relation to Laffer's Triangle and also the area near Lander Road. I wish to commend the Department of Transport and Maunsell's for the level of consultation that has occurred with regard to this project.

The consultation process around Sturt and Darlington has received acclaim from a number of residents in that area. Recently we had a meeting with the residents who live around Morphett Street and Lander Road with regard to the location of the expressway through the reserved area. The residents are pleased with what has been proposed to date and look forward to continued consultation with regard to the development of the Southern Expressway.

The Southern Expressway will provide greater opportunities for residents and businesses in the south and ultimately will provide jobs for residents of the southern suburbs. I commend the report of the Public Works Committee with regard to Stage 1 of the Southern Expressway.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: TORRENS BUILDING

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the nineteenth report of the committee on the Torrens Building refurbishment be noted.

The Torrens Building steering committee and the Department of Building Management propose to refurbish the Torrens Building to enable collocation of some 21 community organisations which currently operate from below acceptable standard offices in the private and public sector. In addition, it is proposed that the Australia Day Council and the South Australian Cooperative Housing Association occupy space in the building.

After examining a number of options with the preference of owning a community service headquarters building, the availability of the Torrens Building provided an excellent solution to the collocation initiative. A State heritage listed building in the ownership of the Crown, the Torrens Building presented an opportunity for the preservation and occupation of an important historical site which faced little chance of commercial use in the office accommodation market. The Torrens Building has many advantages, such as: it is Government owned and vacant; it has a CBD location; it has access to public transport; it is a landmark building; it has sufficient floor area; and its existing community asset is quite evident as is its heritage nature.

In considering this building, a detailed building audit was commissioned. The conclusion of the audit is that the building as a significant Government asset needs major upgrading and has potential for the establishment of an office collocation project. The building is currently on the State local and National Trust heritage list and as such it is important as part of any upgrade in a development package that the conservation policy is upheld and implemented. Where possible, significant original features will be reinstated to enhance and interpret the heritage context; for example, the entrance.

The objective of the proposal is twofold: first, to refurbish a significant State heritage asset to enable its occupation; and, secondly, to provide secure, affordable accommodation for a range of groups so they can operate collectively and cooperatively within one building. Due to the age of the building, there are many occupational health and safety and building code deficiencies which need to be rectified prior to the commencement of any tenancies. As a result, extensive works will have to be carried out on the plumbing, air conditioning, mechanical services and electrical and communication systems of the building. Further, a new early fire warning and sprinkler system will need to be installed.

The general design and fit-out of the building has been made to balance tenants' requirements against the constraints and opportunities within the existing building fabric. Interrelationships between proposed tenants and their need for public accessibility have been considered in planning tenants' locations within the building. There has also been particular focus on access for the disabled. The proposed refurbishment has been planned in a flexible manner which does not prejudice the building from being used as fully serviced offices for other Government, community and/or private tenants if a future need ever arises. Accordingly, the proposed extent of the work is not only commensurate with the status of this significant heritage building but will ensure the provision of modern office space to a commercial standard and therefore the effective use of the asset in the future.

Following public consultation, 21 tenants have indicated a commitment to the project. Whilst the committee believes that all of these organisations are deserving of a place in the building, it has some concerns regarding the tenancy selection process and the associated selection criteria. The committee is of the opinion that such a process should have been conducted in a transparent manner in which all non-government community organisations were given an opportunity to register interest. Selection of tenants should then have been based on a set of agreed criteria such as those determined towards the end of the project process. The committee recommends that tenancy for future proposals or changes to the current list of tenants be conducted in such a manner.

As the project is essentially associated with the provision of collocating a number of community organisations, it will benefit the general public by, first, ensuring effective use of a significant State heritage asset; secondly, providing improved public access to a range of community facilities; thirdly, ensuring a level of comfort to the public who utilise the community facilities available; and, fourthly, enabling the Government to more readily manage and monitor the Government's financial support to community organisations in terms of central accounting.

In addition, the committee believes that the project will improve the accommodation conditions for community organisations. Accordingly, the project will enable the continued enhancement of the social and public value of the collocation proposal. The potential for operational cost savings through collocation of community organisations in terms of resource sharing is another important factor in favour of collocation. In addition, security of long-term tenure and greater group interdependence are other obvious

benefits. Ongoing service provision by non-government community organisations will augment services provided in the Government sector. Therefore, it is of economic advantage to the Government to ensure that community groups are stable and are able to provide an effective community service.

The Government has offered a recurrent subsidy of $258 000 per annum which, in addition to the rentals currently paid by community organisations, is required to meet the costs of rental, management and other accommodation costs of the non-government organisations. Rental income from the buildings's proposed tenants will be used by the South Australian Government commercial properties to pay for Government borrowing and debt servicing, maintenance costs, operating costs, management fees, and rates and taxes. However, the committee is concerned by the disparities in the level of rental subsidies applied to individual tenants.

Despite its support for the concept of rental subsidies, the committee has some concerns regarding the *ad hoc* manner in which they have been allocated for this project. Furthermore, the committee believes that the criteria used for deriving the subsidies was inadequate, resulting in anomalies that do not reflect the situations of the groups involved. The Public Works Committee believes the issue of subsidies requires further investigation which is beyond the committee's purview and has referred this matter to the Economic and Finance Committee for its consideration and deliberation.

In summary, the Torrens building refurbishment has been a complex project to investigate due to its long and convoluted history, the method used to determine and select tenants, the level of subsidies proposed for potential tenants, and the nature of its management over the last decade. The committee acknowledges the work of the current steering committee and accepts the frustrations of the community groups for which the project was designed which have been brought about by the long delay in beginning the work on the building. The proposal for housing the chosen groups in a heritage listed Crown asset has the committee's support.

Collocation of community organisations in a central location will have obvious benefits for both the organisations themselves—in terms of accommodation standards, cost sharing and service provisions—and the many people who use the services they provide. Further, the refurbishment and the use of this significant and historic building is to be applauded.

Accordingly, the committee recommends that the proposed work proceed forthwith as it believes further delays may complicate and dilute the project. However, it should be stressed that the lessons of this long exercise are acknowledged by the participants and that future initiatives of this nature be clearly defined and managed in a transparent and equitable manner. Pursuant to section 12(c) of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed public works proceed.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: RURAL POVERTY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Leggett:

That the final report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 30 November. Page 805.)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): In speaking to this motion moved by the member for Hanson—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —I'm not sure—I commend the committee for the amount of effort it put into this report. It is not an easy topic, and I know from experience on committees that, with a reference as broad as this, it is very hard to focus on the issue and come up with meaningful recommendations. It is extremely difficult, and I have always believed that parliamentary committees do not work best on these broad issues. There must be narrow focus issues—highly important issues—but we must keep to a tight brief: parliamentary committees can work better in that field. Nevertheless, the brief went to the committee, and this report is the result.

I know that the member for Unley had reservations about some of the things that have been said, and the member for Brindal defended his position very well, indeed. It is not for me to reinforce the defence of the member for Brindal against some of the—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Lewis): Order! The member for Giles will recall that it is not Mr Unley, the member for Brindal to whom he is referring: it is Mr Brindal, the member for Unley. I thank him to use the name of the honourable member's electorate.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I think the honourable member acquitted himself very well without requiring any further strengthening of his position from me. I make one brief point. As far as I can see, the committee has not dealt properly with the withdrawal of Government services from rural areas. To me, for any Government—I do not care whether it is Liberal, Labor, or whatever, and in this case it happens to be a Liberal Government—to be crying out constantly, as it does, about poverty in rural areas whilst, at the same time, withdrawing hundreds of jobs (although now it may well be thousands of jobs) from the non-metropolitan areas of South Australia absolutely smacks of hypocrisy. The value of those jobs in non-metropolitan areas is enormous.

Whilst one teacher's job in a very large suburb of Adelaide is not unimportant, the importance of that job in a small rural community is enormous, particularly if that public sector employee has a family. That job assists in keeping the rest of the infrastructure in that country town or provincial city to a degree that people in Adelaide obviously do not understand. There are, I would have thought, sufficient members of Parliament in the House who come from rural areas to understand that position and to fight for every single public sector job outside the metropolitan area. Unfortunately, that appears not to be happening. Maybe all the rural members opposite get rolled by the metropolitan members in Caucus. I do not know. If that is the case, I understand that. Someone can constantly be rolled in Caucus. I know that, if you try and fail, you go down with honour.

I suspect that possibly that is not the case, whether it is in relation to teachers, the agriculture department or the fisheries department. Now, as I understand it, school buses are being withdrawn in many areas, put out to contract or tender. It is inevitable that there will be fewer people employed and fewer students able to get to the schools. All this is being done without complaint by rural members, with one exception, and that is the member for Ridley. The member for Ridley does stand up in this place and defend the employment of public sector people in country areas and, where the policies of this Government are detrimental to his electors, he stands up and says so—as he did with the previous Government. But any

fair-minded person reading *Hansard* would have to concede the point that, apart from the member for Ridley, no member opposite is standing up for country people against the policies of the Government.

To have the cutback in terms of school buses that is occurring now, without any opposition from members opposite, is an absolute disgrace. Unfortunately, I also know that the member for Eyre is not in a position to intervene in every debate. I suppose in reality he could but, in practical terms, the member for Eyre is not in a position to intervene in every debate. I am confident that the member for Eyre would join with the member for Ridley, as well as with me, and oppose these cutbacks.

I know that people will think that I am a bit of a broken record stuck in the same old groove, making the same point time and again, but I get letters these days from people who would normally not give Frank Blevins or the Labor Party the time of day. They come from Eyre Peninsula and the Far North, pointing out the damage that is being done to small rural communities, not just in my electorate but in other electorates, as well, because I circulate my speeches throughout the rural media. These letters say, 'Why won't our local MP stand up and defend us against this Government?' I tell them that it is because the Government has a majority of 70 per cent, it takes people for granted and it thinks that it does not really matter if there is the odd dissenter around the place.

The principle is important. Whilst I appreciate the work that the committee has done, and I understand most of the points that it has made, I feel that if it investigated the effect of the policies of this Government that result in reduced numbers of public sector employees in country areas and provincial cities, I would be happier. I will certainly ask some of the Labor members on the committee if they can make it a reference to the committee to ensure that this is done, because what the committee will find is quite startling.

Virtually every Government department has been withdrawn to a great extent from non-metropolitan South Australia. The depots of the EWS, Highways, ETSA—whatever their new, fancy names are—have all been withdrawn and all the employees have been paid off, and this has had a tremendous effect. Towns on Eyre Peninsula, for example, are having a great deal of difficulty raising football teams. Sporting bodies are folding because the population is declining all the time. I urge the Liberal members of the committee at least to consider whether that committee can investigate some of these problems before the damage is irreparable.

Mrs PENFOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PETROL MULTI SITE FRANCHISING

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I move:

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

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RACIAL VILIFICATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 October. Page 419.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): With the approval of the Leader of the Opposition, who introduced this Bill, I move:

That this Bill be read and discharged.

Bill read and discharged.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (MENTAL INCAPACITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill is a second attempt by the Opposition to gain justice for workers who suffer from an injury of the mind. The first attempt last year failed in this House because of the Liberal Government's failure to recognise that an injured worker can be just as injured or have his or her life just as devastated by an injury which results in mental incapacity as someone who suffers horrific physical injury. This Bill and its origins were explained in some detail in the last debate in this House, so I will not go over all those points again. However, I will reiterate a number of the salient points which we raised at that time and which were convincing enough to pass another place late last year.

The origins of the Bill lie with the Hann case, which was decided by the Supreme Court of South Australia on 28 July 1994. Mrs Hann was a receptionist in a dental practice. Because of difficulties she experienced with a partner at the dental practice she developed depression—a recognised psychiatric illness arising out of her employment. The Supreme Court ruled that mental incapacity, which had been in the section 43 schedule of compensable injuries, had been previously recognised by workers' compensation legislation; but in its judgment of 28 July 1994 the court found that mental incapacity had been deleted from that third schedule by amendments (known as the 'Peterson' amendments, which took their name from the former Speaker of this House) to the workers' compensation legislation late in 1992.

I invite all members to take a cursory reading of the *Hansard* debates of the time in this House and in another place surrounding those so-called 'Peterson amendments' as they prove conclusively, in my view, that Parliament did not intend to delete 'mental incapacity' from section 43 of the Act. No debate took place on the matter; no reference was ever made to it. It was deleted by mistake. Mistakes are made every time workers' compensation legislation is debated in this Parliament because it is such a controversial issue. We have late-night sittings, cobbled together last-minute compromises, legislation by exhaustion and endless negotiations with Parliamentary Counsel, often taking place at 3 o'clock or later in the morning, and mistakes are made. This was such a mistake, and it has had a devastating impact on the individuals concerned.

I will highlight how mistakes are made in workers' compensation legislation. Members will recall that the Government and the Minister responsible for the Act had to come back late last year with a series of amendments to correct a number of mistakes that the Government had made in the drafting of its original Bill at the beginning of the year. Those corrections were agreed to in the sense that when the amendments were brought forward the Opposition agreed to them. The Government should have the fair-mindedness to

recognise that in 1992 a similar mistake of enormous gravity was made with respect to the Peterson amendments.

The Hann case has since been somewhat modified by the Supreme Court to provide that, if a worker is physically injured and as a result suffers a psychological injury, section 43 of the Workers Compensation Act comes into play. For example, if a bank teller is subject to an armed hold-up and as a result is bashed and then suffers from a psychiatric disorder, he or she is eligible for a section 43 payment. However, a constituent of mine, Mr Ramon Curtis, was held up late at night in a service station, threatened by a shotgun being pointed into his face by a drug-crazed offender, told that he was about to have his head blown off, and ultimately not physically harmed but as a result suffered a psychological injury, and he is not eligible for a section 43 payment.

Mr Curtis received no counselling on these matters from his employer. Unfortunately, this has happened to him on two occasions. He has been certified by WorkCover doctors and his own doctor as being incapable of ever working again. He has his house fortified like a security prison and he has nightmares. He cannot walk into a bank if there are more than a few customers present and will stand at a 45-degree angle to the door of the bank because he is constantly on the lookout for a potential armed hold-up.

Mr Curtis is not eligible for a section 43 payment. However, had he been physically assaulted—bashed—by that armed robber, he would have been eligible. The offender would have done Mr Curtis a favour, as he has ruined his life, by clouting him across the head with his rifle butt so that he would at least have been eligible for a section 43 payment. Mr Curtis has had his life destroyed. By the way, the offender got off with a suspended sentence.

Mr Curtis applied for compensation under the victims of crime legislation. The Crown Solicitor recommended that $50 000 be paid to him, but the Attorney-General, in his generosity, unilaterally cut that to $10 000, the minimum allowable under the Act, claiming that he had received $160 000 in workers' compensation payments. Those workers' compensation payments were for loss of income over several years and for medical expenses. The workers' compensation payments did not compensate him under section 43 of the Act. A gross injustice was done and, of course, one can only expect that type of behaviour from Tory Governments where the Government will not allow workers such as Mr Curtis to claim for mental incapacity. It discriminated against him because of a psychiatric disorder, and then, to double-penalise, the Attorney-General reduced the amount payable to him under the Victims of Crime from $50 000 to $10 000 because of budgetary constraints—not justice.

This Bill, as did its predecessor, enjoys the full support of the College of Psychiatrists, the South Australian Branch of the AMA and the Law Society Accident Compensation Committee. I remind the House of what the joint media release of 29 August 1994 stated:

> The principle that the integrity of a workers' compensation system can only be maintained if there is no distinction made between compensation being paid for some injuries but not for others should be affirmed. To deny this principle would create hardship and injustice, and bring the WorkCover system into disrepute. It would be ironic if the clock was turned back 50 years to deny the developments in treatment and understanding of psychiatric illness, particularly at a time when social legislation acknowledges its significance and past discrimination.

The Minister for Industrial Affairs and the Attorney-General continually refer to this Bill as 'opening up the floodgates to stress claims'. Stress has nothing to do with this Bill. It is about an injury to the mind such as that suffered by Mr Curtis: a psychiatric or psychological injury which results in a permanent disability to the psychological or physiological functions of the brain. This Bill is very simple: it is about fairness and it corrects a mistake made by Parliament in 1992. It makes no distinction between workers who suffer a psychological or mental injury and those who suffer a physical injury.

It should also be shameful for this Parliament to be found to be in conflict with the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act 1992. All current exemptions that the various State Governments have on their various pieces of legislation expire in March of this year. As at 31 January the South Australian Government had not indicated an intention to seek an exemption under section 47 or section 55 of the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act, either in relation to the definition of disability or the Equal Opportunity Commission generally.

In March 1995 the Commonwealth Attorney-General specifically wrote to the State Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, about the need to review State legislation and included the reference to the South Australian WorkCover legislation which had been subject to a number of complaints. That matter has been referred, as I understand it, to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. In my view, it is clear that either this Parliament passes this legislation, where on all grounds of justice and fairness it should be passed, and passed unanimously, or, alternatively, the Commonwealth Government will have to step in and find that the Act contravenes the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act unless an exemption is granted. I believe that under any Federal Labor Government no such exemption would be granted to a State Government.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The Minister for Industrial Affairs interjects that he does not have to worry about that because he does not believe that a Federal Labor Government will be returned. Obviously, he is confident that either his Tory mate, Mr Reith, who would be the incoming Minister for Industrial Relations, or the incoming Federal Attorney-General under a Howard Liberal Government, would grant such an exemption. I fear that the Minister's prediction may well be right if a Howard Government is returned. The Howard Government, like the Brown Liberal Government of this State, would discriminate against the very weakest members of our society and grind them down.

I would be very interested if the Minister would enter into this debate, as I would like to hear his rationale on how a Mr Curtis, experiencing an armed holdup with a shotgun shoved in his face but not being physically attacked, is any less eligible for workers' compensation payment under section 43 than is a Mr Curtis working in the same petrol station who is subjected to an armed holdup, is hit on the head—or in some other way physically harmed—and then suffers a mental injury as a result of that holdup. There is no logic, no justice and no fairness in such a discrimination. Sometimes, I point out to the Minister, one just cannot allow so-called budgetary constraints to impede a fair go—justice for individuals. That is what this Government is all about.

This is what the Brown Government has been all about with all of its workers' compensation legislation. We are only a year off celebrating that massive demonstration on the steps of Parliament House which, without a doubt, signals the beginning of the end of the Brown Government. You only have to see the disarray in which this Government has found

itself already, whether it involves privatisation of water or forests, its internal dissensions, the personal hatred existing among Cabinet Ministers and constant leaking to the press and media from parliamentary members of the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Clause 2 makes the amendment effective as from the date of operation of the Peterson amendments of 1992. The effect will be as if the deletion of entitlement for loss of mental capacity never occurred.

Subclause 3(a) replaces the 'brain damage' item with a disability to be known as 'loss of mental capacity' which should cover all manner of (permanent) psychiatric disabilities, as well as impairment of mental capacity as a result of brain damage.

Subclause 3(b) ensures that the amount of compensation awarded will be proportionate to the severity of the loss of mental capacity.

Subclause 3(c) provides for the loss of mental capacity to be diagnosed and assessed according to the same, supposedly objective, set of guidelines against which physical disabilities are assessed.

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RACIAL VILIFICATION) BILL

Second reading.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I move:

That this Bill be discharged.

Bill discharged.

NIGERIA

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I move:

That this House—

(a) condemns the execution of the nine Ogoni community members, including Ken Saro-Wiwa and Dr Barinem Kiobel, in Nigeria on 10 November 1995 and the continued detention of 17 Ogoni members detained under 'holding charges' and calls on the Government of Nigeria to release them or promptly and fairly try them before a properly constituted court; and

(b) resolves to urge the Federal Government to pass these concerns to the Nigerian Government through appropriate multilateral diplomatic channels.

In opening the debate, I quote as follows:

I am a man of ideas in and out of prison and my ideas will live.

This was the last defined public statement made by Ken Saro-Wiwa before being sentenced to death in October last year. On 10 November 1995 Ken Saro-Wiwa, one of Nigeria's most prominent authors, environmentalists and political activists, along with eight other members of his minority tribe, the Ogoni, was taken shackled in ankle chains and moved to the main goal in Port Harcourt. At 7.30 a.m. all nine men were hanged.

When prison officials emerged bearing corpses, hundreds of people lining the streets of the city wept and, quoting from a news release, a nephew of Saro-Wiwa said, 'The devil has had its day.' The military dictatorship of General Sani Abacha held Saro-Wiwa responsible for the murder of four Ogoni chiefs, yet it was well known that the chiefs were killed at an open air rally by pro Saro-Wiwa youths. Ken Saro-Wiwa's trial before a military tribunal was condemned by world leaders and human rights groups as a sham. Prosecution witnesses have even admitted that they were bribed to testify and, all along, Saro-Wiwa protested his innocence.

This man committed no crime. What he tried to do was stop the Government and the oil industry from exploiting the land and water of his homeland, Ogoni land in south-eastern Nigeria. Five years ago, Ken Saro-Wiwa founded a movement calling for greater autonomy for his native Ogoni people and more compensation from oil companies pumping petroleum from Ogoni land. When that campaign turned violent and threatened the regime's coveted oil revenues, the activist and his supporters became targets for armed reprisals. Then in May 1994 a crowd of pro Saro-Wiwa youths killed four local chiefs whom they accused of taking bribes from the military.

Saro-Wiwa's political activities had long galled the Nigerian Government, which depends on oil for 80 per cent of its exports. A successful writer of children's books and novels and a producer and writer of a hugely popular TV series that mocked the rich and famous, the cultivated, pipe smoking Saro-Wiwa founded the movement for the survival of the Ogoni people, who number 500 000 in a nation of 90 million, with some 250 different tribes. Saro-Wiwa unsettled a greedy Government, which was in bed with an even greedier oil company. Saro-Wiwa claimed that his people were victims of oil drillings on their lands by subsidiaries of Royal Dutch Shell, the petroleum giant based in Britain and the Netherlands.

While the Ogoni people lived in poverty along the Niger delta, mostly without running water or electricity, the oil industry was poisoning the air, fouling the land and killing the fish in their waters—without giving the Ogoni a share in the billions of dollars of oil revenues. In October Saro-Wiwa was nominated for the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize, and last April he won the Goldman Environmental Prize, a prestigious $75 000 award given every year by a San Francisco foundation to grass roots heroes who fight for environmental protection. I urge this House to support my motion and let us, as a Parliament, insist that our Federal Government, through its bilateral and multilateral channels, pass on our deepest of concerns to the Nigerian Government.

Nigeria denied Ken Saro-Wiwa and his kinsmen a fair trial. Nigeria blatantly chose to ignore its obligation to its own Constitution regarding fair trials. Nigeria breached its commitment to the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. We as South Australians deplore the actions of the Nigerian Government and, like many other prisoners of conscience, martyrs of freedom, Ken Saro-Wiwa, Dr Barinem Kiobel and the seven other kinsmen who were killed because they had the courage to stand up and be counted will be remembered and honoured with the same status with which we honour Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Taslima Nasrim, Breyten Breytenbach, Martin Luther King, Nelson Mandela and many before them who have suffered ridicule and persecution for their beliefs and for fighting against the wrongs of our world.

A further 17 Ogoni community members are detained on holding charges. We must either call for their release or, at least, have them promptly and fairly tried before a properly constituted court. During the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in November 1995 our Prime Minister, along with other world leaders, told the world how shocked he was at the actions of the Nigerian Government. I ask if these words did anything to stop the atrocities committed in Nigeria. The fate of 17 men awaits the actions of the Commonwealth nations. Our Prime Minister, on our behalf, must lead the way with political action.

In conclusion, I leave members with the epitaph Ken Saro-Wiwa wrote for himself—an epitaph that will not be forgotten for a long time:

Here lies the gentle, sweet man Nigeria loved to cheat.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I support this motion and congratulate the member for Reynell for bringing it before the House and also for the way that she outlined the events leading up to this motion. I could not improve on the description or the sentiments expressed by the member for Reynell. I will enlarge on one or two points. Nigeria, as most people who have followed this case would know, is run by a criminal military dictatorship, and no-one supports those kinds of people. No decent person could. However, they do have the strong support of the Shell Oil Company which, in effect, runs Nigeria. That company props up, certainly through economic and, I am quite sure, other means, the criminals who run the country.

To me, it is not enough to outline the problem; it is not enough to express words of condemnation in this place. As far as I am concerned, what is important is what can be done. I believe things can be done on an international, national and individual level to draw to the attention of the true rulers of Nigeria, the Shell Oil Company, that its behaviour is beyond even the appallingly low standards of oil companies throughout the world. Shell in Nigeria is below the worst behaviour of the oil companies in general.

At an international level, it ought not be too difficult for countries to have something similar to the UN minimum standards; that there ought to be minimum environmental standards by which countries, and people who do business in those countries, must abide; that there ought to be, if there is to be free trade with these companies, some minimum standards on human and civil rights and freedom of association, etc. I do not believe that, if countries around the world wanted to do that, it would be too hard to organise, but that is something for our national Government to do at our urging, and this resolution in its way will assist that process.

On an individual level, what can we do? I certainly will never again buy any Shell products. I would urge every person who has any feeling at all for this and who shares the feeling of horror at what has occurred to join me and others in not buying Shell products. It is very easy to do. There are very many oil companies, and whilst none of them in my view are worthy of my custom I must buy petrol somewhere, but it will never be, as long as I can avoid it, from a Shell company. I will go around the corner, across or up the road, anything to avoid buying Shell products. I also congratulate Tony Baker from the *Advertiser* who wrote a few weeks ago on this issue. Tony Baker, at a personal level, is not buying Shell products.

The effectiveness of this can be demonstrated by the *Brent Spar* operation in the UK towards the end of last year. Members will remember that an oil platform was to be dumped at sea in deep water by the Shell Oil Company, and a very significant campaign was launched throughout Europe to stop the Shell Oil Company doing that, even though the company had the support of the UK Government. I do not want to argue the merits or otherwise of that method of disposal because I know there are arguments on both sides. The point I make is that Shell could not withstand the public pressure, and the *Brent Spar* was towed to a Norwegian fiord and will be dismantled on land: it will not be dumped at sea in the deep ocean.

Shell's petrol sales throughout Europe, particularly in Germany, dropped by a third. The boycotts were very well organised. They were spontaneous; people right across Europe got stuck into Shell and it changed its mind. I know Nigeria probably does not have the sexiness of this platform, where Greenpeace is carrying on and doing one of its stunts; nevertheless, I think the issue is far more important, and world opinion and boycotts of Shell products will certainly have a significant effect. So, what little bit of petrol or any other products I buy, where I can identify them I will buy nothing from Shell, and I urge everybody else to consider doing the same thing.

I do not need to go into the history of what has brought us to this, because I could not better what was said by the member for Reynell, but Ken Saro-Wiwa wanted to give an address to the 'court' before the military criminals who murdered him. He wanted to make a statement to that court and he was not allowed to, but the statement was subsequently published. I have a copy of it and wish to read it into the record so that Ken Saro-Wiwa's own words will be there for anybody to read who is interested. This is the statement which he wanted to make to the court and which he was prevented from reading to them:

My lord, we all stand before history. I am a man of peace, of ideas. Appalled by the denigrating poverty of my people who live on a richly endowed land, distressed by their political marginalisation and economic strangulation, angered by the devastation of the land, anxious to preserve their right to life and to a decent living, and determined to usher to this country as a whole a fair and just democratic system, I have devoted all my intellectual and material resources—my very life—to a cause in which I have total belief and from which I cannot be blackmailed or intimidated. I have no doubt at all about the ultimate success of my cause, no matter the trials and tribulations which I and those who believe with me may encounter on our journey. Nor imprisonment nor death can stop our ultimate victory.

I repeat that we all stand before history. I and my colleagues are not the only ones on trial. Shell is on trial here, and it is as well that it is represented by counsel said to be holding a watching brief. The company has, indeed, ducked this particular trial, but its day will surely come and the lessons learnt here may prove useful to it, for there is no doubt in my mind that the ecological war the company has waged in the delta will be called to question sooner than later and the crimes of that war be duly punished. The crime of the company's dirty war against the Ogoni people will also be punished.

On trial also is the Nigerian nation, its present rulers and all those who assist them. I am not one of those who shy away from protesting injustice and oppression, arguing that they are expected of a military regime. The military do not act alone. They are supported by a gaggle of politicians, lawyers, judges, academics and businessmen, all of them hiding under the claim that they are only doing their duty, men and women too afraid to wash their pants of their urine. We all stand on trial, my lord, for by our actions we have denigrated our country and jeopardised the future of our children. As we subscribe to the subnormal and accept double standards, as we lie and cheat openly, as we protect injustice and oppression, we empty our classrooms, degrade our hospitals, and make ourselves the slaves of those who subscribe to higher standards, who pursue the truth, and honour justice, freedom and hard work. . .

. . . I predict that a denouement of the riddle of the Niger delta will soon come. The agenda is being set at this trial. Whether the peaceful ways I have favoured will prevail depends on what the oppressor decides, what signals it sends out to the waiting public.

In my innocence of the false charges I face here, in my utter conviction, I call upon the Ogoni people, the peoples of the Niger delta, and the oppressed ethnic minorities of Nigeria to stand up now and fight fearlessly and peacefully for their rights. History is on their side, God is on their side. For the Holy Quran says in Sura 42, verse 41: 'All those who fight when oppressed incur no guilt, but Allah shall punish the oppressor.' Come the day.

Ken Saro-Wiwa

Port Harcourt, 1 September 1995.

Motion carried.

FORESTS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): I move:

That this House is of the opinion that, with the objective of protecting the long-term socioeconomic interests of South Australia with respect to forest production and timber processing, the Government must retain control over the annual rate of cutting timber and of the age and location of timber when felled and must not sell broadacres of forestry holdings in the South-East.

This motion is very important for the people of the South-East of South Australia whom I have the great pleasure to represent. In moving this motion I am quite sure that I am putting forward to the House the wishes of the vast majority of people in my electorate and also in the districts outside. Members, particularly those who have been here for the past 21 years, will probably realise that while some have prevaricated on the issue I have consistently and implacably opposed the sale of the forests of the South-East.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Hear, hear!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Giles says, 'Hear, hear!' He was the very next in my line of sight, because it caused me grave concern when his Government—I believe he was Treasurer at the time—mortgaged to the hilt the forests of the South-East for the sum of about $407 million to the Australian Gaslight Corporation. As I said, that caused me and the people of the South-East grave concern to think that the ownership and control of the forests may at that time have already passed out of the hands of the Government. I wonder about the crocodile tears that are currently being wept by members of the Labor Party in the Lower and Upper Houses on this issue. Of course, we have had to discharge that debt over the past couple of years—a very substantial sum of money to pay back.

This motion may well be superfluous in the light of the Premier's statement that, no matter what form of contract is let for the sale of Government timber, the Government will retain ownership of the forests, including the forest land, and control over the location, age and quantity of timber to be felled. In other words, the statement made by the Premier on Tuesday shortly after I gave notice of this motion was almost identical in wording and intent—and that gave me great reassurance. However, I intend to carry on with this motion, because I move it in the knowledge that the Premier and Cabinet and my Liberal Party colleagues are in full support. I also hope that, equally, members on the opposite side of the House will show their concern for the industry and employment in the South-East by supporting it.

Of course, the Premier has consistently said, 'No sale.' He said 'no sale' in December last year when a question was asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and on several occasions he has repeated 'no sale' in the printed and electronic media in the South-East.

Mr Clarke: Only the land.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No, the Premier said that there would be no sale of the forests, and land is not forest—forests, full stop. The land issue is the red herring that the Labor Party keeps bringing up. Of course, there is absolutely no secret of the fact that the Asset Management Task Force, whose documents are currently being quoted, was established by the incoming Government to manage those massively mortgaged State assets which were left to the South Australian taxpayer and to try to diminish the mortgages and debts that it has had to discharge. The Asset Management Task Force had a job to do.

It is no secret that some assets have already been sold to reduce the debt. Quite frankly, I think the vast majority of South Australians would praise the Treasurer for his diligence, his prudent management and the manner in which he has managed to defray the State debt by pretty well the total amount that he said he would defray it by in two years: $1.8 billion. That, in itself, is an amazing achievement by the Treasurer and the Government. The sale of Forwood Products' assets, which was of course incorporated and prepared for sale by the ALP Government—we inherited that—will proceed, and legislation is currently before the House. The sale of the forests—the land and the broadacre forests—will not proceed. The Premier has given an assurance that, whatever the form of contract, the Government will control the location, quantity and age of the trees felled. It does not matter what you call the contract, if you are controlling it.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I point out to the Deputy Leader that the press releases are quite clear and unequivocal. There can be no asset stripping, and that will preserve the integrity of employment in the South-East. The reason I refer to asset stripping of the industry is that asset stripping did occur in New Zealand, and I will refer to that shortly. The Asset Management Task Force obviously had a job to do. Only Cabinet can make decisions regarding sales. Cabinet says no, irrespective of whatever the documentation may have said. The leaked documents, which have been shown around to the media and others over the past few days, are simply history. They represent only one of many proposals put forward to the Treasury for asset disposal and, unless adopted by the Government, they are completely irrelevant. So mischief is being peddled by the ALP—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I invite members to stand on the steps of Parliament House and bring forward a few names.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am not in the business of naming people. The mischief peddled by the ALP, and in light of that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Members opposite can cover up their own folly as much as they like, and it is their folly we are talking about. I addressed the matter to the Premier, the Cabinet and my Liberal Party colleagues, and they have given me 100 per cent unequivocal support. A committee of inquiry has been established by Minister Kerin—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: —and I believe that its investigations will reflect the Government's concern to maximise the financial returns on timber assets for South Australian taxpayers and to secure employment and industrial development for the South-East, which is an important review.

The Woods and Forests operations were set up by Tom Playford in the 1950s. They were neglected by the Labor Party in the 1970s. There was a very substantial parliamentary report which unequivocally pointed out that tens of millions of dollars were needed, and that was invested subsequently to bring that back up to scratch. That heavy investment of plant and machinery and the tremendous losses of $60 million on scrimber only show you can still have a fiasco even if you spend money. In two years, under Dale Baker's administration, the Woods and Forests Department

turned to profitability—$30 million profit in the past year and I think about $15 or $16 million profit in the preceding year; a good sign. The forests are producing $40 million worth of growth per annum.

A valuation has to be done as a matter of urgency to determine the extent of the asset, because valuations taken out by the ALP Government a few years ago showed a discrepancy of about $600 million between the lowest valuation and the highest valuation—and the former Treasurer will be aware of that. The Australian Accountancy Research Foundation is currently investigating valuations, the incremental annual growth increases of forests, and the best method of presenting these figures in annual reports. I raised this matter with the foundation several years ago in the Public Accounts Committee. It is a complex issue.

My reasons for opposing the broadacre sales and loss of contractual control are many fold, and I will give the House a few of them. Valuations are not accurate. The forests could easily be sold too cheaply, if you do not know what they are worth, but they will not be sold, so that is irrelevant. We have to know how much they are worth in order to determine a fair rate of return. Are we maximising the return? If there were asset stripping by a sole purchaser, the sole purchaser could mill timber rapidly to amortise the purchase price. They could do that in 18 to 20 months. The forests could be depleted; shortages could follow in ensuing years; and employment fluctuations and damage to local communities could occur. As I said, that has happened in New Zealand. The Government's and the taxpayers' profit could be minimised instead of maximised, as is our intention.

The Government has shown clearly its intention of controlling the agenda by recently letting the logging contracts to four successful tenderers, and they were given five-year logging contracts plus a further five years right of renewal—which, in itself, is a sign of the Government's integrity—prior to this. That was done two or three weeks ago. The matter was before Cabinet about Christmas time. The Government's intentions were clear; the logging contracts were let, and that clearly implies that the Government will retain control. The issue was already well in hand prior to Christmas. This has given security to those contractors who have invested in plant and equipment, and the South-East log contractors are among the world's best from the point of view of cost and efficiency of operations. They have some security.

When I was advising my colleagues, I also felt that the sale of broad-acre forests could create a monopoly. In doing so, you could disadvantage the unsuccessful local tenderers, if they all bid for the forests. Obviously, they could not all be successful. So, although I am quite sure that a number of South-Eastern operations might have been interested in acquiring forests, all of them have realised that the sale of forests to a monopoly—particularly an overseas monopoly—could disadvantage them to the extent that they might be starved of local timber, and they would not be able to process in the South-East. I suspect that the timber millers in the South-East would be equally supportive of my motion. In fact, logs could be shipped out of the district with minimal local value adding taking place. Already about a million tonnes of woodchip is exported from the South-East as a by-product of sawn timber, and that is sent out through the port of Portland.

I advise members there is also a glut of softwood on the markets. A member of the Australian Democrats in the Upper House said that there was a world shortage of softwood. In the past few months, the situation has turned around to the extent that we have Chile, New Zealand, California, probably South Africa, Victoria and New South Wales coming on stream with very substantial amounts of *pinus radiata* and many other species of pine, probably of a better quality. Our main competitors have *pinus radiata*. There is also downturn in the industry. I point out to all members that any sale of forests by any country at this stage would be an act of folly, because bidding companies could bid on the lower side of forest value rather than on the higher side.

Mr Clarke: Why is that American company so keen on setting up here?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Deputy Leader asks why an American company is keen on getting our forests. The answer is simple: the United States is determined, through its green movement, to protect the hooded owl in the American Rockies. It is about 12 to 18 months since a complete embargo was placed on the clear felling of the valuable softwood timbers in the Rocky Mountains. The obvious implications of that are that American companies that were milling in the United States now have a problem. If they wish to retain their markets, they will now look abroad to New Zealand where, of course, the New Zealand Government did precisely that: it sold an asset to a New Zealand company which subsequently resold to an American company.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am not really worried whether they are setting up here, because the only people who can help them would be a Labor or a Liberal Cabinet. There will be not be a Democrat Cabinet; I think we are all agreed on that. It would be a Government Cabinet. This Cabinet has said quite clearly and unequivocally that it will support the local member. I am interested not only in regional development and expansion but in regional protection. It is equally important. This motion is designed to get the support of the whole House to protect the industry, employment and potential future development by people who might be interested in milling in the South-East. ANM was looking at setting up a paper mill and PRATTS is currently investigating Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. There could be others come out of the woodwork and into the South-East forests—spare the pun, members. I therefore ask members to support this motion and I express my personal thanks to the Premier, to Cabinet and to my colleagues for the support that they have already indicated that I have without question from them.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

NARACOORTE AND MILLICENT SWIMMING LAKES

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That this House expresses its concern that the Government and in particular the Minister for Health have failed to resolve issues associated with the Naracoorte and Millicent swimming lakes and calls on the Government to take the necessary steps to enable the lakes to be re-opened for the remainder of this summer and to provide assistance to the respective corporations to upgrade these essential community facilities for future seasons.

The swimming lakes in the South-East at Millicent and Naracoorte have been a very important part of those communities for many years. The lake at Millicent was opened in 1969 and the one at Naracoorte in 1961. They have a total area of approximately 7 000 square metres. The volume of water held in each of those lakes is around 10 million litres.

They have been used over this time by local communities and tourists for recreational swimming. The lake in Millicent has been chlorinated since 1970 and is regularly tested for water quality. In 1992 a chlorine manufacturing plant was installed. The lake at Naracoorte is regularly maintained by the council with chemical treatment and regular monitoring for health purposes.

It is believed that there have been no reported cases of disease or infection to any person who has used the lakes over this time. That assertion was backed up in a recent consultant's report on this issue. In July 1992 the public and environmental health regulations 1992 became law. As a result, all swimming pools other than residential house pools came under these regulations. Therein lay the genesis of the problems that we face today. An issue arose concerning whether these lakes were lakes or pools and, if they were pools, how they were affected by the regulations. A very long saga developed, which I will attempt to detail briefly, in relation to the handling of this issue. Some of the players in this are the present Minister for Health, Dr Kerry Kirke (Executive Director of the Public and Environmental Health Branch) and Mr Peter Jarrett (Acting Manager of the Environmental Health Branch). I have mentioned those names because they will come up when I detail events that have happened over the years.

On 21 September 1994, in a ministerial briefing, Dr Kirke recorded that the councils of Naracoorte and Millicent were requesting clarification on the status of the lakes in relation to those regulations. On 22 September, Mr Jarrett noted that the councils had agreed that the lakes were swimming pools under the new definition and that the councils were requesting exemption from the regulations. This was supported by the member for MacKillop. In a letter to the member for MacKillop from the CEO of the District Council of Millicent on 23 November 1994, the CEO reiterated that the councils were seeking not an unconditional exemption from the regulations but a conditional exemption. In the letter the CEO said:

> Such conditions . . . would be the subject of negotiation between the councils and the SA Health Commission, and would include conditions relating to water quality and clarity, taking into account the uniqueness of these two (2) swimming lake facilities.

He also said:

> It must be stated that both councils are aware of the need to provide swimming facilities that are safe for use by the public. . .

On 13 December 1994, in an internal memorandum to the Minister, Dr Kirke said that he was unaware of what the councils had in mind regarding such a conditional exemption, and he sent the memorandum back to the Minister. On 24 January 1995, there was another internal memorandum from Dr Kirke to the Minister, and it states:

> I have not received the information on the conditions which the councils would propose as acceptable if a conditional exemption was to be considered.

He also mentioned that the Local Government Association had offered assistance to resolve the issue. On 12 October 1995, in another memorandum from Dr Kirke to the Minister, mention was made of a consultant's report, and Dr Kirke expressed concern about this report to the Minister. On 25 October 1995, John Hawkes, the Minister's senior staffer, wrote to Dr Kirke asking him to consider additional information including the councils' assertions that they meet all the requirements except water turnover. He also mentioned the issues about school swimming programs, which would happen soon, and he urged that an answer be forthcoming as soon as possible. On 8 November 1995, Mr Peter Jarrett strongly recommended that the amendments not be made to the regulations. He suggested:

> . . . the local councils should consider either the construction of a swimming centre accessible to both councils or build within the lakes a specific area for swimming which could be managed under the current legislation.

On 17 November 1995, there were further internal memoranda between Dr Kirke and the Minister and Dr Kirke and the councils. Finally, on about 11 December last year, this matter was talked about in Cabinet on the instigation of the member for Mackillop, the former Minister for Primary Industries. I quote from a newspaper article, as follows:

> He [the former Minister] has asked that the South Australian Health Commission delay implementing new health and safety requirements for the lakes until March 1996. 'This would allow the families of the South-East to continue to use these lakes as they have for more than 30 years. I have asked Dr Armitage to set aside the requirements associated with the decision to make each of the lakes subject to the constraints that apply to swimming pools. This will give the councils just one more year to meet these new standards or to make other arrangements to provide swimming facilities in the region.'

The article continues:

> Mr Baker said the risks associated with children and young people going swimming in less hygienic creeks and dams was far greater than to allow them to continue to use the lakes for one more year. . . 'I am hopeful that the Health Commission will be able to see that on this occasion common sense should play a role in the final decision.'

Interestingly enough, we still have not had a decision. I should like to quote from a memorandum written by the Minister for Health to Dr Kirke, because it really illustrates what I am trying to say about the bureaucratic approach and the almost *Yes, Minister* way that this office has operated in this matter. The memorandum was in response to some recommendations that Dr Kirke gave the Minister about moving the process on. It states:

> In relation to your fourth dot point, it is not clear to me whether the PEHC advice to the councils to seek expert reassurance that amoebae, such as *Naegleria fowlerii*, do not represent a risk to swimmers, is something to be taken into account in relation to the second dot point. In other words, does that expert reassurance form part of the determination that 'all other relevant water quality criteria can be met'? Are you recommending that I should give a 'dispensation' now and have a regulation drawn up, or do you suggest that I should await the expert reassurance first? Indeed, is it possible for such a reassurance to be given now, or is it a matter of the work being done and then testing being carried out and the onus being placed on the councils not to permit swimming until the appropriate testing and assurances have been obtained?

One could be forgiven for thinking that they were listening to Sir Humphrey Appleby and Jim Hacker. While all this continued for over a year—backwards and forwards—what was happening on the ground in Millicent and Naracoorte? For the first time in 35 years both lakes were closed during summer. The swimming programs for the Naracoorte schoolchildren which always took place in the Naracoorte lake were cancelled. Some of the Naracoorte swimmers, who cannot use their swimming lake, are using natural water holes or swamps because of this closure and, as the member for MacKillop pointed out previously, therefore face far greater health risks. Finally, local businesses, particularly those dependent on tourism, have suffered because, as members may not know, adjacent to the Naracoorte lake is a caravan park which is a very popular destination for tourists in summer.

So, while the Health Commission in its protracted fashion sent internal memorandums as well as letters and had meetings for well over a year, nothing was done. Everyone acknowledges the importance of a safe swimming environment; no-one anywhere has denied that. Instead of taking a bureaucratic approach, the Health Commission and the Minister need to take a proactive approach. They need to get people together to sort out the situation once and for all so that people can go about their daily lives with the help of Government rather than being bound by rules, regulations, processes, procedures or bureaucracy's need to write letters or internal memorandums on a one-to one-basis rather than having meetings. Instead of that, there are communities with barriers placed in front of them, and we have the debacle in Millicent and Naracoorte.

Finally, true to form, the Minister for Health blamed everyone else. I refer to an *Advertiser* article of Friday 15 December 1995. Members would recall that this situation started in September the year before and that, when this article was printed on Friday 15 December 1995, the swimming classes had been cancelled, the summer tourist season was almost there and the lakes had to be closed. The article stated:

> However, Dr Armitage has blamed delays by the Naracoorte and Millicent councils for the summer closures, saying they should have acted much sooner to comply with the regulations. . . However, the Naracoorte council's town clerk, Mr Marc Dilena, said they were appalled at the Minister's attempt to lay blame on the councils.
>
> 'The Minister for Health should not be attempting to apportion blame in this matter, but to explore all opportunities to provide a solution to this matter in the best interests of the Naracoorte and Millicent communities,' Mr Dilena said.
>
> 'The Minister's actions in this matter appear to be directed at protecting his own personal liability, and not at making decisions that will remedy this impasse.'

This comes as no surprise to the Opposition. We have seen this Minister act in this way on a number of occasions. In the interests of common sense and in the interests of reaching a solution, surely this Minister can look seriously into the way in which he and his officials carry out their responsibilities. Their responsibilities are to be proactive, to solve problems, not to put barriers in the way of people going about their daily lives. I urge members to support this motion, which expresses our concern that such bureaucratic nonsense could have occurred and calls on the Minister to get on with the job that he should have done before and fix the problem so that it does not happen again.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH COMPLAINTS UNIT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Stevens:

That this House requires the Minister for Health to establish forthwith an independent health complaints unit in accordance with his obligations under the Medicare Agreement.

(Continued from 16 November. Page 563.)

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I support the motion calling for the establishment in this State of an independent health complaints unit. Members will be aware of my interest in this matter, having several times called for such a unit. During the past four years when I have been either a candidate or a member it has become evident that the need for such a unit is of great concern to people in this State. The number of individuals who feel that they have received bad medical treatment from public and private institutions has been alarmingly high. It appears to be the view of many in our community that there is no independent statutory body to hear and investigate their complaints. In their view, it is often a case of the medical profession and the health system investigating itself.

I am sure that all members have been contacted by constituents who have complained about the medical treatment that they have received. In July last year I brought to the attention of the House the sad case of Mrs Edna Jones who in February 1990 had gone into Calvary Hospital for a fairly minor procedure (the removal of a breast lump), which usually takes about four days. Instead, Mrs Jones remained in hospital for over a month, and four months later she was still receiving treatment on a daily basis and continued after that time to be in a lot of pain. That treatment was for the gangrene that had set in whilst she was in hospital having the minor procedure, and she also developed a secondary condition called pseudomonas.

The family, at the time of the injury, lodged a complaint with the Health Commission through its advice and complaints office and was dissatisfied with the response that it got following that complaint. As members would be aware, a court order was necessary to obtain the medical records of Mrs Jones's time in hospital, because in this State patients do not have an automatic right to their records. The response from the Health Commission's advice and complaints office at that time to Mrs Jones's complaint was that there was no basis in the complaint in that gangrene had not developed. I have personally sighted copies of the surgeon's records, which clearly state that necrosis was caused by infected gangrene. That was in the documentation. There were other complaints, of which at that time I advised Parliament.

Mrs Jones's very sad case was not an isolated incident. In fact, I have been alarmed at the frequency of complaints about medical treatment in both public and private institutions that have been reported to my electorate office. Recently, one of my constituents was admitted to a local private hospital for a minor operation to remove a cataract and was sent home despite protesting that she was in great pain. I think that on that same night she was admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital suffering an infection which resulted in the loss of her eye. She has since had further operations, suffered severe pain and discomfort, and has had to deal with the stress of losing that eye. My office has tried to obtain legal assistance for that constituent. Unfortunately, she is faced with the prospect of a protracted legal battle involving the Medical Board. The incident occurred in a private institution and there is no body to which she can take her complaint to have it redressed.

I have mentioned two cases, although many cases have been brought to the attention of staff at my office. There have been many reports about medical mistreatment during childbirth. People who are aggrieved report an overwhelming feeling of helplessness; they do not feel that anyone is listening to their complaints. There is no body that will hear their complaint let alone do anything about it.

I am not the first person to stand here and call for the establishment of an independent health complaints unit. In 1992 a task force was set up to examine patients' rights. That task force produced a paper entitled 'An Independent Health Complaints Unit for South Australia' and recommended that a unit be established that provided universal coverage of our health system along similar lines to that which occurs in Victoria and Queensland. Importantly, the task force recommended that the unit be separate from the

Ombudsman's office to enable a clear and special focus on the health system and, of course, it should be separate from the Health Commission.

In 1993 the Medicare agreement, which does call for the establishment of an independent health complaints unit, was signed off by the then Minister. We have been hearing for a considerable time that a unit should be established, yet in the Health Services Bill that was introduced and defeated last year there was no mention of an independent statutory body that would address these complaints.

However, the Government does have an obligation, I believe, to investigate not only what happens in our public system but also what happens in our private system. It is important that there be a mechanism for reporting to Parliament so that Parliament can keep track of what is happening within our medical system and thereby correct mistakes that are occurring. I support the motion. It is far and away time that such a body was set up because the constituents of this State are calling for an independent health complaints unit.

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY CONFERENCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brokenshire:

That this House condemns the Australian Labor Party for locking out a political journalist from the Australian Labor Party's annual conference because he was not a member of a union.

(Continued from 23 November. Page 716.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I am sorry that the member for Mawson is not here today in his seat in cobweb corner. I wondered why he was placed in cobweb corner. When he first came into Parliament he seemed a reasonable enough sort of chap and I could not understand why they placed him there. Those members who have been around here for a long time must know—and you, Mr Speaker, certainly know—that I sat in cobweb corner for nearly three years. I know what my sins were. I was well aware of what would happen to me and why I was put in cobweb corner by a former Speaker, whose last act was to ensure that I had a suitable seat from which to operate well in this Parliament. However, I was somewhat puzzled as to why the member for Mawson was singled out and put in cobweb corner.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will link up his remarks. He has not yet addressed himself to the motion.

Mr QUIRKE: I will do so quickly. In fact, we now find out the reason: the member for Mawson falls for silly little tricks like this. That is why he is in cobweb corner. The member for Mawson thought that this was a cheap and quick way to get himself ingratiated either with the *Sunday Mail* or with his Party members and if at the end of the year there is a chance in the ministry he may get there. Well, he failed on most counts. In his speech he trailed the hook and caught some fish, but I do not think he quite achieved his aim. What must have happened—and he will clarify this in summing up—was that he was given this motion because somebody saw him as a mug, a mug that would come in here and start this sort of caper on this sort of matter.

The reality is that in here, at least among those who have been around for a while, this sort of stuff is not all that well thought of. There are good reasons for that. It is not my role here and now to start talking about matters which you, Mr Speaker, the other day ruled were *sub judice*. However, another matter is going on with the *Sunday Mail* and this place, to which I am not allowed to allude, which could cause embarrassment to a number of other members of this place, none of whom are on our side as far as I am aware. It may be that someone on our side will have that problem in future, but at the end of the day—or today, anyway—I understand that this matter is an embarrassment for a number of members of the Liberal Party.

I give this commitment to the House: I will not seek to exploit that issue because I learnt my lessons in cobweb corner. I learnt that you do not carry on like this and deliberately put up such resolutions, the intention of which in this case is to try to embarrass our Deputy Leader; that was particularly evident after the interjections that came when the member for Mawson so stupidly came in and read out his notice of motion.

The Labor Party indeed has a long history of allowing just about anybody into its conferences and monthly State council meetings. That was not always so. Some 33 years ago the media in Australia concentrated strongly on the then national conference of the Labor Party when Gough Whitlam and the leader of the Labor Party at that time, Arthur Calwell, were outside the front of the Kingston Hotel in Canberra while 36 delegates, who later became known by the Menzies campaign for the election of that year as the 36 faceless men, decided policy. Since that time the Labor Party has been absolutely transparent at its State councils and its State convention. I must say that the last time I counted, in 1992, I believe I had been to 23 State conventions and national conferences of the Labor Party, and a good deal more State councils. One of the first items—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I am telling my age, I confess to the member for Torrens. We allow persons to come in there who are not card carrying members of the Labor Party or delegates, or whatever. We allow in there members of the public from all walks of life and, of course, we allow business participants, because the Government made much earlier this year of the program to allow business persons to come in and see how Labor Party policy is formulated. In fact, a wide cross-section of interested persons and groups come into the Labor Party convention and to the monthly State councils. And this includes the media.

It so happens that, for very good reasons, we hold our convention on Trades and Labor Council property. It is a condition of our occupancy of those premises that people who carry out certain occupations need to be a member of the appropriate trade union. Mr Duffy—who I think everyone around here knows is a friend of mine—has taken a certain course of action, which is that he, for whatever reason at that time, decided that he was not going to be a member of what I think is now the Media and Entertainment Alliance. That is for him to make up his mind on. At the end of the day, the Labor Party does have some conditions of entry, albeit very few, in contrast to the organisation that the member for Mawson represents.

I do not think that I as a card carrying member of the Labor Party would be allowed into his organisation's monthly State council. I do not think that I am allowed into its conventions. I cannot understand why that is the case, because at those conventions it does not make policy that is binding on members. I find it somewhat amusing that a member of an organisation that is not transparent, that will not allow the public to enter into its meetings and will not allow journalists except when it suits it, comes in here and

has a few words to say about us in the Labor Party and the way that we do business. Others have spoken on this, and I just want to make it quite clear that I do not share some of the remarks made about the *Sunday Mail*, because I have found that it has been an accurate reporting mechanism.

I have found that, when I have contacted the *Sunday Mail* or it has contacted me, I have had reasonable and fair treatment, as I am sure it would accord members of this House on whatever issues they were raising. It is unfortunate that this argument has developed here. It will probably be even more unfortunate for Government members than another argument that I cannot talk about which also seems to be brewing behind the scenes. I want to make it quite clear that, although the member for Mawson has sought some cheap political advantage out of this, and that I cannot speak for our entire Caucus, I can say that we have taken no Caucus position to attack the *Sunday Mail*, to embarrass the *Sunday Mail* or to say anything about it. I am not here empowered by Caucus or anyone else to say that it is the best organisation in town, but I would say that it has fairly and accurately reported the information that I have shared with it or concerning which it has telephoned me and bounced off me over a number of years.

I can also suggest that there are a number of reporters around the place for whom I do not have a lot of time, because they seek to put words in the mouths of members of Parliament. They seek to set things up, and they seek to do a range of other things. I can honestly say that, although Mr Duffy does not take out his ticket in his appropriate union, something which I regret, I must say that he has never done that to me. I lament that this issue has arisen in this place. The member for Mawson ought to realise why he is in cobweb corner and why he is likely to stay there for a while, if he keeps bringing up this sort of stuff.

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION RESOURCES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Clarke:

That this House condemns—

(a) the way in which the Minister for Education and Children's Services has broken the Government's election promises on education and embarked on a policy of cutting resources for education in South Australia;

(b) the reduction of 790 teachers and 276 ancillary staff between 30 June 1994 and 31 January 1995;

(c) the Minister's decision to cut a further 250 school service officer full-time equivalents from January 1996 that will result in up to 500 support staff being cut from essential support work in schools; and

(d) the Minister's decision to cut a further 100 teachers from areas including the open access college, special interest schools and Aboriginal schools.

(Continued from 23 November. Page 723.)

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I support the motion before this House and, in so doing, I condemn the way in which the Minister for Education and Children's Services has broken the Government's election promises and embarked on a policy of cutting resources to our students in South Australia. The Government talks about South Australia being the smart State in a clever country but, when situations arise, obviously it is not. This Government is ripping out the guts of South Australia's education and training systems with the reduction of 790 teachers, 276 ancillary staff between 30 June 1994 and early last year, and 250 SSO full-time equivalents, and probably many more when one takes into consideration that many of those staff are part-time employees.

The impact these cuts will have on our State schools this year alone is recognised by every parent in this State; is recognised by every community in this State; and is recognised by most of the Liberal backbenchers in this House. The member for Kaurna made her views quite plain in the *Advertiser* recently. That is the extent to which every member in this Chamber recognises that the decision by this Government to cut so brutally into the education system is wrong. The Minister's further decision to cut 100 teachers from areas, including the open access college, special interest schools and Aboriginal schools cannot be defended, and it certainly will not be defended by the Labor Party in this State. I commend the motion to the House and I ask that every member in this Chamber put their mind to supporting it.

Mr BASS (Florey): I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (24)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P. (teller)
Becker, H.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Condous, S. G.	Cummins, J. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Leggett, S. R.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Penfold, E. M.	Scalzi, G.
Wade, D. E.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (11)

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

Majority of 13 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

GAMING MACHINES

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Stevens:

That this House calls on the Government to allocate sufficient funds from the taxation windfall that it has received from poker machines to fund fully the increase in demand for social welfare services and emergency relief that has occurred since their introduction.

(Continued from 12 October. Page 229.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I support the motion. Whilst I may have had some misgivings earlier in the piece about any further motions regarding charities while the Hill report into the impact of gaming machines on charities was being commissioned, it is pretty clear that the money that went into the Hill report—whatever amount that was, whether it be $5 000, $10 000 or $20 000—could have been much better spent on the affected charities, as since that time next to nothing has been spent on charitable organisations. As we found out yesterday in the response to the question that I asked the Deputy Premier and as I stated in my speech, although this year the Government will make twice the

estimated revenue from gaming machines and next year will make the same amount again plus a further 25 per cent, which will take its total revenue from gaming machines for the 1996-97 financial year to about $125 million, only $1 million of those funds is earmarked to help charities.

The Deputy Premier made a big thing about the .2 per cent the other day when I said that it came from the industry itself. He said that it did not, that it came out of Treasury revenue. I have news for him, and the news is all bad: a 4.2 per cent levy is placed on the Casino, and .2 per cent of that is administered by the Minister now on the front bench. He yelled across the Chamber the other day that the Government is very generous, that it sends money to where it belongs. That has not been my experience. I think the member for Elizabeth is onto something here. I have said many times in this place and on the radio that the amount of money that is finding its way to those charities that are directly affected is insufficient.

The Hill report which has been commissioned by this Government makes out a case that there are wider implications for other organisations which hitherto have determined that they get their money from gaming and bingo tickets, etc., and that there has been an impact on those traditional forms of gambling revenue, and that needs to be addressed. I suppose the Government can take the attitude now that it is being generous by handing over roughly three-quarters of a per cent of what it gains in revenue to those charities that are more directly affected, but organisations such as the MS Society, to which I referred in the House yesterday and the day before and which do good community work, will either not be able to do that work or will come back to the Minister on the front bench and say, 'We want it from some other line.' So, as a consequence of the introduction of gaming machines into South Australia, we find a lack of provision for the affected charities in particular, both those that directly deal with gambling and its addiction and those that deal with all sorts of other things, particularly organisations such as the MS Society.

I do not want to take up any further time except to say that the Opposition wants to regurgitate the words of the Deputy Premier when he was shadow Treasurer. At that time, he made it fairly clear that a 10 per cent figure—$5 million out of the windfall revenue of about $50 million—should be used by the Government to address the issues arising as a result of the impact of gaming machines. Of course, since he became Treasurer, it will not be 10 per cent—it will be three quarters of one per cent. At this stage, that is nothing at all. I know I will receive howls from Government members who will say, 'What about the $500 000 that was given just before Christmas?' As was correctly pointed out the other day, that is from the levy imposed when gaming machines were introduced.

The reality is that we have a miserable and miserly Government that spent money on a report, which disappeared without trace within a matter of hours of its release. The report was released on a Tuesday, and by the Thursday of that week we never heard any more about it. What we heard was that the money that was to go into the Government's coffers was to be spent on health and education. You do not have to be a genius to realise that 57 cents in every dollar in South Australia is spent on health and education, so there is a fair chance that at least 57 cents in every dollar of revenue generated by gaming machines will probably go there, as well. We all realise that.

What I am saying, and what this motion makes abundantly clear, is that the provision made for affected organisations by the introduction of gaming machines is wholly inadequate. It will be some time before the provisions cut in to give money to charities. By my reading, it will be the end of next financial year before they will get this miserly amount of money.

Mr BECKER (Peake): It is wonderful to be in Opposition! It is dead easy to be able to get up there and attack the Government on any financial matter at any time—

Mr Clarke: You had plenty of practice!

Mr BECKER: Yes, as the Deputy Leader says, and as I concede, I had plenty of practice. I always looked forward to the opportunity to defend the Government of the day, and on many occasions, even in Opposition, I defended the Government and took a bipartisan approach to many social issues.

Mr Oswald: The only one!

Mr BECKER: As the member for Morphett says, 'The only one'. With respect to this motion, we must bear in mind the fact that the Hill report is the first such report into the impact of the effects of electronic gaming devices and gambling in South Australia. In 1986, when moving one of many motions for poker machines to be established in licensed clubs, I called on the Government to prepare an economic impact statement. I was laughed at and virtually howled out of the Chamber. I will not forget it. I remind those in opposition, whilst most of them were not part of the Labor Party Government in those days, that they had the opportunity to set up a committee to look into the impact and effects of gambling in South Australia.

In the 1970s, Don Dunstan reminded this House that he had to take further funds out of the TAB (and it was then in its infancy) because demand was being placed on the State to increase its income so it could qualify for additional finances from the Commonwealth Government. There was quite a row in those days. The late Hugh Hudson always reminded us of the $60 million that was gambled away in SP betting. It could never be proved. We never knew from where he got the $60 million, but certainly a lot of money was involved. Of course, in those days the allegation was that SP betting was rife in the local butcher shop, the baker shop and the local pub or hotel.

It is easy to say that the impact of poker machines in South Australia has left some families destitute and that some people have become addicted to them. That might be true, but the number of compulsive gamblers has not yet been defined. Many people have changed their gambling habits from bingo, horse or harness racing, or the dogs. It is going around in a circle, and at present everybody is shocked by the huge turnover of electronic gaming devices or poker machines. It is estimated that only 1 or 2 per cent of the population is affected.

I would like to remind the member for Playford that the Economic and Finance Committee could and probably should look at the financing of welfare agencies in South Australia—at their clients and at what is the true need of the people who are having financial difficulties. In the early 1970s, when Ron Payne was the Minister for Community Welfare, I suggested that financial counselling facilities be made available to people. I argued then that a vast majority of people receiving Government benefits did not know how to handle their finances. It is ironic that the other day somebody rang me and said that he had telephoned the Labor Party candidate and did

not get much of a response: he believed that the pension should be paid weekly instead of fortnightly. He believed that most people today who are dependent on the aged or invalid pension or unemployment benefits for two, three or four days have a considerable sum of money but for the following 10 days are struggling. They live in absolute poverty, and many of them have to depend on handouts.

This person said that he believed that people should receive the pension or Government assistance weekly. By doing that, they might be rich for two days, but it would not be quite as bad. He said that people could be trained to get themselves through seven days rather than having to wait 10 of the 14 days before they received their next payment. There is a lot of merit in that. In certain cases we ought to look at paying people pension benefits weekly. I realise it would be expensive for the Government to administer. From an administration point of view, anything you ask the Government to do these days seems to be expensive. I would have thought that it would not be too difficult at all with computers. It is just a matter of a bit of time on a computer to print out the cheques or pay the money into a peron's bank and to authorise that bank to make the money available. We could overcome that system, and that is something we have to look at.

We will not stop the compulsive gambler. It is a bit like the compulsive cigarette smoker or whatever: people will do it. If it involves 1 or 2 per cent, why do we have to go to huge expense to try to solve those problems when it is best done by the various welfare and voluntary agencies, which do a marvellous job? We should not be critical of that. The amount of money that they need has never been defined. I would rather see the Economic and Finance Committee, or some other committee, define the actual needs of these people. We could give some people $1 000 a week and they would never survive; they would spend the whole amount in the first two or three days. They would find all sorts of ways of getting rid of that money.

Where do we start and where do we finish in relation to handing out money? The State Government has been responsible. It has been cautious: it has been careful. It has made $1.5 million available to these welfare agencies and they have to prove their case. If members look at the Hill report—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the Minister for Family and Community Services reminds me, the industry has made the money available. Members should look at the Hill report and some of the examples in relation to the number of clients handled by some of the agencies and the amounts of money they received. Having looked at this report, I find it very difficult to support the claim for additional sums of money at this stage. It is a well-known fact on my side of town that several people almost make a living by going around to various welfare agencies every few days for some benefit. They know they will receive $20, $30, a food voucher, or some assistance, and even assistance with clothing.

A few will start off with the RSL, then they will progress to the St Vincent De Paul Society—which does a marvellous job at Thebarton and Mile End—the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, if they can, the various local churches and then some of the charities and missions on that side of town that have established a system of benefit to the people through local councils or community development bodies. There is a great deal of assistance available and, if you apply yourself, you can receive the pension and you can get two or three handouts every fortnight to supplement the pension. Some people do pretty well. I get very cross about it, because they are denying those who are genuinely in need.

I think that this resolution is a little early. It is all very well for the member for Playford to say that the Government will receive an extra $125 million—the honourable member got the figure wrong, anyway. The amount of money that the Government earns, the money it receives, has risen dramatically. No-one knew how much it would receive. The Government aims to receive an extra $25 million from the operators of electronic gaming devices. That $25 million has been specifically ear-marked for education, health and welfare benefits. That will take off some pressure. It is estimated that in the 1995-96 year the Government will receive approximately $146 million.

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2 p.m.]

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Classification of Publications Board Report, 1994-95.

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

Ministerial Statement—Old Parliament House Restaurant Tenancy Agreement.

QUESTION TIME

UNITED WATER

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier stand by his statement to the House that Thames and CGE can bid for contracts in almost all of Asia only through United Water? On 18 October, the Premier told the House that 'United Water has exclusive access to almost all of Asia' and that Thames and CGE would have 'no rights to tender against United Water for the vast majority of the Asia area including Indonesia, Malaysia, certain key provinces of China, India, Singapore, Vietnam, the Philippines and Cambodia'. At a briefing with the Opposition last week the Chairman of United Water, Mr Malcolm Kinnaird, denied that these exclusive rights existed.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I indicate that the information given accurately reflects what I have been briefed on and what the Minister has been briefed on, and other people were present at that briefing. I did acknowledge in the answer that some countries within Asia were excluded from that exclusive relationship. At one stage in this House I went through and listed in considerable detail exactly which countries were involved in that exclusive arrangement. That is what the Government has been briefed on.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. As South Australia remains committed to meeting the obligations of the Hilmer report and entering the national electricity market, will the Minister report to the House—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I suggest to the member for Hart that if he wishes to see the completion of Question Time he not make those sorts of comments, which are an indirect reflection on the Chair. The member for Hartley.

Mr SCALZI: Can the Minister report to the House the achievements ETSA has already made in enabling it to compete successfully in the national market, and highlight areas where further research and work is being undertaken?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: ETSA has improved substantially its performance in the course of the last six years. There have been very substantial productivity and efficiency gains within the organisation which have led to substantial reductions in tariffs for electricity consumers in South Australia.

Among the number of significant achievements which will position ETSA to be a participant in the national electricity market are benchmarks such as safety. Lost time through injury has been reduced by 70 per cent. Regarding customer satisfaction, ETSA is in the top two within Australia. Labour productivity has more than doubled over the past five years in terms of power generating capacity per employee. As regards supply availability and reliability, ETSA is now 99.8 per cent reliable as a supplier of electricity within South Australia. With respect to service levels over the past year, the average time delay for answering customers telephoning ETSA has gone from eight minutes per telephone call to 20 seconds per call.

There has been a progressive reduction in operating costs over the past five years from $732.9 million in 1991 to $674.5 million in 1995. The contribution to the Government is up from $53 million in 1988-89 to $217 million in 1994-95. On tariffs, there has been a 20 per cent reduction in the average real price of electricity from 11.9¢ per unit in 1988-89 to 9.5¢ per unit in 1994-95.

Employee numbers have been reduced from 5 290 in 1991 to 2 952 to December 1995. The work force and management are to be congratulated for the substantial productivity and efficiency gains that have been put in place over the past five years. By doing so, they have positioned the Electricity Trust of South Australia to be able to compete against other electricity generating units within Australia. With the introduction of a national electricity market, it is critical and essential for the retention of generating capacity and jobs within South Australia that our productivity and efficiency gains are better than interstate instrumentalities.

The track record of this Government is particularly good. For example, charges to small business for off-peak electricity were reduced by 22 per cent, there was a further cut of 15 per cent last year and there will be another 5 per cent this year related to off-peak electricity tariffs.

We are continuing to pursue with ETSA its involvement in the national electricity market. Only full implementation of competition policy reforms will guarantee full payment from the Federal Government. The Federal Government and Hilmer have made it clear that unless we implement full competition we place at risk the competition payments from the Federal Government under the Keating-Hilmer reforms. Non-participation in that national electricity market, as dictated by the Federal Government, will jeopardise up to $1 billion over the next 10 years. In fact, in 1997-98, $87 million will be at risk to the State of South Australia should we not position our Government trading enterprises with real competition principles applying.

I do not need to remind the House that, given the level of debt that we inherited, we cannot as a Government ignore a cash disbursement of that amount from the Commonwealth Government. Hence, we are pursuing a range of initiatives and looking at options to protect South Australia's financial position as a participant in the national electricity market. That is why a series of reports has been prepared for the benefit of the Government in considering the options available to it in the lead-up to and the negotiation of our position relative to the national electricity market and the National Grid Management Council. These reports, to which I have referred, evaluate a whole range of cases that might apply—hypothetical cases in some instances, worst case scenario, best case scenario and what the options might be—so that the Government has at its disposal information upon which it can make a value judgment about its negotiating position in the national electricity market with the National Grid Management Council.

That is why the Government pursued with the Industry Commission a review of the structure of ETSA and to also look at the financial implications to the State of South Australia in, first, not being a participant in the national electricity market and the financial disbursements from the Commonwealth and, secondly, how we position it to ensure that we continue the thrust that this Government has put in place from day one, namely, to create a conducive business climate in South Australia for business so there is a reason to invest in South Australia in new plant and equipment and in the creation of jobs. Further, how do we get down the cost of living for South Australians by reducing costs for things such as electricity and water? That thrust is to ensure that we preserve the long-term position of South Australia.

The Industry Commission is due to report towards the end of February, or the first or second week in March at the latest. Upon advice from the Industry Commission, coupled with the reports currently being prepared for the Government, we will be in a position to look at the range of options available to preserve our negotiating position as we take it up for the introduction of the national electricity market. Let the House be assured that the Government has the long-term economic interest of South Australia at the forefront in determining our negotiating position.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Does the Minister for Infrastructure stand by his statement to this House of 29 November and in subsequent press releases that United Water would be 'the sole bid vehicle for CGE and Thames Water in the nominated countries throughout Asia'? At a briefing session last week the Chairman of United Water, Mr Malcolm Kinnaird, told the Opposition that the company does not have an exclusive contract to bid in those countries and that United Water will be the bid vehicle only if the parent companies agree to a joint project. Mr Kinnaird said that the parent companies reserved the right to directly bid in Asia if those companies decided that it was in their corporate best interests and that there was no exclusive deal through United Water in Asia.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What the member for Hart conveniently overlooks—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: He conveniently overlooks the fact that an agreement has been signed with United Water International—it has committed itself contractually to take

$628 million worth of exports out of the State of South Australia in the course of the next 10 years, $38 million being in the first year. That commitment is underpinned by separate unconditional whole of life guarantees by the parent companies, CGE and Thames. You cannot get a better lock in than a system like that where the world's largest water firm and the UK's largest water firm are prepared to underwrite in contract long-term commitments and guarantees to deliver the outcome about which we told the House. It is in the contract and it is locked in.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford will spoil his excellent record if he continues to interject.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Will the Premier advise the House of the latest developments in the court action initiated by the State of Florida against EDS?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I was waiting for the member for Hart to ask this question because on 14 November he asked seven questions on the one day about this very issue. The next day in the Parliament he asked another four questions, and the day after that another four questions. He asked 15 questions and made two grievance debate contributions in the one week. He was very interested in what was happening in the State of Florida. It might pay the member for Hart to listen to the answer.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Seeing that the member for Hart was so interested in this, he might like to listen to the answer. He grieved twice in that week. He took selective information from the Attorney-General of Florida and ran it around to the media—not the full material from the arbitrator, just selective parts from the Attorney-General of Florida. But, worse still, after talking with the Attorney-General of Florida, the member for Hart and the Labor Party in this State specifically turned down a request from EDS to be briefed about the court action in Florida. In other words, he was willing to hear only one side of the story. I am able to say—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, it is not, because I wrote to the Attorney-General of Florida and asked him—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —to send me all the information he had on the court action in Florida. I might add that, at the time, he sent me a very biased picture, I discovered. He sent me only a few extracts from the overall judgment that was handed down by the arbitrator and only those parts that favoured the State of Florida. But what I am able to say to the member for Hart, and to the others who are now willing to listen, is that a series of court actions have now been concluded. In fact, all outstanding issues between the State of Florida and EDS have been concluded. I am able to say that the court threw out all the claims in the actions put up by the State of Florida.

A further judgment has now been handed down that the State of Florida must pay to EDS $38.3 million immediately plus accrued interest; and, when the accrued interest was taken into account, the court found that immediately $US52.8 million should be paid to EDS, with no payment whatsoever to the State of Florida. Further, the State of Florida has now advised that it has waived its right to further appeal the case. Every judgment, since the honourable member asked his questions in this House—all 15 questions—have come down in favour of EDS.

Why has the member for Hart not bothered to follow up those 15 questions from last year to find out what happened? It is because he is embarrassed. He is embarrassed because he has been running the case for the Attorney-General of Florida. He has not been interested in the facts. The honourable member simply wanted to try to smear EDS and the outsourcing of our data processing. That is the sort of shabby politics the Labor Party is now running in South Australia. It has no regard for the truth; it has no regard for justice. All it wants to do is smear any company that signs a contract with the South Australian Government.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Opposition wants South Australia to go backwards. Apparently, it does not want EDS, under this Government, to set up its data management centre for the whole of Asia in Adelaide; it does not want EDS to set up its processing centre for the whole of Australia in Adelaide; and it does not want EDS to set up a major regional centre for the Asian area in Adelaide and, as a result, it wants to lose jobs and certainly not create the opportunity for new jobs for young South Australians. That shows the shabbiness of the Labor Party's politics in this State and, in particular, the member for Hart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Premier that it is not proper to impute improper motive.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Peake.

Mr FOLEY: Does the Premier stand by his statement to the House of 18 October, as follows:

> Over a 10 year period this company, United Water, will be required to buy $628 million worth of product on present-day values from South Australian companies?

The report by the Solicitor-General said that the committed level of exports offered by United Water had been increased by $255 million, which represented repatriated profits and other dividends. This was further confirmed by Mr Malcolm Kinnaird, Chairman of United Water, in a briefing session with the Opposition last week.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The answer is 'Yes.' All the member for Hart is trying to do is to draw a thinly veiled question over the point of management fees for the projects. If an Adelaide company buys South Australian products and takes them overseas, then the company in Adelaide quite legitimately has the right to claim management expenses for putting together that contract. Surely the honourable member does not expect the company not to be able to take out of that $628 million the actual management costs involved in the export. I have been involved in an export company: you buy a product, you add to it a margin, and you export it out of South Australia. As a result, you bring money back into South Australia. As the Minister for Infrastructure said in answer to the last question, $628 million will be coming back into South Australia from both interstate and overseas.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide the House with details of the latest labour force figures released today by the ABS?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Today's figures highlight more than ever the need for a change of Government at the Federal level in Canberra. South Australia has not been able to escape. The same changes that have happened on average across Australia have been reflected here, because the Federal Government cannot manage the economy. It has its hands on the big levers, and it has stuffed it up. What we see here is a reflection of that trend when the Federal Government put on the brakes with its obsession particularly with monetary policy.

The rate of unemployment is unacceptable. In terms of helping the unemployed in Australia, the best help they can get is for Paul to lose his job. The best thing that could happen for the unemployed whether in South Australia or anywhere else in Australia is for Paul to lose his job. This morning in the northern suburbs I met with people from EDS at the new CAD-CAM Design Centre. The executive from EDS said that, in relation to employment opportunities with them in this State, they had received the instruction: 'No limit'. There is no limit to the number of people they can take on board if we as a State can get hooked in, locked in and focused on information technology. There are plenty of opportunities in South Australia, and information technology is one. As a State Government, we are doing all we can, including taking 1 500 young people into the Public Service, but we are doing that against a backdrop of a Federal Government that has wrecked the economy and has not addressed monetary and fiscal policy, and as a result hundreds and thousands of Australians are still out of work.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Infrastructure still have full confidence in the Chief Executive Officer of SA Water, Mr Ted Phipps, and what action has the Minister taken following the report by the Solicitor-General into the receipt of the final bids for the water contract? The report by the Solicitor-General reveals that on 4 October United Water was given four extensions of time totalling over four hours, that security procedures for receiving documents were downgraded, causing concerns for the acting manager of security, that the probity auditor allowed two bids to be copied and circulated and then left the building early before the United bid was received, that the first two bids were circulated to unauthorised personnel, that the security camera tape ran out and was not replaced, that the unsuccessful bidders were not informed that United Water had been granted an extension of time, that the contract manager left the building for dinner and did not return until after the United Water bid had arrived at 9.20 p.m., and that the probity auditor had knocked off early. At a briefing last week, the Chairman of United Water, Mr Malcolm Kinnaird, described the Government's handling of the receipt of the bids as 'The Looney Tunes'.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We really are at the bottom of the barrel today. The basis of this question is a press release issued by the Leader of the Opposition in about the third week of December last year. He got a run with it at that time. So unimaginative is the Opposition with questions that it is just recycling press releases of a month ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What the CEO of SA Water has delivered on behalf of the Government, as an agent for the Government, is a $1.5 billion contract—the world's largest contract negotiated under these circumstances last year. That is not a bad coup for South Australia. Not only has Ted Phipps and his officers delivered a contract of that nature for South Australia but locked into that is a 20 per cent saving in the delivery of that service to South Australians. That saves $164 million over the life of the contract for South Australians.

Over the first month of operation, we have seen a seamless transition to this company. The water still runs out of everybody's taps; the price has not gone off; nobody knows, in effect, that the whole system is currently being operated as agent (United Water) on behalf of the Government, on a monthly fee for service basis. The general public has not noticed a transfer from SA Water to United Water in the management and operation of our asset and our structures. We have the saving and the provision of a better service, as I identified to the House on Tuesday. Importantly, and in addition to that, we have created locked in exports out of South Australia—the basis and the foundation to build a water industry for this State.

I can advise the House—and certainly the Opposition—that, every time a contract is signed and written in relation to this deal, I will bring home to the Labor Party time and again the benefits for South Australians that will start to flow from this contract. We will go out and ask the 1 100 people who will get permanent new jobs out of this come next election who they will support in the next election in South Australia: a Government which is prepared to put in policy options that will bring permanent new jobs to South Australians and an industry in this State, or an Opposition which has no new, imaginative policy options for this State, which destroyed the economic base of the State in the 1980s, and which can now only carp and criticise when some really good economic signs are starting to show up for the economy of this State as a result of the policies we have put in place. Where were the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hart last week when all Thames Water-Asia Pacific managers met in Adelaide, looking at the procurement out of Adelaide to supply the massive markets of Asia? Where were they then?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Did you congratulate Thames Water-Asia Pacific for all their managers coming into Adelaide—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know under which Standing Orders the Leader is operating, but he knows full well that he cannot interrupt when a Minister is answering a question, except by way of point of order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In relation to the Leader of the Opposition's comment, we understand how the Leader of the Opposition uses information. We remember the Roxby debate. The attitude was to take off the front cover, stamp 'confidential' on it and distribute it to the media and say, 'Nudge, nudge, here's a confidential report.' Doctoring reports, changing information, putting a new version—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You know you were caught out on that issue. We are seeing a private discussion being changed as it suits the Opposition. This is about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I would ask that you rule that the Minister withdraw his comments, because they made a direct reference to the Leader of the Opposition doctoring documents and peddling them around to the media.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It would be most helpful to proceedings if all members contained themselves. The Deputy Leader would have been correct if he had taken a point of order trying to ensure that the Minister relate his comments to the question. I think the Minister is now straying somewhat from the original question and I ask him to round off his remarks.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I refer the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to numerous reports in *Hansard* about that incident of the front page coming off a report and 'confidential' being—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Not by me but by a range of other members. I know that the Leader of the Opposition does not like being held to account for some of his actions which have not been what one might say were totally honest, frank and forthright, but that is the fact of the matter. The Opposition does not want established in the public arena in South Australia the benefits from this contract. The Opposition is desperate to push that matter to one side. This contract will deliver long and sustainable economic benefits to South Australia. What is the Opposition going to say as Thames Water Asia/Pacific shifts its procurement division out of Melbourne into Adelaide (and it has just done that)? What will the Opposition say about the Procurement Manager for Australasia, based at the Centre for Manufacturing in Adelaide, South Australia, working with the Industrial Supplies Office (ISO) to meet the $628 million committed exports out of South Australia?

The Opposition wants to ignore all the good upside of this venture. Members opposite do not want it to be put on the public agenda because they know deep down that this is a damn good deal for South Australia, and a good deal it will be seen to be over the course of the next 10 years as people have water and sewerage services supplied to them at no additional cost and, in fact, with a 20 per cent saving. Will the Opposition deny the $164 million being disbursed to education, Government services and other—

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the Minister round off his answer.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Clearly, the benefits from this contract will be seen over the course of the next two years. They are substantial benefits that will bring real jobs to South Australians.

TENDERS

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Can the Premier advise the House of any irregularities that occurred with tendering processes under the former Labor Government?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have just seen the Leader of the Opposition ranting and raving over something that the Auditor-General—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —has clearly shown involved nothing illegal having been done whatsoever. I highlight a matter that came to my attention recently involving a very serious corruption of the tendering process carried out by the former Labor Government. The House should know that the current Leader of the Opposition was a member of the then Labor Government. Let me give details to the House. On 9 May 1987 very comprehensive—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As the Premier has just said that I was a member of the then Government, he should be well aware that I did not join Cabinet until three years after that, and there is not a skerrick of truth from this Premier once again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that all members contain themselves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will not interject. The matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition is not a point of order. If the Leader is misrepresented he knows that he can make a personal explanation by leave, which will be granted to him, as is the right of any member.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I stand by my statement: he was a member of the Government. He sat on the Government benches. I bring the House's attention to the corruption of the tendering process that occurred. On 9 May 1987 the then Labor Government, of which the now Leader of the Opposition was a member, called for tenders for market research information to be ascertained. I remind the House that tenders were called on 9 May 1987, and tenders closed on 23 May. In fact, 23 companies responded to that advertisement, and I have a list of those companies. One of the companies that did not respond was ANOP, which members need to appreciate happened to be the company doing the market research for the Australian Labor Party.

ANOP had not responded to the advertisement at the close of tenders on 23 May. I have the newspaper advertisement and I would be only to happy to show it to the Leader of the Opposition if he wishes. With the tenders closed on 23 May, we found that on 29 July 1987—more than two months later—ANOP put in an application for the job. A letter from ANOP, signed by Rodney Cameron (a name I have heard before), Managing Director—the man doing the market research for the Australian Labor Party—was sent to the Director of the Cabinet Office of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The letter stated:

> South Australian Government Research Program. Due to our misunderstanding as to the closing dates for tenders for the Government's research program, ANOP is now submitting its proposal.

This was on 28 July, more than two months after the close of the tenders. I ask one big question of members: guess who won the tender? More than two months after the close of tenders, low and behold, ANOP won the tender against 23 other companies that had actually complied with the advertisement. It goes further than that. Let us look at what this tender was all about. It was a tender worth $410 000 for survey work. ANOP had to carry out survey work in the following areas: community attitudes to crime, law and order, which cost $80 500; community attitudes to primary and secondary education, which again cost $80 500; community attitudes to economic directions, which cost $68 500; community attitudes to environmental issues, which cost $80 500; and community attitudes to health and age issues,

which cost $99 300, giving a total figure of $410 000. I found it an absolute miracle that ANOP, under the former Labor Government, could even be admitted into the tender list two months after tenders had closed with the simple excuse that it had somehow misunderstood the closing date.

The other particularly disturbing matter is that we have found that all the relevant survey information went straight to the ALP on South Terrace. So, about 12 months before the election, the taxpayers of South Australia funded to the tune of $410 000 a major political survey which went straight to the Australian Labor Party. But, worse than that, the Government made sure that the Labor Party's own pollster, ANOP, obtained the job two months after the close of the tendering date, even though ANOP was not on the original list. They corrupted the process.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. What is the timetable for the share offer by United Water to achieve 60 per cent Australian equity, and will the Minister guarantee that there will still be a public float within 12 months? On 18 October the Minister told the House that 'there will be a public float so that South Australians can become involved'. At a briefing session last week the Chairman of United Water, Mr Malcolm Kinnaird, advised the Opposition that shares would be offered only to institutional investors and only when the company required additional capital. Mr Kinnaird went on to advise that the company would not be offering shares on the Stock Exchange to South Australian mums and dads.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As I indicated to the House last year, the contract requires United Water International to seek 60 per cent Australian equity within 12 months. That is in the contract, it has been signed off, the company will be required to seek that Australian equity, and it will have 60 per cent Australian equity in—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart talks about institutions: I thought that a lot of mums and dads had money in the AMP Society. Is that not a component in terms of individuals having capacity in relation to institutional investment? The simple fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Mr Speaker, members opposite move the argument on. When they get this up they just move the argument on to the next benchmark and then the next benchmark, trying to make a story from it. On 18 October, when I announced the preferred bidder and indicated that we would enter into the basis of negotiations, I said that the offer included 60 per cent Australian equity offered by the company. That is in the contract, signed off by the components to the contract, and in the fullness of time it will be delivered.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson has the call, and the Chair wishes to hear the question.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Treasurer outline the impact on State finances of changes to Commonwealth grants over the past 10 years? Recently, in my letterbox I received some misleading information from the local Federal member, who got it right only once that I can recall when he said that the Opposition could not run a chook raffle—

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Standing Order 97 requires that in 'putting any such question a member may not offer argument or opinion'. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule that the member for Mawson has offered both argument and opinion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! At the time the honourable member was asking the question I had already asked once for members not to interject. The Chair's attention was slightly taken, but I suggest to the member for Mawson that if he is commenting he is completely out of order and, therefore, he should round off his question.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, Sir. I was not commenting.

The SPEAKER: Order! For the benefit of the member for Mawson, that being the case the Chair will examine *Hansard* very closely and will remind him and the House if he was commenting.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: The Federal Labor member claims that the Federal Government has been putting extra funding into the State's health system.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I have a copy of that, and it starts, as follows:

> I couldn't care less who wins the election. I wouldn't even vote if I didn't have to.

That is by Gordon Bilney. What an outstanding scholar! We definitely need voluntary voting if Gordon cannot decide whether he wants to vote or not. The more fundamental issue that was outlined by the Minister for Health is the dire circumstances in which this State was left. It was not only the State Bank—$3.15 billion—but the treatment that was meted out to us by the Federal Labor Government. I remind members, if they ask why we are in difficulty, that not only did we cop the big bill for the State Bank, but also, as Labor members would recognise, we have been treated abysmally by the Federal Government over a long period—worse than any previous Government.

I will point out some of the facts which members should consider when reflecting on the Federal election and why we should change the Government in Canberra. Commonwealth grants have fallen by about $160 million, or 5 per cent in real terms, and that is annually. South Australia's share of total Commonwealth grants has fallen from 10.2 per cent to 9.3 per cent over the period 1985-86 to 1995-96. Grants have fallen as a share of gross State product from 11.2 per cent to 8.5 per cent. Grants in real per capita terms have fallen by 12 per cent, reflecting a fall in real per capita grants nationally as well as a fall in the State's share.

If we take our share today—not the original share, which would be much greater—and translate it back to 1985-86, we are $290 million a year worse off on the tax sharing arrangement. With $290 million a year I am sure that the Minister for Health could do a lot for hospitals and health, and the Minister for Education and Children's Services could have a bigger and better system to cater for our children. We would love to have that money available to enhance those areas which are important to this Government. It is also important to relate that during this time one of the ways in which it was possible for the Federal Government to reduce the grants so

severely was that it had its mates here in South Australia—the State ALP Government.

UNITED WATER

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Minister for Infrastructure declined an invitation to appear before the parliamentary select committee investigating the water contract; and, given Tuesday's statement by the Premier that the Government must remain fully accountable to the people through the Parliament, will the Minister now guarantee that he will give evidence before that inquiry so that we can settle whether he or Mr Kinnaird is telling the truth about the water contract?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Leader of the Opposition, as I have already pointed out to the Premier, that members cannot impute improper motives.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Yesterday in *Hansard* the Opposition took a point of order when the Premier said that the Deputy Leader had absolutely no regard for the truth, no regard whatsoever, and you, Sir, ruled:

> The Leader of the Opposition has raised a point of order in relation to the Premier using the term 'untruthful.' The Chair is not of the view that that is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: And the Chair stands by that ruling. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am available in this Parliament at Question Time on any sitting day of the Parliament for the Opposition to ask me a whole series of questions in relation to this contract. I am here and I am available for questioning. The Opposition has used that opportunity in the past and I am sure that it will use it in the future. I assure Opposition members that I will be here every sitting day over the course of the next month or two and, if they want to ask me questions, by all means they can do so.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SYSTEMS

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs inform the House of any initiatives taken by the State Government to promote its industrial relations system, and are there any key themes and target groups in this promotion?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Norwood for his question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I don't think you should say too much about it, because you are the only advocate I have known to be held in contempt of the Industrial Relations Court. The honourable member's knowledge of what I might be wanting to do is probably quite different from mine. The purpose in answering this question is to put into context some of the industrial relations issues which are being canvassed in this Federal election period.

Over the past two years about 180 individual enterprise agreements have been formed in this State, taking up 35 per cent of all State employees. One of the major reasons for the take-up has been a strong promotional campaign called 'Flexibility with Fairness.' It is a very simple campaign with a very simple and encouraging set of words to bring together enterprise agreements.

It is interesting that in the Federal context of this election there has been no criticism of the State's industrial relations system. The other day I wondered why there had not been any criticism of the State's system. I was interested in why there had not been any criticism until, on the ABC news the other night, the Federal industrial relations system was released. It had a very interesting headline, 'Flexibility and Fairness at Work.' We now have an amazing set of words used by the Keating Government, which has picked up the whole promotional scheme of the South Australian industrial relations system.

Here we have a would-be Prime Minister not criticising the South Australian system but picking up all our themes and promotion and trying to promote the worst and most inflexible Federal system that we have ever seen in this country. The Federal Government, which cannot get any new ideas in its system with the worst unfair dismissal process ever in the history of Australia, is now adopting the South Australian program and theme. Surely the member opposite can go along to his Federal colleagues, particularly Keating, and say, 'If you want to copy the South Australian system, just implement the best and most flexible scheme in Australia.'

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Taking up the invitation of the Minister for Infrastructure—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member knows better than to begin a question like that.

Mr FOLEY: I am sorry, Sir. My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not wish the member for Hart to be distracted.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you for your protection, Sir. How much will United Water International pay the 100 per cent foreign-owned United Water Services for technical advice over the life of the water contract, and what guarantees does the Government have that this arrangement will not be used as a vehicle for sending all profits overseas?

On 18 December the Minister announced that Thames and CGE will use a 100 per cent foreign-owned joint venture company called United Water Services as the vehicle to provide technical assistance to United Water International. This replaces the earlier deal revealed to the select committee under which United Water Services would have been subcontracted to operate the water system, allowing profits to be sent to Paris and London.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me first respond to the allegation made by the Leader of the Opposition in his first question because I have just received some advice from—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will get to your question in a minute, but I will put clearly on the record an important fact to demonstrate to the House that once again the Opposition has it 100 per cent wrong in the accusations it has made in the House. We sought specific advice on the inclusion in the contract of a clause in relation to exclusive tendering overseas. The advice states:

> In particular, the contract provides that United Water International will be the sole and exclusive vehicle by which CGE and Thames will tender for projects in Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, Vietnam, India, the Philippines, Malaysia, Pacific Islands and in agreed provinces and/ or projects in China.

It also states:

> That CGE and Thames will not compete with United Water in tendering for projects in Thailand, Malaysia and China where United Water identifies the opportunity.

That is out of the contract. It is clear and specific. It is clear that what the Government has been putting to the House is 100 per cent accurate. It is also clear that what the Opposition has been alleging is 100 per cent inaccurate.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is only one thing I will go by, that is, what is in the contract: the legal commitment upon this company to deliver to South Australians. Again, this Opposition is not prepared to use the facts. It wants to fudge those matters. Members opposite do not want the truth or the facts.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You are not interested in the truth or the facts. You are not interested in the contract. You simply want to downgrade this deal and its importance to South Australia. All your verbiage will not change the fundamental fact that this deal will deliver real jobs to South Australians in a water industry in the future.

In relation to the 'repatriation of profits', the second question from the Opposition related to exports. As I interjected across the House, I suggest that the member for Hart get a definition from his colleagues in the Federal Government on what is described as 'an export'. Project management fees within Australia on projects overseas where the funds come back here to employ South Australians in the development of a project management system is an export out of the State of South Australia, generating jobs in this State for South Australians. I suggest that the honourable member obtains the definition from the Federal Government in relation to that.

In relation to United Water International and United Water Services, we negotiated the position with United Water International whereby it is the employer of all people. United Water International is the body which will operate and maintain sewerage infrastructure in South Australia on a monthly fee for service basis. We know that the retained earnings out of that are quite minimal. That is based on economic modelling done by Fay Richwhite for Treasury in South Australia. I only have to remind the House that the cost of the provision of this service by United Water is 20 per cent below what SA Water was providing it for yesterday—it is 20 per cent below.

That is the position. The profits the Opposition talks about do not come from the operation and maintenance. We know from the economic modelling done independently by Fay Richwhite that that is not the case. That is not where the benefits of this deal for South Australia are for United Water. The profits to be earned from this are in the development of a water industry, a manufacturing base and export markets into Asia. If you want to talk about profits out of that, those profits go to about 150 small and medium South Australian businesses, clearly and concisely dispersed within this community.

In addition, as I indicated to the House, consistent with my statement of 18 October and signed off in the contract, United Water International had to seek 60 per cent Australian equity within 12 months. That is a commitment. It becomes an Australian equity company. Six of the 10 directors will be in Australia. The chairman will be a South Australian. Members opposite may not like it, but the simple fact is this: we have locked into the contract those components consistent with my press release of 18 October last year.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You do not like it, but it is a fact.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not particularly like the sound of the interjections.

STATE DEBT

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Treasurer outline the Government's debt management strategy and his response to suggestions that the Government should legislate to reduce debt? Last month the Leader of the Opposition proposed a radical new plan which, via legislation, would prescribe stepped reductions in the State debt through to the first decade of the next century.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I was working hard in my office when I received a phone call from the press saying that the Leader of the Opposition had issued a press release. I said, 'Not another one—what is it about this time?' They said that he had this great new idea on how to lock in debt reduction targets within South Australia. I said that I thought they had the same system in New South Wales and New Zealand. One would question whether it is the way to go, but at least New Zealand is performing. I thought that perhaps there was something I was missing. However, I was given the basic details of what the Leader of the Opposition was suggesting.

Perhaps as a first step he should say to the Federal Government, which may not be there much longer, 'Will you introduce some debt reduction targets?' We have done it here in South Australia, we are in front of it, and we are sticking to the targets we outlined in our four year plan. We do not need to be told how to suck eggs: we are actually reducing the debt. However, I point out to the House the way debt has been managed in the Federal sphere. I ask everyone to examine the Federal record and look at how high the deficit has been. More importantly, this country was $20 billion in debt when the Labor Party came to power in Canberra in 1983. That figure now stands at over $170 billion. So, when the Leader of the Opposition makes suggestions about reducing debt, which he, his mates and his Government have caused, he should turn his attention to his mates in Canberra and get something done. Fortunately, it is unlikely that they will be there to implement anything.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Infrastructure advise why he has not been advised how much United Water International will pay United Water Services for technical advice? At a briefing session last week the Chairman of United Water, Mr Malcolm Kinnaird, advised the Opposition that the Government had not asked and had not been told how much the fully foreign-owned affiliate company will be paid for its technical advice.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Until such time as the technical advice is called in and a fee for service is paid for it, it is an impossible question to answer.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Who told the Premier that the two unsuccessful bidders for the $1.5 billion Adelaide water contract were informed that United Water had been granted

an extension of time to lodge its final bid, and when did the Premier receive this advice? A newspaper report of 12 December quotes the Premier as follows:

> All the due processes had been gone through to make sure that the delay was approved by the auditor and also that the other companies knew of this delay.

I immediately asked at the time to make sure the delay was signed off by the auditor, and I was given that assurance and that the other companies were notified. The Solicitor-General's report of 17 December states that the two other bidders were not told of the extension of time by United Water.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Again, the member for Hart fails to understand that it was a proposal: it was not a tender. He keeps talking about a tender. A tender is quite different. A tender—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —is where you put in one price, one submission only, and that is it. This process had been going on for some time. The Auditor-General has told the select committee all about that. The Solicitor-General has specifically referred to the fact that it was an ongoing process, and that absolutely nothing improper whatsoever was done. The Auditor-General, when appearing before the select committee, said:

> There has been no illegal, no corrupt, nor improper conduct.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This is the Auditor-General.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am coming to the question. I point out that the honourable member, in asking this question, tried to imply—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —that something illegal or corrupt had been done, and that certainly there had been misconduct in the way the tender had been carried out. The Auditor-General himself has made a clear statement to the Parliament that that is not the case.

Mr CLARKE: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I draw attention to Standing Order 98, under which the Minister should answer the substance of the question. The question was: who told the Premier that the two unsuccessful bidders—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to the Deputy Leader that, if he is so keen on reading the Standing Orders, he read that Standing Order dealing with interjections or interruptions of other members of the House, which he has failed to take into account today.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I fully endorse what you say. The honourable member has a great deal to learn from reading and understanding the Standing Orders. To answer the specific question, it was the staff of the office of the Minister for Infrastructure who passed the information through, and they had got it from SA Water.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Taylor has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Ministers will assist the Chair greatly by not interjecting.

HAIRDRESSING PILOT PROGRAM

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. In an environment of increased private provision within the TAFE sector, what safeguards will the Minister implement to ensure continued equality of access to courses? In response to a recent question about the contracting out of a new hairdressing pilot program, the Minister indicated that selection of students for that course would be handled by the private provider. I have become aware of a concern, by students in particular, that private providers will be more likely than the public provider to be influenced by factors such as physical appearance, disability, personality and the like when selecting students for some courses.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The member for Taylor has a funny view of the world, because private providers must conform to accredited programs and the law and, if they are discriminating on the basis of sexuality, or anything else, they will be dealt with under the law.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development report to the House on the achievements of the former Economic Development Authority in attracting and working with companies to encourage investment and job creation in South Australia? I ask this question following the evidence of strong growth in this State's economy.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can assure the Deputy Leader that I am enjoying thoroughly what I am doing in this Government, and I will be around doing it in this Government for a long time to come, much to his disquiet. Enjoy your seat over there, because you ain't going nowhere fast, I tell you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: During the 18 months from 1 July 1994 to December 1995, the department successfully completed some 70 investment attraction projects for South Australia. The total investment in that was over $250 million, creating more than 6 000 jobs in South Australia. Examples of companies that have been attracted include Safcol, relocating its food and packing operation headquarters out of Victoria to South Australia; Australian Wool and Pelt's processing facility for exports to North Asia; an extension of Caroma's high-tech manufacturing facility to absorb its New Zealand operations that have relocated to South Australia; Onan Australia, a manufacturer of power generators, where 50 new skilled jobs have been created with $50 million worth of additional production, mainly for exports to Asia; and the expansion of Vision Systems at Technology Park to develop a laser system for the US navy.

That is just a snapshot of a few companies that have been brought to South Australia for new investment. It is often said that the Government is committing funds to the Westpacs, the Motorolas and the Galaxys—the bigger companies—but what about existing industry and the smaller companies? Over 53 per cent of the support given by this Government is to existing South Australian industry to expand and grow. But quite often it is the range of smaller initiatives within South Australia that are not newsworthy. Westpac, for example, getting 1 000 jobs in one hit is quite newsworthy, or Bankers

Trust getting 400 jobs or Link Telecommunications getting 400 jobs—that is big news and is profile.

But the simple fact is that 53 per cent of all the dollars we spend, in terms of support for industry, goes to expanding the existing industry base of South Australia. That has paid real dividends to South Australia. In many respects, the support we have given these companies is not in the form of a big cheque but in revenue forgone. As the member for Peake and Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee says, that is not a cost to the State: it is building a quantum in the State and more economic activity. The member for Hart says, 'Of course revenue forgone is a cost.'

Last year, the Government put a few hundred thousand dollars into a particular manufacturing facility, with a proposal of revenue forgone for a set period for a number of employees. In the 18 months since that facility has been operating, it has paid back more in payroll tax in South Australia than we ever gave in the incentive. So, it is a dividend three, five times over. Had we not put that in place, that facility might be interstate. Therefore, there is no cost to us by getting industry here giving revenue forgone. We are creating some critical admass and some economic activity, and it generates revenue in the long term for South Australia.

It is clear why the member for Hart gets contracts, such as the water contract, so wrong when he starts criticising with comments such as that revenue forgone is a direct cost to South Australia. We are creating the catalyst for more revenue to the State of South Australia and, in the process, as demonstrated without any doubt, more jobs. As the Premier outlined to the House only yesterday, Morgan and Banks clearly indicates that South Australia is heading in the right economic direction. The number of jobs being created in this State clearly underscores the fact that we are going in the right economic direction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart should go out and have a cup of tea when he gets into one of these obstreperous moods and does not want to conform with what is normally acceptable. The Chair has been very tolerant towards him.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): During my time in this House I have never been afraid to speak in the interests of my electors, even if at times that appeared to be against what was considered to be in the best interests of the Government. I was worried when on Monday night Pam came into the room in which I was watching television and informed me that our sink was not draining. I asked her to ring the member for Hart, the ABC and various others: I was fooled for a moment into thinking that the member for Hart's dire predictions about SA Water had come true, because my sink refused to drain. When we did a bit of investigation, we found that my stepdaughter had put rice husks down the drain and that there was no problem.

I must tell members opposite that, despite the fear that they engendered even in me, my taps still work and water comes out of them, my sewer still flushes and there is no problem in my household, despite the fact that for the past X months members opposite have bleated, carped, criticised and said that this whole deal is smelly and will fall apart.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Playford is most helpful: he reminds me that they whinge. I had forgotten that. I acknowledge the help of the member for Playford in describing his own team. I cannot help but think back to some of the great Premiers who have occupied this Chamber: Playford, Dunstan, Hall, Tonkin, Bannon and Arnold—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: And Corcoran. All of them would be genuinely appalled at the conduct of this Opposition in this Parliament. Most of those people, whether they sat for a time on the Treasury or Opposition benches, were genuinely committed to the best interests of South Australia. This is one of the few Parliaments where I believe the term 'Her Majesty's loyal Opposition' has reached a new low, because there is nothing loyal about this Opposition when it comes to the best interests of South Australia.

Mr Atkinson: Loyal to what?

Mr BRINDAL: Loyal to the people, loyal to the system in which we believe, and loyal to the electors who give us enough trust to believe that, no matter on which side of the House we sit, we are elected to serve the best interests of this State and to try to help this State. That is a trust in which this Opposition is a singular and spectacular failure.

There is no better example than SA Water. I remind members of this honourable House that opposite sits the very herd that has drained the watering hole of South Australia to the point where the supply is perilous. Having virtually destroyed the basis of South Australia's economy, members opposite now, like the herd animals they are, trample around the edges, muddying it, to convince the people of South Australia that the water they have left is not fit for human consumption. They are not interested in this State, they are not interested in their children or their children's children; they are merely and simply interested in regaining the Treasury benches at all costs. We have to sit here day after day, Question Time after Question Time, trying to amuse ourselves, listening to absolute drivel and tripe, and all sorts of things being peddled out—

Mr Atkinson: Drivel and tripe?

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, both drivel and tripe being peddled out, on the flimsy pretext that an Opposition can put forward whatever argument it likes without having to be held accountable. I am getting a bit tired of it. I suggest to my Party room that we should reconsider Question Time if the best that members opposite can come up with is the drivel that we hear day after day. I have not in this House even commented on the corruption that existed in State Print and the absolutely abysmal contracting processes and preference given to Canon Photocopiers. That matter has not even been raised because it has been fixed quietly. If members opposite want to come in here and start talking about corruption where there is none, I am sure, Sir, that you with your length of experience in this House and many other members would stand up in this place and talk about real corruption where it did exist under Labor.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): In Question Time today the Minister for Industrial Affairs talked with pride about flexibility and fairness in industrial relations in this State. In fact, he made fun of the Federal Labor Government's

assertion of flexibility and fairness in the way workers are treated in this country. Despite what the Minister says, the facts are that fairness in the State of South Australia is becoming a foreign concept when it comes to industrial relations. I refer to a particular group of people who I think are getting pretty shoddy treatment under the new legislation and amendments to the WorkCover Act in terms of compensation, and that is those people who have been on workers' compensation for in excess of two years.

A flood of people in this category have come to my office with letters from private insurers which, in some cases, are outrageous. Let me provide an example. One of my constituents, who has been incapacitated for a period exceeding two years and in receipt of notional weekly earnings of $484.58 per week, received correspondence from the private insurer dealing with his case to say that, since he was only partially incapacitated for work, he could earn an average weekly earning of $556.20 per week in suitable employment 'as a crane operator, which employment you have a reasonable prospect of obtaining'. On the surface that may sound reasonable, but the facts are that this gentleman had open heart surgery in November last year. He has a medical certificate to October 1996 that states that he is totally incapable of working in any manner. Yet this private insurer has informed him that, under the loss of earning capacity assessment, he is adjudged capable of getting a job as a crane operator.

My constituent's employee advocate says—and anyone who saw this gentleman would see—that he is hardly capable of going up a staircase, yet he is supposed to be able to operate a crane. It is incredible. The really disturbing part of this is that his medical condition was not taken into consideration when he was adjudged capable of operating a crane at the salary mentioned. This is not an isolated case. I see an increasing number of people coming to my office who have been subjected to these assessments in similar situations with outrageous expectations of work. What about the 60 year old Italian migrant with a reading age of seven years who was told, 'You are capable of landing a $411 per week job as a shop assistant'? These are unrealistic expectations. In truth, they are intimidation tactics by private insurers.

This is a further example of this callous State Liberal Government reneging on its obligations to the people of South Australia in the hope that they will get these people off their books. There is an incentive for private insurers to get these people off the tail end of their books. The assumption is that they will go on to social welfare and that the Federal Government will pick up the slack where the State Liberal Government is not willing to accept its responsibilities. It is a case of out of sight, out of mind.

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

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to rise this afternoon to commend and congratulate all those in my electorate of Chaffey who were involved with the Australia Day celebrations a few days ago. This is the first opportunity since this House has—

Mr Atkinson: What celebrations?

Mr ANDREW: Australia Day celebrations—resumed for me to comment in that regard. I particularly want to thank all those involved. I refer specifically to the leaders in the community who organised some very fine events and to all those in the community who turned up to those functions to make them successful. I also want to congratulate those individuals who were awarded Australia Day awards, whether they be in the senior or junior categories. Without any doubt, we would all agree that this is a day of national significance. Since being elected to this position, this is the third time I have been formally involved in the proceedings of those Australia Day celebrations. Since my personal involvement, a couple of things are obvious to me about those celebrations, that is, the numbers at the organised functions have been increasing significantly, particularly the numbers of young people attending those functions on Australia Day have been increasing.

While time does not permit a detailed description of all the events that took place, I will use my brief opportunity today to mention some of the specific formalities that were celebrated out of the major towns and also to mention specifically some of the names of the people who were appropriately awarded and who were recognised for their contributions to the local communities. For example, in Loxton there was a breakfast, and over 800 people attended that breakfast. The Mayor, Jan Cass, presented Mrs Suzanne Biddle with the junior Australia Day award, and Mrs Norma Stasanowsky was the senior citizen of the year.

In Barmera there was a sausage sizzle at lunch time, at which over 500 people attended, where Mrs Mary Ridley presented Mrs Elaine Vasey with her citizen of the year award. In Renmark, well over 100 people attended a morning session where Miss Rebecca Weiss was presented with the junior Australia Day award, and Murray Dyer, a long serving and well-recognised citizen of the Renmark community, was presented with a senior citizen of the year award at this flag-raising ceremony in Renmark. In Paringa a morning breakfast was held, where Mr Tim Edmonds was awarded the senior citizen of the year award, and Mr Lynton Gilgen won the junior citizen of the year award.

In Waikerie, there was an evening function. It began with a combined church service in conjunction with the local Ministers fraternal, and then many people stayed to enjoy an Aussie barbecue after that service. In that proceeding, Mayor Centofani presented junior citizen of the year award to Miss Karen Parsons, and the Australia Day award to Mrs Barbara Maywald. In Berri, a breakfast was held on the lawns, with local service communities, and there Mayor Margaret Evans presented the Australia Day awards to Mrs Dorothy Thurmer, and the junior award to Mr Ashley Couzens.

Members would appreciate that in my electorate it is hard to attend all the functions, particularly when they clash time-wise. At the breakfast function at Loxton, I congratulated Loxton on its being awarded the 1995 South Australian tidiest town award. It reflected that, as they celebrated the day, they not only indeed recognised the historical significance but were looking to the future. This was reflected by the pride in the community facilities as they stood and participated in those venues on the day. As I mentioned at Loxton, there is significance in that regard. It is relevant to say that I believe the communities could see that day as another milestone of achievement, bringing with it a sense of pride in their communities. It brought with it that sense of pride that also facilitated an incentive to do things better and to perform better and, associated with that, the whole community is better off and richer for it. I congratulate all local communities in that regard. I congratulate the organisers and those specific awardees who can be proud of their contributions to the local community.

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

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I thought today I might spend a couple of minutes on matters economic, in particular, on the problem of Australia's current account deficit. In 1994-95, as most members know, it was at $27 billion, which is equivalent to 6 per cent of Australia's GDP. In fact, Australia's current account deficit is the worst in the OECD by a substantial margin—even worse than Mexico's. It is very interesting to note that in 1986 Mr Paul Keating warned that Australia could not fund a current account deficit of $12 billion per year. In fact, I will quote him when he was on a John Laws program, as follows:

> You can't fund $12 billion a year in perpetuity every year and then the interest on the year before that, and the interest on the year before that. The only thing to do is to slow the growth down to a canter. Once you slow the growth under 3 per cent, unemployment starts to rise again. . . Then you have gone. You are a banana republic.

Labor is now trying to down play the importance of the current account problem. It wants the Australian people to accept its failure. It also is attempting to make a virtue out of a failure, portraying cyclical improvements as successes, even while our deficit is the worst in the OECD and still adding to foreign debt.

Australia is locked in the cycle. It recorded a run-away current account deficit in 1985-86, when it went as high as 6.1 per cent. It happened again in 1989-90, when it went as high as 5.8 per cent of GDP, and five years later we are back there again. As I said, the current account deficit totalled over $28 billion in 1994-95, or 6 per cent of GDP. I remind members that 6 per cent is the trigger rate for international credit agencies when they seriously start looking at Australia's credit rating.

Mr Keating has also presided over the worst ever monthly current account deficit—nearly $3.2 billion in May 1995—and the worst quarterly performance since the ABS started collecting quarterly statistics in September 1959, and that is of 6.6 per cent of GDP in June 1995. Servicing foreign liabilities is a massive burden. Labor likes to claim that the debt servicing ratio, that is, the proportion of export revenue needed to fund foreign interest payments, has fallen from 21 per cent in the late 1980s to 11 per cent today. There are three things that Labor ignores, however. First, export revenue is required to do more than service just foreign interest payments. Export revenue is also needed to pay for imports and other income flows such as dividends to foreign shareholders.

The servicing costs on foreign equity has to increase dramatically. The current account deficit tells us that Australia is not earning enough revenue to fund these out flows. I will provide some percentages. The proportion of exports to the year September 1995 needed to pay for imports, that is, the import servicing ratio, is 109 per cent. The net interest, which is the foreign debt servicing ratio, is 11.2 per cent, and net dividends, which is the foreign equity servicing ratio, is 8.2 per cent. That is a total of 128.4 per cent.

Secondly, part of the fall in the debt servicing ratio is due to a cyclical fall in world interest rates. The amount of net interest paid overseas declined from $12.5 billion to $9.7 billion between 1991 and 1994-95, even as net debt rose from $142.7 billion to $180.4 billion. The average interest rate paid on that debt fell from 8.8 per cent to 5.5 per cent. The debt servicing ratio has worsened over Labor's term. In 1982-83 it was 9 per cent, rising to 11.2 per cent in 1994-95. Australia is also doing very poorly compared with other countries. According to a Standard and Poor's rating service Analysis of Debt Servicing Ratios in June 1995, Australia ranked thirty-sixth out of 40—only Canada, Mexico, Pakistan and Brazil rated worse. Our current account problems arise from low savings, high consumption, high imports and lower exports. Only a Liberal Government can solve this.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): The South Australian public has been deceived about nearly every aspect of the Brown Government's $1.5 billion water management privatisation deal. That was certainly confirmed both in Parliament today and in a briefing given to the Opposition last week by Malcolm Kinnaird. It has been confirmed that the Premier's statement that United Water will be required to buy $628 million worth of product on present day values from those South Australian companies and to take that overseas over 10 years was wrong and that the figure is actually $373 million. The Premier failed to explain that $255 million of the $628 million was repatriated profits and management fees that could simply be washed through a bank account in Adelaide and sent straight back to France and the United Kingdom.

There is a conflict between the United Water executives' understanding of the contract and that of the Brown Government. United Water told the Opposition that there is no exclusive right for United Water to bid for the $300 billion water industry market in Asia and that United's parent companies, France's CGE and Britain's Thames Water, reserve the right to bid separately. We were told this last week by Malcolm Kinnaird, Chairman of United Water. Indeed, he confirmed that United Water could actually be in competition with CGE and Thames on projects in Asia. We also found out that South Australian mums and dads will not have the opportunity to take up share offers by United Water to achieve 60 per cent equity within 12 months and that United Water has stated that only institutional investors will be invited and only when additional capital is required. We were told that also by Malcolm Kinnaird last week.

The Infrastructure Minister has refused to appear before the select committee inquiry into the water contract, despite statements by the Premier yesterday that the Government must 'remain fully accountable to the people through this Parliament'. If the Minister for Infrastructure is confident of his brief and the benefits of this contract, why does he not have the courage to come before the committee? I would like to see the Minister for Infrastructure and Malcolm Kinnaird called on the same day so that we can get to the bottom of this story and find out what the hell is going on. The Minister for Infrastructure says that he retains full confidence in SA Water executives, despite a series of bungles in the bid process which was described by United Water as 'loony tunes'. Those are the actual words that Malcolm Kinnaird used in our briefing last week.

It is clear that the Brown Government has been desperately trying to beat up positive aspects of this water management privatisation deal, but nearly every aspect has fallen over when put under scrutiny. There are now serious conflicts of understanding between the Brown Government and United Water about what is contained in this deal, which involves more than $1 billion of taxpayers' money.

On another issue, I am delighted to welcome in my electorate of Salisbury the announcement of a massive $850 million high-tech urban village and new Technology

Park development which is expected to begin mid-year, following the finalisation of an exclusive joint venture agreement. The first stage of the project, located adjacent to the University of South Australia's Levels Campus, will incorporate state of the art urban design and water management strategies as well as the future development of the area as a high-tech and telecommunications hub. It is a 10-year project, and I am pleased that the MFP will join with the private sector in ensuring a phased development in my electorate of Salisbury.

I understand that the MFP Board has now reached agreement with the Delfin-Lend Lease consortium in a joint venture to be finalised within 90 days—about 30 days has already expired. I understand that State Cabinet pledged $30 million in January towards the deal and that the Commonwealth has also made a sizeable offer of contribution should the deal go ahead. I am pleased with statements by Brian Martin, Chairman, of Delfin on this issue. Development will see the construction of an urban village that will incorporate the world's latest technologies, but it is not just the housing development, because there will be associated commercial stages for the development in my electorate and the construction stage of the project is expected to reach its peak in 2½ to three years and involve over 1 000 construction jobs. It is exciting news for Salisbury and it is also exciting news for South Australia. Obviously, the Salisbury area already has a reputation as the defence capital of Australia.

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

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): As wrong again Mike leaves the stadium it is not surprising that no-one else was in the House other than the Opposition Whip who was fast asleep because the Leader of the Opposition, like Federal Labor, is very tired. His arguments fail to hold water and leak like a sieve all over the place. As I said, Federal Labor is tired and dead in the water. The Australian community knows exactly what is going to happen to Federal Labor. We had a window of opportunity in Mundingburra over the weekend and that opportunity was taken. The former Queensland Premier, Mr Goss, knows it, north Queensland knows it but, unfortunately, Mr Keating does not know it. It was apparent over 12 months ago that Mundingburra was a safe Labor seat but now it is very much a Liberal seat in Queensland.

In 1993 the then Opposition was led by Dr Hewson who introduced FightBack and we were told by Keating and his henchmen that Australia would end up like New Zealand. Unfortunately, since 1993 Australia has slipped behind New Zealand. Indeed, recently the financial community reassessed New Zealand's credit rating and it now has a better credit rating than Australia. If we look at the financial indicators of the Australian economy we wonder where we have headed over the past few years under the tired Labor Government. Our world ranking of income per capita has slipped between 1983 and 1993 from tenth to twenty second in the world. Despite massive asset sales under Federal Labor we have still had six budgets with an underlying deficit. Federal Labor has sold the Commonwealth Bank. Federal Labor has seen the demise of Australian Airlines. Federal Labor has ensured that we sold QANTAS and now it has also got rid of the monopoly associated with Telecom, yet Federal Labor has the hide to claim that the Opposition is going to sell one-third of Telstra, yet Federal Labor has given away the communications franchise for no return to the Australian community.

We have had massive sales to fund recurrent expenditure and, whilst this has occurred, the Commonwealth debt has risen by 300 per cent over the past four years. It is now $100 billion and the interest rate for the Australian community is $10 billion per year. Foreign debt in Australia has increased by 800 per cent since 1983. Australia now has the third highest foreign debt after the United States and Canada. The trade weighted index for the Australian dollar is equal to half the buying price of the dollar when I was a kid at school. It is now half its previous rate. A can of Coke and a loaf of bread in the past 30 years have doubled in price. Over the same period national savings were once 11 per cent of gross domestic product but under Federal Labor they have fallen to 1 per cent of gross domestic product.

In December 1990, the Canberra press gallery was told by Paul Keating, 'I have Treasury in my pocket, the Reserve Bank in my pocket, wages policy in my pocket and the financial community—both here and overseas—in my pocket.' I can tell members that unfortunately over that period Paul Keating has developed one big hole in his pocket.

The 1994-95 deficit is now equal to 6 per cent of gross domestic product. The Reserve Bank has gone, because we now have the second highest prime rate of any OECD community. Our wages policy is no longer in his pocket: it is on the floor, because our dollar will buy only half of what it could before the ALP gained power in 1983. The financial community is no longer in his pocket: it has gone. The financial community now recognises that the New Zealand economy has a better credit rating than Australia.

RACING (TAB) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act 1976. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of this Bill is to restructure the Totalizator Agency Board in such a way as to achieve independent representation and in doing so reduce the potential of vested interest difficulties which may occur with an industry nominated Board.

The new Board structure will enable the appointment of members with appropriate skills and expertise for the running of a multi-million dollar gambling business. People with a range of marketing, financial, legal, commercial and technical skills will combine with people with relevant industry knowledge and experience.

This Bill also seeks the power to remove a member of the TAB. The following Acts include a similar provision:

Gaming Supervisory Authority Act 1995 (section 6(2)*(d)*)
Electricity Corporations Act 1994 (section 15(2) and (3))
South Australian Water Corporation Act 1994 (section 13(2) and (3))
Land Acquisition Act 1969 (section 26b(3))
State Bank of South Australia Act 1983 (section 9(3)).

It is proposed to increase the number of members of the TAB to seven to give the Government the opportunity to broaden the range of skills and experience on the Board.

It is the intention of Government to consult widely with both the business community and the racing industry prior to the selection of members to ensure that the most appropriate representatives are appointed.

This Bill also amends the obsolete term chairman and replaces it with the current term of presiding officer.

To enable this Bill to have immediate effect a provision has been included which affects the vacation of the offices of the current members of the TAB on the commencement of the new Act.

I commend the Bill to this Parliament and seek leave to have inserted in Hansard Parliamentary Counsel's detailed explanation of the clauses without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2:

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 42—Interpretation

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

Clause 4: Substitution of s. 44

This clause replaces section 44 of the principal Act which provides for the membership of the Board.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 45—Terms and conditions of office

This clause amends section 45 of the principal Act. Paragraphs *(a), (b) (c)* and *(d)* make consequential changes. Paragraph *(e)* replaces subsection (5) with a provision that enables the Governor to remove a member of the Board on a ground that he or she considers sufficient.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 47—Quorum, etc.

This clause makes consequential changes.

Clause 7: Amendment of Schedule 3

This clause amends schedule 3 of the principal Act to provide that existing members of the Board will vacate their offices on the commencement of the amending Act.

Mr FOLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November. Page 834.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): This legislation contains a number of different components. The Opposition has no problem with some components of the Bill; in fact, quite a number of the principal issues in respect of this legislation will be supported by the Opposition. We will support the second and third readings of the Bill. When the Bill gets to the Legislative Council, we will seek to insert the amendment I will move this afternoon either exactly the same or in a slightly different form. It is only when the Bill gets to the Legislative Council that there will be problems with its passage. I make these remarks because I have no doubt that I will be portrayed as someone who opposes good sense and order in prisons. I have no doubt that by tomorrow morning my name will be blackened in the media. I do not care too much about that.

I make it clear that, of the principal issues in this Bill, there is only one to which the Opposition takes exception. Having said that, we will take strong exception to it, because it is a violation of basic human rights, and we will not cop it. When the Bill gets to the Legislative Council, we will not cop it up there, either. When we go through the legislation we find some eminently sensible ideas. However, we then find a provision which gives prison officers the right to strip search and detain innocent persons—and they are innocent. We are not arguing about prisoners; we are not arguing about those whom the courts, the judges and the juries have sent behind bars for good reason; and we are not arguing about matters of prison management for prisoners. We will argue in favour of those poor unfortunates, the loved ones of these prisoners, who have not been convicted by any court and have not had a custodial sentence imposed on them.

The clause in this Bill which allows the management of a prison the right to detain a person on, they say, good grounds and then to search that person on what, they say, are good grounds rightly falls within the province of the South Australian police. The Opposition's view on this is consistent. Police officers must have the right of search, detention and seizure. We have voted in this House for police officers who believe that drugs or firearms are involved (to pick two issues) to have quite wide powers of search and seizure. In all matters, we give members of the South Australian police the right of detention and arrest, because in a civilised society that is how it functions. In respect of this Bill, I again make it absolutely clear that the Opposition will not support the extension of those necessary police powers beyond the South Australian police.

The Opposition does not believe that the managers of prisons or that prison officers should have the right to strip search those innocent persons who are predominantly females and who are the loved ones of those people who have transgressed. If there were a Bill before us that sought to provide for the good order of the management of prisons by giving prison officers the right to search persons in a prison, we would have no problem with that. We know that it is existing practice and we support it. The Opposition believes that, when a person is in custody, a court has made a determination that that person's human rights are less than those in the community. Of course, there are certain inalienable rights, and one of those is to be free of physical abuse. There are others, and we support them. We would not vote for a suspension of those rights at all. However, we do accept that there are management issues in the prisons which require the sorts of powers that this Government now seeks to extend to those people who go onto prison property.

I will elaborate on this point a little further. It could well be argued that drugs in prisons, which are obviously the principal driving force behind this part of the Bill, are such an important issue that we have to suspend some human rights. In the Committee stage I will move an amendment to delete new section 85B. We are not entirely happy with that. That is our first ambit. I am happy to talk with the Minister about it, because I am not sure how we can resurrect a few elements of new section 85B. Under that new section a prison manager will have the right to search vehicles that move into a prison or onto prison property.

I am not sure of the current practices with respect to the search and seizure or detention of vehicles, but the Opposition would have no problem with the searching and detention of vehicles if the management of a prison had reasonable cause to believe that should happen. So, I want to throw this out now. We will support not only eight of the principal issues in this but we will also support the ability to search and, if necessary, detain vehicles until police officers, forensic people or whoever can conduct a closer inspection and investigation of vehicles going onto prison property. We will make that concession now. I understand that is part of section 85B, but Parliamentary Counsel advised me that it would be very difficult to cauterise that point. If the Government wants to talk to me about that before we go to the Legislative Council and we can find a form of words, we will support that as well.

I understand that what has driven a fair bit of this legislation is the issue of drugs in prisons. I accept what many of the professionals associated with prison management have told me and others about the insidious role of drugs in our gaols. I accept that all sorts of problems are associated with drugs in prisons. Some of the problems, on which we have some pretty clear evidence, are associated with the fact that, when a person in prison manages, through whatever means, to get a shipment of drugs, the other prisoners would like to get

hold of them as well. Therefore, it creates that sort of problem. In many ways, it is the currency which works within prisons. Drugs in prisons are like $100 notes in the rest of our community, and they have that sort of impact.

Over the past few years the Government and this Minister—certainly since I have known him—have run a consistent line about the insidiousness of drugs in our prison system. In 1992 and 1993, when he was shadow Minister, I recall that he asked many questions about various activities in prisons, particularly the provision of drugs. I accept that he has had an inquiry into prisons and that at least one of the recommendations is this power of search and detention by prison officers of non-convicted persons, but frankly it has gone too far. It is a power with which we will not agree, which we will not allow and which we will not vote for, because we believe it is wide open to abuse.

I am grateful to the Minister and his department and to his executive assistant for organising a briefing for me with an officer regarding this matter. The officer gave me a briefing on any issue that I wanted to raise. The Minister made all the resources freely available, and I am grateful to him for that. When the officer and I went through this issue, I said, 'Just imagine that I am in prison.' That may have been a very difficult leap of faith for him, but I do not know. It may be that the member for Unley, who is sitting behind me, is right and that it is not so hard to imagine. I went on to say, 'The probability is that I have strangled your boss and I am now inside the hoosegow (or whatever other word it is) and my good wife has decided to come along with four kids to visit me.' So I am in prison, my wife turns up and somebody decides that she could possibly be bringing in an illicit drug of one kind or another.

Mr Lewis: Or a firearm.

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Ridley wants to make little of this. He ought to think about it, because even he has some constituents who from time to time go behind bars and who also have loved ones. If I had believed what he said 3½ years ago, he should have been there for quite a while. But, like the rest of the world, I did not believe him when he told us the story about shooting his mate in the middle of some jungle in a place that he has never visited. At the end of the day, I take the view that even the member for Ridley ought to have some semblance of empathy with people in this situation.

Mr Rossi interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I do not expect that from the member for Lee, but I do not expect him to be here too much longer anyway.

Mr Lewis: You blackguard!

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I believe that expression should be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The remark made by the member for Ridley was certainly very offensive. I also suggest that the challenge put to the member for Unley was not in the best of taste. In the circumstances I ask the honourable member to withdraw the term that he used. I also caution the member for Playford against further challenges of that nature. I can understand the rationale behind the member's outburst, but I ask him to withdraw the term that he used.

Mr LEWIS: I withdraw it, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I resent the misrepresentation by the honourable member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I appreciate that.

Mr QUIRKE: The central issue is the power of search and detention of persons who are not convicted by the courts and who are deemed to be innocent. That is a view that I hold very strongly. I have not been privy to all the information on how drugs get into prisons. However, I have been told by prison officers and by persons who have served time in prison that drugs are widely available. I accept the findings of most of the reports that drug use in our prisons should be stamped out entirely but that it is a widespread practice. That does not stun me too much, because drug usage is the reason why many people wind up in prison.

It may not be the event that attracts the sentence, but I am told by police officers that drugs are responsible for a very large percentage of crimes in South Australia. Many crimes, such as robbery, armed robbery and burglary, see people receive custodial sentences, but quite a lot are drug driven. Therefore, when these people go to prison they have a pattern of drug usage, and I understand that continues whilst they are in custody.

I was giving the example of my wife visiting me in prison. I put it to the officer at the time, 'If this became law, what would happen?' In response, he told me that there would be the power to detain my wife and/or children if they were suspected and forcibly search them. In that instance, those people have committed no offence. It may well be the case that prison management has a good reason to assume that they are carrying drugs or other illicit materials. I do not have much power to review that decision. Indeed, all I have is the word of the management of the prison that they had good grounds. I have some doubts about that. I doubt that some of our prison officers want to be put in that position. There are good reasons why the Police Force in South Australia has those powers and there are very good reasons why they ought to remain with the Police Force.

I accept the fact that this Government has continued to struggle against drug usage in prisons. In fact, the recent acquisition of machinery—I think it is called the drug sniffer, and the Minister might be able to tell us more—has gone one stage beyond the old biological method of doing that task, namely, the dog. However, at the end of the day, if a person is suspected for that reason or other reasons of having drugs on their person, it is my view that the South Australian Police ought to be involved at that stage. I know that I am going to be told that the police are busy, that they have lots of other functions to fulfil, but I do not believe that it is necessary or desirable for prison officers to take over their role, and neither does the Labor Opposition.

I turn to some of the other measures in this legislation which we support. I make absolutely clear to the Minister and the Government that, if they want to discuss with me a form of words over the right to search vehicles, I will cop that. A probable source of drugs in prisons is through tradespersons coming in to do work upon gaol premises. I accept that. I accept the fact that an easy way of smuggling in drugs is in certain parts of motor vehicles—after all, Customs tells us that is the way they are brought into Australia. We accept the fact that some work must be done, and I give a commitment to the House that the Opposition is happy to look at that matter, so we need a proper formulation of words. We will extend the provision not to the tradesperson but to the tradesperson's vehicle, or to whatever other circumstance the vehicle may be on prison property.

The Minister's second reading explanation deals with the question of board and lodging for prisoners in cottages. My understanding of this, and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong, is that this is a widespread practice. I am told that the maximum amount of money that is paid is $80, and that is

probably an appropriate amount. If anything, it is probably a generous amount because, to get board and lodging in a $500 000 house in most parts of the community, and that is what some of those cottages are, would cost a lot more than $80 a week, but we will not go too far down that road. The Opposition has no problem with that, and we will support that part of the legislation, come what may in the other place.

We see it as a necessary part of rehabilitation, particularly of long-term prisoners, that they realise that they have some obligations. It will not make it a great deal easier for taxpayers because, even in the cottages, the cost of supervision would be well beyond $80 a week, but, at the end of the day, the practice instils in prisoners soon to take their part in the community some sense of financial responsibility for their own well being. I also point out to the House that, if the Government did not charge these persons for board and lodging, they would not want to leave the cottages, because it would cost them a lot more money outside, where taxpayers do not subsidise these activities. We understand the necessity of that, we support it, and we will vote for it.

The same can be said about home detention. Recently, a report was released on home detention. I had not been the Opposition spokesperson very long, but I was contacted by a reporter who asked me, 'Isn't it terrible that one-third of people on home detention have to be sent back to prison for some time?' I cannot remember whether it was a newspaper or radio interview—it might have been both—but I commented that I thought the figure was a bit high but that we in the Opposition are committed to home detention and that we will work our way through it. We believe that, whatever the figure, it is necessary to work through the concept of home detention for two principal reasons. It is a useful arm of custody and, indeed, it is a way to minimise the impact on the taxpayer of custodial sentences. It is appropriate that, for some prisoners who really do not require the heavy security of Yatala or our other prisons, home detention is an option. We have no argument with that. As a consequence, we will support the measure in the Bill that provides for home detention for that handful of prisoners who are serving under various Federal sentences in South Australia.

The Minister may tell us in summing up how many Federal prisoners there are. I understand that it is very few—not that many. We have no problem with that and believe that it is a matter of consistency. Likewise, the suggestion of the change in the residency clause, specifically for Aboriginal custody in terms of designating areas in the Aboriginal homelands as a place for the home detention of Aboriginal persons, is one of the items—the Minister can correct me—that relates to the Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody. As a Labor Opposition we support that concept. There is much there to work through on it and we support the Government's initiative on that question.

With regard to the power of searching mail, I pose a question to the Minister. I am concerned about this matter, although we could deal with it in the Legislative Council if we have to. From my reading of the Bill and of the Minister's second reading speech, I understand that parliamentary mail is not to be interfered with, both going in and going out of the prison. We have no problem with that. However, legal mail, presumably from the solicitor to his or her client and back to the solicitor, lawyer or barrister is also not to be interfered with. We have no problem with that: it is basically necessary and we can understand it. We have a question about mail from the Ombudsman. My understanding from what I have been told by the Minister's department is that the Ombudsman's mail is now treated in the same way and that, if a letter comes from the Ombudsman with his official stamp on it, it is then handed to the prisoner. Likewise, if the prisoner is corresponding with the Ombudsman that mail is not intercepted. That ought to be the case, but does this legislation guarantee the passage of the Ombudsman's mail in the same way as it does parliamentary and legal mail? It is not suspended but is guaranteed?

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: It is already in the Act.

Mr QUIRKE: The Minister has answered and does not need to answer later. That was a concern in Caucus. I now turn to the notification of persons that the release of an offender is imminent and the fact that that notification be to a range of people—obviously the victim and some of the victim's relatives. I understand that the impact of the legislation is to effectively notify all persons concerned in all instances that we can think of out there, should the release of a prisoner take place. We support that and believe that it is a necessary part of the Act.

I have a question or two on that. Because of the nature of one question I have of the Minister, I may do it privately. A matter has been raised with me that is of concern with respect to one part of that matter, but I will speak to the Minister after the proceedings today to get an answer to that concern.

We have no problems with the rest of the legislation and seek to work with the Minister to sharpen up a few of the issues in there. I emphasise that we will not support the random power—as that is what it will be—of strip search and detention by prison officers. That is correctly work that it is within the province of serving and sworn police officers. If we have our way, that is where it will remain.

Mr BASS (Florey): This legislation is very important, especially in relation to new section 85B, the power of search and arrest. I have to disagree with the member for Playford when he says that this is a task for police. For too long, Governments in South Australia have found that the Police Department—that body of 3 600 men and women—can do everything. If there is a proposal for Neighbourhood Watch, the police will do it; if there is a proposal for Victims of Crime, the police will do it. The Police Department has limited resources. It is time that it concentrated on its core activities and carried out those duties, and the Correctional Services Department carried out duties in relation to prisoners.

I have no doubt that, when this legislation is enacted, it will help to prevent not only drugs but other articles such as syringes and small parts of firearms going into prisons. It is not long ago that a complete gun and ammunition was found in a prison. One would ask: how does a person get something of that size into a prison? There are many ways—via people who have to work in the prison and those who visit their loved ones in prison. I make no bones about it: it must be terrible for a person who has a loved one in gaol, but the loved one is in gaol because of their own doing.

To protect the prisoners and the correctional personnel, there must be a law which allows the manager of a correctional institution, based on reasonable grounds, to search either a person or a vehicle. Regarding the power to search and arrest, new section 85B provides:

> The manager of a correctional institution may cause any person who enters the institution to be detained and searched for the presence of items prohibited by regulation, if there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that the person is in possession of such an item without the permission of the manager.

It does not provide that, if the manager of the prison does not like someone, he can have that person searched or if he does not like a prisoner he can have that prisoner's visitor detained. I am sure that, if anyone who is searched by persons acting on the instructions of a manager feels that they are not being treated correctly, there are avenues through which they can complain.

In relation to a vehicle, the manager of a correctional institution is in the same position. There are many different items that enter in vehicles. Items can be taken in without the driver of the vehicle knowing that there is anything in the back. It is so easy. A ute can be taking supplies into the prison: the prisoner's mate is waiting and just tosses the item in. It can be bullets, a syringe, heroin or marijuana. These are items that we must keep out of our prisons.

The section further provides that, when a person is searched, that person may be required to open his or her mouth, to strip, or to do anything reasonably necessary for the purpose of the search. If a person complies with the search, then no force will be necessary. If, of course, the person refuses to be searched, reasonable force can be applied to secure compliance with the requirement. To be quite honest, if a person has nothing to hide, there is no reason why he or she should not be compliant with the requirement to search. New subsection (3)(b) rightly provides that force cannot be applied to open a person's mouth except by or under the supervision of a medical practitioner, and I agree entirely with that. It is very easy to break a person's jaw when trying to open their mouth, and that new subsection provides protection for the person.

New subsection (3)(c) provides that nothing may be introduced into an orifice (including the mouth) of a person's body, and again that protects the person. New subsection (3)(d) provides that at least two persons, apart from the person being searched, must be present. That would stop a disgruntled prison officer from going in on his or her own and doing something illegal. New subsection (3)(e) provides that those present at any time during the search when the person is removing his or her clothing and is naked must be of the same sex as the person who is being searched. Again, that is protection for the person. New subsection (3)(f) provides that the search must be carried out expeditiously and undue humiliation of the person must be avoided. There are very clear guidelines under which searches can be carried out.

I know that to give people this power is always a risk, and that is why new section 85B is so detailed in what a manager of a correctional institution can and cannot do. Having been involved for so long in the areas of correctional services and police, I commend and support this legislation.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I also support this Bill, which has several key amendments. First, there is an amendment to allow deduction from prisoners' salaries for the rent on cottages during the time they are released for work. Secondly, there is an amendment fixing the unintentional preclusion of Federal offenders from the home detention scheme, and further allowing the Department for Correctional Services to revoke home detention schemes when there are breaches of conditions that apply. Thirdly, there is an amendment to require visitors to have a manager's approval to carry prohibited items, and to provide for the detention and search of any visitor suspected of being in possession of prohibited substances.

Fourthly, there is an amendment regarding the handling of mail to control infiltration of drugs: that is, mail can be opened and inspected. Fifthly, there is an amendment giving the Department for Correctional Services discretion to provide appropriate information to victims about offenders. Sixthly, there is an amendment to allow the Department for Correctional Services and the Parole Board to provide information about a prisoner to certain people, such as the Government, OARS and the Victims of Crime Service.

Generally, the community has a view that life in prison is one where the prisoners live in a motel suite: they do nothing all day but watch TV and generally have a very easy time during their stay inside. Obviously, prison affects different people differently, just as the pressures on the outside affect people differently. Some prisoners, therefore, would be expected to succumb to the stress of prison sentences easily, while others could be expected to revel in that environment. The prison system in South Australia is basically designed to be a punishment style system—punishment to appease the needs of the victim; punishment to satisfy the community that justice has been served; and punishment to achieve a certain level of revenge. All forms of imprisonment and punishment contain those elements of justice, revenge and society's satisfaction.

I argue that this is equally so if the crime is a speeding offence or murder. To argue illogically, therefore, as some do, that certain heavier penalties—that this House knows I support—can be rejected because of the basis of revenge, justice or society's satisfaction is simply not accepted. Accepting that various prisoners come to the prison system from a varying range of drug related, abuse related and violence related backgrounds, it is not hard to understand that those issues of drugs, abuse and violence continue to dominate the lives of prisoners inside prison. In fact, prisoners reveal that about 70 per cent of all prisoners experience drug abuse in prison.

Obviously, prison is largely a money-less environment—and what I mean by that is that if there are approximately 150 paying jobs available for 400-odd prisoners at Yatala, obviously not everyone earns money, so the only ones able to conduct the 'buys', as they are called, are those who work or who receive money from people outside. They are only able to conduct their buys on twice what they earn. So, if they are not earning in terms of work in the prison they might be earning 50¢ a day, so one can see that they do not have a huge amount of money for their buy.

In such a money-less environment, drugs form part of the money process. And drugs are moved around the system by violence, sexual favours, phonecard and the reward system, and it is very difficult for us on the outside to understand how the drug system is much more focused in that closed environment and how it has more of an effect on the downside of human behaviour than it does in the general population. All those elements set the scene for drug dealing and the market share competition within the prison community, thus more violence, more favours and more demand for drugs to enter this prison from the outside. Prisoners say that drugs are the biggest single problem in prison leading to violence, rapes and payback, not only on the inside but also on the outside.

One can clearly imagine the difficulty of prison management and the potential threat to both prisoner and officer safety in such an environment. This week I attended a program called Straight Talk at Noarlunga FACS, where three current prisoners came to address juvenile offenders. They spent much of the two hours stressing that drugs were the biggest problem in prison, and highlighting all the difficulties associated with drug use in prison. They were

trying to brighten up these young offenders, to make them aware of just what prison is really like, and to use their knowledge to challenge these young people to make a positive choice to change their ways before they ended up in prison. I found it an excellent program, but I could feel the frustration of one prisoner, in particular, because it was obvious that he knew that half the kids he was talking to would still end up inside and with the idea that prison was a glamorous place to go. No doubt, in a few months they will have the opportunity to experience this first hand.

Drugs in prisons are an enormous problem and must be countered. The measures in this Bill go some way towards that end; namely, to allow the opening and examination of prisoner mail and the search and detention of persons entering the prison. Both of these were recommendations of the drugs in prison inquiry. No doubt, there will be an argument from the civil libertarians about the invasion of visitors' privacy, being examined when merely visiting a prisoner. That is, that they are the injured party in two ways: they are the injured party in that their relatives or loved ones are already inside, and they are the injured party in that they are innocent, not guilty of any crime, as has been said by one of the members opposite; and that, further, they should not be put to the further injury of these examinations.

The alternative, as I see it, is to have no contact visits at all; that is, never to give a father or a mother the opportunity to have physical contact with their children or loved ones. Perhaps this is what we are coming to. I hope that measures such as those proposed in this Bill are taken in the spirit in which they are intended, for the benefit of all in the system. It is not difficult to imagine how particular prisoners' visitors could be singled out and made an issue of. If unilateral investigation of urine were made across the board on a regular basis, it would very quickly identify which prisoners would have the visitors who were expected to be carrying the drugs.

The issue of drugs being thrown into prison complexes should be overcome easily, as it is a management issue. A more disturbing issue is that of drugs entering prison after a court appearance. The positive side is that drugs are being intercepted, but that should remain a cause for grave concern at this stage. I support the Minister's aim to create a drug-free prison environment in South Australia, and I look forward to further initiatives along this line in the near future.

The only other issue in this Bill on which I really wish to make comment is the area of access to offender information, where the provisions allow for wider flexibility in the release of information relating to prisoners. The Parole Board would therefore have the discretion to release details of any orders that it makes about an offender to people the board deems to have a proper interest in that matter. According to Liberal Party corrections policy and the law reform policy before the last election, it was our Government's stated plan to give the police the right to submit to the parole board and that victims be notified of any applications for parole. Appropriate information will be made available to victims, the prisoner's family, friends and legal representatives, or other appropriate people. Information such as sentence details, release dates, home detention, escapes, etc., is important to the victim in particular.

It is patently stupid to believe that a victim loses all interest in the process once the offender is imprisoned. Victims continue to wear the scars of the offence throughout life, and naturally continue to feel part of the process throughout imprisonment. It is natural to expect that they would want the details of the release, etc., particularly in cases of family involvement and violence. There is no compulsion to release the information; indeed, the information can be refused if it is deemed to be in the best interests of the prisoner's safety.

I believe that this amendment gives back a sense of power to the victim, who in the past has rightly felt that all is weighted in favour of the offender. Many victims have indicated to me that they entered and left the process feeling that they had no rights and in some cases were almost a nuisance in the process, because they wanted to remain fully informed. This is not a bizarre phenomenon: it is a natural sense of seeking justice for the victim—an assurance in the victim's own mind that they have the power to know all the outcomes of the case from which, after all, they were the only ones to suffer unnecessarily.

I believe that the whole issue of victims' rights should be taken very seriously, because it is obvious to me that a lot of the dissatisfaction felt in the community about the justice system stems from a feeling of disempowerment and of lack of ability really to interact with the system and influence it in some way. The involvement of victims under the juvenile justice program has proven very successful not only because of the outcome for the juvenile offender but also for the sense of satisfaction to the victim. At long last we are starting to develop a system that punishes the real offender and not the innocent victim. I support the Bill and congratulate the Minister on his initiative.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Correctional Services): I thank the members for Florey and Kaurna for their supportive remarks and likewise the member for Playford. I am pleased that the Opposition has seen sense in supporting this Bill in principle, and welcome the broadly supportive comments of the member for Playford. Obviously, I am disappointed that the honourable member feels that he is unable to support clause 85(b), which relates to the strip searching of prisoners. I will refer to that in more detail as we come to debate that clause of the Bill. This Bill is a miscellaneous amendment Bill. It has come about because of a need to make a number of amendments to the Correctional Services Act, for a variety of reasons. However, it is fair to say that those most contentious aspects of the Bill are directly related to the investigation of drugs in prisons. A report that was produced as a result of that investigation was subsequently tabled in this Parliament by me, as I believed it was in the interests of the public and of sound and rational debate that that report be publicly available.

I am somewhat disappointed that the member for Playford does not appear to have read that report—he has certainly made no reference to it—and I will discuss that further during responses that I make to any questions he may have relating to that part of the Bill. It is relevant for me to say at this time that the strip searching of visitors is something which the department and I see as absolutely essential in order to ensure that we are better able to combat the incidence of drugs in prisons.

One of the most dangerous practices which contributes significantly to the number of deaths and incidents which occur in the State's prison system is the presence of drugs and other illegal substances and their use by prisoners. The report of the drug investigation confirms that one of the major ways of entry of drugs into prisons is via visitors to those institutions. It is recommended by the investigator that prison officers be given the power to detain and search visitors

where they are reasonably suspected of carrying a prohibited substance. That recommendation was not made lightly; it is one that I personally talked about at length with the investigator; and I accept his reason for deeming that power necessary for prison officers.

The member for Playford points out that the police currently in that power, and he argues that the police should continue to have that power. I do not disagree with that part of his argument, but he also argues that they should be the only ones to have such power, and that if there is a suspicion of drugs being carried by a visitor the police could be called in. The difficulty is, of course, that if correctional officers have no ability to detain visitors, if they suspect someone of carrying drugs, all they can do is turn them away from the institution and call the police. Realistically, if the police are being tasked to other incidents they may not be able to get to the institution in time to apprehend the visitor or prevent the visitor from passing the substance to someone else visiting the prison, thereby still being able to get through prison security.

I hope the member for Playford will listen to the logic of the investigator and will take the trouble to read the report on the investigation into drugs in prisons and eventually come to the same conclusion that those of sound mind have come to by examining the problems presently in the prison system through drugs and the way in which they are able to infiltrate the system.

The member for Playford indicates that he is of the view that in relation to home detention the number of Federal prisoners in an institution at any one time is relatively low. He is right in that respect: of the approximately 1 300 prisoners in the South Australian prison system at this time, it is fair to say that usually less than 1 per cent would be Federal prisoners. So, whilst this section of the Act does not relate to a large number of people, nevertheless it ensures that, as far as practicable, those sentenced under Commonwealth and State law have the same access to the home detention scheme.

The member for Playford also mentioned the amount of board that is paid by those who presently reside in places such as the Northfield cottages. He is correct in saying that that board is currently set at $80 a week. I welcome his implied call for a higher level than that. I agree that it is time that that amount be reviewed upward, and that review is currently under way.

The member for Playford also mentioned mail sent by the Ombudsman to a prisoner or vice versa. He expressed concern that the Ombudsman's mail may be able to be opened. I advise the honourable member that the Correctional Services Act provides the necessary protection for mail to and from the Ombudsman (sections 33(7) and 33(8)).

I commend this Bill to the House. It is an important Bill for the Correctional Services Department; it is important to ensure that order is maintained in the prison system; and, above all, it is important to ensure that the incidence of drugs is reduced in the prison system.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Prisoners' mail.'

Mr QUIRKE: I would like to put a hypothetical case to the Minister. A member of Parliament may not, for whatever reason, wish to receive mail from a particular prisoner. Obviously, this Act would have to contain certain powers if in the future a member of Parliament, the Ombudsman or a solicitor, who was no longer acting for a particular client, did not wish to receive mail from a prisoner. What would be the procedure for such a person to notify the Correctional Services Department—if they can do that—so that that unwanted communication does not slip through legislation such as this and cause some other mischief?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Playford raises an important point. Indeed, this difficulty could be experienced by any person in the community. Regrettably, it is a fact of life that, even after their imprisonment, people in the prison system may harass people outside through writing unwanted letters to them. All people in that situation need do is communicate with me as Minister and provide me with the name of prisoner, and I will ensure that that prisoner is unable to write to those people, by that mail being dealt with appropriately. The Chief Executive Officer of the department would be advised, and she would in turn ensure that the prison manager of the institution involved would ensure that no mail was sent to that person, even if that person were a member of Parliament, the Ombudsman or a legal representative. Obviously, mail that is detained in that way will be handed over to legal authorities and assessed for any harassment of the people involved. Of course, it could then be used in evidence in further proceedings.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Substitution of s.85B.'

Mr QUIRKE: I move:

Pages 3 and 4—Leave out proposed new section 85B.

I do not want to go through the issues for too long. I think I made a reasoned explanation of the amendment in my second reading contribution. No doubt this will go further up the corridor and much more will be said when it reaches the Upper House. The argument revolves around the protection of the rights of an innocent person, and they are innocent until a court of law proves them guilty. Overwhelmingly—and I am guessing at this—this will protect predominantly females who visit our prisons. I know that is not entirely the case, but I do not know the figures. It may well be that the department has certain targets in mind. If they are not female, that is an issue for prison officers. I believe these people at that stage have no case to answer.

The other thing that has to be very clearly understood is that, in many respects, many of these people are victims of the society we live in, victims of the fact that their loved ones have committed acts which have required them to be locked up behind bars, and life is hard enough as it is. No matter which way you look at it—and I listened earlier to the member for Florey's comments—I do not think there are too many more humiliating things than strip searching. I accept the necessity behind bars for it, and I accept the necessity for the police to have the power to do it, but I am not prepared to extend that to prison officers. It is unfortunate that this issue is included in the Bill, because the way it is cast here makes it difficult for me to support the concept of vehicle search, which again I make clear to the Minister and the Committee we are not opposed to at all, and we can deal with that by a different set of words if the Minister is interested in taking us up on that offer.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It is unfortunate that the member for Playford has taken issue with this part of the Bill in this way. Again, I invite the member for Playford, if he has not done so—and I assume from his statements that he has not done so—to read very carefully the document I tabled in

this Parliament, 'Investigation into Drugs in Prison in South Australia', which was completed in January 1995. That report, following investigation, was completed for very good reason: drugs are a problem in prisons in South Australia, as are other items of contraband, and I know that the member for Playford recognises that problem. His Government, when in power, grappled with that, and governments in other jurisdictions, both inside and outside Australia, have that problem.

However, in order to combat the problem, decisive action needs to be taken. At the moment, we have the ability to detect many items of contraband entering prisons. The honourable member would be well aware of what has been tagged as 'sniffer dog computer' that is now being used in our prison system to detect the presence of drug substance. While we can detect the presence of drug substance using equipment such as that and the more traditional means such as trained sniffer dogs, the problem is that correctional officers have neither the power to detain nor to search.

For the benefit of the member for Playford, we can divide the argument for the time being carefully into two separate parts: detain and search. If we were to take up the honourable member's argument that police have that power and could therefore be called in, they are now. The problem is, without the power to detain a visitor, the visitor can leave the site and therefore the police are unable to apprehend, or they can pass on the item of contraband to another person. Therefore, the fact that that power resides only with the police is not in itself a sufficient deterrent to prevent contraband getting into prisons, unless we have police officers stationed at the prisons for every visiting time.

That is certainly a possibility. It is a situation that was discussed with police when canvassing the options presented by the investigator. Obviously, police would be concerned about having officers stationed at an institution for that period. By providing prison officers with the power to detain, it certainly gives police greater opportunity to attend the site. Obviously, if there is a suspicion of drugs the police will need to be involved, anyway. The power to detain automatically gives the police more time to attend—amongst their other taskings—and to apprehend the person should it be proven that they are carrying contraband.

The power to search can involve a number of aspects. It may be, if the contraband is clumsily fitted into the sole of a shoe or into someone's pockets, that it is very easily retrieved. Some people use other methods of concealing contraband. It may be that they have it in their mouth or other parts of their body. A strip search will enable the officers to detect some of those instances. As is pointed out in the accompanying second reading explanation, there will be no searching of any bodily orifice by any prison officer under these provisions, and indeed nor is there at the moment. Those searches can be undertaken only by a qualified medical practitioner. We are dealing with a sensibly applied approach to prevent contraband from entering a prison. As has been pointed out by the member for Florey during his address, there are sensible steps to ensure that that procedure is applied properly so that any strip search is conducted by officers of the same sex.

I understand the concern of the member for Playford with regard to civil liberties. I for one would not be standing up in this Parliament and advocating this type of approach to suspected shoplifters, for example. We are not talking about the outside community; we are talking about a prison. We are referring to a place of incarceration; a place where drugs are getting into; a place where people are given the privilege of visiting a prisoner and prisoners are given the privilege of receiving that visit in order to assist in their rehabilitation.

Some of the jurisdictions that have tackled this problem have simply banned contact visits. One other option open to us is to ban contact visits altogether. The member for Playford should think about that. I would have thought that the banning of contact visits altogether would have far more serious ramifications on prison visitors than giving officers the ability to search, providing they have reasonable grounds for doing so.

That is the issue. We very much want to retain contact visits in the prison system because, as the Minister, I believe that they are beneficial to the rehabilitation of an offender. Incarceration is difficult not just for an offender but for the offender's family, as the member for Playford said today, and I agree. That is why contact visits are so important. But, if drugs are getting into a prison through contact visits and we keep the contact visits going and do not ban them as they have in other jurisdictions, particularly overseas, we need another method, and this is the proposal.

I implore the member for Playford to think carefully about what is proposed and the reasons behind it. I commend the proposal to the honourable member as something that has not been thrown into the Bill at the last minute; it has received detailed thought and debate and, I might add, considerable debate by me with officers of my department. I also fully explored this issue with the investigator into drugs in prisons before agreeing that I would bring this forward as legislation.

Mr QUIRKE: I am well aware of the argument. I know about the potential banning of contact visits for prisoners for a lengthy period. That issue was raised with me. I am not at all comfortable with some of the powers that reside in that area. I accept the fact that a ban for a length of time, however long that may be, may be necessary now as a management tool.

I have been made aware that that ban could be as much as six or nine months in some instances. I have not taken up that issue as it was raised with me only yesterday. I would be very unhappy if that were the case, because that is grossly unfair. At the end of the day, the Minister may have had discussions with a lot of people but he will have some more unless he can get the Australian Democrats up the other end of the corridor to wear this legislation. If they do, they will wear it around their necks. The Minister may then have to deal with us, and we submit that we are dealing with people who are not convicted by the courts. We will not extend policing powers of detention and of search to other than police officers. We accept what management informs us about what happens in prisons.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Mawson asks whether I trust these officers. As the member for Mawson has only recently come into this debate I would have thought that it would be pretty clear, even to him, that implicit in what I am saying is that I do not believe that they ought to have those powers. I do not believe that anyone else in the community ought to have them. either. If the member for Mawson had been here for the second reading speech he would have heard the argument as to why I do not believe they ought to have those powers. I went at great lengths to explain why I believe they should not have those powers. For the benefit of the member for Mawson, I also made the point that I thought a lot of them would not want the sorts of powers being sought. I believe that this measure goes too far.

I have said that in this place and it will be said by someone else who will deputise for me in another place. If the Minister can convince the Australian Democrats then he will have his Bill intact. But this is the core of our opposition. We will wear the rest of it. We will work with the Minister on a couple of other issues to sort out problems in the prisons, but we will not subject people who are innocent and who have not yet been found guilty to random searches and to detention by anyone other than police officers. The member for Mawson can read into that whatever he wants. At the end of the day, that is our position.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: To ensure that those who have not read the drug investigation report are familiar with part of the problem, it is important that I read part of the report into the record. At page 27 the report states:

5.2. The Adequacy of the Screening of Visitors.

Reports from other Correctional Service Departments confirm that there is a well-established connection between contact visits and the introduction of drugs into prisons. All the persons interviewed who were qualified to give an assessment nominated contact visits as the foremost method of inmates obtaining drugs in prisons. This conviction is supported in a number of ways including:

· Sunday night cell searches by the Emergency Response Group which found that eight out of the 10 cells targeted had either green vegetable matter or tablets (October 1994);

· infirmary records which show, on Sunday night and Monday, a sharp rise in the number of prisoners treated for behaviour and appearance believed to be drug induced;

· custodial officers note that after weekend visits often there are prisoners taken from their units because of disorientation and behavioural patterns consistent with drug abuse; and

· intelligence gathered by the Dog Squad.

As Minister for Correctional Services I am well aware that there have been deaths in the prison system which were directly or indirectly related to the taking of drugs and that there are violent incidents in the prison system which are related directly or indirectly to the taking of drugs. I ask the member for Playford whether he believes that, by trying to defeat this clause of this Bill in this way, he will be comfortable every time a prisoner dies through a drug overdose; every time a prisoner is battered by another through a drug related incident; and every time a prisoner is raped by another because the other is under the influence of drugs. That is the reality of prison life. In prison, drugs induce these incidents. People die, people get maimed, injured, and badly abused. It is not a particularly pleasant environment, and the drugs getting in there simply do not help us control the situation.

These measures are put forward for no other reason than that they are the only way we will be better able to combat the problem. I believe it is irresponsible of the Opposition to overlook the results of drugs in prisons and to try to block the measure in this way. Obviously the Government insists on the clause remaining.

Amendment negatived.

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

Page 5, after line 21—Insert new subsection as follows:

(5) The Chief Executive Officer must not release information relating to a prisoner's release on parole without the consent of the Parole Board (but the board may waive this requirement in such circumstances as it thinks fit).

This amendment has been introduced at the request of the Parole Board, which has had an opportunity to examine the Bill in detail. The board has pointed out that, as it is responsible for determining the release conditions of a prisoner, it is appropriate that the Chief Executive Officer should not release that information until it is satisfied that information relating to those details be released to a victim. I agree with the logic put forward by the Parole Board and for that reason bring forward this amendment.

Mr QUIRKE: The Opposition supports the amendment. We think that it is eminently sensible and we cannot see any problem with it. I should also like to take this opportunity to say that we support the role of the police in giving information to the Parole Board.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9, schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.4 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 13 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6 February 1996

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

BELAIR RAILWAY STATION

9. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. Why has TransAdelaide ordered the closure to the public, and to hikers in the National Park in particular, of toilets on the main platform of Belair Railway Station?

2. Will the Minister permit volunteer graffiti removalist and station caretaker Mr Neil Stallard of Blackwood, who is provided with keys to the toilet, to open the toilets for public use during daytime on weekends?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:

1. TransAdelaide has not ordered the closure of toilets on the main platform of the Belair railway station. The toilets at Belair railway station have been closed to the public for the past three to four years, as a result of graffiti vandalism and looting problems.

Mr Neil Stallard has been a volunteer caretaker at Belair railway station during this time and has had a practice of opening the toilets for general use on weekends and public holidays whilst he has been in attendance. TransAdelaide has provided him with keys to do so.

The location of train operating crews at Belair, resulting from single line train operations, has meant TransAdelaide staff utilise these toilets. The toilets have been substantially upgraded to meet the needs of these train crews.

2. Mr Neil Stallard has been asked not to leave the toilets open and unattended for the use of the general public during daytime on weekends and public holidays. He is aware that his keys may be used to gain access if asked by a member of the public.

I suggest that in the event of an emergency, passengers requesting the use of the toilet facilities, when an employee is on the premises, would also be given access. A sign will be erected to this effect.

CASINO

20. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. What amount of money has been written-off as bad debts by the Casino in each of the financial years of trading since the licence was issued?

2. Was the amount in 1 (in each of any instance) deducted from the revenue of the Casino before a calculation was made of the amount of tax the Casino had to pay to the State Government on its turnover revenue?

3. If, in any or every instance each year referred to in 1 and 2, no such deduction had been made, what would have been the additional revenue the State would have received each such year?

4. What would be the current value of revenue foregone in III if it had attracted SAFA bond rates for borrowings month to month using highest result options up to the present?

5. Why have gambling debtors to the Casino been allowed to gamble on credit?

6. Why haven't these debts been collected by the Casino?

7. What sum of the total of bad gambling debts are known to have been incurred by parties who are:

(a) definitely permanent residents of South Australia;

(b) definitely permanent residents of Australia; and

(c) others whose domicile is not included in the foregoing?

8. How many (what number) of such debtors as referred to in 7 (a), (b) and (c) are there?

9. What is the largest amount ever owed by any debtor (or associated debtors forming a party of gamblers) referred to in 7?

10. In what country is the debtor referred to in 9 domiciled or believed to be domiciled?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER:

1. The Casino is prohibited from permitting patrons to gamble on credit. No credit is or has at any time been provided to casino patrons. However, the Casino does, from time to time, allow patrons, on a selected and vetted basis, to cash cheques. Losses are suffered if those cheques are dishonoured. This is not information upon which there is an obligation on the Casino to report and, as a result, there is no such information in the public domain.

The Licensee (Lotteries Commission of SA) has advised the Gaming Supervisory Authority (formerly Casino Supervisory Authority) by means of individual monthly financial reports of the amount of money written off as bad debts by the Casino. However, in order for the Authority to obtain an accurate figure of the amount of money written off as bad debts by the Casino in each of the financial years of trading since the licence was issued, it would mean looking at approximately 120 monthly reports (assuming that these are still on hand) and copies of minutes of Adelaide Casino cheque review meetings (held monthly) over that period. Since

- this would involve many hours work;
- the information is not available in the public domain;
- such losses do not impact on the return to the Government;

I am not convinced that the effort to extract the information is warranted.

However, I have asked the Gaming Supervisory Authority to investigate the current Casino policy and regulations concerning cheque cashing to determine whether any changes are required.

2. Amounts written off as bad debts by the Casino do not affect the amount of tax to be paid to the State Government based on net gambling revenue.

3 Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

5. See reply to Question 1. Section 17 of the Casino Act does not permit persons to gamble on credit.

6. From the information provided by the Licensee to the Gaming Supervisory Authority, the Casino holds monthly cheque review meetings when reports are provided on cheque analysis and outstanding balances to date. In this way, appropriate follow up action is initiated either by the Casino debt collectors or a Casino executive is allocated the task. From the reports given by the Licensee, and the Chief Executive of the Casino direct to the Authority, these follow ups are carried out diligently and with a genuine desire for recovery in respect of overseas, interstate and local patrons.

7. Refer 1 above.

8. Refer 1 above.

9. Refer 1 above.

10. Refer 1 above.

WORKCOVER

23. **Mr BROKENSHIRE:**

1. Since incorporation of the WorkCover Corporation how many complaints have been filed with the Medical Board of South Australia?

2. On what dates were hearings held to assess these complaints?

3. What was the result of the findings from the Medical Board of South Australia?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:

1. Four.

2.

Complaint	Referred to Medical Board	Hearing
1	16 April 1991	22 June 1995
2	2 July 1992	No
3	7 September 1992	5 November 1992
4	1 August 1995	No

3. Of the four complaints involving allegations concerning 29 medical practitioners, the Medical Board has only heard two to date. Regular inquiries about the status of complaints 1 and 2 have been lodged with the Board by the Corporation. (See attachment 1 for details).

Complaint 1 (referred to Medical Board on 16 April 1991) was heard on 22 June 1995 and referred to the Medical Tribunal for a further hearing.

The subject of complaint 3 has been counselled, which is conducted confidentially. The Medical Board does not release details of complaints if a penalty is not applied or counselling takes place. The Fraud Department, WorkCover, has also declined to release the name of the practitioner involved.

Attachment 1

Referrals to Medical Board

No. 1.

Original complaint	16.04.91
Second complaint (interference with witness)	04.07.91
Letter to Medical Board from Corporation	05.08.93
Letter from Board to Corporation (extremely complex matter)	23.08.93
Minister of Health requested by	

Minister of Industrial Affairs to look into delay	29.04.94
Letter from Corporation to Medical Board advising to progress matter or Judicial Review to be sought	22.08.94
No. 2	
Original complaint	02.07.92
Phone call to Medical Board re status	13.07.92
Medical Board contacted Trent Fuller (fraud prevention manager) Board ready to proceed with initial inquiries	22.07.92
Inquiry with medical board from corporation re status	30.11.92
Letter Corporation to Medical Board re status	30.11.92
Letter to Corporation from Medical Board—inquiries to be completed first half of 1993	07.12.92
Letter Corporation to Medical Board re status	05.08.93
Letter Medical Board to Corporation re status 'being dealt with'	23.08.93
Letter from Minister to Minister of Health re delays	29.04.94
Letter from Crown Solicitor to Corporation—'Medical Board unable to proceed until review finalised'	07.07.94

HEALTH COMMISSIONERS

25. **Ms STEVENS:** Who are the present Commissioners of the South Australian Health Commission, when were they appointed and what were the terms of the appointment?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The membership of the South Australian Health Commission is as follows:

Full-time member—

Raymond Howard Blight, B.Tech, B.Ec, M.B.M. (to be also Chairman) appointed 6 April 1995 until 26 September 1996;

Part-time members—

David Roy Filby, B.A., Ph.D. (to be also Deputy Chairman) appointed 6 April 1995 until 30 June 1996;

Helen Tolstoshev, RN, Grad.Dip.Hlth.Sc., appointed 30 November 1995 until 29 November 1998;

James Birch, BHA., appointed 30 November 1995 until 29 November 1998.

There is one vacant part-time member position as a result of a recent resignation.

ADOLESCENTS AT RISK PROGRAM

26. **Mr ATKINSON:** Does the Government intend to adopt and fund the Adolescents At Risk Program proposed by the Coober Pedy Community Development Committee?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Country Principal's Forum met in November 1995 and selected schools to be invited to make submissions for 1996 funding of programs. Coober Pedy's Adolescents at Risk Program has been targeted for consideration for 1996. The salary to maintain the program for Term 4 is being provided by the school and the Country Regional Services of the Department for Education and Children's Services. Funding for submissions will be available in 1996.

TAXIS

29. **Mr ATKINSON:** Is the money raised from the sale of taxi plates hypothecated to a particular fund and if so—

(a) what is the name of that fund and what are its purposes;

(b) are there any other sources or revenue for the fund other than the sale of taxi plates; and

(c) can the Minister account for the revenue and expenditure of the fund for the past two financial years?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The money raised from the sale of taxi plates in 1995 was used by the Passenger Transport Board for taxi related matters, not hypothecated to a particular fund. At this time the balance in the Fund was $4.7m.

(a) The Metropolitan Taxi Cab Industry Research and Development Fund was established under legislation passed in 1989. It was funded through the sale of taxi licences and was used to fund projects relating to the taxi industry.

With the passage of the Passenger Transport Bill 1994, the name of the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Industry Research and Development Fund was changed to the Passenger Transport Research and Development Fund 'The Fund'. To reflect the broader ambit of the Fund Section 62(1)(d) outlines the functions of the Fund as follows:

the Fund may be applied by the Minister in consultation with the Board—

(i) for the purpose of carrying out research into the taxi-cab industry; or

(ii) for the purpose of promoting the taxi-cab industry; or

(iii) for any other purpose considered by the Minister and the Board to be beneficial to the travelling public, in the interests of the passenger transport industry, and an appropriate application of money standing to the credit of the Fund.

(b) The Fund is held in an interest bearing account with the Department of Treasury and Finance and earns interest on a quarterly basis.

(c) The revenue received and the expenditure incurred for the financial year ended 30 June 1994 can be accounted for as follows:

	1994 $
Opening balance	3 076 000
Payments	405 000
Receipts	2 057 000
Closing balance	4 728 000

The revenue received and the expenditure incurred for the financial year ended 30 June 1995 can be accounted for as follows:

	1995 $
Opening balance	4 728 000
Payments	344 000
Receipts	329 000
Closing balance	4 713 000

HOUSING TRUST FENCES

30. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. What is the policy of the Housing Trust regarding the erection of front fences for new dwellings?

2. Will the Housing Trust erect a front fence for its new units at No 1 Standard Avenue, Croydon Park and if not, why not?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:

1. The Housing Trust considers individual cases for provision of fencing on new housing, on their own merits. All rear yard spaces are fenced to provide security and roller doors are provided to carports or garages. Alternatively double gates apply where appropriate to provide security for at least one car parking area.

In major joint venture project areas such as Golden Grove, Regent Gardens and Seaford Rise, the installation of front fencing is not actively encouraged as the landscaping is encouraged to flow to the street alignment. Landscaping is provided by the Trust to the front yard spaces of all new houses at a cost of approximately $1 300.

Within the Trust's redevelopment areas the requirement for front fencing is considered on the merit of the individual sites. The Trust takes into account the existing streetscape and projects are designed to blend in with the existing surroundings.

2. The three house project at Standard Avenue Croydon Park was a project accepted by the Trust in the 29th Design and Construct Call where proponents submit to the Trust proposals on their own land. The 29th call on builders land was approved by the Trust's Board on 19 April 1994, and offered land and houses in areas where the Trust normally has minimum land holdings hence achieves better integration of Trust tenants. It also offers the Trust accommodation adjacent to the redevelopment areas for relocation of tenants from those affected areas.

Standard Avenue Croydon Park is a typical mixture of post 1950-1960 era housing where there is approximately 10 per cent to 20 per cent of redeveloped housing in close proximity of the Trust's site. Front fencing was not a feature required of proponents for this project because this would have been inconsistent with the somewhat open nature of nearby developments.

It is not intended that this site be fenced by the Trust.

GREEK ORTHODOX COMMUNITY

31. **Mr ATKINSON:** When and why is it proposed to end the Greek Orthodox Community's funding for a half-time aged care worker and how does the Government propose that this community continue the service?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Greek Orthodox Community of SA is funded through the Department for Family and Community Services.

Funding is provided to assist in the employment of an aged care welfare worker. The organisation provides a range of general welfare services for older persons of Greek background.

The decision to withdraw funding through the Department for Family and Community Services originated with the previous government. Funding of such projects was considered to be a relatively lower priority for Departmental Funding programs.

While I recognise the need to address priorities in funding, I have however, continued to approve the funding of the Greek Orthodox Community.

I recently advised the organisation's Chairman of a continuation in funding to 30 June 1996.

My office is currently working with the Department for Family and Community Services, the Office for the Ageing and the Office of Multi-Cultural and Ethnic Affairs, to develop a longer term resolution to the funding issue.

LANGUAGE STUDIES

32. **Mr ATKINSON:** Can the Minister confirm that 91 p.c. of South Australian primary-school children studying a language do not continue the language at high school and when will the Government respond to the report on languages in South Australian schools by Mr Joseph Lubianko?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: It is incorrect that 91 per cent of South Australian primary school children studying a language do not continue the language at high school. 1995 statistical information provides the evidence that:

- 80 per cent of year 7 students of languages continue with a language at year 8;
- 56 per cent of year 8 students of languages continue with a language at year 9;
- 43 per cent of year 9 students of languages continue with a language at year 10;
- 59 per cent of year 10 students of languages continue with a language at year 11;
- 61 per cent of year 11 students of languages continue with a language at year 12;

The overall attrition rate in languages studies between year 7 and year 12 is 93 per cent.

The Government will respond to the report on languages in South Australian schools once responses have been received and considered from all interested groups and individuals following the recent release of the report for public consultation.

GARIBALDI CORONIAL INQUIRY

33. **Ms STEVENS:** Has the Minister actioned Recommendation 12 made by the Coroner in his findings concerning the death of Nikki Robinson and initiated a review of resources available for the enforcement of food legislation and if so—

(a) will the review address statements made to the Coroner by three former employees of Garibaldi's (refer to transcript pages 3826, 3827, 4103 and 4237 to 4239) that the company received prior warning of inspections by health authorities and investigate the extent and probity, of this practice;

(b) will the review address matters raised in evidence to the Coroner (refer to transcript pages 3679 to 3728) concerning resource problems associated with inspections, the practice of categorising premises and the frequency of inspections;

(c) who will conduct this review and what is the date for reporting; and

(d) what are the terms of reference for the review?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Yes.

(a) Section 24 of the Food Act gives an authorised officer extensive powers to enter and inspect food premises 'at any reasonable time'. These provisions and practices have been in place for many years under previous Governments. They are being considered in the context of reviewing the Food Act.

(b) see answer to (a) and (b).

(c) There are a series of 'reviews' occurring within and across agencies and involving the National Food Authority and Local Government Association (given that authorised officers are, in the main, environmental health officers employed by Local Government). One option being considered by local government is the creation of 'controlling authorities' by pooling of resources of groups of local councils, thereby providing critical masses of experts.

The South Australian Health Commission has reviewed its capacity to deal with routine communicable disease matters and respond to foodborne outbreaks. The Communicable Disease Control Unit has been upgraded to Branch status, with 5 additional positions, in response to escalating demands for surveillance and control activities. Two additional positions for the Environmental Health Branch's Food Unit have been approved and resources are being considered in the context of discussions with the Local Government Association about roles and responsibilities and best use of resources.

Action has been and is being taken as the 'reviews' progress.

(d) The series of 'reviews' cover the matters raised in the Coroner's recommendation 12.

VETLAB

35. **Ms GREIG:**

1. Will Vetlab retain responsibility for the compilation of State wide livestock disease information and if so:

(a) maintain as a core function the duty to properly monitor, survey and investigate disease in livestock species; and

(b) maintain responsibility in emergency situations such as assisting in the diagnosis and containment of serious diseases?

2. What current Vetlab services will remain available to the rural community?

3. What private sector companies can provide a viable alternative source to Vetlab services?

4. What functions will Vetlab maintain and will it retain research capabilities?

5. Why did the review into Vetlab only highlight the Victorian and Tasmanian systems for comparison to our own service?

6. What protection will be put in place to assist the rural sector in maintaining a market advantage as per the GATT resolutions?

7. How can the Government assure quality and competitiveness on the global market?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN:

1. The responsibility for the compilation of State livestock disease information rests with the Chief Veterinary Officer who uses information provided by Vetlab and from other sources including Primary Industries of South Australia field staff. The information is required quarterly for the National Animal Health Information System and annually for the *Office International des Epizooties*.

Vetlab will continue to monitor and investigate diseases in livestock species and maintain responsibility in emergency situations for assisting in the diagnosis and containment of serious diseases.

2. Essential Vetlab services will remain available to the rural community.

3. A number of commercial providers of veterinary services operate in Australia but no comparative assessments have been made regarding the veterinary capabilities of these organisations either among the organisations or with Vetlab. There is no plan to reduce the capability of Vetlab where that capability is essential to meeting the Government's obligations.

4. There are no plans at present to reduce the range of functions undertaken by Vetlab. The amount of research carried out will depend on the availability of external funds and the relevance of the work to the Government's obligations and objectives.

5. When the review was taking place the Victorian Government had recently sold its regional veterinary laboratories to a commercial provider *Centaur International* while retaining control of its central veterinary laboratory. The review team held discussions with representatives from the Victorian Government and *Centaur International* to ascertain the reasons for, and impact of, the changes.

Tasmania like South Australia has only one State Veterinary Laboratory which is similar in size to Vetlab.

The situations in Victoria and Tasmania enabled members of the review team to assess systems of veterinary laboratory management

in situations which compared to South Australia, were in Victoria's case very different and in Tasmania's case, quite similar.

6. International access for animals and animal products are dependent on the exporting country maintaining support services and infrastructure which is used to give credibility to declarations as to the animal health status of that country.

International access is negotiated at a national level and as such Vetlab is a component of the national animal health infrastructure and will continue to contribute in assisting Australia maintain access to international markets.

7. The maintenance of product quality is an important factor for increasing the competitiveness of animal products on international markets. Livestock producers and processors are adopting quality management systems which include the international quality standards ISO 9002, industry based systems, and methods such as the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) method which can be applied to food and non-food products. Agricultural businesses must not only be quality conscious but must be able to prove it through independently certified quality systems. The Government can assist in this process by ensuring that South Australian producers have access to the necessary monitoring procedures to support the quality assurance systems. The Government can also support the industry through promotion, facilitation and assistance with development of appropriate quality systems.

HEALTH PROJECTS, OVERSEAS

38. **Ms GREIG:**

1. What initiatives has the Health Commission undertaken in export health?

2. What countries have been targeted by the Government for future health initiatives?

3. How many staff members are working on overseas initiatives within the Health Commission and what overseas projects have been investigated?

4. What success has been had with overseas contracts in the health portfolio?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1. South Australia's health products and services are amongst the world's best. The SA Health Commission has recently put strategies in place to pursue opportunities to export health skills and/or health services, ensure that economic development opportunities are incorporated into all tender specifications which invite the participation of the private sector and encourage and facilitate the expansion and further development of local industry in health and related fields. In line with these strategies the Commission has created a Health Industry and Export Development Unit reporting directly to the Chief Executive Officer.

2. The SA Health Commission is focusing its export attention towards the East Asia Growth Area including Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines. However there are other activities, particularly in the Asia/Pacific basin.

3. Currently there are two staff members working on overseas initiatives.

The SA Health Commission cannot, within the terms of the SAHC Act, be directly involved in commercial health exports. The role of the Health Industry and Export Development Unit is to identify new commercial opportunities to sell skills, intellectual property, systems and services on both national and international markets, assist new opportunities within the health industry which may generate economic activity and provide an effective conduit between the SA Health Commission, the health units, the private sector, the universities and other Government agencies to promote SA's economic development.

Ventures are undertaken by the commercial health organisations such as Med Vet Science, SAGRIC and the Australian Cranio Maxillo Facial Foundation. These and the 120 private sector organisations exporting health services and products from SA make a significant and growing contribution to the State's health. Areas of particular expertise for which opportunities are presently being sought include the direct provision of services to overseas patients here in SA, biomedical engineering, pathology, education and training and tele-health. In addition the Commission has supported trade missions to Malaysia and Indonesia in which SA services and products have been promoted.

4. There appears to be plenty of scope for growing health export activity in SA. For example in the first month of 1996 the SA Health Commission has hosted groups from overseas.

To assist the export drive the Premier will launch the release of a promotional video on SA's health services and products on 15 February 1996.

The SA Health Commission has also been developing strategic alliances with organisations in the private sector to add value to their services and to assist in securing projects from overseas. An example is its collaboration with the architectural firm of Woodhead Firth Lee and the consulting firm Connections International Pty Ltd which resulted in a hospital development project in China. Another strategic alliance with University of Iowa gives South Australia access to new health products.

In addition, the Health Commission is working with health units to provide technical consultancy in hospital support services to the Malaysian market and in this area has been successful in securing a short term consultancy with an organisation in Malaysia.

Other successful initiatives include winning an education and training project from the Ramathebodi Hospital in Thailand to provide continuing education to its senior nurses. This project was undertaken in collaboration with the Flinders University's School of Nursing, the Flinders Medical Centre and the Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital.

The Health Commission has also been actively working with SAGRIC International to bid for aid funded health projects overseas. Examples of successful projects include the Vietnam Iodine Deficiency Disorder Project and the PBG Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS Prevention and Care Project.

The export of health is not limited to overseas markets. SA enjoys a strong working relationship with the Northern Territory in which, through tele-links, psychiatric, renal, emergency, plastic and other medical services are presently being provided or anticipated.

LONSDALE LAND

40. **Ms GREIG:** How many industrial/commercial blocks of land owned by the Government are still available for sale within the Lonsdale area?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The South Australian Housing Trust has 26 industrial allotments listed for sale plus four under contract. It has no commercial land listed for sale in the Lonsdale area.

BUSINESS REGISTRATION

42. **Ms GREIG:** How many new businesses were registered during the 1994-95 financial year and how many of these businesses were in the southern region?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am advised that 15 812 new businesses were registered in South Australia during the 1994-95 financial year and 768 of those new businesses were registered in the Southern region incorporating the Southern Development Board.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

43. **Ms GREIG:** In what countries does the Economic Development Authority have a presence, how long have these offices been established and what have these offices achieved?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The South Australian Government overseas offices were recently reviewed to ensure that they are strategically located to assist in the achievement of the State's overall economic development goals. Their role includes providing market information, analysis of commercial opportunities, promotion of SA, investment attraction, export facilitation, government and business liaison, and international mission support.

Currently, the Economic Development Authority has a presence in Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, Indonesia, China, and the United Kingdom.

The Japan Office was established in 1970 (Elders representing) for an important market in terms of exports and inwards investment for South Australia. Annually, approximately 100 trade and investment inquiries are generated, and approximately 60 SA companies are given assistance in terms of Japanese market information and visits.

One example of a recent achievement is the visit from Japan in July 1995 by a business delegation examining opportunities in the seafood industry. In addition to $2 million already invested in tuna farming, there are further investment prospects plus a potential to increase SA tuna exports by a further $2-3 million over the next 12 months.

The Singapore Office has been established for more than 20 years. Singapore and Malaysia are an important source of investment

for SA with the Ramada Grand Hotel and Terrace Towers both examples of property investment.

Other recent achievements include the relocation of Frederick Duffield from Singapore to Adelaide. The relocation of this manufacturer of hydraulic fittings for mining and heavy industry will lead to the creation of 50 new full time positions and attract investment of $5 million. Also, in September 1995, the Singapore office supported a delegation of 8 companies from South Australia to participate in a major water and environmental management trade exhibition in Singapore. Exports of goods or services to the value of approximately $500 000 were generated.

The Hong Kong Office was established in 1976. Major achievements of the Hong Kong Office include the Hong Kong Adelaide Grand Prix Promotion Activities held in 1994 and again this year. The 1994 Grand Prix Event including related trade exhibitions and business delegations from SA generated business to the value of $15 million for South Australia.

In March 1995, the Hong Kong Office supported a visit to South Australia by 12 companies to examine investment and trade opportunities in the food and beverage sectors. Every month there are large purchases of seafood, fruit, processed food and wine from South Australia by Hong Kong importers. In October, the Hong Kong Office facilitated seafood, fruit and other food exports to the combined value of $1 million.

The Indonesian Office was established in 1994. It has played a major part in the MEDSTEP Project to develop the quality of medical science, technology and health education in Indonesia. The SA Health Commission, EDA and Luminis Pty Ltd are participants in this 22 year program, which will generate exports of health related goods and services from SA.

The Shanghai Office in China was established in April 1995 and officially opened in August 1995. The Shanghai Office coordinated a successful trade mission comprising 22 business delegates from SA to Shanghai, Gansu Province, and Beijing in August. One outcome was the sale of computer software by an SA company to the value of $45 000.

Shanghai Office staff also participated in the Australia-China Forum '95 in Shanghai from 18-21 September 1995, attending the SA Investment Stand during the forum. This forum raised awareness of SA, attracted a number of Chinese business delegates interested in investment opportunities in SA, and received many trade inquiries for exports from SA into China.

The Jinan Office in China was established in September 1995 as part of a management agreement between the EDA and the Kinhill Group. Support of the Adelaide-based Kinhill Engineering Group for many large projects in China is one achievement. This office is expected to deliver strong economic development opportunities to SA businesses wishing to access China's rapidly expanding markets.

South Australia has had representation in the United Kingdom (Agent General) for over 100 years. The London Office with European responsibilities is administered by the Department for Premier and Cabinet, and provides services to the SA Government and businesses.

Since July 1995, around $15 million in business migration investment in SA has been generated due to the efforts of the London Office. This office is particularly important to the Defence, IT&T, Automotive and Food Sectors in SA.

CHINA OFFICES

44. **Ms GREIG:** How many Government offices/departments are there in China, how long have these offices/departments been established and how many staff operate these offices/departments?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There are two South Australian Government offices in China. They are located in Shanghai and Jinan.

The Shanghai office has been in operation since April 1995 and the official opening was in August 1995.

The Jinan office was established in September 1995 as part of a management agreement between the EDA and the Kinhill Group.

The Shanghai office is staffed by 3, including the Commercial Representative. All employees are local Chines people with language skills.

The Jinan office is staffed by Kinhill.

HAIRDRESSING PILOT PROGRAM

45. **Ms WHITE:**

1. Will the pilot hairdressing program which the Minister announced on 24 October would be put out to tender next year and would be 'open to bidding from private trainers' also be open to tendering from the public TAFE sector?
2. When will tenders for this hairdressing pilot program be called?
3. What is to be the tendering process?
4. What level(s) of hairdressing qualification will be involved in this pilot?
5. Will the private or public provider control selection of students for admission to the pilot program?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH:

1. In line with the Government's 'contracting out' guidelines, it is intended that the pilot hairdressing program will be open to both TAFE and private sector training providers.
2. Extensive developmental work involving legal, contractual, benchmark costing and audit requirements will necessitate the pilot commencing in the second semester. Given this time frame the commencement of a tender process should be determined in the first half of 1996.
3. The tendering process has yet to be fully developed but will involve a public call in the press inviting interested training providers to respond.
4. It is envisaged that the level of hairdressing qualification involved in the pilot will be limited to Apprenticeship Training i.e., Australian Standards Framework (ASF) level 3.
5. It is envisaged that the selection of students will be managed by the successful tenderer in response to employer preference for the provider of their choice. There will be a fixed number of trainee places associated with the pilot which has yet to be determined.

SCHOOL BUS

47. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. In which suburbs or neighbourhood areas in the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide are there Education Department school bus services operating?
2. Which such school bus services are in any part within 5 kms of a public transport route serviced by buses contracted and/or licensed and/or owned by the Minister for Transport?
3. Which schools located in the greater metropolitan area, have school bus services?
4. Which schools, located just outside the greater metropolitan area, are attended by students from within the metropolitan area and who travel to the school on school buses?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Department for Education and Children's Services provide school buses in the following greater metropolitan areas.

1. BUS ROUTE
From(suburb/area) to Destination
Kangarilla to Aberfoyle Pk
Cherry Gardens to Aberfoyle Pk
Sellicks Beach to Aldinga
Virginia to Gawler
Uraidla to Heathfield
Bridgewater to Heathfield
Scott Creek to Heathfield
Ashton to Norwood-Morialta
Aldgate to Oakbank
Summertown to Oakbank
outlining areas to One Tree Hill
Sheidow Pk to Seaview Downs
Aldinga to Willunga
McLaren Flat to Willunga
Moana to Willunga
Virginia to Elizabeth
Silversands to Willunga
Sellicks Beach to Willunga

2. All of these services with the exception of the bus serving the One Tree Hill area travel within five kilometres of a public transport service (viz Trans Adelaide train/bus/tram, PTB contract services). Department for Education and Children's Services school buses are dedicated services provided for eligible students who live five kilometres or more from their nearest Government school and are entitled to free assistance in terms of the school transport policy.

A statewide review of school bus routes is being undertaken to ensure that school bus services, including services in the metropolitan area, are operating in accordance with policy and in a cost efficient manner.

3. Schools in the greater metropolitan area served by Department for Education and Children's Services school buses are detailed as follows:

Aberfoyle Pk High School
Aldinga Primary School
Craigburn Primary School
Evanston Pk Primary School
Gawler High School
Gawler Primary School
Heathfield High School
Heathfield Primary School
Elizabeth City High School
Smithfield Plains High School
McLaren Flat Primary School
McLaren Vale Primary School
Norwood-Morialta High School
One Tree Hill Primary School
Seaview High School
Stradbroke Primary School
Willunga High School
Willunga Primary School

4. The Oakbank Area School is the only school located just outside the metropolitan area where students travel to school on Department for Education and Children's Services school buses which operate from inside the boundaries of the greater metropolitan area.

SA WATER

48. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. How many ratepayers to South Australian Water are there in each of hundreds of McGorrery, Kekwick, Allen, Billiatt, Kingsford, Peebinga, Cotton, Bews, Nildottie, Bakara, Mantung, Forster, Bandon, Chesson, Mindarie, Bowhill, Vincent, Wilson, McPherson, Auld, Hooper, Marmon, Jabuk, Molineux, Parilla, Pinnaroo, Price, Allenby, Quirke, Day and Fisk?

2. What is the total rate revenue derived from those ratepayers in each of those hundreds?

3. What quantity of potable water supplied by metered measure is used by the ratepayers in each of those hundreds?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:

1. Potable water is available to only four of these hundreds, namely McGorrery, Hooper and Mantung where rates are levied on a country lands basis and the hundred of Price in which the township of Geranium is located. The number of ratepayers in these hundreds based on the 1994-95 year were as follows:

McGorrery	3
Hooper	54
Mantung	50
Price (Geranium)	50

2. Total water rate revenue derived from these hundreds for the 1994-95 year was:

McGorrery	$ 5 726
Hooper	$51 793
Mantung	$37 894
Price (Geranium)	$12 762

3. The total water usage for these hundreds for the 1994-95 year was:

McGorrery	6 213 kilolitres (kL)
Hooper	57 840 kL
Mantung	41 031 kL
Price (Geranium)	13 115 kL.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

49. **Ms WHITE:**

1. Will the Minister ensure the appointment of a young person to the Premier's Youth Unemployment Taskforce?

2. Did the Minister suggest at the Annual General Meeting of the South Australian Youth Affairs Council on 22 November 1995 that he had put forward young peoples names but was over-ruled by the Premier?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH:

1. A young person, Ms Heidi Wilkinson aged 24, has been appointed to the Youth Employment Task Force. Heidi won the Farmer's Federation On Farm Trainee of the Year in 1991 and was a rural representative at the Queen's Trust Forum in Perth in June this year.

2. I addressed the Annual General Meeting of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia (YACSA) on 22 November 1995 on the topic of youth participation. At the end of my presentation the acting President of YACSA, Ms Jenny Davey, asked a question concerning YACSA's membership on the Youth Unemployment Taskforce established by the Premier. Part of my response included a statement that I had made recommendations to the Premier as to membership of the taskforce.

No comment was made by me that I had 'been overruled by the Premier'. Any suggestion of that kind is, incorrect, malicious and mischievous.

TAFE TRAINING HOURS

50. **Ms WHITE:** What are the figures from 1993 and 1994 which substantiate the Minister's repeated claim of an increase of one million TAFE 'training hours' in the first 12 months of the Minister coming to office?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The statistics used to conclude there has been a significant increase in TAFE 'training hours' were taken from the 1993, 1994 and 1995 (projected) total VET ANTA activity (ASCH) tables. The 1993 and 1994 hours have been audited and substantiated by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research and have been agreed to by ANTA. The VET Sector total ANTA hours increased by 1.85 million for the 1994 academic year (the first 12 months in office) and are projected to increase by 0.95 million for this 1995 academic year.